
Item ID Number 01560

Author

Corporate Author

Report/Article Title Summary of Agent Orange Data Released by Interagency Group

Journal/Book Title Pesticide and Toxic Chemical News

Year 1981

Month/Day February 11

Color

Number of Images 2

Description Notes

And, for Penncap-M and Penncap-E, by April 23, 1981, the registrant is to "submit an acceptable methodology for determination of the nylon-type encapsulating polymer in environmental substrates, particularly pollen and honey."

The conditions were presented in a letter to the registrant from Jay S. Ellenberger, Product Manager, Insecticide-Rodenticide Branch, Registration Division, OPP, EPA. The letter stated that "substitution of ethyl parathion data to support registration of the methyl analog or vice versa is not acceptable."

The following label warning is required for Penncap-M: "Do not apply within 7 days prior to bloom or while bloom is present in the treatment area."

The conditions for the Penncap E registration on sorghum allowed 18 months from registration for filing of results of numerous tests similar to those for Penncap-M, including:

- A honey bee acute contact LD₅₀ study; a number of avian toxicity studies similar to those for Penncap-M.
- A test to measure toxicity of Penncap-E residues on foliage to honey bees.

Penncap E is classified for restricted use.

SUMMARY OF AGENT ORANGE DATA RELEASED BY INTERAGENCY GROUP

A comprehensive summary of available information on Agent Orange and its possible effects on Vietnam veterans has been released by the Interagency Work Group to Study the Possible Long-term Health Effects of Phenoxy Herbicides and Contaminants in the form of a summary report of the Work Group's Sept. 22 public meeting.

(Copies of the report are available from the Interagency Work Group, Room 716E, Hubert H. Humphrey Bldg., 200 Independence Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20201.)

The report includes texts of statements by Joan Z. Bernstein, Work Chair and then General Counsel of the Department of Health and Human Services, and Dr. John A. Moore, Chair of the group's Scientific Panel; summaries of statements by a dozen public participants; some 25 questions posed in writing and orally to the Work Group, with the answers given; and additional supporting information.

In the Q&A there was a lengthy discussion of the credibility problems the Air Force faces in its epidemiological study of the Ranch Hands, or those who sprayed Agent Orange in Vietnam. The Work Group recommended that the Air Force conduct the study, with monitoring by an independent peer review committee.

Bernstein said she "came to believe that the credibility issue was less an issue of formal conflict of interest than it was an issue of general perception of lack of credibility." She added: "In straightforward lay language, people said nobody will believe the study if the Air Force does it."

She said the continuing peer review "was just one way in which to add some reassurance to those who continued to have a perception of lack of credibility. I did not feel that lack of credibility. But I thought it was a wise judgment to take that last step to insure continuing credibility."

Major General William Augerson, of the Air Force Surgeon General's office, added:

"I must say I was surprised by this idea of linking the way in which medical people in the Air Force might somehow affect the outcome of the Ranch Hand study because of some perception of the interest, or the lack of it, of the Air Force in chemical warfare.

"I guess it is a form of left-handed compliment that assumes that somehow we are well enough coordinated...that medical people thumping chests and examining people would somehow be susceptible to influence from some of the more weapons-oriented people. I assure you that is not the case."

Dr. Michael Gough of the Office of Technology Assessment said he didn't think "any agency of the government, or the government as a whole, will establish credibility if, every time a delicate and sensitive subject comes along, the government farms it out to an independent agency."

Dr. David Logan of the Department of Labor's OSHA said he and others on the scientific panel were "impressed" with the "sophistication and obvious level of expertise put into the development of the protocol" for the Ranch Hand study by the Air Force. This "led to a feeling that the Air Force was going to be very responsible in the conduct" of the study, he said.

Statements from veterans organizations split on the issue of whether there should be a separate study by the Veterans Administration of the health status of Vietnam veterans, in addition to the congressionally-mandated study of the health effects of Agent Orange on them.

Lewis Milford of the National Veterans Law Center said the Work Group recommendation "is premature and should not be implemented until the Work Group independently evaluates DOD efforts to identify populations of ground troops" exposed to Agent Orange.

John Sommer of the American Legion supported the additional study "but only with the assurance that scientific studies on the long range health effects of Agent Orange not consequently be de-emphasized."

Frank McCarthy, Agent Orange Victims International, however, called for a "full-blown retrospective and prospective epidemiological study of all 2.4 million veterans (as) the true answer in terms of a study."



EPA IMPOSES FREEZE ON EFFORTS OF ITS OFFICE OF PUBLIC AWARENESS

EPA's acting managers have put a freeze on all publications or pamphlets and most press releases from the agency's Office of Public Awareness (OPA), according to an