

HESI pilot project: Testing a qualitative approach for incorporating exposure into alternatives assessment

Greggs, Bill; Arnold, Scott; Burns, Thomas J. ; Egeghy, Peter; Fantke, Peter; Gaborek, Bonnie; Heine, Lauren; Jolliet, Olivier; Muir, Derek; Rinkevich, Joseph; Sunge, Neha; Tanir, Jennifer Young

Publication date:
2016

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):

Greggs, B., Arnold, S., Burns, T. J., Egeghy, P., Fantke, P., Gaborek, B., ... Tanir, J. Y. (2016). HESI pilot project: Testing a qualitative approach for incorporating exposure into alternatives assessment. Abstract from 20th Annual Green Chemistry & Engineering Conference, Portland, Oregon, United States.

DTU Library

Technical Information Center of Denmark

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

SUBMISSION ROLE: 20th Annual Green Chemistry & Engineering Conference

CONTROL ID: 2488333

ABSTRACT SYMPOSIUM NAME: Alternatives Assessment and De Novo Design-Oral

AUTHORS (FIRST NAME, LAST NAME): Bill Greggs², Scott Arnold⁵, Thomas J. Burns⁶, Peter Egeghy⁷, Peter Fantke⁸, Bonnie Gaborek⁹, Lauren Heine³, Olivier Jolliet¹⁰, Derek Muir¹¹, Joseph Rinkevich⁴, Neha Sunger¹², Jennifer Young Tanir¹

INSTITUTIONS (ALL):

1. Health and Environmental Sciences Institute, Washington, DC, United States.
2. Soleil Consulting, LLC, Sanibel, FL, United States.
3. Northwest Green Chemistry, Juneau, AK, United States.
4. Scivera LLC, Charlottesville, VA, United States.
5. The Dow Chemical Company, Midland, MI, United States.
6. Novozymes, Raleigh, NC, United States.
7. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Raleigh, NC, United States.
8. Technical University of Denmark, Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark.
9. DuPont, Newark, DE, United States.
10. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, United States.
11. Environment Canada, Burlington, ON, Canada.
12. West Chester University, West Chester, PA, United States.

TITLE: HESI pilot project: Testing a qualitative approach for incorporating exposure into alternatives assessment

ABSTRACT BODY:

Abstract: Most alternatives assessments (AA) published to date are largely hazard-based rankings, and as such may not serve to determine a practical and functional replacement. With an assessment goal of identifying an alternative chemical that is more sustainable, other attributes beyond hazard are also important, including exposure, risk, life-cycle thinking, performance, cost, and social responsibility. Building on the 2014 recommendations by the US National Academy of Sciences to improve AA decisions by including comparative exposure assessment, the HESI Sustainable Chemical Alternatives Technical Committee, which consists of scientists from academia, industry, government, and NGOs, has developed a qualitative comparative exposure approach. Conducting such a comparison can screen for alternatives that are expected to have a higher exposure potential, which could trigger a higher-tiered, more-quantitative exposure assessment on the alternatives being considered.

This talk will demonstrate an approach for including chemical and product exposure information in a qualitative AA comparison. Starting from existing hazard AAs, a series of four exposure examples were examined to test the concept, to understand the effort required, and to determine the value of exposure data in AA decision-making. The group has developed ingredient and product parameter categorization to support comparisons between chemicals and methodology to address data quality. The ingredient parameters include a range of physicochemical properties that can impact exposure, while the product parameters include aspects such as exposure pathway, use pattern, frequency/duration of use, concentration in product and use volume, accessibility, and disposal. Key learnings, challenges, and opportunities for further work will also be presented.

(No Image Selected)

(no table selected)