

Questions and Comments Submitted from Webcast Participants

(1)	Could you comment on the EU REACH program and its precautionary approach to control toxic exposures in the environment?
(2)	In order to change industrial and agricultural uses of chemicals to the degree that chemicals are used in safe and healthy ways for all peoples it will be necessary to bring about a vast change in the way that government regulates these two sectors of the economy. How can the regulators be separated sufficiently from the polluters so that great reductions in pollutant releases to the environment can be accomplished in a relatively short period of time?
(3)	Are there plans to partner with OSHA to evaluate chemical exposures in the workplace?
(4)	Given the last decade of research and evidence showing how total environmental conditions influence and in fact alter effects of exposures to especially toxic products. Example: use of sunscreens and increased insecticide skin absorbance rates, does it make sense to continue to have and promote singular permissible exposure limits in the work place which can lead to a false sense of maintaining safe work environments?
(5)	How can viewers participate in future national conversation working groups?
(6)	The National Conversation on Public Health and Chemical Exposures will succeed to the extent that Americans are strong enough to force industry and agriculture to use chemicals in a safe way. That much strength will only come from individual spiritual growth. How can the spirituality of Americans be nurtured by the process entailed in the National Conversation?
(7)	Please discuss how new 'safe chemical management' legislation can proceed with open discussion and debate to others than consultants/staffers to incorporate lessons learned and avoiding the mistakes of the past.
(8)	Taxing industry to allow pollution is not acceptable; forcing the cessation of pollution is the right solution.