UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

APR 21 2009

THE ADMINISTRATOR

Dr. Deborah L. Swackhamer
Chair, Science Advisory Board
Dr. Deborah Cory-Slechta
Chair, Acrylamide Review Panel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Dear Drs. Swackhamer and Cory-Slechta:

Thank you for your December 19, 2008, report on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's draft assessment titled "Toxicological Review of Acrylamide" (December 2007). The Agency appreciates the Acrylamide Review Panel's efforts in conducting an independent expert peer review of this draft toxicological review, which represents a significant investment of time, effort, and thought on the part of the Agency.

It is gratifying that the expert panel agreed with the Agency's fundamental conclusions and methods regarding the hazard characterization and quantitation of the dose-response for acrylamide. Specifically, the expert panel agreed with the Agency's selection of the most sensitive non-cancer health endpoint, the appropriate use of a physiologically based toxicokinetic model in the derivation of the reference values, the overall methods used to derive values for acrylamide's non-cancer endpoints (i.e. an oral reference dose and an inhalation reference concentration), and acrylamide's potential carcinogenic effects (i.e. an oral slope factor and an inhalation unit risk).

The Panel's report also provided a number of recommendations that will improve the transparency of the underlying arguments and the scientific support for the conclusions reached in the assessment. Examples of the recommendations included further discussion of: 1) the neurotoxicity mode of action and the data needs for more functional endpoints; 2) the importance of potential heritable germ cell and other reproductive effects and the need for more low-dose data; 3) the carcinogenic mode of action and the underlying rationale for the quantitation of cancer risks; and 4) the Physiologically Based Pharmacokinetic model parameter values, including an update of those values based on more recent data. The Agency is working expeditiously to respond to these SAB recommendations and to further improve the assessment.

Again, thank you for the many thoughtful and incisive comments and suggestions that the Panel has provided.

Sincerely,

Lisa P. Jackson