

Captafol/*o*-Nitrotoluene Expert Panel Report

Part B – Recommendation for listing status for Captafol in the RoC and Scientific Justification for the Recommendation

The Report on Carcinogens (RoC) expert panel for Captafol/*ortho*-Nitrotoluene met at the Sheraton Chapel Hill Hotel on October 15 & 16 2007, to peer review the draft background document on captafol and make a recommendation for its listing status in the 12th Edition of the RoC. Members of the expert panel are as follows:

Lauren Zeise, Ph.D. (Chair)
California Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Environmental Health Hazard
Assessment

Michael Elwell, D.V.M., Ph.D.
Covance Laboratories, Inc.
Department of Pathology

Penelope A. Fenner-Crisp, Ph.D., D.A.B.T.
Independent Consultant
(Retired from the International Life Science
Institute and the U.S. Environmental
Protection Agency)

Gregory L. Kedderis, Ph.D.
Independent Consultant

Steven Markowitz, M.D.
Queens College, City University of New York
Center for the Biology of Natural Systems

Robert C. Millikan, D.V.M., Ph.D.
University of North Carolina,
School of Public Health,
Department of Epidemiology

Shane S. Que Hee, Ph.D.
University of California, Los Angeles
School of Public Health, Department of
Environmental Health Sciences

Thomas J. Slaga, Ph.D.
University of Texas Health Science Center
Department of Pharmacology

Alexander W. Teass, Ph.D.
(Retired from the National Institute of
Occupational Safety & Health)

The recommendation follows this page.

Part B - Recommendation for Listing Status of Captafol in the RoC and Scientific Justification for the Recommendation

Overall Evaluation

Following a discussion of the body of knowledge, including the strengths and weaknesses for each section of the background document, the expert panel applied the RoC listing criteria and made a recommendation for the listing status of captafol in the RoC. The expert panel recommended by a vote of 8 yes/0 no that captafol should be listed in the RoC as *reasonably anticipated to be a human carcinogen* based on sufficient evidence of carcinogenicity in experimental animals and strong supporting mechanistic evidence. The expert panel also voted (8 yes/0 no) that there is evidence that a significant number of people in the United States are or have been exposed to captafol. The potential long latency period of cancer makes past exposures of concern for current and future risks.

The major considerations discussed that led to this recommendation include:

Human Exposure

Past captafol exposures in the United States associated with its manufacture, formulation, application, and field reentry are still of concern. The U.S. population has probably been exposed in the past to low concentrations of captafol from environmental (air, water, soil) and food sources, judging from the low environmental concentrations reported in the NTP document in countries where use still occurred in the recent past. Exposure to the U.S. population may still occur from imported food and products from countries that continue to use captafol. Individuals including research and technical personnel may currently be exposed to captafol in spite of the cessation of use in agriculture and the 2006 revocation of the remaining tolerances.

Human Cancer Studies

The available epidemiologic evidence is insufficient to establish carcinogenicity of captafol in humans. There is only one epidemiologic study that directly addressed captafol exposure. This study was based upon ecologic (group-level) exposure assessment and had several potential sources of bias and did not account for multiple comparisons (18 pesticides were studied). Studies of captan or mixtures of fungicides (e.g., phthalimides) are of limited value in addressing carcinogenicity of captafol. This limited scientific database has the following significant shortcomings: (1) most of the studies addressed only a single cancer site; (2) none addressed the specific cancer sites implicated in laboratory animal studies (kidney, liver, small intestine, heart, etc.), (3) none addressed exposure from food or food products, environmental contamination, or directly evaluated occupational exposure; (3) none addressed genetic susceptibility relevant to the proposed mechanisms of action (e.g., inherited variation in DNA repair as

