

Participants: Shaun Clancy, Rick Canady, Carolyn Cairns, Treye Thomas, Steve Froggett, Janet Carter, Andy Atkinson, Yasir Sultan, Bill Kojola, Darrell Boverhof, Jo Anne Shatkin, Cathy Fehrenbacher

Updates: none

Agenda:

1. Decide the top 2 materials

- Before to this meeting, the group had gone through a ranking exercise that helped SC members think through priorities. Input from each of the SC members were summed and used to generate a “heat map”. Preliminary analysis of the group’s input, suggested material ranking resulted in two top tiers containing 4 materials each, with a large third tier comprised of all the other nanomaterials considered. Although the analysis was performed to help the SC visualize the input from others in the group, the ranking was not firm and members were encouraged to make a case for moving materials higher, or lower, among the tiers.
- Based on the previous input of the SC members, the top tier comprised: MWCNT, n-Ag, n-silica & n-TiO₂, and the second tier included: n-Cu, SWCNT, n-clay and nanocrystalline cellulose
- Applications using NMs in the auto industry (stain resistant flooring, sealants, composites with enhanced strength, adhesives, advanced display technologies, fabrics, batteries with n-Phosphate paste used to coat lithium ion cells) were placed in a category together without identifying the specific NM used. The group discussed adding these applications to specific NMs as appropriate.
- The group considered at length the ‘weight’ of the top two tiers – was either tier more heavily weighted toward any of the decision criteria – for example; uses in commerce vs. potential and magnitude of release? It was general believed that both tiers were balanced among the various criteria.
- The group also discussed the possibility that a NM(s) may have been over-weighted by a single factor. During that discussion, n-clays and carbon black were discussed as examples of NMs used in large volumes, and thus should perhaps be raised to a higher tier.
- In addition to the NM, the group generally agreed that methodology used to detect these NMs should be another factor considered. For example, CNTs are difficult to study/measure, while metals are less so. Selecting NMs more amenable to measurement may help ensure a successful project outcome, especially in the first run through.
- Another criterion the group discussed and generally considered important was the ability to find generalize-able methods in addition to finding novel information. **The SC agreed the project should not endeavor to repackage data that is available.**
- While keeping the points raised during the discussion in mind, the group returned to consideration of the NM tiers and discussed if any re-ranking was necessary.

- Once the group agreed that tier one NMs are good to move forward with, discussion turned to the upcoming workshop. Did the SC want to go to the workshop with all four NM or with fewer?
- The group agreed that it would be most effective to select two NMs to explore more fully at the workshop; one NM that was likely to be successfully studied and another that may be more difficult – but could highlight the problems with measuring release.
- The group agreed to leave open the option to pull in a different NM as the sub-groups looking into scenarios and methods learns more about the two selected NMs. The two NMs not selected for the initial focus would be kept on the table, and prepped for the second round (or separate ‘track’) of method development.
- The general agreement among the group was to move forward with selecting the top two, by voting via email. This would allow additional time to consider and discuss with colleagues before making a selection. In addition to the vote, each person could indicate which sub-group they would like to be involved with: (choosing scenarios & methods, or develop a list of experts to invite to the workshop).
- As this effort moves forward, the group agreed to encourage partnering with other efforts interested in working on one of the NMs, considered by the NanoRelease SC (even if it isn’t one of the two NMs selected initially).

2. Close on location and date for the SC workshop

- EPA has an available conference center, but it only holds 44 people.
- ACC also have facilities and may be another option.

Next Steps:

1. Provide a summary of the conversation of NM ranking.
2. Send out an email for each member of the SC to vote on the top two NMs.