RAFG, STUDY SHEET

THREE OBJECTIVES (P.2)	RISK MANAGEMENT (P.3)	ROOTS OF THE CONTROVERSY (P.1)
RISK ASSESSMENT (P.3)	INFERENCE GUIDELINE (P.4)	FOUR FEDERAL AGENCIES (P.5)
FOUR STEPS (P.3)	INFERENCE OPTIONS (P.4)	CLEAR CONCEPTUAL DISTINCTION (P.7)
1970S (P.9)	NO-EFFECT DOSE (P.10)	UNIFORM INFERENCE GUIDELINES (P.7)
LARGE FRACTION (P.9)	7,000/5,000,000 (P.11)	DOMINANT ANALYTIC DIFFICULTY (P.11)
ADVERSE EFFECTS (P.13)	ECONOMIC COSTS (P.13)	CONCLUSIVE DIRECT EVIDENCE (P.11)
CANCER (P.17)	UNIFORM GUIDELINES (P.17)	ORGANIZATIONAL SEPARATION (P.17)
RISK ASSESSMENT (P.18)	PERCEIVED RISKS (P.18)	MUTAGENS, CARCINOGENS (P.22)
RISK MANAGEMENT (P.18)	FOUR MAJOR STEPS (P.19)	ADMINISTERED DOSE (P.24)
EXTRAPOLATIONS (P.23)	ANIMAL BIOASSAYS (P.22)	EXPOSURE DATA (P.27)
HIGH DOSES (P.23)	STRUCTURAL CLASSES (P.23)	AMBIENT (P.27)
24,000 (P.24)	SUPRALINEAR MODEL (P.25)	EMISSION RATES (P.27)
1 IN 100,000 (P.24)	EPIGENETIC MECHANISMS (P.25)	SYNERGISTIC EFFECTS (P.28)
GENOTOXIC (P.25)	SUPRALINEAR (P.26)	HAZARD IDENTIFICATION (P.29)
LINEAR (P.26)	2 UNCERTAINTIES (P.28)	METHOD. VALUE JUDGMENTS (P.29)
THRESHOLD (P.26)	EPIDEMIOLOGIC DATA (P.29)	ANIMAL-BIOASSAY DATA (P.29)
POLICY (P.33)	STATISTICAL POWER (P.29)	SHORT-TERM TEST DATA (P.30)
INFERENCE OPTIONS (P.33)	EPIDEMIOLOGIC DATA (P.31)	STRUCT. SIMILAR. TO CARCINOGENS (P.30)
BENIGN TUMORS (P.34)	ANIMAL-BIOASSAY DATA (P.31)	DOSE-RESPONSE ASSESSMENT (P.31)
LITTLE GUIDANCE (P.36)	EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT (P.32)	RISK CHARACTERIZATION (P.33)
DEVOID OF POLICY (P.36)	LESS CONSERVATIVE (P.34)	NEGATIVE ANIMAL DATA (P.34)
VALUE DECISION (P.37)	REGULATORY OPTIONS (P.39)	INFORMED SCIENTIFIC JUDGMENT (P.36)
COMPONENTS (P.38)	WORST-CASE (P.40)	RISK ASSESSMENT POLICY (P.38)
OSHA (P.41)	FIVE STATUTES (P.41)	BALANCE REG. COSTS & BENEFITS (P.42)
CONTROVERSY (P.48)	DELANEY CLAUSE (P.43)	TECH.-BASED EXPOSURE CONTROLS (P.43)
TWO KINDS (P.49)	INTRUSIONS (P.49)	JUDG., WHEN INFO. INCOMPLETE (P.48)
FALLOUT (P.54)	INFERENCE GUIDELINE (P.51)	MOST IMPORTANT FEATURE (P.51)
RISK SIDE (P.55)	ACCEPTABLE LIMITS (P.53)	DRAWING INFERENCES (P.53)
NO DRUG (P.56)	IONIZING RADIATION (P.54)	FDA'S SENSI.-OF-METHOD GUIDE. (P.57)
FIRST AGENCY (P.58)	GENERIC APPROACH (P.59)	REAGAN ADMINISTRATION (P.61)
ALMOST ALL (P.63)	SIX SELECTED OPTIONS (P.62)	ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST (P.68)
CONSISTENCY (P.70)	DEFAULT OPTION (P.65)	ADVANTAGES OF GUIDELINE USE (P.69)
PRIVATE SECTOR (P.71)	INFORMED JUDGMENT (P.69)	INDUSTRY REPRESENTATIVES (P.71)
COOKBOOK (P.74)	POSITIVE RESULTS (P.75)	PROPONENTS OF GUIDELINES (P.72)
ALWAYS POLICY (P.76)	WEIGHT OF EVIDENCE (P.75)	DISADVANTAGES OF GUIDELINE USE (P.74)
DEVOID OF POLICY (P.77)	CONSERVATIVE METHODS (P.76)	BEST SCIENTIFIC ESTIMATE (P.76)
FREEZING (P.78)	OPTIONS EVIDENT (P.79)	UNSUCCESSFUL UNLESS (P.81)
INTEGRATION (P.89)	INDEPENDENT PANELS (P.91)	INTRA-AGENCY SEPARATION (P.90)
DISCOVERIES (P.94)	LABOR UNIONS (P.94)	EXTRA-AGENCY SEPARATION (P.90)
OSHA (P.109)	LESS THOROUGH (P.98)	REASONABLE CERTAINTY (P.101)
NIOSH (P.109)	SCIENCE COURT (P.133)	NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (P.114)
SAP (P.126)	INDEPENDENT REVIEW (P.138)	POOR PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING (P.131)
BIAS (P.131)	SEPARATE & CENTRALIZE (P.139)	POOR-QUALITY PERSONNEL (P.132)
EXAGGERATION (P.131)	BEFORE ANNOUNCEMENT (P.146)	COMPOSED OF SCIENTISTS (P.145)
BEFORE ACTION (P.156)	CLEARLY DISTINGUISH (P.153)	CONCEPTUAL DISTINCTION (P.151)
DISQUALIFIED (P.157)	BOARD (P.171)	GOVERNMENT SCIENTISTS (P.160)
CANCER (P.169)		UNIFORM INFERENCE GUIDELINES (P.162)