

RISK: Health, Safety & Environment (1990-2002)

Volume 11 | Number 2

Article 2

March 2000

Table of Contents Volume 11, Number Two, Spring 2000

RISK Editorial Board

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.unh.edu/risk>



Part of the [Law Commons](#), [Life Sciences Commons](#), [Physical Sciences and Mathematics Commons](#), and the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Risk Editorial Board, *Table of Contents Volume 11, Number Two, Spring 2000*, 11 RISK [vii] (2000).

This Prefatory Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the University of New Hampshire – Franklin Pierce School of Law at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in RISK: Health, Safety & Environment (1990-2002) by an authorized editor of University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. For more information, please contact ellen.phillips@law.unh.edu.

RISK

Health, Safety & Environment

Volume 11 2000 Number 2

Articles

Warwick Gullet, *The Precautionary Principle in Australia: Policy, Law & Potential Precautionary EIAs*

Dr. Gullet argues that environmental impact assessments are a logical vehicle for factoring the precautionary principle into large-project-approval processes. 93

Elizabeth Atherton, *From Discounting to Incorporating Decisions' Long-Term Impacts*

Ms. Atherton urges a different approach to valuing the impact of present day decisions on future generations. 125

George William Sherk, *Tricresyl Phosphate Neurotoxicity Potential*

Mr. Sherk discusses the potential effects of ongoing human exposure to ordinary doses of neurotoxicants. 151

Arash Behravesh & Wilbur A. Spaul, *Comparing the EPA Indoor Air Quality Personal Computer Model and Field Data*

The authors recommend caution in using an EPA model for reconstructing past exposure events as well as for predicting future exposures. 165

Kevin C. Elliott, *A Case for Caution: An Evaluation of Calabrese and Baldwin's Studies of Chemical Hormesis*

Suggesting a need for more research, Mr. Elliott argues that it is too soon for risk-assessment policy to account for recent challenges to a toxicological linear dose-response assumption 177

Correction

We are sorry that James Flynn & Paul Slovic, *Expert and Public Evaluations of Technological Risks: Searching for Common Ground*, 10 Risk 333 (1999) contained several errors. For example, in Figure 5, at 342, “tree sare” and “relaying” in the next-to-last item should have read, respectively, “trees are” and “relying.”

Also, Table 1, at 348 would have benefitted from a reference to QA and QB, as defined earlier at 346, and the title of Figure 10, at 352, should have read: “*Differences in Perceived Health Risks... by Gender.*”

One paragraph was inadvertently omitted:

Figure 8 shows 22 conditions, activities, or procedures that might be used in programs of forest vegetation management. The forestry professionals were more supportive than the public for nearly all the practices listed. The greatest differences were on items the public found most unacceptable. The gap with the public was greatest for the industry foresters, followed by the government foresters, and then the biologists. Government and industry foresters differed from the public on 20 and 17 of the 22 items, respectively. Biologists differed with the public on 12 items. Forestry professionals tended to express less concern than the public about environmental problems and protection of other species. They were more trusting of science and government. They thought there was less risk to forestry activities and practices than did the public. Industry foresters tended to differ most from the public, followed by government foresters and then government biologists.

Of statistical consequence, the first full sentence at 353 should have read: “Notice that non-white males and females are not significantly different in their risk evaluations, and they are quite similar to white females.”

Finally, Figures 1-9 and 12 as originally submitted contained generally vertical lines connecting data points corresponding to each of the several groups compared therein. However, believing, e.g., that distinct symbols are alone adequate, Professor Field omitted them.