MADRID
inter.noise 2019
June 16 - 19
NOISE CONTROL FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT

National Occupational Research Agenda for Hearing Loss Prevention

William J. Murphy[1]
NIOSH Division Applied Research Technology
1090 Tusculum Ave, MS C-27
Cincinnati OH 45226-1998

Amanda S. Azman[2]
NIOSH Pittsburgh Mining Research Division,
66 Cochrans Mill Rd.
Pittsburgh, PA 15236

Elizabeth A. Masterson[3]
NIOSH Division of Surveillance, Hazard Evaluations and Field Studies,
5555 Ridge Ave, MS R-17
Cincinnati OH 45226

Lauraine L. Wells[4]
3M Company, Personal Safety Division
St. Paul, MN 80537

ABSTRACT

The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) has a mandate to conduct research on occupational safety and health. The research portfolio is organized by industrial sectors and cross-sectors for illnesses and injuries that are found in all sectors. The Hearing Loss Prevention research cross sector council is comprised of representatives from government, labor organizations, academia, and industry representatives. The HLP council held several meetings throughout 2018 to determine research needs for occupational hearing loss prevention in the United States. The following five objectives were determined. 1. Provide input for policies and guidelines that will inform best practices for hearing loss prevention efforts. 2. Develop effective, evidence-based education designed to improve hearing conservation program outcomes for exposed workers and management. 3. Develop, commercialize, and widely implement noise control solutions on jobsites in key industries. 4. Develop audiological tests for hearing loss prevention. 5. Improve occupational hearing loss surveillance. These topic areas will be discussed in detail to help motivate other researchers to join us in furthering our knowledge to prevent occupational hearing loss.

Keywords: hearing loss prevention, National Occupational Research Agenda, evidence-based programs, noise control engineering, occupational hearing loss surveillance, hazardous noise, best practices, ototoxicants
I-INCE Classification of Subject Number: 60

1. NATIONAL OCCUPATIONAL RESEARCH AGENDA

The National Occupational Research Agenda (NORA) is a partnership program to stimulate innovative research and workplace interventions. In combination with other initiatives, the products of this program are expected to reduce the occurrence of injuries and illnesses at work. Unveiled in 1996, NORA has become a research framework for the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) and the United States. Diverse parties collaborate to identify the most critical issues in workplace safety and health and develop research objectives for addressing those needs.

NORA entered its third decade in 2016 with an enhanced structure. The ten sectors formed for the second decade continue to prioritize occupational safety and health research by major areas of the United States (U.S.) economy. In addition, there are seven cross-sectors organized according to the major health and safety issues affecting the U.S. working population. While NIOSH is serving as the steward to move this effort forward, it is truly a national effort. NORA is carried out through multi-stakeholder councils, which are developing and implementing research agendas for the occupational safety and health community over the decade of 2016 to 2026. These councils address objectives through information exchange, partnership building, and enhanced dissemination and implementation of evidenced-based solutions.

NORA groups occupational health and safety issues into seven cross-sectors. The Hearing Loss Prevention Cross-Sector focuses on reducing occupational hearing loss through research on controlling hazardous noise and ensuring hearing protectors are as effective as possible where dangerous noise exposures have not yet been controlled or eliminated. Hearing loss prevention researchers seek to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Provide input for policies and guidelines that will inform best practices for hearing loss prevention efforts.
2. Develop effective, evidence-based education designed to improve hearing conservation program outcomes for exposed workers and management.
3. Develop, commercialize, and widely implement noise control solutions on jobsites in key industries.
4. Develop audiological tests for hearing loss prevention.
5. Improve occupational hearing loss surveillance.

2. HEARING LOSS PREVENTION CROSS SECTOR COUNCIL

The hearing loss prevention target audience is diverse, because this council addresses the needs of many populations and worker groups. Population groups can include persons of different ethnicity, gender, age, education, and socio-economic status. Hearing loss prevalence also varies according to industry and occupation [1, 2, 3]. Consequently, the hearing loss prevention target audience includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the following:

- Occupational safety and health professionals, audiologists, hearing conservationists, occupational physicians, occupational nurses, industrial hygienists, and safety officers;

- Researchers from a wide range of specialties in audiology, industrial hygiene, engineering noise control, epidemiology, and basic and applied science;
- Workers in all occupational sectors;
- Management and employers in all occupational sectors;
- Labor organizations and unions concerned with the hearing health of their workers;
- Academic and professional organizations interested in hearing loss prevention, engineering noise control, and improvement of the hearing health of workers;
- National and international consensus standards-setting organizations;
- Health-related agencies in the federal, state, and local levels of the U.S. government; and
- Health-related agencies in non-U.S. governments concerned with occupational hearing loss.

3. ELEMENTS OF THE NATIONAL OCCUPATIONAL RESEARCH AGENDA FOR HEARING LOSS PREVENTION

The complete NORA Agenda for Hearing Loss Prevention has been made available for public comment starting February 8 until April 8 2019 on the US government website, https://www.regulations.gov/docket?D=CDC-2019-0001.[4] The docket number is CDC-2019-0001 and contains the Agenda and comments from the public.

This section will summarize each of the five Agenda objectives identified in section 1. A list will be given at the beginning of the subsection and a brief overview of the research needs in the area will follow. Given the limitations of a proceedings paper, we encourage the reader to download the Agenda to gain a more complete understanding of the reasons for inclusion.

3.1. Provide input for policies and guidelines that will inform best practices for hearing loss prevention efforts

1. Assess exposure limits for mixtures of noise and other ototoxicants.
2. Promote fit testing in industrial hearing loss prevention programs.
3. Use applicable age correction for audiometric data.
4. Establish damage risk criteria for various noise exposures.
5. Develop business cases that demonstrate economic benefit for hearing loss prevention programs.
6. Develop standards for personal exposure monitoring with in-ear dosimetry.
7. Develop better technologies for hearing loss prevention.

For those working in the field of hearing loss prevention, the primary causative factor for hearing loss is noise exposure. The effects of noise have been studied for decades and U.S. regulations have been in place for more than 50 years. Research needs to be informative about how best to implement hearing loss prevention programs and should give clear guidance to regulatory bodies about how to establish policies that are feasible. The economic bottom line is increasingly more important in gaining support for hearing loss prevention in the corporate world. NIOSH, the National Hearing Conservation Association, and the Council for Accreditation in Occupational Hearing Conservation sponsor the Safe-in-Sound Excellence in Hearing Loss Prevention Award highlighting success stories from employers and of individuals who have been innovative and

effective in the practice of protecting noise-exposed workers. . More examples are needed to show that reducing noise not only reduces instances of hearing loss among workers, but also reduces employer liability and expenses.

Ototoxicants such as organic solvents, heavy metals or pharmacologic substances when combined with noise exposures present a greater risk to the auditory system than noise or the ototoxicant in isolation. In some cases, the ototoxicant poisons the sensory cells, while in other cases they may affect the myelinization of the nerves. Johnson and Morata [5] published an excellent report that details a number of chemical ototoxicants that should be considered. As these compounds are investigated, better estimates of safe exposure limits may be generated.

Hearing protector fit testing has seen an increased popularity as manufacturers are developing new and innovative methods. The purpose is to determine if the hearing protector is suitable for an individual's particular exposure. Although the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) does not require fit testing, they have issued a letter of interpretation that describes its appropriate use in a hearing conservation program.[6] HPD fit test systems have the potential to be incorporated into the annual audiometric monitoring program. Teaching a worker the proper fitting procedure and selecting the hearing protector that allows the worker to obtain sufficient attenuation are critical to solving the issue of poor HPD use.

The age-correction values that were proposed by NIOSH in its 1973 criteria document are obsolete and need to be updated. These corrections often yield over corrections for persons that have little or no hearing loss as they age. Deiters et al. have recently developed age-correction tables from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) [7]. These tables were recently validated, but more work is needed to implement these data as a part of regulations.

Noise exposures to complex combinations of continuous, intermittent and impulsive noise yield different risks of hearing loss. Research is needed to understand how to assess these complex noise exposures, and exposures to high-level impulse noises from firearms or explosions.

Currently U.S. dosimetry is performed using an outdated standard that requires a microphone mounted on the shoulder. The advent of miniature microphones and high quality data acquisition that can fit within the ear has led to in-ear dosimetry. Davis et al. demonstrated the improvement in the assessment of in-ear dosimetry compared to a microphone sampling from just outside the ear [8]. A new standard needs to be developed that will allow for accurate measurements from within the ear canal or underneath a hearing protector.

Finally, better technologies for hearing loss prevention can revolutionize the practice. Technologies that match a worker to a noise exposure are going to help reduce the uncertainty of exposures. Mobile devices with accurate sound measurement tools allow noise mapping to be integrated with exposure monitoring. The future has many possibilities.

3.2. Develop effective, evidence-based education designed to improve hearing conservation program outcomes for exposed workers and management.

1. Recognize noise exposure hazards.
2. Study interaction of medical conditions and/or pharmaceuticals with noise exposures.
3. Assess communication and work performance in noise (application of electronic solutions, localization, and speech intelligibility).
4. Focus on research-to-practice efforts for tinnitus.
5. Improve and promote hearing protector fit testing.
6. Adapt training to various worker groups.

An educated workforce should be an informed workforce. In some industries, the inertia of long-established habits prevent good industrial hygiene practices from taking hold. Some worker populations expect that hearing loss is a natural outcome of their trade.

Greater awareness of noise hazards both in the workplace and outside of work is needed. Of particular concern, is the risk of permanent hearing loss and tinnitus due to use of recreational firearm. For unprotected ears, a single shot can produce sudden onset of tinnitus and perhaps temporary threshold shift (TTS). While this would seemingly be a harbinger of permanent damage to the ear, if the TTS recovers within a few minutes, hours, or even a day, the extent of damage is often unrealized. Research is needed to create additional effective interventions, such as The Dangerous Decibels® program, which has a very simple message: Turn It Down, Walk Away, and Protect Your Ears.[9]

Pharmaceuticals can be ototoxic, especially in combination with noise exposure. Some chemotherapy compounds are especially ototoxic and occupational physicians, audiologists, safety, and hearing conservation professionals should be aware that their employees may be at risk.

The concept of situational awareness has gained prominence in the military environment due to the simultaneous need for audibility of the surroundings, communication, and protection from hazardous sound. Hearing protection is required whenever firing most weapons, but compromising the ability to be hear and respond to critical sounds, or to communicate with colleagues, is of paramount concern. New solutions in electronics, noise cancellation technology, and near field communication networks will likely improve the future of hearing protection devices.

Tinnitus is often a consequence of noise exposure and work in a noisy environment. The Department of Veterans Affairs provides annual compensation for tinnitus and hearing loss as a primary service-connected disability to millions of veterans at a cost more than 4 billion dollars [10,11]. Research in the field of diagnosing tinnitus and developing effective treatment is needed to preserve and improve the quality of life for those who must endure disabling tinnitus.

OSHA regulations mandate that workers be provided education about the proper selection and usage of hearing protection devices and that fit testing can be used toward meeting this requirement. Hearing protector fit testing can potentially be combined with the audiometric monitoring program. Employers and audiometric service providers have both a financial and ethical issue: fit testing is not required and it will take time. Time away from the job equates to an expense that cannot be recovered. If the training

afforded by fit testing workers can be demonstrated as reducing liabilities and worker compensation costs, then the return on investment may be positive. In addition, providing services such as fit testing may help emphasize an overall culture of safety, as well as potentially bolster employee morale in working for an employer willing to "go the extra mile" for their safety. Lastly, providing fit testing without a cost benefit may likely be the ethically correct path for the employer to take.

Training in hearing protection or noise awareness is not necessarily transferable across worker groups. For instance, providing training in English will be of little value to a population of workers for whom English is not the primary language. Stephenson et al. [12] found that carpenters accepted the fact that they would lose their hearing. Changing the messaging to avoidance of tinnitus had a more positive impact on compliance with wearing HPDs. The audience for training must be understood and the message must be tailored to fit the audience.

3.3. Develop, commercialize, and widely implement noise control solutions on jobsites in key industries.

1. Assess feasibility of developing and commercializing low-cost noise control solutions.
2. Evaluate the dissemination and effectiveness of practical engineering noise-control solutions for workers exposed to occupational noise.

The Hierarchy of Controls list elimination of a hazard, substitution of a safer process for a hazardous process, and Engineering Control of a hazardous process as the top three elements, respectively. Administrative controls and use of personal protective equipment are the least effective controls because they are so easily disregarded. Engineering noise controls should be the primary solution for all hazardous noise exposures. The NIOSH hearing loss prevention programs have focused on identifying potential noise control solutions, developing them into a viable product and then partnering with industrial companies to see how well the solutions works. Integral to the process is determining whether a solution is feasible.

Once a solution has been developed, how do we communicate the benefit of using it to the public? NIOSH has championed the use of the Buy Quiet and Quiet-By-Design programs. The concept is simple. Take an inventory of your products or tools that make noise. Identify the known sound output levels for those tools. As the tools reach the end of the life-cycle, then identify replacement tools that are substantially quieter and which provide the same functionality. The Safe-in-Sound award has identified several companies that have implemented noise control in the workplace. Simple fixes to noisy processes are possible. If employers and workers are aware of these solutions then they can implement their own form of Buy Quiet and Quiet-By-Design.

3.4. Develop audiological tests for hearing loss prevention.

1. Develop objective mechanisms for early detection of noise-induced hearing loss.
2. Conduct speech-in-noise testing.
3. Develop research goals for the understanding of how hidden hearing loss might lead to early identification of noise-induced hearing loss.

4. Develop an acoustic standard for assessment of otoacoustic emissions for hearing loss.
5. Develop an acoustic standard for extended high-frequency audiometry.
6. Develop recommendations for inclusion of these methods into occupational hearing loss–prevention programs.
7. Assess the tools.
8. Evaluate mobile technologies.

One of the shortcomings of the current practice of Hearing Conservation Programs is that they tend to document the progression of hearing loss of the workers rather than identify early symptoms of over-exposure to noise. Wouldn't it be better to be able to identify which workers are most at risk before they lose their hearing? While hearing science has grown increasingly sophisticated, the administration of audiometric monitoring is still mired in the practices from the late 1960s, using a pure-tone audiograms to identify hearing shifts.

The pure tone audiogram is an assessment of sound detection, however there are other aspects of hearing ability or disability that need different diagnostic testing to assess. Cochlear synaptopathy and hidden hearing loss have been revealed as possible byproducts of over exposure to noise affecting both persons in the general population and noise exposed workers [13]. Research is needed to characterize synaptopathy in humans, its relation to early identification of noise injury and its effect on noise-induced hearing loss. Is synaptopathy correlated with decreases in otoacoustic emissions (OAEs)? Can tests for synaptopathy and auditory processing be incorporated into hearing loss prevention programs?

In some persons, the audiogram appears to be within normal limits, but individuals may find it difficult to communicate in noisy environments. Testing a person's speech-in-noise performance may identify early deficits not captured by pure-tone testing.

The existence of hidden hearing loss is an important issue for the hearing loss prevention community. Research is needed to determine whether noise-exposed workers are at a higher risk of hidden hearing loss than the general population. As well, the underlying mechanisms for hearing-in-noise deficits are not yet understood.

Otoacoustic emissions are becoming increasingly practical in a screening environment. The ideal test characteristics need to be determined for early identification of hearing loss in noise-exposed workers. Standards of practice for incorporating OAEs into a hearing loss prevention program need to be developed and evaluated. Similarly extended high frequency audiometry suffers from a problem of calibration issues when coupling a transducer to the ear canal. At frequencies above 8 kHz, the acoustics of the pinna, ear canal and middle ear can substantially affect the levels presented to the ear.

For each of these new methods, recommendations need to be made for how best to included technological advances in existing hearing loss prevention programs. Hearing conservation practitioners need provide input on how best to utilize new tools in their practices. These new tools should be assessed in well-designed studies. Mobile

technologies have the potential to bring the test to the worker rather than the worker to the test. Many new boothless and wireless solutions for audiometric testing have been develop in recent years. As advances are made, the solutions need to be evaluated and verified.

3.5. Improve occupational hearing loss surveillance

1. Improve exposure surveillance, including measuring and monitoring worker noise and ototoxic chemical exposures and the use, effectiveness, and cost of worker protections, while preserving and improving the quality of the data collection.
2. Improve outcome surveillance, including measuring worker hearing loss, tinnitus, and related health outcomes, while preserving and improving the quality of the data collection.

Surveillance of occupational hearing loss and related health conditions, exposures, and protections among U.S. workers is an ongoing need and must be improved. Surveillance includes monitoring the burdens and trends within industries and occupations to identify high-risk groups, hazards, and worker protections, to guide prevention and research priorities, and to evaluate progress in hearing loss prevention efforts. Current mechanisms for collecting surveillance data need expansion, and new sources need to be identified to include additional worker populations, exposures, outcomes, and protections.

There is only limited systematic collection of noise measurement data, namely during regulatory inspections. Access to this information is limited and is not a representative sample of exposures for any particular industry, occupation, or region. There is no systematic collection of data on worker chemical exposures, particularly ototoxic chemical exposures. Not all ototoxic chemicals have been identified, and there is no requirement for audiometric testing, record keeping, or hearing conservation activities based on ototoxic chemical exposure. There is only limited systematic collection of data regarding the use of hearing protection (in NHANES), and there is no systematic collection of the types of worker protections employed (such as earmuffs, earplugs, engineering controls, and administrative controls). There is also no systematic collection or basic surveillance of the effectiveness, costs, or cost-benefits of the different types of worker protections.

Exposure surveillance can be improved by 1) using existing data sources to analyze noise and ototoxic chemical exposure data and data regarding the use, effectiveness, and costs of personal protective equipment, engineering controls, and other worker protections; and 2) collecting new surveillance data and improving existing surveillance systems to capture noise and ototoxic chemical exposure data, as well as data regarding the use, effectiveness, and costs of different worker protections.

Outcome surveillance can be improved by 1) using existing data sources to analyze information on worker hearing, cardiovascular health, mental health, and other related health conditions; and 2) collecting new surveillance data and improving existing surveillance systems to capture data on worker hearing, cardiovascular health, mental health, and other related health conditions.

4. CONCLUSION

The NORA Agenda for Hearing Loss Prevention is not a stagnant document. As we interact with scientists and practitioners, we will learn what elements may be missing. By the time this conference proceedings paper is published, the docket will be closed and the agenda will be finalized. The scope of this agenda is broad and cannot be completed by a few researchers in NIOSH. Rather it will require a collaboration across private industry, academia and government to address these issues. We anticipate successful outcomes from this agenda and hope that in future years these successes (and failures) can be shared.

Disclaimer: *The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not represent any official policy of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, or 3M Company. Mention of company names and products does not constitute endorsement by the CDC, NIOSH, or 3M.*

5. REFERENCES

1. Kerns E, Masterson EA, Themann CL, Calvert GM (2018). Cardiovascular conditions, hearing difficulty, and occupational noise exposure within US industries and occupations. *Am J Ind Med* 61(6):477–491.
2. Masterson, EA (2015). Trends in worker hearing loss within the Manufacturing Sector, 1981 – 2010. *CAOHC Update* 27(1), 8–10.
3. Masterson EA, Deddens JA, Themann CL, Bertke S, Calvert GM (2015). Trends in worker hearing loss by industry sector, 1981 – 2010. *Am J Ind Med* 58:392–401.
4. NIOSH National Occupational Research Agenda for Hearing Loss Prevention. DHHS-CDC-NIOSH, Cincinnati OH (2019) Accessed Feb. 28, 2019 at https://www.regulations.gov/docket?D=CDC-2019-0001.
5. Johnson AC, Morata TC (2010). The Nordic Expert Group for Criteria Documentation of Health Risks from Chemicals, 142. Occupational exposure to chemicals and hearing impairment. Univ. Gothenburg (Geson Hylte Tryck, Gothenburg).
6. US Department of Labor, Standard Interpretations – Ear plug fir-testing systems that measure real-time noise reduction. Occupational Safety and Health Administration, July27, 2017. Accessed at https://www.osha.gov/laws-regs/standardinterpretaions:2017-10-20
7. Deiters KK, Flamme GA, Hall CB, Themann CL, Byrne DC, Goldfarb D, Prezant DJ, Stephenson MR, Zeig-Owens R, Murphy WJ (2019). The OSHA Age Corrections are not correct: Evidence from NHANES and longitudinal analyses of exposed workers. Presentation at the 43rd meeting of the National Hearing Conservation Association, Dallas TX.
8. Davis SK, Smalt CJ, Calamia PT, Murphy WJ, (2019). In-ear and on-body measurements of impulse-noise exposure. *Int. J. Audiol.* 58:Sup1, S49–S57. DOI: 10.1080/14992027.2018.1534012
9. Martin WH, Sobel JL, Griest SE, Howarth LC, Becker TM. (2017). Program sustainability: hearing loss and tinnitus prevention in American Indian communities. *Am J Prev Med*, 52:Sup3, S268–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2016.10.031
10. Yankaskas KD, and Komrower JM (2019). Military and industrial performance: the critical role of noise controls, *Int. J. Audiol.* 58:Sup1, S74–S80, DOI: 10.1080/14992027.2018.1534013

11. Veterans Administration. (2016). Annual benefits report fiscal year 2016. United States Department of Veterans Affairs. http://www.benefits.va.gov/REPORTS/abr/ABR-Compensation-FY16-0613017.pdf
12. Stephenson MR, Shaw PB, Stephenson CM, Graydon PS. (2011). Hearing loss prevention for carpenters: Part 2—demonstration projects using individualized and group training. *Noise Health*, 13:122–131
13. Le Prell CG (2019) Effects of noise exposure on auditory brainstem response and speech-in-noise tasks: a review of the literature, *Int. J. Audiol.*, 58:Sup1, S3-S32, DOI: 10.1080/14992027.2018.1534010

[1] WMurphy@cdc.gov
[2] AAzman@cdc.gov
[3] EMasterson@cdc.gov
[4] Laurie.Wells@mmm.com