

California continues to lead the way nationally on nanotechnology regulation, despite some bumps along the way. Most recently, the Department of Toxic Substances Control issued a [request for information](#) regarding analytical test methods, fate and transport in the environment, and other relevant information from manufacturers of reactive nanometal oxides. Substances covered include aluminum oxide, silicon dioxide, titanium dioxide, and zinc oxide. The request is just that—a request. Prior to issuing a mandatory call-in of information, DTSC must try the more cooperative route.

On a different note, Assemblyperson Mike Feuer announced that he would not seek action on nanotechnology legislation this year. He expects to pursue such a bill next year, and encouraged parties interested in participating in informal discussions regarding the bill to [contact his office](#). His comments came at part of a luncheon address he delivered at the [UCLA Working Conference on Nanotechnology Policy](#), at which scientists, social scientists and legal scholars presented a series of papers discussing concrete policy options for the regulation (or not) of nanotechnology.