



**BC RTC Teleconference-- requests for clarification by Panel**

**Erika Sasser** to: Stephanie Sanzone  
Cc: James Hemby

06/24/2011 03:35 PM

Stephanie--

We have relatively few questions or clarification requests for the panel. The Panel's comments are very helpful, and in many places they have specifically provided additional references that the Agency can incorporate into the next draft. There are a few places where additional clarity and/or references would be helpful. These could be discussed in the context of their conversation about particular sections. Specifically:

- Page 7, graphic of Teflon filters: is this available in an existing publication and can EPA replicate it in the Report to Congress?
- Page 8, lines 13-24: types of carbonaceous particles-- the Panel has encouraged EPA to construct a table showing RF of BC as a ratio of mass, and to provide quantitative estimates of the change in light absorption due to physical transformations within emissions plumes. A table showing a estimated forcing/g of the common chemical constituents of PM could be valuable, and this same table would be directly relevant to the Panel's suggestion that we provide estimates of the relative change in light absorption as a function of atmospheric aging. However, EPA is not aware of references that would allow us to construct such a table. Can the Panel recommend any existing calculations in the literature from which we can construct the table?
- Page 9, lines 12-20 and Page 10, line 40 to Page 11, line 3-- Climate response-- the Panel encourages EPA to extend the discussion of BC's climate impacts beyond radiative forcing and to put more emphasis on climate response. However, EPA is not aware of many studies looking at climate response, and few specific references are suggested by the Panel. EPA requests that, where possible, the Panel help identify other studies, in addition to the Jacobson references re: semi-direct and indirect effects already provided, that would help the Agency address climate response to BC emissions/mitigation more thoroughly.
- Page 27, lines 18-25-- comments on mitigation overview (Chapter 6)-- the panel requests that EPA "cite any small studies that measure BC directly and investigate their health effects" with the purpose of clarifying the potential health benefits of BC reductions specifically. EPA's approach in the report has been to consider net health benefits of total PM<sub>2.5</sub> reduced due to BC-oriented control strategies, since BC reduction measures will affect the entire PM mixture. If the panel is aware of specific studies that would enable calculation of differential benefits from reductions in particular constituents, can the panel please provide references? Additional clarity in the language in this paragraph would be helpful.

James Hemby will be lead point of contact for EPA on the call. In addition, we expect the following workgroup members to attend the call: Joe Somers, Ben DeAngelo, Mike Geller, Terry Keating, Brooke Hemming, Linda Chappell, and Susan Anenberg. There may be others (James can send you a list after the call). I'm very sorry that I won't be able to attend, but I will be on a long-planned vacation with my family. A couple of other workgroup members will be out on vacation as well.

If you need to talk to James prior to the call on Monday, his phone is 919-541-5459. His information: James Hemby, Senior Policy Analyst, Air Quality Assessment Division, Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards, OAR/EPA.

Thanks,

Erika