

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Science Advisory Board
Integrated Nitrogen Committee
Public Teleconference Meeting December 13, 2007
Final Minutes

Committee: Integrated Nitrogen Committee

Date and Time: December 13 from 2-4 Eastern Time as announced in the Federal Register on November 20, 2007 (Volume 72, Number 223, Page 65340)

Location: By Telephone Only

Purpose: On this conference call, the working groups summarized the progress they made on their assignments, identified what else was needed to complete the work, and engaged in other Committee business as needed

Materials Available: Materials made available for the INC's previous meetings and public teleconferences are identified in the relevant minutes. The Committee received no additional materials in advance of this teleconference. A revised draft of Section 3.2 was sent out just after the teleconference by the Producers Working Group

Attendees: Drs. Aneja, Cassman, Dickerson, Doering, Galloway, Herz, Hey, Kohn, Lighty, Mosier, Paerl, Shaw and Theis were present on the call. Drs. Boyer, Cowling, Mitsch, Moomaw, and Stacey were unable to participate in this call.

No one from the Agency was present. Members of the public included Ellen Baum of the Clean Air Task Force, Larry M. Antosch of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Clifford Snyder of the International Plant Nutrition Institute, Ann Coan of the NC Farm Bureau Federation and Terry Francil of the American Farm Bureau. Kate Winston of Inside EPA joined during the call.

Actions and Decisions:

1. The Producers Working Group and Environmental Systems Working Group are awaiting input from Boyer, particularly the table of national input.
2. The Producers Working Group also needs material from Herz and Kohn
3. Cassman will circulate the PWG's draft.
4. The DFO was asked to schedule a non-public preparatory teleconference for the PWG in February in addition to the one for January 10 from 2-3 Eastern. The PWG call will be February 6 from 3 – 4 Eastern.
5. The Environmental System Working Group also needs material from Hey and Mitsch.

6. All Environmental System Working Group members are to provide their comments on the October 14 draft of Section 3.3 to Mosier by December 27.
7. The Environmental System Working Group's next a non-public preparatory teleconferences are scheduled for January 9 from 3-5 Eastern and February 6 from 4-5 Eastern.
8. The Impacts and Metrics Working Group is missing a section on using dollars as a metric of nitrogen damage to be prepared by Moomaw.
9. Theis will provide a draft of this section before December 25.
10. The Impacts and Metrics Working Group will discuss and revise the draft on its a non-public preparatory teleconference January 14 from 3-4 Eastern.
11. Dickerson is preparing a section on the Clean Air Act similar to that Stacey prepared on the Clean Water Act for Chapter 4, being prepared by the Risk Reduction Working Group.
12. The Risk Reduction Working Group will discuss and revise its draft on a non-public preparatory teleconference from 4-5 Eastern on January 14.
13. The working groups will report to the Committee on its next teleconference, January 17, 2008 from 2-4 Eastern. This teleconference is a public meeting.
14. As each working group is happy with its product, it will share with the full INC.
15. March 1 is the drop dead date for sharing with the full INC.
16. Section 3.4 and Chapter 4 may be ready earlier, possibly by February 1

Details of the Meeting: After the DFO opened the meeting, the chair welcomed the members and asked if there were any additions to the agenda:

- Call the roll.
- Review of assignments and schedule
- Status of work completed and in progress
- Identification of any barriers to completing the work on time
- Problem solving, as needed, to keep work on time
- Process for assembly and distribution of the various writings, for review of and revision of the combined text.
- Questions, answers, and reminders.
- Adjourn

Although no time for public comment had been requested, the chair added a brief period for public comment at the end of the meeting. The chair then asked the working group leads and co-leads to report on their progress on writing assignments.

Producers Working Group

Viney Aneja & Kenneth Cassman

Cassman said that the PWG had a conference call since the October 29-31 INC meeting. The PWG is trying to complete section 3.2 of the INC's report which addresses sources. PWG is still missing the big numbers that are expected to come out of Boyer's nitrogen budget. These provide the fabric against which the components of section 3.2 will be presented. Galloway and Mosier each spoke with Boyer in early December; she assured them that things were on track.

Assuming Boyer provides the information by December 15, PWG should be OK. Cassman feels the agricultural section is pretty strong. He will send the current draft to the PWG today, with comments in the margins; he asks that the PWG members to edit and/or approve the text. Cassman noted that Herz and Kohn need to provide input. The livestock people need to tell their story. Lighty has provided her material. She also did some overall editing which he found helpful. He encourages others to do the same.

Galloway confirmed that Boyer was to provide the table of the national picture and asked whether the rest of section 3.2 could proceed without that section. Cassman said yes, but not well, because the various pieces can't be placed in context. Galloway encouraged the PWG to put in some placeholders and keep on writing. The document should be fun to read, not like a Ph.D. literature review. Members should write about their components in the context of the big picture.

Cassman asked individual PWG members to state where they are in the process. Herz is working on the figure with types of N fertilizer as wedges with caveats. He can't make December 15, but can meet early January.

Kohn thinks that the text will be easy to write once the tables are together. He is working on the tables now. Cassman said that, if Kohn thinks a different formulation of the table would be more helpful, change it. For some commodities, the size of animal is not as important as how quickly they produce the product.

Cassman said the big picture is that PWG has made progress; if the members provide what they said they would when they said they would, they can have it done. The latest draft circulated to the PWG is November 10. Cassman will circulate an updated draft today, December 13.

He asked Galloway if it sounds like PWG is writing what the chair wants. Galloway agreed that it was.

Cassman is also working with Mosier on some text that will go into Chapter 4. Herz is also making a contribution there which may be moved to the chapter on risk reduction.

White to see whether Feb 5 or 6 is better for PWG 2nd call

Environmental System Working Group

Arvin Mosier & Russell Dickerson

The last draft of Section 3.3 is October 14. Mosier is still waiting for input from Hey and Mitsch on that. At the ESGW conference call, Mitsch assured Mosier he would provide input, but none has arrived. He encouraged Hey to provide his comments. ESGW is also waiting for input from Boyer.

ESGW wants to put numbers on the flows. The only data he has comes from the 16 northeastern watersheds. Although he has heard that there is data for the Mississippi River Basin, but none has been provided. Mitsch has the action for this. Mosier is also working with Kohn on some references relating to livestock nitrogen efficiencies.

Galloway charged the ESGW members with commenting on Section 3.3

Dickerson said it would be a report on the state of the science. Mosier would like to have the next draft out before the ESGW's January 9th conference call. He observed that, if the ESGW is to give its members any time to read, he needs comments on the October 14 draft no later than December 27. Sooner is better. ESGW has a second call scheduled for February 6.

Impacts & Metrics Working Group

William Moomaw & Thomas Theis

Theis has been working on section 3.4 which addresses metrics. He has a fair amount of material. The only thing he is missing for this section is Moomaw's section on using dollars as a metric of nitrogen damage. Moomaw has an example from Chesapeake Bay.

The draft will address four kinds of metrics:

1. human health based standards
2. impact assessment including both human and ecological impairment
3. ecosystem services
4. dollar valuation

Theis will be finished the week of December 17. The I&MWG will discuss January 14 and revise.

Galloway asked if there were any questions for Theis or additional comments; there were none.

Risk Reduction Working Group

Thomas Theis

Theis said the RRWG has received a lot of input. Dickerson is writing a section on the CAAA similar to Stacey's on the CWA. The chapter will address:

1. research needs (treatment technologies, BMPs, measurement, modeling, risk assessment) This is the kind of thing the entire INC should contribute to.
2. risk reduction management strategies
 - a. command-and-control
 - b. pricing instruments
 - c. government monetary programs like grants and subsidies.
3. social and policy aspects. This area is not as well developed yet.

Boyer will write up a piece on information management needs.

Theis will send out a draft before Christmas. Theis will be finished the week of December 17. The I&MWG will discuss on a teleconference January 14 and revise.

The chair summarized:

Right now all the action is in the working groups.

As each working group is happy with its product, it will share with the full INC

March 1 is the drop dead date for sharing with the full INC

However, Section 3.4 and Chapter 4 may be ready earlier, possibly by February 1

The chair provided an opportunity for public comment.

1. Kate Winston from Inside EPA is trying to get a handle on why INC is putting the report together. Galloway will be happy to talk with her after she has gotten up to speed.
2. Ann Coan of North Carolina Farm Bureau has worked on nitrogen issues. She, too, is interested in the final report. Who is INC's target audience and what does INC help to accomplish? Galloway will be happy to talk with her after she has gotten up to speed.

As a committee of the SAB, their target is the Administrator. They hope to provide an overview of how an integrated nitrogen management strategy might be devised. EPA staff has been extremely helpful. Their second target audience is other federal agencies involved in nitrogen management. A third target audience is at the state and tribe level because nitrogen issues aren't just a federal issue.

3. Cliff Snyder, Nitrogen Program Director for the International Plant Nutrition Institute, had observed the activities of the Hypoxia Advisory Panel. Has INC heard about the HAP report? Galloway said that the draft HAP report is available to INC as a public document. Hans Paerl is on both INC and HAP. The chartered SAB approved the

HAP report last week; both Galloway and Theis reviewed it and commented on it in their capacities as members of the chartered SAB.. Snyder wanted the other public attendees to know there is a growing body of EPA activities on nitrogen. Galloway described how the HAP and INC efforts differ.

Snyder asked how much reliance INC is placing on Sparrow, Swat and other models. Galloway responded with a description of Boyer's modeling for the nitrogen budget.

White will check with Vu, but believes invited participants for workshop need to be identified in early January. Galloway suggests names by January 23, but White believes this is too late. White will set up a conference call the first week of January with Galloway and working group chairs to move this task along.

White reviewed planned teleconferences. She will work with PWG to set one Feb 5 or 6, then send full list of meetings to INC members.

Respectfully Submitted:

/s/

Ms. Kathleen E. White
Designated Federal Official

Certified as True:

/s/

Dr. James N. Galloway, Chair
SAB Integrated Nitrogen Committee