

**Summary Minutes of the Science Advisory Board Telephone Conference Meeting  
April 1, 2005, By Telephone Conference Only  
Washington, DC, 20004**

**Board Members:** Participants included Drs. Matanoski (Chair of the Panel), Henry Anderson, James Bus, Trudy Cameron, Myrick Freeman, James Galloway, Phil Hopke, Cathy Kling, Mike McFarland, Granger Morgan, Rebecca Parkin, David Rejeski, Kristin Shrader-Frechette, Deorah Swackhamer, Tom Theis, Robert Twiss, and Lauren Zeiss

**Date and Time:** Friday, April 1, 2005 (See Attachment A for the Federal Register notice for the meeting) The Agenda for the meeting is in Attachment B while Attachment C is the roster of Board members participating in the call.

**Location:** By Telephone Conference Only

**Purpose:** The purpose of this meeting was for the Board to reach consensus on several remaining issues concerning their advice on the FY 2006 EPA Science budget.

**Others attending:** Non-SAB persons identifying themselves included EPA representatives Barbara Walton, Rita Schoeny, and Mr. Cantor identified themselves for the call. From the public, Ms. Patt Phibbs (BNA) and Dr. Craig Schiffries (NCSE).

## **Meeting Summary**

### **Friday, April 1, 2005**

**A. Introductory Remarks and Welcome:** Mr. Thomas Miller, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the Board opened the meeting and noted that this SAB meeting was being held under the principles and requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and other relevant statutory, as well as EPA and other policy requirements for such bodies. Dr. Vanessa Vu also welcomed the members. Dr. Morgan welcomed and thanked the members for participating. Dr. Matanoski thanks members for their work on this project to date and noted the items for the day's agenda.

**B. Public Comments:** **Dr. Craig Schiffries**, Senior Scientist at the National Council for Science and the Environment offered a brief public statement in support of a strong science and technology budget for the environment. NCSE advised EPA S&T receive at least \$750 million, that the STAR grants program be funded at a full \$100 million and that the STAR Fellowships program receive a full \$10 million. He offered strong support

for the STAR program and STAR fellowship program benefits. He also noted the need for more resources in EPA's Office of Environmental Education.

Board Members asked of Dr. Schiffries would be providing his comments to the Congress as well. He noted that NCSE will do so and mentioned that there is a new appropriations committee in charge of the EPA budget. Members agreed with Dr. Schiffries regarding the importance of emerging and innovative issues research to the vitality of the nation's economy.

Members asked Dr. Schiffries to comment on the uniqueness of EPA's research program given that it is only 7% of the overall US Government funding for environmental issues. Dr. Schiffries noted NCSE's interaction with the National Research Council to identify the overall environmental R&D picture. They are trying to identify any gaps in focus that might exist. The report is not yet available. Dr. Morgan suggested that one of the issues likely to be shown is that much of the overall Federal environmental research is the dominance of things such as NASA's Earth sensing, and other such programs that are broadly focused.

**C. Discussion of the Draft Report:** Dr. Matanoski noted that the focus today was to resolve several issues, identify points for the letter to the Administrator, and to assign final efforts for the drafting. She then directed the discussion toward the remaining issues.

- i) **Pilot Program:** Members of the Cross-cutting group noted the need to give advice to ensure the pilot program, if carried out, is effective, efficient, focused, and subjected to evaluation to learn of the effectiveness. The group noted that the current proposal to allocate on a "shares" basis might be better if done via a competitive program. Members asked for clarification of the source of the money and EPA noted it was from the existing ORD base. Members also noted the near-term focus of the pilot program and that it might provide benefits to ORD because it has the possibility of building stronger client support through helping programs respond to near term needs as contrasted with much of the research program that focuses more on the mid- to long-term. Integration of planning for the use of the resources is key.
- ii) **NEIC Enforcement focused research and technical support:** Members pointed to the need for research here and not just technical support. Some were concerned with the use of NEIC personnel and a general transfer of resources to efforts in support of Homeland Security. Members were interested in knowing, and reflected some concern with the perception that a one-for-one dollar shift from research in various categories, including enforcement, to Homeland Security was occurring. There was a thought that this shift could explain a perceived decrease in enforcement cases during the 1998 through 2003 time frame. Members suggested EPA try to ensure that Homeland Security efforts to have a dual outcome in that they could support traditional as well as Homeland Security missions of EPA. Members suggested the need to

focus the comments in this section on Homeland Security vis a vis NEIC and not enforcement cases per se. Alternate language will be proposed to clarify the issue.

- iii) Environmental Economics Research: Members noted the need to discuss research needs for valuing ecosystem services, to remind the Agency that the Economics Research Strategy, with the EEAC's support noted the need to do research on valuation of non-fatal health endpoints, and that continued research needs to be conducted on voluntary actions and incentives. They also noted the importance of STAR grants in this program. The efforts pursued under the STAR economics area can't be replaced with internal EPA research. Members also noted the need for social sciences and behavioral sciences research. Members also discussed the "environmental shock" issue with respect to economics.
- iv) High-performance Computing: Members discussed the need for EPA to regain its position in high-performance computing. The capability in this regard has slipped greatly over the last several years. Language will be clarified to note the importance of this area to EPA.
- v) Overarching Issues:
  - a. STAR: Members will ensure that the report is clear on the importance of the STAR program. This will emphasize the importance of the Fellowship program as well.
  - b. Regional Office science needs should be addressed.
  - c. Clarification of the Great Lakes discussion vis a vis "clean up" will be done.
  - d. Members noted the need for a statement indicating concern over the quality of information available on overall federal environmental research budget information vis a vis EPA budgets.

#### **D. Next Steps**

The Panel Chair for the Science and Research budget review will work with the DFO to edit the document and then send it to Board members for approval.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

*/ Signed /*

---

Thomas O. Miller  
Designated Federal Officer

Certified as True:

/ Signed /

---

Dr. Genevieve Matanoski  
Chair, Science and Research  
Budget Advisory Panel

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A: Federal Register Notice  
Attachment B: Agenda  
Attachment C: Roster of Board Participants  
Attachment D: Public Comments, Dr. Craig Schiffries, NCSE  
Attachment E: Draft Report, March 22, 2005 with letter to Board of March 22