

June 1, 2006

**U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD
RADIATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE RadNet REVIEW PANEL
CONFERENCE CALL AGENDA
June 12, 2006
1:00 PM - 4:00 PM, Eastern Standard Time (EST)***

Purpose of Conference Call: The purpose of this public conference call meeting is for the EPA SAB RAC's RadNet Review Panel to complete edits to their May 31, 2006 working review draft report in review of the Agency's draft document entitled "Expansion and Upgrade of the RadNet Air Monitoring Network, (Vols. 1 & 2), Concept and Plan," dated October 2005, and to receive public comment.

June 12, 2006 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM EST

1:00 pm	Convene the Meeting, Meeting Administration Log-In of All Participants	Dr. K. Jack Kooyoomjian <i>Designated Federal Officer</i>
	Introductory Remarks	Dr. Jill Lipoti, <i>Chair, RadNet Review Panel</i>
	Introduction of Panelists	SAB/RAC/RadNet Panelists
1:15 pm	Overview of Edits to Date	Dr. Jill Lipoti
1:25 pm	Panel Discussion of Current (May 31, 2006) Draft Edits	Dr. Lipoti & RAC/RadNet Review Panel
2:30 pm	Public Comments	Interested Public
2:45 pm	Feedback from Agency Staff regarding current draft: 1. Has the Committee adequately responded to the	Dr. Mary E. Clark & ORIA/NAREL and RIENL Staff

- questions posed in the Charge?
2. Are any statements or responses made in the draft unclear?
3. Are there any technical errors?

3:15 pm	Panel Open Discussion: Continued	Dr. Lipoti & Panel
3:55 pm	Summary and Closure Steps in Preparation of Quality Review Draft for Review by the Charter Board	Dr. Lipoti, Chair <i>RAC/RadNet Review Panel</i>
4:00 pm	ADJOURN	

*NOTE: Call 202-343-9999 to obtain the Dial In Number and Pass Code (or call/email Dr. K. Jack Kooyoomjian at 202-343-9984, or e-mail at kooyoomjian.jack@epa.gov)

Charge Assignments Summary:

CQ #1 (**Links overall lead**) others include Kahn, Johnson & Boecker (also Jaquish) on instruments; Brooks on Use of Data; Kahn & Griffith on Decision Rules (Optimum Siting and a Process to Refine Choices, etc.). Also Bussod, Fry, Hornung, Sandquist, Vetter, and Wiltshire & others as appropriate to provide inputs (e.g., Bussod to provide inputs on philosophy for 25 miles rather than 50 miles to cover large population centers).

CQ #2 (**Bussod & Johnson overall lead**) - others include Dodd, Grogan, Kahn, Links, and Sanquist (see below)

CQ #2a, b & c (**Dodd**; specifically 2a regarding Integration of Existing Systems, 2b regarding Criteria for Local Siting, Obtaining a Representative Sample, and Need for an Aerosol Expert; 2c regarding Philosophy Regarding Pre-Deployment Criteria & Locations at Prominent Events/Sites (Times Square at New Year's Eve, the Olympics, etc.);

CQ #2c (**Links overall lead** - on role of fixed & deployable monitors);

CQ #2d (**Sandquist** to provide text on questions pertaining to time to deploy the deployables.)

CQ #3a (**Griffith overall lead** regarding also issues dealing with Communications Systems & Data Systems, to Cover topics such as different trigger points & complexity of the different data screens);

CQ #3b (**Dodd overall lead**) - others include inputs from Brooks et al; other Inputs from Fry on CQ3b Input to Dodd on Issues such as Elec Pwr, Contingencies, & Security for Deployables; Jaquish to provide inputs to Dodd;

CQ #3c (**Brooks overall lead**) - others include Griffith, Jaquish, Kahn, Links, Vetter, and Wiltshire; and

CQ #3d (**Sandquist overall lead** on Qual Assurance & Control Procedures, as well as Parallel DataBase SOPs).

The Proposed Charge: The Agency's Office of Radiation and Indoor Air (ORIA) is requesting that the EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB) review and provide advice on a draft document entitled "*Expansion and Upgrade of the RadNet Air Monitoring Network*," (Vols. 1 & 2), dated October 2005. EPA seeks comments on the following specific charge questions:

Charge Question 1: Are the proposed upgrades and expansion of the RadNet air monitoring network reasonable in meeting the air network's objectives?

Charge Question 2. Is the overall approach for siting monitors appropriate and reasonable given the upgraded and expanded system's objectives?

- 2a) Is the methodology for determining the locations of the fixed monitors appropriate given the intended uses of the data and the system's objectives?
- 2b) Are the criteria for the local siting of the fixed monitors reasonable given the need to address both technical and practical issues?
- 2c) Does the plan provide sufficient flexibility for placing the deployable monitors to accommodate different types of events?
- 2d) Does the plan provide for a practical interplay between the fixed and deployable monitors to accommodate the different types of events that would utilize them?

Charge Question 3. Given that the system will be producing near real-time data, are the overall proposals for data management appropriate to the system's objectives?

- 3a) Is the approach and frequency of data collection for the near real-time data reasonable for routine and emergency conditions?
- 3b) Do the modes of data transmission from the field to the central database include effective and necessary options?
- 3c) Are the review and evaluation of data efficient and effective considering the decision making and public information needs during an emergency?
- 3d) Given the selected measurements systems are the quality assurance and control procedures appropriate for near real-time data?

The charge listed above can also be found on the Agency's ORIA Web site, as well as the Science Advisory Board website at www.epa.gov/sab/.