

AGENDA
EPA SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD
REDUCED FORM TOOLS REVIEW PANEL
PUBLIC TELECONFERENCE
May 28-29, 2020
12:00 NOON TO 5:00 PM (eastern time)

Topic: Peer Review of EPA’s draft report titled, “*Evaluating Reduced-Form Tools for Estimating Air Quality Benefits (October 2019).*”

Please note that all times are approximate (see note at end of agenda).

THURSDAY, May 28, 2020

12:00 NOON Meeting Opening and Administrative Procedures –
Dr. Sue Shallal, Designated Federal Official, SAB RFT Review Panel

12:10 PM Introduction of Panel Members –
Dr. Jay Turner, Chair of the SAB RFT Review Panel

12:20 PM Agenda Review –
Dr. Jay Turner, Chair of the SAB RFT Review Panel

12:30 PM OVERVIEW OF EPA’s draft report: Evaluating Reduced-Form Tools for Estimating Air Quality Benefits–
Dr. Erika Sasser and Mr. Kirk Baker, EPA Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards

1:00 PM Clarifying Questions-
RFT Review Panel members

1:15 PM Public Comments-
Registered Speakers

Panel Deliberations

1:30 PM Charge question #1-
Please comment on the evaluation approach developed by EPA to compare reduced-form models to full-form equivalents. Please comment on whether the emissions reduction scenarios used in the proposed evaluation approach provide enough diversity to adequately assess reduced-form performance over a range of possible applications (e.g., magnitude, type, and spatial variations of emissions reductions). Please discuss whether the specific assumptions that EPA made to

apply each tool as consistently as possible (e.g., emissions, meteorology, use of direct vs. BenMAP estimates, etc.) are appropriate and clearly explained. Please assess whether the report's description of its limitations is complete

2:30 PM

BREAK

2:35 PM

Charge Question #2-

Please comment on the results of the reduced form tool evaluation in Section 3, considering both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the model intercomparison. Was the information clearly presented and informative? Were EPA's conclusions reasonable? Are there other results which would be useful to include in the comparison?

3:35 PM

Charge Question #3a-

Exhibit ES-4 "*Ratio of National Avoided Premature Mortality Benefits Estimates*," shows how different reduced-form tools generated different estimates as compared to full-scale air quality models.

3a. Does the report provide a clear and thorough explanation for why some tools under- or over-estimated PM_{2.5} health benefits as compared to the full-scale air quality modeling? Please add any additional explanations for the pattern of results observed.

4:15 PM

Charge Question #3b-

How do the results of this study inform our understanding of the suitability of these tools for regulatory economic analyses in their current form?

5:00 PM

Recess –

Dr. Sue Shallal, Designated Federal Official

Friday May 29, 2020

Please note that all times are approximate (see note at end of agenda).

12:00 NOON Meeting Opening and Administrative Procedures –

Dr. Sue Shallal, Designated Federal Official, SAB RFT Review Panel

Panel Deliberations - continued

12:15 PM

Charge Question #3c-

Can any of the reduced-form tools explored in this report easily be modified to allow quantifying the extent to which the total health benefits accrue to specific geographic areas (e.g., by state, or where ambient concentrations are above or below the NAAQS)?

- 1:00 PM** **Charge Question #4a-**
Since 2008 EPA has used SA-BPT to estimate the health impacts of numerous regulations. Under the scenarios examined in this report, EPA’s SA-BPT approach over-estimated PM_{2.5}-related health benefits by between 10 and 30 percent, depending on the sector. To ensure BPT estimates correspond to full-form results as closely as possible, the report recommends updating the underlying emissions inventories and air quality modeling used to inform the EPA SA-BPT approach over time.
4a. In the interim, how might EPA improve its characterization of results derived from the 2005 SA-BPT approach, specifically the potential degree of over- or underestimation in BPT-based results for a particular regulatory scenario?
- 1:45 PM** **Charge Question #4b- General Methods**
What criteria (e.g., geographical scale, regulated sector, pollutants/precursors) should EPA examine to determine the potential for divergence between SA-BPT results vs full-form air quality modeling results (resulting in over- or under-estimation)?
- 2:30 PM** **Charge Question #4c- General Methods**
Based on the results of this study, does the panel have any additional recommendations about BPT-based approaches?
- 3:15 PM** **BREAK**
- 3:20 PM** **Charge Question #5- General Methods**
How do the results of this study inform the future development of reduced-form tools that are capable of providing reliable estimates of impacts associated with different sectors, across a variety of spatial scales, and for different portions of the air quality distribution? Are there other, less resource intensive approaches than full-scale air quality modeling for informing the public about the size and distribution of PM health benefits associated with alternative regulatory scenarios?
- 4:20 PM** **Clarifying Comments-**
Registered Speakers
- 4:35 PM** **Panel Deliberation Summary and Next Steps-**
Dr. Jay Turner and RFT Panel members
- 5:00 PM** **Adjourn –**
Dr. Sue Shallal, Designated Federal Official

As noted above, please be advised that agenda times are approximate; when the discussion for one topic/charge question is completed, discussions for the next topic/charge question will begin. For further information, please contact the Designated Federal Official for information regarding this meeting, Dr. Sue Shallal, via email: shallal.suhair@epa.gov