

Summary Minutes of the  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)  
Superfund Benefits Analysis Advisory Panel  
Public Teleconference  
April 29, 2005

Committee Members: Dr. Rick Freeman, Dr. Robin Autienrieth, Dr. Kathy Segerson, Dr. Anna Alberini, Dr. Keith Moo-Young, Mr. Tim Thompson, Ms. Kate Probst, Dr. Mark Miller, Dr. Ted Gayer, Dr. Jim Boyd

Date and Time: 2:30pm – 4:30pm, April 29, 2005

Location: Teleconference

Purpose: To discuss the Panel’s Draft Advisory

SAB Staff: Dr. Holly Stallworth, Designated Federal Officer

Other EPA Staff: Kelly Maguire, Robin Jenkins, David Nicholas, Glenn Farber, Al McGartland

Other: Alex Farrell, E2; Meredith Preston, BNA; Sid Wolfe, Environmental Management and Support; Tom Echikson, Sibley, Austin, Brown & Wood; Kerry Kelly, American Chemical Council

Meeting Summary

The discussion followed the issues and general timing as presented in the meeting agenda (Attachment A).

Opening of Public Meeting

Dr. Holly Stallworth, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the Superfund Benefits Analysis Advisory Panel opened the meeting.

Dr. Freeman began by asking panelists to offer reactions to the first five pages of the Advisory. Panelists agreed that the general tone of Section 3.1 was too negative agreed on recommending against aggregating benefits into a single number. The suggestion was made that the Superfund Benefits Analysis (SBA) clarify what is possible and what data might be collected in the future.

The Panel heard from Dr. Al McGartland, Director of EPA's National Center for Environmental Economics. Dr. McGartland expressed the view that the report could be more positive and constructive. Dr. McGartland raised objections to some of the discussion in the Advisory on the SBA's hedonics. Panelists offered clarifications on the meaning and intent of this section of the Draft Advisory. Panelists agreed that the tone of the Draft Advisory needed to be more positive and that the Advisory present more constructive suggestions.

One panelist raised the question of whether OSWER was feeling pressure from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to monetize all benefits of Superfund. Dr. McGartland cited a number of advantages of monetizing benefits.

The Panel returned to the topic of revising the Advisory and pondered how specific to make their recommendations. It was agreed that the general structure and organization of the draft was satisfactory. Panelists discussed whether to recommend that OSWER use the Greenstone study, whether to recommend case studies that might be costly, and whether to recommend that OSWER develop a multi-year research strategy.

The meeting concluded with the Chair suggesting that a subcommittee of 3 people revise the front section for tone and incorporate all of the good points brought up during the teleconference. These included:

- recommending that the Agency develop a framework for thinking about the benefits of all elements of the Program, including removals;
- encouraging the Agency to make greater use of case studies to illustrate both the magnitude and form of monetary benefits where possible (for example, the Lybarger study) and the quantifiable but nonmonetized benefits (for example, ecological indicators).

Gayer, Probst and Alberini volunteered to take on this task. Scheduling for a subsequent teleconference was postponed.

Respectfully Submitted:

*/Signed/*  
Holly Stallworth, Designated Federal Officer

I hereby certify these minutes of the 4/29/05 Superfund Benefits Analysis Advisory Panel teleconference are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

*/Signed/*  
A. Myrick Freeman  
Chair

NOTE AND DISCLAIMER: The minutes of this public meeting reflect diverse ideas and suggestions offered by the Panel members during the course of deliberations within the meeting. Such ideas, suggestions, and deliberations do not necessarily reflect definitive consensus advice from the panel members. The reader is cautioned to not rely on the minutes to represent final, approved, consensus advice and recommendations offered to the Agency. Such advice and recommendations may be found in the final advisories, letters or reports prepared and transmitted to the EPA Administrator following the public meetings.