

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Science Advisory Board
Scientific and Technological Achievement Awards Panel
Final Minutes of Closed Meeting August 10-12, 2004

Committee: Scientific and Technological Achievement Awards Panel (STAA) of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Science Advisory Board (SAB). (See attached Roster)

Date and Time: August 10-12, 2004 (See attached Federal Register Notice)

Location: Science Advisory Board, 3rd Floor Conference Room, 1025 F. Street, NW., Washington, DC.

Purpose: The purpose of the meeting was to allow the Panel to review papers nominated for the EPA's Scientific and Technological Achievement Awards and to discuss possible improvements to the process and program.

Materials Available: The agenda, roster, Federal Register Notices for the wide cast and for this conference call, the biosketches for the short list, the papers to be reviewed, the nominating forms for those papers, and the nomination and review criteria, were circulated in advance of the meeting. The Panel had access to previous year's reports and Agency responses through the SAB website (www.epa.gov/sab). A table summarizing the preliminary individual ratings of the papers was completed and shared at the face-to-face meeting. Other materials, such as previous STAA reports were available to the Panel

Attendees: All Panelists were present for the meeting. The attached roster identifies the Panelists and their employers.

Summary

There were some departures in timing from the agenda, but not in content. The Panel's ultimate recommendations will be found in its final report.

Before the meeting, each panelist had read a number of papers and reported their rating of the paper (Level II, II, or II, HM or NR) together with an estimation of the individual's expertise (1-4) to the DFO. The DFO entered these, with the reader's names, into a master table. The Panelist's provided the DFO with their individual personal notes from their reviews for the FACA files.

The Panel then identified all those papers where all the individual reviewers were agreed that the paper did not deserve an award. If any panelist wished to challenge the preliminary assignment of those papers to a rating of "NR" they had the opportunity to do so.

The Panel then began discussing the other papers in order, a process which took the better part of two days.

After the Panelists finished their preliminary consensus rankings of all papers, they compared their preliminary scores with the final scores of the previous year's, between categories of this year's papers. This was part of a discussion so that the

Panel could be comfortable that it had “calibrated” its preliminary recommendations correctly. The Panel considered papers which had been flagged for further discussion when the Panel first considered them and any others which the Panelists wished to reconsider. The Panel agreed upon is final rankings.

The Panel then considered possible improvements to the process, the history of the program, which is approaching its 25th anniversary, and its future. Dr. Gilbert provided an example of a summary table which could be used in celebrating that history.

After thanking the members for their efforts, Dr. Cory-Slechta adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted:

Certified as True:

_____/s/_____
Ms. Kathleen White
Designated Federal Official
Environmental Engineering Committee

_____/s/_____
Dr. Deborah Cory-Slechta, Chair

Attachments (paper, not electronic)

1. Agenda for the meeting
2. Committee roster
3. Biosketches
4. Federal Register Notices
5. List of papers and authors
6. Public Comment
7. Email approving minutes