

**Summary Minutes of the
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Science Advisory Board (SAB)
Ecological Processes and Effects Committee Meeting
July 12, 2006**

Panel Members: See Panel Roster – Appendix A

Date and Time: Wednesday, July 12, 2006, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. (Eastern Daylight Time)

Location: By telephone only

Purpose: The purpose of this teleconference was to discuss a summary document and follow-up report to the Committee's Ecological Risk Assessment Workshop.

Attendees: Chair: Virginia Dale

Committee Members: Wayne Landis
Lawrence Master
Judith Meyer
Michael Newman
James Oris
James Sanders
Timothy Thompson

EPA SAB Staff: Thomas Armitage, Designated Federal Officer
Anthony Maciorowski, Associate Director for Science

Other EPA Staff: Glenn Suter, EPA Office of Research and Development
Latoya D. Miller, EPA Region 4
Kathleen A. Patnode, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Others Present: Jeffrey Giddings, Compliance Services International
Bernalyn McGaughey, Compliance Services International
Spencer Mortensen, Monsanto
John Samuelian, AMEC Earth and Environmental

Meeting Summary

The discussion followed the issues and timing as presented in the meeting agenda (Appendix B).

Convene Meeting, Call Attendance

Dr. Thomas Armitage, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the SAB Ecological Processes and Effects Committee opened the teleconference at 10:00 a.m. He stated that the call was being held under the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) and he noted the Committee's compliance with federal ethics and conflict-of-interest laws. He stated that records of Committee discussions are maintained, and those summary minutes of the meeting would be prepared and certified by the Committee Chair. Dr. Armitage then asked the Committee members and members of the public on the call to identify themselves and their affiliations.

Purpose of the Call and Review of the Agenda

Dr. Virginia Dale, Committee Chair, reviewed the purpose of the call and the agenda. She stated that the purpose of the call was to discuss follow-up products from the Committee's Ecological Risk Assessment Workshop. The follow-up products included: 1) a draft workshop summary document, 2) a Committee report to EPA, and 3) peer-reviewed workshop publications. She noted that a draft of the workshop summary document had been sent to the Committee for review along with an outline of the Committee's report containing detailed bullets in each outline section. The bullets had been provided by Committee members.

Discussion of Ecological Risk Assessment Workshop Products

The Chair opened the discussion of the workshop products noting that the challenge facing the Committee was putting together all of the material in a synthesis report with recommendations to EPA. A member noted that the workshop was focused on decision-making. He asked whether the workshop report should therefore focus on recommendations to improve ecological risk decisions rather than other general problems. Another member stated that it would be useful to discuss the draft workshop summary document first and then then focus on the report outline.

The Chair agreed with the suggestion of first discussing the draft workshop summary document that had been sent to committee members (available on the SAB website at http://www.epa.gov/sab/sab_epec_wkshp_eco_risk_02_7-9_2006.htm) and called for discussion of the document.

Dr. Suter (EPA Liaison to the workshop steering committee) noted that the Committee had originally planned to hold two workshops, the first workshop focusing on the state-

of-the-practice, and a second workshop focusing on developing recommendations to EPA. He noted that the first workshop had addressed parts of both these subjects. He noted that the general findings on page six of the draft workshop summary document contained a number of recommendations that were restatements of state-of-the-practice presentations and other discussions at the workshop. He stated that he did not agree with all of the key findings presented in the summary document and questioned whether all of the key findings should be included.

A member stated that the Committee should review the key findings section of the summary document and identify the statements related to information gathering and decision-making. He stated that the draft summary document was a good first cut but the challenge would be to develop a specific set of recommendations.

Dr. Maciorowski noted that it was important to make sure that appropriate terminology was used in the Committee's documents.

Another member stated that important recommendations were presented in the key findings section of the workshop summary document, but it was difficult to relate some of them to the breakout session discussion sections of the document. The relationship between some of the key findings and the breakout group discussions was not clear.

The Chair noted that some of the key findings were included in all of the breakout group discussion sections of the document. These key findings should be highlighted in document.

Several members stated that the summary document provided very good documentation of the workshop discussion and that the document contained all of the necessary information for developing the Committee's report. Members noted, however, that the Committee should examine the document to determine what should be included in the key findings section. Members also noted that a long list of findings was presented in each of the discussion sections, but they were not prioritized. A member stated that it would not be possible to prioritize the findings based on the discussions held at the workshop. (i.e., this was not a charge to the workshop participants).

Another member questioned how contradictory information (i.e., contradictory points raised in different breakout sessions) should be presented in the document. Several members stated that this information could be captured in the key findings section. A member noted that if the appropriate information were included in the key findings section at the beginning of the workshop summary document, that part of the document could be important part of the EPEC report to EPA. A member suggested that the workshop rapporteurs might identify material that could be included in the key findings section, and that workshop speakers could review the summaries of their presentations and provide any needed revisions. One of the rapportures stated that she thought it would be preferable for the entire Committee to undertake the task of reviewing identifying the key findings. The Chair agreed and asked that: 1) each member of the Committee review the draft workshop summary document report and provide input on the material that

should be provided in the key findings section (as well as any additional comments on other sections of the document), 2) the DFO send the presentation summaries to the workshop speakers for review and approval. The Chair stated that she would develop a revised introductory section for the summary document.

The Chair then called for discussion of the detailed outline of the Committee report to EPA (this outline had been sent to the Committee and posted on the EPA SAB website at http://www.epa.gov/sab/pdf/epec_ecorisk%20rept_collated_outline_7-6-06.pdf). The Committee discussed how recommendations to EPA should be developed. The Chair noted that the workshop summary document was really a verbatim summary of the workshop discussion. The summary document should contain key findings but recommendations to EPA should be included in the Committee report. These recommendations could be developed using the workshop summary document as a reference. The Chair noted that members should provide comments on the summary document to the DFO and that the document would be revised based on comments received. The Chair then stated that she wished to discuss development of the report to EPA and publications for the peer reviewed literature.

The Chair reminded Committee members that a decision had been made at the last Committee meeting to develop papers for publication in the journal *Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management*. These papers would include a paper on the history of ecological risk assessment, a paper on the strengths and limitations of ecological risk assessment, a paper on EPA applications of ecological risk assessment, and a synthesis paper. Drs. Suter, Kaputcka, Barnthouse, and Maciorowski, and Dale had agreed to work on these papers. The Chair stated that she would remind the authors about the need to complete these papers.

The Committee then continued to discuss the outline of the report to EPA and the timing for developing the report. A member stated that the report could be an important landmark document. Another member stated that it would be preferable to develop the Committee report before holding another workshop. The Chair stated that the detailed report outline should be reviewed by Committee members. She noted that some of the points included in the outline were repetitive. Committee members agreed that the report would provide useful background material for another workshop. The Chair stated that a second workshop should be delayed until 2008 when the Committee had completed its report.

Dr. Maciorowski noted that the Committee might want to consider the option of holding an EPEC meeting with invited experts rather than another workshop. He stated that the Committee should decide which option would be preferable.

A member stated that the 35 page outline of bullets was a “good start” on the Committee’s report but that more context was required “up front.” The report should address EPA’s experience. The Chair suggested that she would like to make assignments to Committee members to develop parts of the report from the outline that had been prepared. Several members agreed that writing assignments would be useful. Another

member stated that it would be important to look at the cross-cutting issues that were identified by the workshop breakout groups (and described in the workshop summary document). The Chair stated that after the Committee provided additional comments on the workshop summary document and the report outline she would ask for volunteers to develop sections of the report. She stated that this work could begin after the workshop summary document was complete. A Committee member stated that the report should include information on “what works” as well as recommendations for advancing the state-of-the-practice of ecological risk assessment. The member stated that this material could be included in the introductory section of the report. The Chair stated that this could be included in a discussion of EPA experience.

The Chair then thanked the Committee members for their input and asked whether any members of the public present on the teleconference wished to provide comments. There were no public comments so the Chair summarized the discussion and next steps for development of the workshop products as follows. She asked the DFO to send a follow-up memo to the Committee.

1. Section 3.0 of the workshop summary document (Key Findings and Cross-cutting Recommendations - pages 5-12) should be revised to clearly reflect key points described in other sections that summarize workshop sessions. Committee members should review Section 3.0 and send necessary changes to the DFO. The full committee will see another version of this section and be asked to comment on that draft (it may take several iterations before this section is finalized).
2. Committee members should review those sections of the workshop summary document that summarize the sessions they attended and provide any needed revisions to the DFO.
3. The DFO should send the summaries of workshop presentations (in section 4.0 of the workshop summary document) to the speakers for review.
5. After the workshop summary document is revised, writing assignments will be made to Committee members to develop various sections of the ecological risk assessment report to EPA. Committee members should look at the report outline and send the DFO an indication of the sections of the report they would like to develop.
6. Four workshop papers on the following topics are being developed for publication in *Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management*: the history of ecological risk assessment in the U.S. (Suter), the strengths and limitations of ecological risk assessment (Barnthouse and Kapustka), EPA application of ecological risk assessment (Maciorowski), and a synthesis paper on the Committee's report.
7. The Committee's report will serve as background material for another possible workshop or EPEC ecorisk meeting but this will not be planned until the Committee report is completed.

8. Much of this follow-up work can be completed by email, but a future teleconference will probably be needed. Members will be sent sending requests for dates of availability for a future ecorisk teleconference.

The Chair then adjourned the teleconference.

Respectfully Submitted:

Certified as True:

/Signed/

/Signed/

Dr. Thomas Armitage
Designated Federal Officer

Dr. Virginia Dale, Chair
Ecological Processes and Effects
Committee

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Roster of SAB Ecological Processes and Effects Committee

Appendix B: Meeting Agenda

Appendix A – Committee Roster

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Science Advisory Board Ecological Processes and Effects Committee

CHAIR

Dr. Virginia Dale, Corporate Fellow, Environmental Sciences Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN

MEMBERS

Dr. Richelle Allen-King, Associate Professor of Geology, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY

Dr. G. Allen Burton, Professor & Director, Institute for Environmental Quality, Wright State University, Dayton, OH

Dr. Ivan J. Fernandez, Professor, Department of Plant, Soil and Environmental Sciences, University of Maine, Orono, ME

Dr. Wayne Landis, Professor and Director, Institute of Environmental Toxicology, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA, USA

Dr. Lawrence L. Master, Chief Zoologist, NatureServe, Boston, MA

Dr. Judith L. Meyer, Distinguished Research Professor, Institute of Ecology, University of Georgia, Athens, GA

Dr. William Mitsch, Professor, Olentangy River Wetland Research Park, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH

Dr. Thomas C. Mueller, Professor, Department of Plant Sciences, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN

Dr. Michael C. Newman, Professor of Marine Science, School of Marine Sciences, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, College of William & Mary, Gloucester Point, VA

Dr. James Oris, Professor, Department of Zoology, Miami University, Oxford, OH

Dr. Charles Rabeni, Leader, Missouri Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, U.S. Geological Survey, Columbia, MO

Dr. James Sanders, Director, Skidaway Institute of Oceanography, Savannah, GA

Mr. Timothy Thompson, Senior Environmental Scientist, Science, Engineering, and the Environment, LLC, Seattle, WA

Dr Ivor van Heerden, Associate Professor & Director, Department of Civil and Environment Engineering, LSU Hurricane Public Health Research Center, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA, USA

SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD STAFF

Dr. Thomas Armitage, Designated Federal Officer, Washington, DC,

Appendix B – Teleconference Agenda

**SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD
Ecological Processes and Effects Committee
Public Teleconference
July 12, 2006, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. (Eastern Daylight Time)**

Agenda

10:00 a.m.	Convene Meeting, Roll Call of Meeting Participants	Dr. Thomas Armitage Designated Federal Officer EPA Science Advisory Board
10:10 a.m.	Purpose of the Call and Review of Of the Agenda	Dr. Virginia Dale, Chair
10:15 a.m.	Discussion of Ecological Risk Assessment Workshop Products <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Draft Workshop Summary Document- Committee Report- Publications	Dr. Dale and Committee
11:30 a.m.	Public Comments	Dr. Virginia Dale, Chair
11:45 a.m.	Next Steps and Assignments	Dr. Virginia Dale, Chair
12:00 p.m.	Adjourn	