

**Summary Minutes of the
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis
Public Meeting
May 9, 2008
SAB Conference Center
1025 F Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20004**

Committee Members: Dr. James K. Hammitt, Chair
Dr. David Allen
Dr. Shelby Gerking
Dr. Fintan Hurley
Dr. Wayne Gray
Dr. F. Reed Johnson
Dr. Michael Kleinman
Dr. Rebecca Parkin
Dr. David Popp
Dr. Kathy Kiel
Dr. Virginia McConnell
Dr. Chris Walcek
Dr. Mort Lippman
Dr. Patrick Kinney
Dr. Bart Ostro

Date and Time: May 9, 2008, 8:30 am – 3:00 pm Eastern time

Purpose: The Council discussed draft case study of the benefits of reducing benzene emissions (posted at <http://www.epa.gov/air/sect812/prospective2.html#mar08>).

SAB Staff: Dr. Holly Stallworth, Designated Federal Officer

Other EPA Staff: Jim Democker, Jeneva Craig, Maureen Gwinn, Ken Davidson, Ted Palma, Rich Cook, Brian Heninger, Lisa Conner

Other: Jim Newmann, Industrial Economics
Henry Roman, Industrial Economics
Tyra Walsh, Industrial Economics
James Wilson, Pechan
Steven Cowl, Lyndell Basell

FRIDAY, MAY 9, 2008

Meeting Summary

The discussion followed the issues and general timing as presented in the meeting agenda (posted at <http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/sabproduct.nsf/f697818d4467059f8525724100810c37/fe27fc6fd2ffa7a3852573e6007031ba!OpenDocument&TableRow=2.2#2>).

Dr. Holly Stallworth, Designated Federal Officer (DFO), opened the meeting with a statement that the Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis is a federal advisory committee whose meetings and deliberations meet the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Dr. Jim Hammitt reviewed the agenda and discussed the purpose of the meeting, then turned the floor over to Mr. Jim DeMocker, Project Leader, Office of Policy Analysis and Review in the Office of Air and Radiation, who updated the Council on the status of the 812 Report. Mr. Democker's presentation, "Status of The Second Prospective Section 812 Benefit-Cost Analysis of the Clean Air Act," may be found at the same URL given above.

Ms. Jeneva Craig, also in EPA's Office of Policy Analysis and Review in the Office of Air and Radiation, provided an overview of the benzene case study. Ms. Craig was followed by Mr. Ted Palma of EPA's Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, who presented the air quality modeling and exposure modeling work done for the benzene case study. Mr. Henry Roman of Industrial Economics, Inc. presented the Health Benefits and Valuation component of the study. All three presentations may be found at the URL given above.

On the subject of benzene emissions, Council members remarked on the discrepancy between ambient concentrations and the emissions inventories and discussed the potential causes of this discrepancy, specifically: whether the controls were being modeled accurately, whether underreporting was the problem or whether fugitive emissions were causing the gap. Council members raised questions about whether vehicle type changed over time in the models used for the case study and the extent to which inspection and maintenance programs played a role.

With respect to air quality modeling and exposure modeling, members had questions about whether benzene emissions spilled outside the three counties, the role of meteorology, airports, background levels, indoor sources, marine sources and the various inventories used for different sources of emissions. Background emissions were defined as concentrations that are assumed to be from emissions outside the 3 counties targeted in the case study. The point was made that a key limitation of the benzene case study was its lack of accounting for roadway exposures.

On the subject of health benefits and valuation, Council members asked about the timelines for exposures versus deaths and whether benefits that would accrue after 2020 are accounted for in the case study (they are not). One Council member raised the issue of how leukemia deaths are “scored,” i.e. whether a recurrence after 5 years is counted as a new case or as a continuation of the first disease. Members discussed the risk coefficients used and whether the value of statistical life reflected valuations for fatal cancer as opposed to other causes of death. One Council member remarked on the difference between the exposure maps and the map of mean concentrations. An observation was offered that the case study did not carry the same level of complexity through from exposure to health effects.

For the rest of the meeting, Council members discussed the charge questions as shown in the agenda. The members’ preliminary written comments are posted at the SAB website (URL given above) and thus will not be repeated here. Not posted, however, was the Council’s discussion of the overall value of the case study. On this subject, Council members mentioned the difficulty of pursuing 189 residual risk estimates for the full suite of hazardous air pollutants, the feasibility of looking at suites of HAP’s based on maximum available control technologies, and the possibility of folding HAPs work into ongoing air quality modeling.

The Council Chair asked each group of members assigned to a charge question (as shown on the agenda) to provide a single synthesized draft to the DFO by May 16.

Respectfully Submitted:

/Signed/ Holly Stallworth
Designated Federal Officer

Certified as True:

/Signed/ James K. Hammitt

Chair

NOTE AND DISCLAIMER: The minutes of this public meeting reflect diverse ideas and suggestions offered by Committee member during the course of deliberations within the meeting. Such ideas, suggestions and deliberations do not necessarily reflect 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, commentaries, letters or reports prepared and transmitted to the EPA Administrator following the public meetings.