

Summary Minutes of the  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)  
Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis  
Ecological Effects Subcommittee (EES)  
Public Teleconference Meeting  
December 20, 2004

Committee Members: Dr. Charles Driscoll, EES Chair  
Dr. Elizabeth Boyer  
Dr. Christine Goodale  
Dr. Mark Castro  
Mr. Keith Harrison  
Ms. Laurie Chestnut (Council member)  
Dr. Trudy Cameron (Council Chair)

Date and Time: 2:00pm – 4:00pm, December 20, 2004

Location: Teleconference

Purpose: The Ecological Effects Subcommittee of the Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis will teleconference to discuss draft answers to charge questions 18-20 contained in the Office of Air and Radiation's Benefits and Costs of the Clean Air Act 1990-2020 found at: <http://www.epa.gov/air/sect812/mainbody51203.pdf>.

SAB Staff: Dr. Holly Stallworth, Designated Federal Officer

Other EPA Staff: Brian Heninger, Jim Democker,

Other: Maura Flight, Industrial Economics  
Darren Samuelsohn, Greenwire  
Peter Bella, Alamo Area Counsel of Governments, San Antonio

Meeting Summary

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

**December 20, 2004**

Opening of Public Meeting

Dr. Holly Stallworth, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for EES, opened the meeting with a statement that the EES is a standing subcommittee of the Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis, a chartered federal advisory committee whose meetings are subject to the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Dr. Driscoll said the purpose of the teleconference was to continue and advance the discussion of draft responses to EPA's charge questions. No comments were offered on charge question 18. Minor comments were offered in regard to the draft response for question 19. Some discussion took place over the relative impact of nitrogen vis-à-vis other pollutants and the possible problems with extrapolating with different levels of bioavailability across media, e.g. atmospheric inputs to the watershed versus the estuary. Members acknowledged the need to caveat any extrapolation from one media to another.

Dr. Driscoll pointed out the case studies were now divided into coastal/upland. Dr. Boyer discussed her Waquoit Bay write-up. Dr. Castro said his write-ups on Barneget Bay and Chesapeake Bay would come by the end of the week. Some concern was expressed over the different tables and figures in the Everglades draft. Another concern was the focus on mercury in the Everglades section. Mr. Democker said it was possible to do a case study that focuses on mercury and hence the focus on mercury was fine. Members asked about the technical sophistication of their audience and whether measurements should be expressed in metric units or U.S. units.

Some discussion took place on the weaknesses in the Gulf of Maine site as a possible case study and one member suggested that Cosco Bay in the Gulf of Maine would be a better choice because of the importance of air deposition there.

Tampa Bay was suggested as another case study. Dr. Driscoll said he would take on that write up. Dr. Goodale volunteered to help with Tampa Bay.

A Council member referenced the previous EPA assessments on lost fishing recreation values for Adirondacks as coming from the last (1999) 812 report.

Dr. Driscoll spoke about his attempts to get more economic information on the Southern Appalachian Mountain Initiative (SAMI) and that acid deposition was higher in SAMI than in either Catskills or Adirondacks.

Dr. Boyer spoke about her write-up of the Rocky Mountains and said this area drew a lot of interest because of its national parks and tourism dollars.

Brian Heninger informed the members about an EPA workshop that focused on Tampa Bay and referenced a series of SAB reports on Tampa Bay that could be found on the SAB website under "2001 Reports."

Respectfully Submitted:

*/Signed/*  
Holly Stallworth, Designated Federal Officer

Certified as True:

*/Signed/*  
Charles Driscoll  
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.