

**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency**  
**Science Advisory Board**  
Integrated Nitrogen Committee  
Public Teleconference Meeting February 13, 2008  
Final Minutes

**Date and Time:** February 13, 2008 from 2:00-4:00 p.m. Eastern Time

**Location:** by teleconference only

**Purpose:** On this conference call, the working groups summarized progress on their assignments and identified what else was needed to complete the work.

**Materials Available:** Materials made available for the INC's earlier meetings and teleconferences teleconferences are identified in the minutes for those meetings. The only additional material made available for this teleconference was the agenda.

**Attendees:** INC members Viney Aneja, Beth Boyer, Russell Dickerson, Otto Doering, James Galloway, William Herz, Richard Kohn, JoAnn Lighty, William Mitsch, William Moomaw, Arvin Mosier, Hans Paerl, Paul Stacey, and Thomas Theis were present for all or most of the call. Drs. Cassman, Cowling, Hey, and Shaw were unable to participate. Kathleen White of the Science Advisory Board Staff Office was present; no other Agency staff were on the line. Sue Gray, Pauley Bradley and Tyler Wegmerer of John Deere were on the call.

**Summary:** After the DFO called the roll, Dr. James Galloway, Chair reviewed assignments and schedule. By March 1, he would like to have a draft that can be assembled in a binder and looked at in its entirety. The next teleconference will be March 19, to be followed by a face-to-face meeting in Washington April 9-11. A final meeting July 21-23 in Washington is planned.

The leads and co-leads of the working groups reported on their progress with the writing assignments.

Dr. Aneja reported that the Producers Working Group had made much progress. He was very pleased with progress on sources, emissions and depositions of nitrogen by Dr. Boyer. He has since received comments from Mr. Herz. The DFO sent the February 1, 2008 draft to full INC. Dr. Aneja thinks the PWG is making good progress and will have a draft by March 1. He asked other PWG members to add their thoughts, especially Dr. Boyer.

Dr. Boyer continues to make progress on the nitrogen budgets and hopes to send the next increment by the end of the weekend, including the agricultural analysis. She is working up a set of numbers on watershed response to compare inputs to states to watersheds or other boundaries. She spoke with USGS about how soon a critical data set will be published. USGS indicated they will be public by April. She will have material to

include in the March 1 draft and acknowledged the input from Mr. Herz. Dr. Aneja mentioned that Dr. Shaw will be checking Dr. Kohn's calculations, which will help bring the report to conclusion.

Dr. Mosier reported that the Environmental System Working Group has substantively revised Section 3.3. Dr. Dickerson used Dr. Boyer's data from last week to strengthen the atmospheric deposition section. He hopes for more input from Drs. Hey and Mitsch. There are blanks in the section; these should be filled in with data from Dr. Boyer. If so, the ESWG should meet the March 1 deadline. Mosier invited comments from other ESWG members

Mr. Herz will provide Dr. Mosier with a short piece on adoption rates within the next few days. Dr. Mitsch will provide Dr. Mosier with comments within a week. The latest draft of Section 3.3 was circulated on February 13. Drs. Cassman and Mosier agreed to moving the turf grass section to 3.2 which Dr. Cassman will work out with Dr. Aneja when they are both stateside.

Dr. Theis reported that the Impacts & Metrics Working Group has made good progress on Section 3.4. The I&MWG has had several productive teleconferences. The only major gap is the section on monetization which Dr. Moomaw is preparing. Dr. Theis anticipates Section 3.4 will be in presentable form by March 1. The latest draft was circulated on February 3.

Dr. Theis reported that Chapter 4 has more holes than Section 3.4. Three sections that have not yet been drafted. One is on the various kinds of government programs impacting nitrogen; these programs need to be documented because they could have profound affects. Another is on the role of research in reducing risk from Nr; he hopes the whole INC will contribute to that section. The more specific the INC can be, the better. Finally, the last part of the chapter – which addresses social, economic, and educational aspects of nitrogen – has yet to be written. The idea is to consider what affects various actors' behaviors (farmers, power plants, transportation). He hopes to have this in shape by March 1. Chapter 4 will remain a work in progress until the input from the April 9-11 meeting has been incorporated.

Following these reports on the status of work completed and in progress, the chair instructed the INC members to provide comments to the relevant working group leads. When Dr. Moomaw came on the line, he said he was working on his section today and would provide it to Dr. Theis by early next week.

Dr. Galloway then addressed the report preparation process. The Committee will make a tremendous step forward on March 1 when we have it all in a binder. INC members will need to not only make specific comments, but also "helicopter" comments. It will take a commitment of concentrated time by the members to do this.

However, the Committee also needs to have a distillation of its thinking to distribute in April. There was a discussion of how to get from where the INC is to such a document. Some of the ideas raised follow.

To prepare the distillation, the INC should set a page limit and ask the leads to write a distillation to their limit.

Dr. Galloway spoke of the importance of the overall goal of the April meeting - to learn about policies and programs, past and present, that directly or indirectly affect how reactive nitrogen is managed. With that preamble, the focus should be on sections 3.4 and chapter 4.

Giving out the existing document would be a mistake because it isn't polished and because it is full of interesting information that could divert the discussion. INC needs to focus on creating a ten page document to give to the participants in advance to prepare for the meeting and their parts in it.

Dr. Mosier suggested summarizing the needs from each section. Dr. Doering clarified that this would include research needs.

The INC discussed whether the consensus points go in? Dr. Theis thinks the existing ones reflect where we were, but do not yet reflect an integrated strategy. Dr. Galloway suggested sending them to the INC again so the members can begin the process of modifying them as appropriate keeping in mind the recommendations from the various groups that have evolved since the current existing consensus points were prepared in October. No one disagreed. Dr. Mitsch clarified that INC could add points. Dr. Galloway said they aren't resolute and complete until they are transmitted to the Administrator. The DFO, Dr. Galloway and Dr. Theis will clean up existing potential consensus points before sending to INC. These may become an appendix.

It appears there will be three items circulated to prepare:

1. Consensus points
2. Recommendations
3. Ten-pager

By March 10, each WG chair will produce a 2 page summary of the main points of the product of their working group. Associated with those main points are their recommendations. The INC will look at it, do some integration and see how it compares with the consensus points.

The chair asked if anyone from the public would like to say anything. Mr. Tyler Wegmeyer of John Deere asked what the INC's expectation is of what the Administrator will do with the report once he gets it. Dr. Galloway said INC is trying to do some education on reactive nitrogen and identify places in the nitrogen cascade where something might be done to capture or reduce nitrogen in the environment. A major

point is that whatever you do on nitrogen has to be very integrated. There will be a section on existing policies, programs, etc. for reducing nitrogen.

The DFO briefly noted that most SAB reports are peer reviews, whereas this is a self-initiated study. She also said that, historically, most of the SAB's advice has been accepted and implemented, but that the implementation often took years, even a decade, to complete.

The public was also interested in the nature of public comment – when and how specific. Ms. Sue Gray asked, “How will this be available?” Dr. Galloway agrees he would like to have a draft to share before the July meeting.

There was time available for further Committee discussion. Dr. Lighty had read all the sections. She suggested that the outline be revised to reflect the report structure.

The DFO adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

Respectfully Submitted:

/s/

Ms. Kathleen E. White  
Designated Federal Official

Certified as True:

/s/

Dr. James N. Galloway, Chair  
SAB Integrated Nitrogen Committee