



HOMELAND SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE

Conference Call Summary
Friday, July 11, 2008
1:00 – 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time

Welcome

Dr. Gary Saylor, University of Tennessee, Subcommittee Chair

Dr. Gary Saylor, Chair of the Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) Homeland Security Subcommittee, welcomed the Subcommittee members to the teleconference. After reviewing the names of Subcommittee members present on the call, he asked other participants, including those from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), to introduce themselves. Finally, he explained that the purpose of the call was to discuss the Subcommittee's draft report.

Administrative Procedures

Mr. Greg Susanke, EPA/Office of Research and Development (ORD), Subcommittee Designated Federal Officer (DFO)

Mr. Greg Susanke, Subcommittee DFO, reviewed the Federal Advisory Committee Act procedures that are required for all BOSC Subcommittee meetings. All meetings and conference calls involving substantive issues, whether in person, by phone, or by e-mail, that include one-half or more of the Subcommittee members must be open to the public. All public meetings of the Subcommittee must be published in the *Federal Register* at least 15 days prior to the meeting; the notice for this teleconference was published on June 16, 2008. An opportunity for public comment will be provided at 2:45 p.m. The minutes are being recorded by a contractor and, following review by the Subcommittee members and certification by the chair, will be available on the BOSC Web Site and via the electronic docket.

Mr. Susanke explained that those Subcommittee members who returned their homework sheets for their time spent at the face-to-face meeting should have received payment. Dr. Daniel Walsh's homework sheet is being processed; Dr. Anil Nerode will send his homework sheet by the end of the day. The travel vouchers for the face-to-face meeting are being processed. The face-to-face meeting minutes still need to be approved by the Subcommittee members. Subcommittee members should wait to send their homework sheets for this teleconference until it has been determined whether another teleconference is needed. The next homework sheet will include all time spent since the face-to-face meeting, including drafting and reviewing the draft report.

Chapter-by-Chapter Review of Draft Report

BOSC Homeland Security Subcommittee

Dr. Saylor explained that any editorial comments should be sent to him via e-mail using Microsoft Word's "Track Changes" feature. He then will incorporate these changes and the substantive comments discussed on this teleconference. He explained that the reference to Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD) 22 on page 6 will only include the title. The Subcommittee began discussing specific aspects of the draft report.

On page 8, the Subcommittee agreed to change the term “high” to “good” in the sentence that begins, “The general quality of the research being conducted is quite high...”

Dr. Saylor explained that he would highlight items that can be considered recommendations. These items need to be identified and called out in the text of the report. Some recommendations are secondary recommendations to the main recommendations. The summary section will focus on the main recommendations. In reviewing the draft report, Dr. Saylor will stress the key recommendations and the Subcommittee members can agree or disagree as appropriate; the recommendations will be highlighted when they are enclosed within descriptive text.

On page 8, Dr. Nerode suggested that the sentence begins, “The full scope of the research under the NHSRC mandate could be very large and un-accomplishable...” be rewritten so that the sentence does not begin with a negative observation; Dr. Saylor will rewrite the sentence.

On page 9, the Subcommittee members discussed the sentence, “As research matures and end user needs are more completely satisfied there seems to be a mechanistic gap, from an operational perspective, on how to achieve a research project life-cycle assessment to close mature projects or release them to the commercial sector.” A Subcommittee member commented that the gap was from a programmatic and operational level on how to achieve life-cycle analysis. Acquiring a life-cycle model aligned with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) or Department of Defense (DoD) approaches would be a significant enhancement to the Program. Ms. Ellen Raber thought that NASA and DoD are large compared to the National Homeland Security Research Center (NHSRC) and that this approach was not feasible. Dr. Romano commented that DoD’s medical branch was comparable to the NHSRC. Dr. Saylor commented that a specific model does not have to be specified in the draft report, just the suggestion.

Dr. Nerode stated that the following sentence on page 9 was an implicit recommendation: “To date there appears little activity relative to protection of the cyber infrastructure, another area coming under recommendation of the NRC report.” Dr. Saylor explained that in this particular case, it is known why every base is not being covered by the Program. The Subcommittee could recommend that the Program examine the future need for cyberstructure analysis. Within the same paragraph, Dr. Nerode recommended changing “peer review process” to “review process” as the process encompasses more than peer review; he will add this to the comments that he sends to Dr. Saylor.

Dr. Saylor explained that the overall rating assigned on page 9 is an important component of the report. The Subcommittee members agreed that an overall rating of “Meets Expectations” was appropriate, as long as it is accompanied with a narrative that explains the basis for assigning this rating.

In response to a question from a Subcommittee member, Dr. Saylor explained that much of the content included on page 10 was a descriptive overview of Long-Term Goal (LTG) 1. Dr. Nerode suggested that a subheading called “Descriptive Overview” be added to the portions of the report that are descriptive narrative to distinguish these sections from Subcommittee recommendations. Dr. Saylor stated that all recommendations would be stated as such after they have been identified, so this will help highlight them in the text.

Dr. Nerode thought that the second paragraph on page 11 that begins “However, there are indications that linkage to the first responder community...” was not stated strongly enough, and he suggested adding a recommendation that the Program strengthen its linkage to the first-responder community.

The last sentence of the third paragraph on page 11 was identified as a recommendation. Dr. Nerode thought that the recommendation should be targeted to a specific EPA laboratory or center versus all of EPA, as stated. Ms. Raber and Dr. Saylor explained that this was a generic statement that did not need to be specific to a laboratory or center. A Subcommittee member commented that LTG 1 included a

protection component, and EPA should consider the most promising research efforts to achieve these goals. Ms. Raber stated that this could be added under Theme 1.

Dr. Sayler called the Subcommittee's attention to the following sentence in the third bullet under Program Structure: "The program is asking the right questions, however, every effort should be made to ascertain if advancements in similar research eclipses or could eclipse the work being done at the Center."

Dr. Nerode and Ms. Raber agreed that this is a good recommendation. The next sentence contains a corollary to this recommendation regarding direction of funds.

Ms. Raber suggested that recommendations that apply to both LTGs be highlighted. Dr. Sayler agreed to highlight them in the summary section of the report. He also stated that acronyms must be defined at their first use. Each Subcommittee member should define acronyms for which they were responsible when they forward their comments. Subcommittee members also should clarify any embedded recommendations, and Dr. Sayler will edit them for the next draft of the report.

Most of the section on behavioral science research is descriptive, although there is a recommendation regarding the status of a National Program Director (NPD) for the Center. Dr. Sayler asked whether this recommendation should remain within this section. Dr. James Romano, Jr., commented that he had intended the recommendation to be broader than behavioral science. He is concerned about the acting NPD's ability to function and fully execute the role of an NPD, because his position is not at the same level as other NPDs within ORD. Ms. Raber agreed that this recommendation should be removed from this section and placed with the recommendations that affect both LTGs.

Dr. Sayler identified the following sentence on page 13 as a recommendation: "Prior to implementation of the RTMs and TEVA to any more systems, a detailed sensitivity analysis of these technologies to determine the variance of the resulting decisions should be performed."

The Subcommittee members discussed the first sentence of the second bullet on page 13: "To ensure quality research the program employs peer review however, an operational perspective on scientific direction should be employed." The peer review mentioned in this sentence is appropriate as the recommendation is referring to true peer review as well as a review in terms of accomplishments. Dr. Romano stated that the work should be reviewed in a technical merit format and also for programmatic relevance. Dr. Nerode agreed that the term "programmatic relevance" should be added to the recommendation. Dr. Romano stated that this should be reflected in funding decisions as well.

Mr. Leo Lebah suggested that the Blast Vulnerability Assessment Tool (VAT) mentioned on page 13 should be removed, as it is not generally accepted. He will rewrite this paragraph and include it with his comments.

Dr. Sayler highlighted the following sentence on page 14: "The second overall point was a 'need for greater transparency and stakeholder involvement/input in future research planning.'" Based on the presentations made at the face-to-face meeting, there was not a good deal of evidence to suggest that the program is working equally hard to improve this aspect. The Subcommittee needs to make a recommendation that greater efforts are needed to show that outside organizations are being embraced effectively in regard to collaboration and achieving programmatic goals. Dr. Nerode thought that a liaison needed to be assigned within the laboratory to be in charge of this; he will craft a recommendation and include it in his comments. Dr. Walsh stated that this was an important issue for him. Dr. Romano added that this liaison should have a direct link to the acting NPD to provide guidance and ombudsmanship. Dr. David Banks explained that he had made a suggestion for the Program to have representation outside of the research group within the regions. His impression from the regional presentation at the face-to-face meeting was that this communication was not strong enough.

Dr. Greg Sayles, EPA, agreed to send the definitions of the acronyms ESSENCE and RODS to Dr. Saylor via e-mail.

Dr. Saylor explained that the section on program performance and efficiency was complicated, and Mr. Phillip Juengst of EPA was present on the call to answer questions related to this subject. The driving force behind this is proving EPA efficiency to the Office of Management and Budget; as a result, the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) published a report on evaluating research efficiency. The Subcommittee has been charged to address this new issue. The NAS report identifies two categories of efficiency: investment and process. Process efficiency is more traditional relative to issues that can be quantified (e.g., speed of publication). Investment efficiency focuses on portfolio management and the need to identify promising lines of research for desired outcomes without focusing on the outcomes themselves *per se*, as many are long term. The process to identify these efficiencies is much more subjective in terms of how to analyze the issue of research performance and efficiency. The majority of the Subcommittee did not think that they received enough or the right kind of information to address this issue adequately. The goal is for the Subcommittee to determine a ranking regarding efficiency by the end of this conference call.

Dr. Nerode stated that the Center based its efforts on the most urgent and feasible tasks that could be accomplished, and he regards this as efficiency. The tasks that required immediate attention were addressed first, but with a new Program it is difficult to say much more than that. Dr. Romano agreed that the Program did an excellent job of identifying and prioritizing the “low-hanging fruit.” A Subcommittee member thought that Ms. Raber provided an excellent summary of this issue (i.e., 50% of tasks addressed immediately vs. slowly accomplishing the next 30–40% of tasks); this text probably should be included in the report. Quantifying resource issues and how prioritization decisions are made regarding these resources is a valuable recommendation. Another Subcommittee member commented that a portfolio analysis would need to be completed to accomplish this. Dr. Nerode commented that the manner in which this Program receives funding affects short- and long-term plans, and this is a limitation. Dr. Saylor asked the Subcommittee members to draft their comments regarding this issue and send them to him via e-mail.

The Subcommittee members discussed the lag that sometimes occurs in releasing effective tools (e.g., the Provisional Advisory Levels), and addressing this lag needs to be a fast-track recommendation.

Dr. Nerode asked Mr. Juengst about his perception of efficiency. Mr. Juengst responded that Dr. Saylor explained the concept well and captured all of the pertinent NAS points. The NAS report is new, so EPA has not figured out exactly how to accomplish the recommendations yet. Investment efficiency is an all-encompassing concept that requires an examination of the quality, relevance, and utility of the research, at a broad level, as well as the extent to which resources are managed effectively.

Mr. Lebaj mentioned that the Blast VAT tool will not work in the community, because the tool focuses on explosives and not on chlorine storage. Modifying and directing the tool so that it incorporates protection of chlorine storage facilities would be more useful. There is a low risk of terrorists targeting water supplies via explosives, but tampering with chlorine storage could create panic, sickness, and death. He will rewrite the bullets on page 16 in paragraph format. A Subcommittee member disagreed that the risk of explosives is low; explosives could have an enormous impact if used in the right location or as an adjunctive attack. Mr. Lebaj maintained that systems with limited resources should not be spending their resources fixing items that are unnecessary when compared to other, more likely scenarios. Dr. Saylor stated that both ideas could be incorporated in the report by explaining the wide range of this issue; he will edit Mr. Lebaj’s new paragraph as necessary to incorporate both views.

In response to Dr. Saylor’s question, Mr. Lebaj explained that the acronym VBIED stands for vehicle-born improvised explosive device.

Within the section on detection, in terms of the recommendation to focus more on assessment and analysis of an alarm, a Subcommittee member explained that he likes what the Program is doing in general, but an assessment component needs to be stressed. Unless assessment is performed, detection is of no use. Most utilities do not have good assessment methodologies or laboratory infrastructure, which increases the time to notify the public; in many cases, the public already will be sick. Dr. Nerode commented that this is a recommendation for developing a rapid assessment useful to utilities; Ms. Raber agreed. One concern that Dr. Nerode had was that the attitude appears to be that any potential terror biological agent already is known and can be tested for. Although the focus should be placed on issues that have some degree of probability of occurrence, there is a limited range of detection in commercially available detection devices. Ms. Raber thought that EPA should not be developing these tools but evaluating them. Dr. Saylor asked which agency currently funds development of such tools. Ms. Raber replied that DoD, the Department of Homeland Security, the National Institutes of Health, commercial entities, and startups in the medical countermeasures community currently fund this type of research. EPA should invest its efforts in learning what currently is being developed, and Dr. Nerode agreed that this is an appropriate recommendation.

In response to Dr. Saylor's question, Dr. Sayles explained that the acronym AHRF stands for all-hazards receipt facility.

On pages 17–19, the Subcommittee relies too much on the National Research Council's (NRC) report. This paragraph should be shortened and made more specific to the Subcommittee's recommendations. Dr. Lindell Ormsbee stated that it is unclear whether many of the issues had been addressed. Dr. Saylor commented that much of the discussion at the face-to-face meeting focused on reliable limits on model calibration. Dr. Ormsbee replied that there were many questions regarding this issue: In how many cities will this tool be deployed? How long will implementation take? Will this approach work? Dr. Saylor agreed that these questions were notable, but the recommendation regarding the calibration issue is important and must be included in the report. Dr. Ormsbee agreed that the Program must demonstrate that it can calibrate the model within the area that is being measured. Dr. Saylor stated that the Subcommittee will address the verbiage on pages 17–19 that relies too heavily on the NRC's recommendations.

In terms of the containment section on page 20, Dr. Nerode asked whether ensuring that the public is notified following detection should be included within behavioral science; Dr. Saylor agreed that the issue should be addressed in this area.

The following sentence on page 20 will be revised and moved to the section addressing LTG 1: "Risk Based Advisory Levels is good science but more applicable to LTG 2." Ms. Raber will add details and send the updated text to Dr. Saylor via e-mail.

Dr. Walsh thought that the section on remediation needed to be bolstered, because this was an especially weak point for the Agency. The Program has not accomplished much in terms of remediation research, and attention needs to be given to the consequences of this. Dr. Walsh and Ms. Raber will send comments to Dr. Saylor via e-mail regarding remediation.

Dr. Saylor will craft the following sentence on page 22 into a recommendation: "We suggest that the plan needs to be more focused and quantitative and list more specifics." Also on page 22, the following sentence was considered a strong recommendation, and the language should be used in the development of the executive summary: "A recommendation is made to better understand and evaluate time dependent research requests and address them in a way that will be appropriate for some level of implementation if possible." The following sentence on page 22 also was identified as a recommendation: "Direct engagement by ORD of outside decision makers through workgroups that expose a full range of local and state responders for cities of varying size is recommended."

The Subcommittee agreed that, on page 23, the following was a recommendation: “We recommend broadening the overall scope of the survey and to provide some follow-up assessment information for the outside boards so that they can better understand what recommendations have been addressed by the Center and how the end-user community has received this.”

On page 23, the Subcommittee discussed whether the following was a recommendation: “However, the human health issue should really be focused on eliminating the inhalation risk, which can be addressed by decontamination as well as by other approaches.” Ms. Raber thought that focusing on soil cleanup was not necessary if there is no inhalation risk unless other health issues are identifiable. It is more beneficial to approach the issue rather broadly and determine what the actual health problem is that requires remediation. Dr. Romano agreed with this assessment and promised to e-mail his comments to Dr. Sayler.

The following sentences on page 24 were discussed: “It would also be very beneficial for the Center to take a more active role in identifying and evaluating existing technologies that are ‘road ready’ and/or commercially available. Advancements to the LTG 2 areas are numerous, many are oversold and the EPA is the right place to evaluate these products for the civilian sector. This is a very different evaluation and has quite different requirements than is done for the military sector.” The Subcommittee thought that this should be made more global. Ms. Raber commented that it was important to ensure that the evaluation process that the Program was using for technology reflects what is important in the civilian sector rather than the military sector, which has very different needs. Dr. Sayler asked her to summarize this in a two-sentence recommendation. Dr. Romano commented that a similar thought was mentioned at the bottom of page 11 in terms of historical strengths and weaknesses. Ms. Raber thought that the recommendation should be that the Program needs to examine what is important for civilian needs and design the test to meet these needs, and she will write something up about this issue and send it to Dr. Sayler.

Dr. Nerode thought that the following sentence on page 26 needed to be made a recommendation, and Ms. Raber volunteered to draft the appropriate language: “It is not clear that the current pathway for this information to ORD, through EPA regional staff, is the most efficient method.”

In the first bullet about the Subcommittee’s general thoughts regarding overall themes on page 27, the thoughts on behavioral psychology need to be crafted into a recommendation.

Public Comment

Mr. Susanke called for public comment at 2:45 p.m. No comments were offered.

Chapter by Chapter Review of Draft Report (continued)

BOSC Homeland Security Subcommittee

On pages 27–29, Dr. Sayler identified the following as recommendations:

- ✧ “Periodic assessment of the NHSRC’s broad research agenda should consider optimizing the leverage of limited resources to acquire the greatest level of response capability across all sectors (prevention, detection, mitigation and containment, decontamination) in as short a time as possible.”
- ✧ “NHSRC goals should include development of well defined digital ‘clearinghouses’ of technical information that are easy to search and cover each of the major topics (prevention, detection, mitigation, etc.).”
- ✧ “Research is recommended on the social and behavioral dynamics of command of complex, catastrophic incidents as a means to improve success in future events.”

- ✧ “It is recommended that the full role that resource availability plays in setting the multi-year research agenda should be defined, particularly where research objectives of high and immediate importance are deferred due to limited resources.”
- ✧ “It is strongly recommended that NHSRC pursue the release of interim deliverables in all research programs.”
- ✧ “A mechanism to gage the degree to which these priorities are heard and addressed in research activities is recommended.”

The last two recommendations on the above list are interlocking recommendations; these are related to Center and first responder priorities. Communication between the Center and the first responder/user community is important.

Ms. Raber asked whether EPA has a mission with respect to LTG 2. Dr. Walsh thought that the Agency should be doing more in this area, but Ms. Raber did not think that was part of the mission and funding would not be provided for this particular area. Dr. Saylor agreed that protection against attack is not defined as a responsibility under LTG 2. Ms. Raber suggested that a comment be added to the report that indicated that this area is important, and the Program should be well coordinated with the response community and provide input.

The Subcommittee discussed the appropriateness of making recommendations that are valuable but not technically within the charge. Some issues have “slipped through the cracks,” and calling this fact out can aid in prevention, which has an enormous value. Dr. Saylor agreed that the Subcommittee can make observations whether or not they are considered recommendations. Protection is not a responsibility under LTG 2, so the Subcommittee can indicate that this is the reason that there are no recommendations regarding this issue.

On pages 29–30, the following recommendations were identified:

- ✧ “In particular, realistic sources terms for key threat agents need to be determined in order to effectively set research objectives for detection (characterization), mitigation and decontamination.”
- ✧ “Research aimed at coordinating indoor/outdoor-modeling efforts that can potentially answer the question of whether to evacuate or shelter in place. Excellent models exist for outdoor modeling as well as indoor modeling. However, these modeling capabilities have never been linked to allow for a 24/7 integrated response capability. Having such a capability would aid overall protective measures (providing guidance as to ‘evacuate or shelter in place’ as well as more quickly and effectively allowing for implementation of containment options and could assist OSCs in an expedited way in characterization activities).”
- ✧ “Development of protocols for establishing sampling playbooks for key infrastructure facilities that are based on statistical modeling and utilize site/area specific characteristics. This is considered as a preplanning tool.”

Dr. Saylor will modify the sentence on page 31 that begins, “The reviewers feel that the NHSRC should focus its efforts in evaluating existing commercially available real-time...” to “The Subcommittee feels that...” Dr. Bozzelli commented that this recommendation falls under LTG 1.

Recommendations identified on pages 31–34 include:

- ✧ “Development of PALs for additional media beyond water and air are recommended to assist consequent management.”

- ✧ “Additionally, it is important for the EPA to pursue advances in microbial risk assessment and to do this in partnership with CDC.”
- ✧ “Additional research in technical mitigation measures appeared lacking and it is recommended that some efforts be pursued in this area.”
- ✧ The three bullets on page 32.
- ✧ “Research to assist environmental responders function effectively in these complex situations is recommended and may include effective communication techniques.”
- ✧ “An examination and report on the environmental settings and media that are likely to be impacted by various threat scenarios and the basic research needs to address fate, residence and persistence is strongly recommended.”
- ✧ The four bullets on pages 33–34.

Identification of Final Action Items

Dr. Gary Saylor, University of Tennessee, Subcommittee Chair

Dr. Saylor commented that the report is strong, and he hoped that the Subcommittee was happy with its quality. There are many recommendations to highlight. He will write the summary and accumulate the recommendations. Subcommittee members should send their tracked changes by July 21, 2008. The goal is to craft as final a draft as possible for the next discussion within a few weeks. The ultimate goal is to provide a final draft for the BOSC Executive Committee to review during their meeting in mid-September; the Subcommittee will receive a draft no later than August 1, 2008, to meet this deadline.

Adjourn and Final Comments to Committee

Dr. Gary Saylor, University of Tennessee, Subcommittee Chair

Ms. Raber will be without e-mail access from August 2–25, 2008, but will provide her comments on her return.

Dr. Saylor asked whether the Subcommittee concurred that in terms of efficiency, the Program meets expectations and may even be considered to exceed them as a young Program; the Subcommittee concurred.

Mr. Susanke directed the Subcommittee members to include on their homework sheets everything from the face-to-face meeting up to, but not including, today’s conference call; the next homework sheets will include this conference call.

Dr. Saylor thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

Action Items

- ✧ Dr. Nerode will send his previous homework sheet to Mr. Susanke after the call.
- ✧ Dr. Sayles will send the definitions of ESSENCE and RODS to Mr. Susanke who will pass them along to Dr. Saylor via e-mail.
- ✧ Each Subcommittee member will send their substantive and editorial comments to Dr. Saylor by July 21, 2008, to include the following:

- Define acronyms for which they were responsible.
 - Clarify any embedded recommendations.
 - Additional comments regarding efficiency.
 - Address the verbiage on pages 17–19 that relies too heavily on the NRC’s recommendations.
- ✧ Dr. Saylor will make the following changes to the draft report:
- Change the term “high” to “good” in the sentence that begins, “The general quality of the research being conducted is quite high....”
 - Rewrite the sentence that begins, “The full scope of the research under the NHSRC mandate could be very large and un-accomplishable....” so that it does not begin with a negative observation.
 - Highlight recommendations that apply to both LTGs and those that apply to each in the summary section of the report. He also stated that acronyms must be defined at their first use. Each Subcommittee member should define acronyms for which they were responsible when they forward their comments. Subcommittee members also should clarify any embedded recommendations, and Dr. Saylor will edit them for the next draft of the report.
 - Move the comments regarding the NPD from the behavioral science section to the section that highlights recommendations that affect both LTGs.
 - Craft the following sentence on page 22 into a recommendation: “We suggest that the plan needs to be more focused and quantitative and list more specifics.”
 - Modify the sentence on page 31 that begins, “The reviewers feel that the NHSRC should focus its efforts in evaluating existing commercially available real-time....” to “The Subcommittee feels that....”
 - Use the following language in the development of the executive summary: “A recommendation is made to better understand and evaluate time dependent research requests and address them in a way that will be appropriate for some level of implementation if possible.”
- ✧ Dr. Nerode will include in his comments the following:
- On page 9, comments about changing “peer review process” to “review process” as the process encompasses more than peer review.
 - A recommendation that a liaison should be assigned within the laboratory to be in charge of external collaboration.
- ✧ Mr. Lebaj will include in his comments the following:
- Rewrite the paragraph on page 13 that deals with the Blast VAT tool.
 - Change the bullets on page 16 to paragraph form and add his comments about the utility of the Blast VAT tool.
- ✧ Ms. Raber will include in her comments the following:

- Additional details on page 20 about the following sentence: “Risk Based Advisory Levels is good science but more applicable to LTG 2.”
- Comments regarding the Program’s remediation research.
- A recommendation that the Program needs to examine what is important for civilian needs and design tests to meet these needs.
- Draft the following sentence into an appropriate recommendation: “It is not clear that the current pathway for this information to ORD, through EPA regional staff, is the most efficient method.”
- ✧ Dr. Walsh will include his observations about the Program’s remediation research in the comments that he sends to Dr. Saylor.
- ✧ Dr. Romano will include remarks about broadening the approach to decreasing inhalation risk in his comments to Dr. Saylor.

PARTICIPANTS LIST

Subcommittee Members

Gary S. Saylor, Ph.D.

Director
UT-ORNL Joint Institute for Biological
Sciences
Center for Environmental Biotechnology
University of Tennessee
676 Dabney Hall
Knoxville, TN 37996
Phone: 865-974-8080
Fax: 865-974-8086
E-mail: sayler@utk.edu

David L. Banks, Ph.D.

Professor of the Practice of Statistics
Institute of Statistics and Decision Sciences
Duke University
210A Old Chemistry Building, Box 90251
Durham, NC 27708-0251
Phone: 919-684-3743
Fax: 919-684-8594
E-mail: banks@stat.duke.edu

Joseph W. Bozzelli, Ph.D.

Distinguished Professor and Ada C. Fritts Chair
Chemistry and Environmental Science
Department
New Jersey Institute of Technology
University Heights
Newark, NJ 07102
Phone: 973-596-3459
Fax: 973-596-3586
E-mail: bozzelli@njit.edu

Leo E. Lebaj

Vice President
Infrastructure Protection Services
Telemus Solutions, Inc.
7600 Leesburg Pike
West Building, Suite 400
Falls Church, VA 22043
Phone: 703-564-2477
Fax: 703-893-3696
E-mail: llabaj@telemussolutions.com

Anil Nerode, Ph.D.

Goldwin Smith Professor of Mathematics
Cornell University
545 Malott Hall
Ithaca, NY 14850
Phone: 607-257-7641
Fax: 607-257-5716
E-mail: anerode1@twcnny.rr.com

Lindell Ormsbee, Ph.D.

Director
Kentucky Water Resources Research Institute
University of Kentucky
233 Mining and Minerals Resource Building
Lexington, KY 40506-0107
Phone: 859-257-6329
Fax: 859-323-1049
E-mail: lormsbee@enr.uky.edu

Ellen Raber

Deputy Program Manager
CBRNE Countermeasures Program
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
L-179, P.O. Box 808
Livermore, CA 94551
Phone: 925-422-3985
Fax: 925-422-4100
E-mail: raber1@llnl.gov

James A. Romano, Jr., Ph.D.

Senior Principal Life Scientist
Science Applications International Corporation
5202 Presidents Court, Suite 110
Frederick, MD 21703
Phone: 240-529-0447
Fax: 301-846-0794
E-mail: james.a.romano.jr@saic.com

Daniel C. Walsh, Ph.D.

Adjunct Senior Research Scientist
Earth Engineering Center
The Earth Institute
Columbia University
838 Seeley W Mudd
Mail Code: 4711
New York, NY 10027
Phone: 212-854-2910
E-mail: dcw43@columbia.edu

Designated Federal Officer

Greg Susanke

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
Office of Science Policy
Ariel Rios Building (8104R)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: 202-564-9945
Fax: 202-565-2911
E-mail: susanke.greg@epa.gov

EPA Participants

Phillip Juengst

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
Office of Resources Management
Administration
Ariel Rios Building (8102R)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: 202-564-2645
E-mail: juengst.phillip@epa.gov

Greg Sayles, Ph.D.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
National Homeland Security Research
Center
26 W Martin Luther King Drive (NG16)
Cincinnati, OH 45268
Phone: 513-569-7607
E-mail: sayles.gregory@epa.gov

Other Participant

Karen Forde

RTI International
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
Phone: 919-541-6000

Contractor Support

Kristen LeBaron

The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc.
656 Quince Orchard Road, Suite 210
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
Phone: 301-670-4990
E-mail: klebaron@scgcorp.com



HOMELAND SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

AGENDA

July 11, 2008

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time

Participation by Teleconference Only

866-299-3188

Code: 2025648239#

1:00–1:05 p.m.	Welcome - Roll Call - Overview of Agenda	Dr. Gary Sayler Subcommittee Chair
1:05–1:10 p.m.	Administrative Procedures - FACA Rules and Procedures - Timesheets, Reimbursement, etc.	Mr. Greg Susanke Subcommittee DFO
1:10–2:30 p.m.	Chapter by Chapter Review of Draft Report	BOSC Homeland Security Subcommittee
2:30–2:45 p.m.	Identification of Final Action Items	Dr. Gary Sayler
2:45–2:55 p.m.	Public Comment	
2:55–3:00 p.m.	Adjourn and Final Comments to Committee	Dr. Gary Sayler Mr. Greg Susanke
3:00 p.m.	Adjourn	