

**SAFE PESTICIDES/SAFE PRODUCTS (SP2) SUBCOMMITTEE
CONFERENCE CALL SUMMARY**

**Wednesday, January 17, 2007
12:00 noon – 2:00 p.m., EST**

Welcome

Dr. Anna Harding, Oregon State University, Chair, Safe Pesticides/Safe Products (SP2) Subcommittee, Board of Scientific Counselors

Dr. Anna Harding, Chair of the Safe Pesticides/Safe Products (SP2) Subcommittee of the Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC), welcomed the participants to the teleconference and reviewed the purpose of the call and the agenda. She explained that the purpose of the first call was to review the administrative and logistical procedures associated with Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) meetings. The purpose of this conference call, which unlike the first call was open to the public, was to inform the Subcommittee members about the SP2 Research Program. Presentations by Mr. Jeff Morris, Mr. Phillip Juengst, and Dr. Elaine Francis of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) were included to provide a context to help better understand aspects about EPA's Office of Research and Development (ORD), the Subcommittee's charge and rating of the SP2 Research Program's performance, and the program itself, respectively. In accordance with FACA requirements, the agenda included a designated time for public comment. The call concluded with a discussion about preparatory work, including writing assignments, in advance of the upcoming face-to-face review meeting in Research Triangle Park (RTP), North Carolina, on February 7-9, 2007.

Dr. Harding mentioned that the Subcommittee members received notebooks and a CD containing information on the SP2 Research Program. Unless specifically requested by the Subcommittee, EPA will not provide additional information for the review. She thanked the Subcommittee members for providing her with input with respect to their preferences for writing assignments to address the charge questions; she noted that these assignments will be discussed later in the call. She then asked Drs. Elly Best and Richard Di Giulio to introduce themselves because they were not on the Subcommittee's first conference call.

Dr. Best is a Team Leader in the Environmental Processes and Engineering Division of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer's Engineer Research and Development Center. She works on plant processes and effects in the context of the environment in which they occur (e.g., aquatic, terrestrial). Dr. Di Giulio is a Professor of Environmental Toxicology at Duke University, and his research involves molecular work on aquatic mechanistic toxicology. Dr. Jerald Ault noted that he also was not on the first conference call and introduced himself. He is a Professor of Marine Biology and Fisheries at the University of Miami, with expertise in theoretical and applied fish population dynamics and community dynamics.

Dr. Craig Adams commented that he was an Assistant Director for the Center for the Study of Metals in the Environment (CSME), an EPA-funded project that was completed on May 31, 2006. He cautioned that if the current Subcommittee discusses CSME, he will need to be recused from those discussions. Dr. Harding asked Ms. Heather Drumm, the Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the Subcommittee, whether she was aware of any potential conflict of interest regarding CSME. Ms. Drumm responded that she had spoken with Dr. Adams earlier about this concern and, as Dr. Adams mentioned, should CSME happen to come up in any of the proceedings, then he will need to recuse himself during that portion of the discussion.

Dr. Harding then turned to Ms. Drumm, who provided the DFO's remarks.

Designated Federal Officer Remarks

Ms. Heather Drumm, DFO for the SP2 Subcommittee, EPA/ORD

Ms. Drumm introduced herself and thanked everyone for their participation in the teleconference. She then stated that the BOSC is a federal advisory committee that provides independent scientific peer review and advice to ORD. The BOSC Executive Committee established the present Subcommittee to review the SP2 Research Program. The Subcommittee has been asked to respond to charge questions and to provide a report to the Executive Committee, which will review and revise it as needed, and then submit the report to ORD. Although the role of the BOSC is to provide advice and recommendations to ORD, the rights of decision-making and program implementation remain with the Agency. Ms. Drumm indicated that this is the Subcommittee's second conference call; the first call was administrative in nature and was held on December 15, 2006. The third teleconference is slated for January 29, 2007.

As DFO, Ms. Drumm serves as the liaison between the Subcommittee and EPA and ensures that the meetings are in compliance with FACA requirements. Ms. Drumm highlighted some key FACA rules. FACA meetings, whether by phone, e-mail, or in person, must be open to the public. These rules apply for any meeting that is attended by more than one-half of the Subcommittee members. Documents received by the Subcommittee also must be made available to the public. Issues that are solely administrative or preparatory in nature are exempt from the FACA requirements. A *Federal Register* notice must announce all public meetings 15 calendar days in advance. Notice for this meeting was published on December 8, 2006. The Chair runs the meeting, mediates the deliberations of the Subcommittee, and ensures that the meeting follows the agenda. The Chair also directs questions raised by the Subcommittee to EPA staff members when appropriate. The Chair must request this response and recognize the EPA staff member before he/she can speak.

The DFO also ensures that the Subcommittee members have satisfied all of the appropriate ethics requirements. Each of the members has filed a government financial disclosure report and has completed the required annual ethics training. Ms. Drumm added that all human resources paperwork has been finalized, so the Subcommittee members can begin to receive remuneration for their work on this program review. The members are requested to begin logging the time they spend reviewing documents for this review on the homework sheet that they received.

Ms. Drumm noted that Dr. Harding decided to divide the Subcommittee members into workgroups to address the charge questions at the RTP meeting. These workgroups will each contain two or more people and they can work among themselves but must report only to the

Chair. At the RTP meeting, the workgroups likely will assemble in different rooms to avoid having to invoke FACA. The FACA guidelines also apply to communications of the Subcommittee via e-mail; thus, any e-mail messages that are sent to other workgroups must involve less than one-half of the Subcommittee members.

Ms. Drumm discussed some travel accommodation details with the Subcommittee members. She also confirmed that the members all received their binders of materials last week. Drs. Judy Graham and Barry Ryan noted that they did not receive the CD in their packages. Ms. Drumm stated that she will re-send a CD to them. She concluded by stating that she will wait until the next conference call to discuss the logistics for the face-to-face meeting.

Dr. Harding thanked Ms. Drumm and welcomed the next speaker, Mr. Morris, who presented in lieu of Dr. Kevin Teichman (EPA), who could not be in attendance. Mr. Morris currently serves as the Acting Director of ORD's Office of Science Policy (OSP); prior to this position, he served as the Deputy Director of OSP under Dr. Teichman.

ORD Overview

Jeff Morris, Acting Director, Office of Science Policy, EPA/ORD

Mr. Morris thanked the participants for their attendance and gave a broad overview of ORD, whose goal is to produce credible, relevant, and timely research results and technical support that inform EPA policy decisions. ORD comprises 1,915 employees, of which approximately 1,200 are scientists, distributed among 13 laboratory or research facilities across the United States. Of ORD's \$557 million budget requested for FY2007, approximately \$64 million is allocated to extramural research grant funding, directed mostly toward universities and primarily via the Science To Achieve Results (STAR) program. ORD's mission comprises three main components: (1) performing human health and ecological effects research; (2) supporting EPA program offices, regions, and other governmental and non-governmental organizations through scientific and technical advice and assistance; and (3) providing scientific leadership in identifying, studying, and resolving environmental health and ecological effects issues and in shaping the research agenda in those areas. For each of its programmatic areas, ORD has National Program Directors (NPDs) who are responsible for planning and managing the research in their respective areas.

The ORD Executive Council makes corporate decisions on what ORD does and how it implements its research programs, based on decision inputs and feedback from evaluations. Guidance on decision-making comes from EPA's program and regional offices, the EPA Strategic Plan, BOSC Reviews, the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) and other external advisory bodies, the NPDs, and the Management Council, among others. These inputs are fed to the NPDs—who decide what research areas ORD should work on and when to conduct that work—as well as to the Laboratory/Center Directors, who decide how ORD produces its research products. Evaluation feedback sources include the program and regional offices, BOSC program evaluations, NAS and other advisory bodies, and Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) reviews conducted by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The feedback is channeled to the Laboratory/Center Directors, who develop ORD's research products, and to the NPDs, who communicate the products to clients. The decision inputs and evaluation feedback also flow directly to the Executive Council.

When implementing its evaluation framework, ORD relies heavily on independent expert evaluation, including the BOSC review feedback. The goal is to move the scientific program toward achieving short-term outcomes, which, in turn, lead to intermediate outcomes that satisfy strategic objectives. These intermediate outcomes lead to long-term outcomes that satisfy strategic goals.

ORD's 13 Multi-Year Plans (MYPs) are used to guide the Agency's research program. These plans consist of Annual Performance Measures, Annual Performance Goals (APGs), and Long-Term Goals (LTGs), all of which feed into one another. The BOSC program evaluations help to determine whether ORD is conducting the right type of research and whether it is doing so in the appropriate way. These evaluations provide evidence for the OMB evaluations using the PART. This tool contains R&D-specific questions that reflect the OMB/Office of Science and Technology Policy Investment Criteria for R&D. The criteria state that: (1) R&D investments must be relevant to national priorities, agency missions, and customer needs; (2) programs must maximize the quality of the research into which they invest; and (3) programs must demonstrate performance by setting APGs and LTGs that demonstrate progress toward outcomes.

Mr. Morris concluded his presentation by mentioning that input from the Subcommittee program evaluation is one of the most important pieces of information that ORD uses when evaluating research program performance. The Subcommittee's time and energy in the review of the SP2 Research Program is much appreciated, and its advice will be critical as the program moves forward.

Discussion

Referring to slide 6 of Mr. Morris' presentation, Dr. Best asked about the difference between intermediate outcomes (strategic objectives) and long-term outcomes (strategic goals), and whether these are found in the Strategic Plan. Mr. Morris responded that the strategic goals are outlined in the Strategic Plan. Relating to long-term outcomes, he gave the example of a long-term goal to improve public health. Ameliorating air quality, which results in reduced incidence of respiratory disease, is a long-term outcome that results from positive changes in air quality. These changes are partly the consequence of an improved scientific understanding of how air pollution affects human health. Again in response to Dr. Best, Mr. Morris stated that there is no particular number of years associated with the term "long term."

Dr. Harding asked about the difference between an "output" and an "outcome." Mr. Morris responded that an outcome is a specific deliverable. For instance, if the goal in an MYP is to complete a certain study, the completion of that study is considered a scientific output. An outcome would be if the information in that study leads to an environmental decision that results in a positive environmental change. As an example, if it was known that a certain pesticide class at a certain exposure level has a high probability of causing adverse human health effects, then a change by a program office regarding the use restrictions or labeling of that pesticide would result in an outcome.

Dr. Harding noted that the charge questions address all of the points on slides 13-16 in Mr. Morris' presentation, which Mr. Morris decided not to cover in this conference call to save time.

Referring to the diagram on slide 5, Dr. Ault asked about the difference between a BOSC review and a BOSC program evaluation. Mr. Morris responded that the left-hand portion of the diagram, which shows decision inputs, ties into the need to evaluate the research program prospectively by moving it forward in the appropriate way. The right-hand side of the diagram represents the retrospective, or evaluative, part of the process, through which the Subcommittee will provide performance feedback on the program. Dr. Ault asked for further clarification, wondering whether the BOSC review is considered to be strategic planning and the BOSC program evaluation is the assessment. Mr. Morris confirmed this point.

In relation to the last point on slide 12, which discusses the R&D criteria (“R&D programs must demonstrate performance by setting annual and long-term goals and demonstrating progress toward outcomes”), Dr. Best asked where details on outputs are described. She agreed that outcomes are more important than outputs; however, part of what the Subcommittee will address is the outputs. Mr. Morris responded that the MYP will provide the framework to achieve those outcomes. He added that, in the course of the BOSC program review, there will be presentations on the outputs that the program has made that contribute to outcomes.

Dr. Harding commented that the R&D criteria do not mention the design of the program; however, this is one aspect that the Subcommittee has been asked to evaluate. She commented that this has been a similar element in other BOSC reviews. Mr. Morris confirmed that the design of a program is important. The R&D criteria are essential to the PART review, but ORD uses the BOSC program reviews for more than just as input for the PART review. ORD also seeks the Subcommittee’s input to advance the program, in addition to addressing the R&D criteria.

Dr. Harding confirmed that the Subcommittee members did not have any other questions and then thanked Mr. Morris for his presentation. She then introduced Mr. Juengst as the next speaker.

Overview of Charge/Rating Performance Program

Mr. Phillip Juengst, Accountability Team Leader, EPA/ORD

Mr. Juengst introduced himself as the Accountability Team Leader for ORD. He provided an overview of Section B (page 6), the Summary Assessment portion of the Draft Program Review Charge document. The conference call participants received this document in advance of the call.

Over the last several years, all of ORD’s programs have worked to develop a suite of performance measures to assess outcomes on an annual and long-term basis. Although there have been internal performance metrics for the SP2 Research Program, measures for the long-term basis have not yet been developed. Currently, ORD is engaging in a PART review with OMB, which will continue for the next 3-6 months, to develop formal measures for the SP2 Research Program.

One of the biggest challenges has been developing measures of long-term performance that could be applied over time in a consistent fashion. A workgroup comprising members of the BOSC Executive Committee, OMB, and ORD has worked over the past year on developing a methodology that will enable the use of long-term performance measures that can be applied

consistently during BOSC reviews. The summary assessment portion of the Draft Charge on page 6 captures this topic. The workgroup is fine-tuning changes to the methodology portion of the charge; these changes will be finalized by the BOSC Executive Committee before the face-to-face meeting next month.

Mr. Juengst noted that the Subcommittee review of the SP2 Research Program is piloting this new rating methodology. It is hoped that the Subcommittee will provide feedback on the use of the proposed qualitative ratings to provide a summary assessment for each of the LTGs. These ratings are described on page 7 of the Draft Charge and include “Not Satisfactory,” “Satisfactory,” “Better than Satisfactory,” and “Exceptional.” The review will serve as a benchmark to assess ORD’s performance in future reviews, with the goal of improving program performance from year to year. Mr. Juengst pointed out that the same three questions that appear on page 6 under Section B also appear under Section A on Program Assessment. Thus, each LTG will be assessed in terms of the same three areas that will be considered when evaluating the program itself. To assist with the ratings, Section B includes key elements to include per LTG.

Mr. Juengst concluded by noting a couple of edits. One change is that the workgroup is looking to rename “Better than Satisfactory” as “Exceeds Expectations.” Another edit is to change “For each question” at the start of the first paragraph on page 7 to “For each LTG.” This paragraph mentions that an appropriate narrative should accompany the individual ratings to provide context and rationale.

Discussion

Dr. Best asked whether the assessment criteria being discussed here are different from the five R&D rating criteria that were listed for the PART review on slide 11 of Mr. Morris’ presentation. Mr. Juengst responded that the R&D Investment Criteria were developed by the White House, OMB, and some of the other policy arms of the White House. These criteria are captured largely in the President’s Management Agenda, but not in the PART. The PART does reference these criteria, however, and it is expected that programs that are assessed under a PART review as doing well should probably address most of what is in the R&D Investment Criteria. The ratings in PART examine how well the program is doing from an independent body evaluation. The BOSC review will factor heavily in the upcoming PART review for the SP2 Research Program.

Mr. Juengst added that there also are performance questions relating to how well this program performs with other programs; these have been a challenge for ORD to answer and largely are not intended to be addressed by the PART review. There are annual and long-term measures, however, and it is hoped that the ratings discussed on page 6 will become long-term performance measures for the LTGs of the SP2 Research Program. It also is hoped that some consistency will be achieved both within a program over time and across programs as to how the ratings are applied.

Dr. Graham expressed concern that the wording “all” might prove problematic in judging whether a program has met particular expectations. For example, the “Exceptional” ranking means that a program “is meeting all and exceeding some of its goals.” She asked what “all” means and whether it is humanly possible to meet all of the goals or requirements. Moreover, is the word “all” necessary? Dr. Best responded that this is for the Subcommittee to decide. In her view, it is unlikely that any of the members think that he or she knows it “all.” It is only possible

to do one's best. She added that the government agency in which she works also is wrestling with this same point. Dr. Graham responded that, without even looking at the material, she is able to say that almost no group meets the criterion of "all." Does this mean that the ratings are setting a program up for failure? A participant responded that it also depends on whether the goals were realistic or not. He expressed concern that, according to the current ratings, if the program is not meeting all of its goals, it is considered satisfactory. Another participant was concerned that for many goals the rating will fall between the "Satisfactory" and "Not Satisfactory" because the former entails meeting most of the goals, whereas the latter means failing to meet a substantial number of goals.

Dr. Graham suggested that perhaps the APGs are written such that they are too unrealistic to attain. In this regard, do the points being expressed represent the true definitions that are intended? Dr. Harding responded that the ratings have evolved to where they are now from a very different previous version. Because this is a pilot ranking tool, the BOSC and ORD will assess its usefulness. There is latitude to redefine the terms as needed. A participant asked whether the term "all" must be used or if the Subcommittee could choose another word. Mr. Juengst pointed out that the paragraph above the ratings terminology on page 7 mentions that other factors can be taken into consideration when arriving at a rating. For example, in the case where the program's goals are not as ambitious, but they are being met, this might warrant a somewhat lower rating than for a program with ambitious goals. He explained that the BOSC participants on the workgroup developing the rating tool drafted these definitions, and the challenge was to define the rating terms in a way that would permit a fairly consistent rating of the quality and performance over time. Another participant asked whether a fourth version of the charge will be provided that contains the category "Exceeds Expectations." Mr. Juengst responded that "Better than Satisfactory" will be reworded as "Exceeds Expectations" at the next Subcommittee meeting.

Dr. Graham asked whether the Subcommittee will have enough information to respond to the charge questions. She pointed out that all of the LTGs include the phrasing "use of ORD science by OPPTS and other organizations." Will the Subcommittee be given examples of how the Office of Prevention, Pesticides, and Toxic Substances (OPPTS) uses information to arrive at an outcome? Dr. Harding responded that the Subcommittee will be given these examples, and Dr. Francis will cover this topic in her presentation. Dr. Graham asked whether any type of performance is relative to resources. For instance, one person working on an APG will produce different results than if there are 100 people working on that APG. Will there be a resource breakdown by hours? Dr. Francis responded that the lowest possible breakdown level likely will be by LTG.

Dr. Graham asked about the phrasing "evaluate entire research program" on page 3 of the Draft Charge. Does "entire" mean to evaluate the SP2 Research Program in context with other programs that involve pesticides and toxics, such as work on human health research and endocrine disruptors? Mr. Juengst responded that the questions listed under Section A of the Draft Charge apply to all of the LTGs for the SP2 Research Program. The questions under Summary Assessment (page 6) should be applied to each of the LTGs for the SP2 Research Program.

Regarding the qualitative rating scale, Dr. Ault stated that it would be helpful to have a reference point or benchmark to which the expectations can be compared. Could the Subcommittee be

referred to such a reference, perhaps a similar summary review, to provide an idea about how the scale should be used? Mr. Juengst responded that because this Subcommittee is the first to use this rating scale, it is establishing the baseline. The benchmark is, hopefully, the definitions of the terminology. For example, a program that is “Exceeding Expectations” is meeting all of its goals and, therefore, is exceeding in some capacity. A “Satisfactory” program, however, is one that appears to be doing most of what is expected of it and is doing it well and on time. Dr. Ault stated that the Subcommittee will need to discuss these criteria to ensure that everyone is on the same page.

Dr. Harding noted that although past reviews have examined the strengths and weaknesses of the programs, they have never qualified performance using rating terminology. She added that after the Subcommittee has worked through all of the materials and had the face-to-face meeting, it is hoped that some of these ratings will logically fall into place. For instance, to be able to conclude that LTG 1 is progressing well, but LTG 3 needs more work. If the Subcommittee finds itself unable to make such conclusions, it might become necessary to inform ORD that the rating system is not working well.

Dr. Harding then introduced Dr. Francis as the next speaker.

Overview of SP2 Research Program

Dr. Elaine Francis, NPD, SP2 Research Program, EPA/ORD/NCER

Dr. Francis thanked the Subcommittee for the opportunity to provide an overview on the SP2 Research Program. She referred to PowerPoint slides that were sent to the Subcommittee members prior to the conference call. Dr. Francis began with the purpose of the SP2 Research Program, which is: “To provide EPA’s Office of Prevention, Pesticides, and Toxic Substances with the scientific information it needs to reduce or prevent unreasonable risks to humans, wildlife, and non-target plants from exposures to pesticides, toxic chemicals, and products of biotechnology.” The program entails a combination of problem-driven and core research. She pointed out that work being done in this program is not being addressed by any other ORD research program. The scope of the program was developed in collaboration and cooperation with OPPTS to determine what scientific needs of OPPTS are not being addressed by other ORD research programs and to note where their needs align with existing ORD research. The nature of the program is unique among research organizations: it is examining a multidisciplinary set of research areas for human health, wildlife, and plants, cutting across the risk assessment/risk management paradigm.

The SP2 Research Program falls under the fourth LTG of the Strategic Plan, i.e., Healthy Communities and Ecosystems. This is the same goal under which OPPTS conducts its own activities. The program factors in customer/user needs, with OPPTS being its largest client; others include the regional offices, the Office of Water (OW), and some federal research partners. Planning for the program occurs through planning teams, the Deputy Assistant Administrator/Regional Administrator, and other collaborations. The SP2 MYP has various implementation plans at the laboratory level of other strategies and frameworks (e.g., Wildlife Strategy) to guide the plan. Research planning input for the program also comes from outside peer advice, through laboratory/division-level peer reviews, the BOSC Subcommittee, NAS, and others.

Dr. Francis provided some history on ORD's research in support of OPPTS. This work has included conducting research on underlying science to assist in data interpretation from industry-submitted studies. Another stride was the initiation of a biotechnology research program in FY2002, which was highly targeted to a specific OPPTS need.

There are three LTGs for the SP2 Research Program's MYP, which includes research activities implemented and planned for 2007 to 2015. Each LTG has three or four APGs. The scheduling/sequencing of the APGs is based on various factors, including existing resources, progress to date, complexity of the research area, and congressionally driven deadlines.

Dr. Francis summarized by mentioning that presentations at the face-to-face meeting will include an overview of the research program as well as the research for each LTG. A poster session will follow to demonstrate the research and its impacts, followed by a poster discussion to clarify any issues. There also will be presentations by OPPTS Office Directors on the relevance of the research that ORD has been doing and how they have used that research in their decision-making processes. Individuals from program offices will present posters as well.

Discussion

Dr. Adams asked whether the SP2 Research Program includes nanoparticles. Dr. Francis responded that nanoparticles currently are not included. Nanoparticles are covered in a separate research strategy that is under development for nanotechnology. She added that it has not been decided which MYP will contain the nanotechnology research.

Before moving to the last portion of the agenda, Dr. Harding asked if there were any questions. There were none, so she moved forward with discussion of the next call and face-to-face meeting.

Preparation for Next Call and Face-to-Face Meeting

In preparation for the face-to-face meeting, Dr. Harding explained that she organized the Subcommittee into workgroups that will be responsible for drafting responses to the charge questions. At the conclusion of the meeting in RTP, the BOSC Subcommittee will have to give an oral report of its preliminary findings to EPA. The Subcommittee members agreed with Dr. Harding's proposal to structure the writing assignments in the same fashion that the LTGs are organized. This would involve preparing written answers to the charge questions for each LTG, and then ranking each LTG according to the assessment criteria, as well as assessing the program in general. After the meeting, Drs. Harding and Ryan will collect the drafts, organize them by LTG, and synthesize a cohesive draft report. The finished product will resemble the format of the Water Quality Research Program Review Report.

Dr. Harding noted that in the binder containing the poster abstracts, Tab I, which is titled "Long-Term Goal 1A," is a combination of LTG 1A and 1B. Tab J, which is titled "Long-Term Goal 1B," contains the poster abstracts for LTG 1C.

Based on input from the Subcommittee members, Dr. Harding divided the Subcommittee into four workgroups of three members each—one for each LTG—to address four sections of the charge: LTG 1A and 1B; LTG 1C; LTG 2; and LTG 3. A lead was assigned for each

workgroup; the lead will be responsible for obtaining the written responses from the other workgroup members and to organize the workgroup's response. The workgroup assignments were as follows:

Dr. Ault: the lead on LTG 2 and contribute to LTG 1C
Dr. Blanco: the lead on LTG 3 and contribute to LTG 2
Dr. Di Giulio: contribute to LTG 1A and 1B and the leadership section
Dr. Coats: the lead on LTG 1C and contribute to LTG 3
Dr. Adams: contribute to LTG 1C and LTG 2
Dr. Graham: the lead on LTG 1A and 1B and contribute to coordination and communication
Dr. Best: contribute to LTG 1A and B and LTG 3
Dr. Ryan: the lead on coordination and communication
Dr. Harding: the lead on leadership

Dr. Harding asked for input on the assignments. Dr. Adams suggested that he would be more comfortable working on LTG 1A and 1B because he has worked on those topics for many years, and he has less knowledge of LTG 2. Dr. Di Giulio offered to switch his LTG 1 A and 1B for Dr. Adams's LTG 2. Dr. Harding approved and noted this change: Dr. Di Giulio will contribute to LTG 2 in place of LTG 1A and 1B, and Dr. Adams will contribute to LTG 1A and 1B in place of LTG 2. Dr. Harding will send an e-mail to the Subcommittee members listing the workgroup assignments. The workgroup members are to decide how they will begin the writing assignments. One suggestion is to divide the charge questions among the workgroup members.

Dr. Graham asked whether Ms. Drumm would need to be present during the conference calls within the workgroups. Ms. Drumm responded that she would not need to be present if the calls include only the workgroup members. The purpose of creating workgroups is so that the members can work together outside of a public meeting to prepare a draft response that will be submitted to Dr. Harding. Ms. Drumm asked that the workgroups copy Dr. Harding and herself on their correspondence to keep them abreast of their progress.

Dr. Di Giulio noted that the CD he received in his package was blank. Ms. Drumm stated that she would provide him with a new CD. As an alternative, she may decide to place the program review documents online and then send the Subcommittee members the Web address so that they can access the materials.

Dr. Harding asked if the Subcommittee members wished to request any additional information from EPA. Dr. Di Giulio commented that it is not clear to him what differentiates the activities of the SP2 Research Program from those of other programs. For example, he is a member of the BOSC Computational Toxicology Subcommittee, and it appears that there is overlap in the work of these two research programs. He was concerned that it may be difficult to determine which program was responsible for the research. Dr. Harding asked Dr. Francis if this will become clearer after viewing the posters at the poster session.

Dr. Francis responded that it was a deliberate, strategic decision to include Dr. Di Giulio on the Subcommittee as an individual who also was involved with the BOSC Subcommittee review of the Computational Toxicology Research Program. She explained that the current MYP for the SP2 Research Program covers extramural research in computational toxicology. It is not uncommon that ORD will leverage resources across MYPs. For example, the work that ORD is

conducting related to drinking water treatment plants and the pesticides that are being discharged from those plants is being leveraged with ORD's Drinking Water Research Program. Therefore, it would not be unusual if work that was presented at the BOSC Subcommittee review of the Drinking Water Research Program also was presented in the current BOSC Subcommittee review of the SP2 Research Program. In having this overlap, ORD can speak to the value of cross-cutting research.

Dr. Graham commented that it might be helpful to have more information on the breakdown of resources by dollar and by FTE, at whatever level of detail is deemed appropriate by EPA. Dr. Francis agreed.

Dr. Harding asked Ms. Drumm if she needed to address any additional items before concluding the call. Ms. Drumm responded that there was nothing else to cover.

Public Comment

In accordance with FACA requirements, Ms. Drumm called for public comment. There were no members of the public present on the conference call and no comments were offered.

Adjourn

Dr. Harding thanked everyone for their help and participation. Ms. Drumm will send out an agenda for the next teleconference, which will be held on January 29, 2007. Dr. Harding concluded the call at 2:02 p.m.

Action Items

- ✧ Dr. Harding will distribute the list of revised workgroup assignments to the Subcommittee members.
- ✧ Ms. Drumm will provide Drs. Di Giulio, Graham, and Ryan with the CD for their information packages. The CD that Dr. Di Giulio had received was blank, and Drs. Graham and Ryan had not received a CD in their packages originally. As an alternative, Ms. Drumm will post the meeting materials on the Web and notify the Subcommittee members of the Web address so that the members can access the materials.
- ✧ Ms. Drumm will send out the agenda for the January 29, 2007 conference call to the Subcommittee members.

PARTICIPANTS LIST

Subcommittee Members

Anna K. Harding, Ph.D., Chair
Associate Professor
Department of Public Health
Oregon State University
309 Waldo Hall
Corvallis, OR 97331-6406
Telephone: 541-737-3830
E-mail: anna.harding@oregonstate.edu

P. Barry Ryan, Ph.D., Vice-Chair
Professor
Department of Environmental and
Occupational Health
Rollins School of Public Health
Emory University
Grace Crum Rollins Building, Room 264
1518 Clifton Road, NE
Atlanta, GA 30322
Telephone: 404-727-3826
E-mail: bryan@sph.emory.edu

Craig Adams, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Civil, Architectural and
Environmental Engineering
University of Missouri-Rolla
220 Butler-Carlton Hall
1870 Miner Circle
Rolla, MO 65409
Telephone: 573-341-4041
E-mail: adams@umr.edu

Jerald S. Ault, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Rosenstiel School of Marine and
Atmospheric Science
University of Miami
4600 Rickenbacker Causeway
Miami, FL 33149
Telephone: 305-361-4884
E-mail: jault@rsmas.miami.edu

Elly P.H. Best, Ph.D.
Research Biologist
Environmental Processes and
Engineering Division
U.S. Army Engineer Research and
Development Center
3909 Halls Ferry Road
Vicksburg, MS 39180-6133
Telephone: 601-634-4246
E-mail:
elly.p.best@erdc.usace.army.mil

Carlos Blanco, Ph.D.
Research Entomologist
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Agricultural Research Service
141 Experiment Station Road
Stoneville, MS 38776
Telephone: 662-686-5275
E-mail:
cblanco@msa-stoneville.ars.usda.gov

Joel R. Coats, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Entomology
Iowa State University
Insectary Building
Ames, IA 50011
Telephone: 515-294-4776
E-mail: jcoats@iastate.edu

Richard T. Di Giulio, Ph.D.
Professor
Nicholas School of the Environment and
Earth Sciences
Duke University
Levine Science Research Center, Room
A346
Research Drive
Durham, NC 27708-0328
Telephone: 919-613-8024
E-mail: richd@duke.edu

Judy Graham, Ph.D.

Senior Director and Senior Scientist
American Chemistry Council
1300 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22209
Telephone: 703-741-5229
E-mail:
judy_graham@americanchemistry.com

Designated Federal Officer

Heather Drumm

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
Ariel Rios Building (8140R)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Telephone: 202-564-8239
E-mail: drumm.heather@epa.gov

EPA Participants

Elaine Francis, Ph.D.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
National Center for Environmental
Research
Ariel Rios Building (8140F)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Telephone: 202-343-9696
E-mail: francis.elaine@epa.gov

Phillip Juengst

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

Jeff Morris

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
Telephone: 202-564-6756
E-mail: morris.jeff@epa.gov

Contractor Support

Deborah Komlos

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

APPENDIX A:
Meeting Agenda

SAFE PESTICIDES/SAFE PRODUCTS (SP2) SUBCOMMITTEE

AGENDA

January 17, 2007

12:00 noon – 2:00 p.m., EST

CONFERENCE CALL

Participation by Teleconference Only

12:00 – 12:10 p.m.	Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none">– Overview of Agenda– Summary of Ongoing Activities	Dr. Anna Harding Subcommittee Chair
12:10 – 12:20 p.m.	Administrative Procedures Logistics for Face-to-Face Meeting	Ms. Heather Drumm Subcommittee DFO
12:20 – 12:50 p.m.	ORD Overview	Dr. Kevin Teichman Office of Research and Development
12:50 – 1:05 p.m.	Overview of Charge/ Rating Program Performance	Dr. Anna Harding Subcommittee Chair and Phillip Juengst Office of Research and Development
1:05 – 1:25 p.m.	Overview of Multi-Year Plan	Dr. Elaine Francis Office of Research and Development
1:25 – 1:30 p.m.	Public Comment	
1:30 – 2:00 p.m.	Preparation for Next Call and Face-to-Face Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none">– Review Draft Agenda– Discuss Writing Assignments– Identify Additional Information Needs	Dr. Anna Harding Subcommittee Chair
2:00 p.m.	Adjournment	