



BOARD OF SCIENTIFIC COUNSELORS

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

**Monday, January 29, 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 this second call was to address any questions regarding the upcoming face-to-face meeting in Research Triangle Park (RTP), North Carolina, to be held February 7-9, 2007, and to discuss the status of the meeting plans and logistics. She explained that Dr. Elaine Francis, National Program Director for the SP2 Research Program, would provide information on the program and address any questions that have arisen thus far in the workgroups. In accordance with the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), the agenda included a designated time for public comment. The call concluded with a discussion of preparations for the RTP meeting, the poster review process and assignments, and the draft report outline.

Dr. Harding asked each workgroup lead to provide a progress update. Dr. Judy Graham stated that her workgroup had parsed out its work and started on the writing assignments. She noted that her workgroup has had difficulty finding information to answer the following question in the Draft Charge: “How responsive is the program focus to program office and regional research needs?” She added that today’s call and the discussions at the RTP meeting should help to educate the workgroup. Dr. Harding stated that some of the questions from today’s call will be answered by presentations at the RTP meeting.

Dr. Joel Coats reported that his workgroup currently is in the reading phase and hopes to have a draft response ready for LTG 1C and LTG 3 before the RTP meeting.

Dr. Carlos Blanco stated that his workgroup also is in the reading phase and has started working on a draft response to both LTG 2 and LTG 3.

Dr. Barry Ryan stated that he is in the early stages of his writing assignment and that he received helpful information from Ms. Heather Drumm, the Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the Subcommittee. He will be providing a first draft of his response to Dr. Graham. Dr. Ryan added that much of the information his group needs for preparing its response will come from the RTP meeting.

Dr. Harding stated that she will have a draft of her section on leadership ready for Dr. Richard Di Giulio to review. She noted that any questions that arise during this call will be addressed at the appropriate time in the agenda. Dr. Harding then asked if there were any other questions at the time.

Dr. Di Giulio asked whether Ms. Drumm had posted materials to the Web, as she indicated that she would do on the last call. He still does not have a CD containing the SP2 Research Program information. Ms. Drumm responded that she did post the material online and had provided the Subcommittee members information on how to access the materials in an e-mail message. She stated that she would resend this message to Dr. Di Giulio. Dr. Graham noted that the attachments posted online are found at the bottom of the Web page.

Dr. Harding then asked Ms. Drumm to provide an overview of the administrative procedures.

Administrative Procedures

Ms. Heather Drumm, DFO for the SP2 Subcommittee, Office of Research and Development (ORD), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Ms. Drumm provided an overview of the logistics for the RTP meeting. She sent an updated draft of the RTP meeting agenda to the Subcommittee members by e-mail this morning; this draft contains her updates as well as those of Dr. Harding. She suggested that on the first day of the event, February 7, the Subcommittee members meet in the hotel lobby at 7:15 a.m. to ensure that everyone has a ride to the meeting site, which is located about 2 miles from the hotel. The same plan is suggested for the second day of the meeting, February 8, with a meeting time in the lobby of 7:45 a.m. There will be two poster sessions on each of the first 2 days of the meeting. The Subcommittee members have been assigned randomly to review the posters. Ms. Drumm noted that having poster sessions during a FACA meeting is somewhat unusual because it is not part of the FACA process. For this reason, a designated poster discussion time for the public record must follow each poster session. She added that BOSC meetings often include poster sessions and the discussion time fulfills the FACA requirement.

Ms. Drumm mentioned that a contractor will be available at the meeting to coordinate all of the logistics, operate the audiovisual equipment for the presentations, take notes, and so on. Copies of documents will be made available at the meeting for everyone's convenience. If any needs arise during the meeting, the Subcommittee members are asked to speak with Ms. Drumm and she will handle requests through the contractor. Ms. Drumm then welcomed questions from the Subcommittee.

Dr. Graham asked whether the LTG 1 Workgroups Breakout Session at 4:30 p.m. on the first day will take place at the EPA location or whether the Subcommittee members could hold this session at the hotel. Ms. Drumm responded that the workgroup can meet at the location they prefer. Dr. Graham then asked whether it would be possible to secure a workroom at the hotel from perhaps 4:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. Dr. Coats suggested that the room be available perhaps until after dinner time (e.g., until 9:00 p.m.).

Dr. Harding pointed out that, in accordance with FACA, it will not be possible to have all of the members of the workgroups present in one room at once following the public session. Ms. Drumm agreed that it would be preferable to have separate rooms for the workgroups. She will

look into securing two small rooms at the hotel. Dr. Graham commented that she has attended other meetings for which mini executive suites were made available; perhaps such arrangements could be made at the hotel this meeting.

A participant asked whether the meeting venue will have wireless Internet accessibility. Dr. Harding commented that, presumably, the venue will have sufficient power outlets for laptop computers but she did not know about Internet access. Dr. Graham stated that the venue does have wireless Internet access. Ms. Drumm responded that she does not believe this to be the case; however, this might have changed since the last time she was at the RTP location about 2 years ago.

Dr. Harding asked the Subcommittee members to bring flash drives to the meeting to facilitate the sharing of files. She then asked whether a printer will be available at the meeting and also for evening use. Ms. Drumm responded that she believes that the contractor will bring a printer, but will confirm this detail and provide an update before the meeting.

Ms. Drumm asked the Subcommittee members to ensure that their travel itineraries have been received and to let her know if any changes are needed; she would have to make these changes within the next couple of days. Ms. Drumm will be sending a travel voucher to each participant after today's call for collection at the RTP meeting. This voucher will permit reimbursement for any travel-related expenses (e.g., rental car). She will need the original hotel and rental receipts. Ms. Drumm also reminded the Subcommittee members that she also will be collecting their homework sheets at the meeting. Lastly, she mentioned that today's agenda included a designated time for public comment. So far, she has not had any requests for public comment. Ms. Drumm reminded the participants to identify themselves prior to speaking and to put their telephone on mute when not speaking to eliminate extraneous noise on the line. She asked if there were any questions and none were posed.

Dr. Harding then welcomed Dr. Francis and thanked her for joining the conference call.

SP2 Research Program in the Context of R&D Criteria

Dr. Elaine Francis, NPD, SP2 Research Program, National Center for Environmental Research (NCER), ORD, EPA

Dr. Francis thanked the Subcommittee for the opportunity to provide information on the SP2 Research Program. She referred to PowerPoint slides that the Subcommittee members had received in advance of the call. She explained that her presentation on the last conference call was focused on the science aspects of the program, discussing how it evolved to reach its current stage. Today's call was intended to provide information about the program in the context of the research and development (R&D) criteria that the Subcommittee members will be addressing in their review. She mentioned that her presentation was intended to provide guidance information and not to be prescriptive in any way.

Dr. Francis began with an overview of the structure of the SP2 Research Program. As mentioned in the first conference call, the science needs for the program were identified through work with senior managers from EPA's Office of Prevention, Pesticides, and Toxic Substances (OPPTS). The program is geared toward leveraging resources and sharing full-time equivalent (FTE) positions and is consistent with both the Agency's Strategic Plan and ORD's Strategic Plan. The

program is aligned under three Long-Term Goals (LTGs) and 11 Annual Performance Goals (APGs).

Dr. Francis then segued into an overview of the three Office of Management and Budget (OMB)/Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) Investment Criteria for R&D programs: relevance, quality, and performance. The criterion of relevance examines the extent to which SP2 research products contribute to decision-making related to risk assessments and reduction/prevention of exposures or releases of potentially harmful as well as toxic substances and products into the environment. Dr. Francis stated that examples of this work will be highlighted in the oral and poster presentations at the RTP meeting. Anticipated outcomes of the program include the development of multiple approaches for prioritizing chemicals for testing; multiple models to assess potential allergenicity to genetically modified crops; and guidelines and tools to mitigate gene-transfer and non-target effects and the development of resistance in targeted pest populations.

The performance of the SP2 Research Program has been categorized in various ways, including a compilation of significant accomplishments identified in Appendix VI of the Multi-Year Plan (MYP) and in the National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory (NHEERL) Implementation Plan; through calculation of the percent of Annual Performance Measures (APMs) met; and via bibliometric analysis. The bibliometric analysis was conducted by a contractor and used the Thomson Essential Science Indicators as well as the Journal Citation Report (JCR) as benchmarks. The analysis found that SP2 publications are highly cited and more highly cited than the average paper. Moreover, 35 percent of the papers are published in high-impact journals and 30 percent appear in the top 10 percent of journals ranked by the JCR Immediacy Index. The analysis also revealed that the papers have a relatively low self-citation rate of 5.6 percent.

In addition to examining performance, the quality of various elements of the SP2 Research Program has been assessed via peer reviews. These reviews have included assessments at the Laboratory/Center Division level and through Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) consultations and the BOSC Review of the Computational Toxicology Program.

Among the roles played by the SP2 Research Program's leadership are chairing and having memberships on interagency working groups and co-organizing international symposia. The program's scientists also play diverse roles, including serving on publication boards, as officers in professional societies, and as invited speakers and session chairs. The program's scientists have been recognized by various awards and honors.

The training of scientists is central to the SP2 Research Program. Currently, the program has 41 postdoctoral researchers and 23 predoctoral researchers. The scientists provide advice across the Agency programs and regions. Communication and coordination is facilitated by regular senior-level meetings between ORD, OPPTS, and the regions; joint work on research planning between ORD, OPPTS, and the regions; and progress reviews, Science To Achieve Results (STAR) grantee meetings, seminar series, and other channels. One of the goals for this year, Dr. Francis stated, is to establish a Web site for the SP2 Research Program. ORD also provides scientific support and advice through collaboration on external requests or activities (e.g., association with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development).

Dr. Francis concluded by stating that the SP2 Research Program is working hard to comply with the OMB/OSTP R&D Investment Criteria.

Discussion

Dr. Graham asked about the completeness of the listing of peer reviews that Dr. Francis referred to on slide 11. Dr. Francis responded that the list provided is intended to be just a snapshot; she offered to provide a complete listing. Dr. Harding asked whether there is an easy way to obtain the complete list of peer reviews. Dr. Francis responded that the MYP lists peer reviews under the section on accomplishments, but not all of the peer reviews have been identified. She added that whenever the program receives a peer review, a response to that review also is prepared. Dr. Graham noted that this point relates to the charge question that asks how well the program responds to peer reviews. She suggested the inclusion of a summary paragraph in the Draft Charge regarding the location of a more complete listing of all of the peer reviews and inclusion of the statement that staff are required to respond to peer reviews. Dr. Francis stated that she would include this paragraph.

Dr. Graham asked for confirmation on whether half of the postdoctoral researchers being trained in the SP2 Research Program are funded out of NCER and the other half are in the laboratories. Dr. Francis responded that she is uncertain of this ratio, but she could provide this information.

Dr. Graham commented that the program relevance portion of the charge asks about the responsiveness of the program's focus to program office and regional needs. She noted that there is much discussion in the MYP on the needs of the program office, but relatively little is mentioned regarding regional needs. Do the regional offices have unique needs? Dr. Francis responded that the regions have not been as forthcoming regarding their specific needs. Thus, the main client for the program has been OPPTS. Dr. Graham asked whether this implies that the regions' needs are the same as those of OPPTS. Dr. Francis responded that the regions have not asked for anything in addition to the requests made by OPPTS. She added that, to a certain extent, the regions are looking for tools. For example, it will be up to the regions to take the ecological information emerging from work conducted under LTG 2 on ecological assessments and examine environmental impacts in a more geographic way than currently is done.

Dr. Graham asked for clarification on whether an APM is considered a milestone. Dr. Francis confirmed this statement, adding that the APMs are entered into a tracking system. Dr. Francis referred the Subcommittee members to a document that they had received in advance of this call outlining potential long-term and annual measures. The bottom of the document displays calculations of APMs as well as tracked APMs over the last couple of years.

Regarding program quality, Dr. Graham asked whether the NHEERL Implementation Plan was completed toward the end of 2005, with its peer review conducted in 2006. Dr. Francis responded that the plan was completed in December 2005, and discussions regarding the peer review occurred in early 2006; this also was the time when discussions were initiated regarding the program evaluation in RTP next week. She explained that 90 percent of the SP2 research plan is essentially the same as the NHEERL Implementation Plan. A separate peer review of the NHEERL Implementation Plan would have required scientists to prepare for two reviews, and it takes considerable time to prepare for just one review. Thus, the NHEERL Director and Dr. Francis decided not to have a separate peer review of the Implementation Plan. Dr. Graham

asked whether the strategy now is to see what transpires from the upcoming review next week and then decide whether a more thorough peer review of the Implementation Plan would be needed. Dr. Francis confirmed this statement.

Dr. Harding thanked Dr. Graham for her insightful questions. Dr. Harding then asked why the charge questions regarding the Summary Assessment of the LTGs are requiring the Subcommittee members to rate criteria that are different from the R&D Investment Criteria of relevance, quality, and performance. Specifically, the Subcommittee members are asked to rate the program's appropriateness, quality, and use. Dr. Francis responded that the three criteria were negotiated by OMB, the BOSC Executive Committee, and ORD's budget office, and that she was not involved in that process and could not provide the rationale.

Dr. Harding asked what the Subcommittee is expected to do with the first table on the potential long-term and annual measures document. This table refers to long-term outcomes and it is indicated that the BOSC will provide review ratings of the program's progress toward each LTG. Dr. Francis explained that the 2011 targets will be based on the evaluations that the Subcommittee provides from the current review, which is establishing the 2007 baseline. Thus, if the Subcommittee members rate one of the LTGs as "satisfactory," then the 2011 target will be to improve this rating to "exceeds expectations." Referring to the second table on bibliometric analyses, Dr. Francis explained that ORD will negotiate with OMB the extent to which the program must improve on the percentage of SP2 publications rated as "highly cited" and the percentage of SP2 publications occurring in "high impact" journals. The current program evaluation is determining how to best set the projected targets for bibliometric analysis measures for 2008 and 2010.

Referencing the third table on the same document, Dr. Harding asked whether APMs have been tracked by the system because there are only a few listed on the table. Dr. Francis responded that 56 APMs were tracked over a 4-year period. She explained that the tables in the SP2 MYP tend to provide a greater degree of information for internal purposes, but what is entered into the tracking system is an aggregate of multiple research products or APMs. For example, if each research program has 20 APMs and there are 16 research programs, there would be an unmanageable number of APMs to be tracked annually. In more recent years, individual research programs have begun to aggregate APMs, thereby providing fewer milestones to track. Dr. Francis added that the official tracking system has evolved over the years.

Dr. Graham noted that on page 52 of the MYP there is an appendix that lists the APGs and the APMs supporting them. When the Subcommittee members rate the milestones according to the charge questions, they would refer to these APMs. Dr. Graham added, however, that in 3 years' time, much work likely will have been done and the items would no longer be called APMs. Dr. Francis confirmed that the APMs listed on page 52 might become combined and appear as one entry in the tracking system. Dr. Graham noted that by 2011, there likely will not be many APMs remaining and more will be inserted by 2009. Dr. Francis confirmed this statement, stating that when this occurs, more APMs would be entered into the system at the start of the fiscal year. By that time there would be a better understanding of where the research is going and a better understanding of the resources.

Dr. Graham asked whether the tables in the MYP could be interpreted as the long-term planning mechanisms and that, on an annual basis, new APMs would be included in the tracking system

that are more consistent with resources. Dr. Francis responded that this would be the case. She reiterated that in the MYP, as time progresses there are fewer APMs; but with each future year, more of them will be identified and included. Thus, over the next month or so, the APMs will be determined for 2009, and in 2009, the APMs for 2011 will be determined.

Dr. Harding confirmed that the Subcommittee members did not have any other questions and then thanked Dr. Francis for her presentation.

Preparation for the Face-to-Face Meeting

Day 1

Dr. Harding referred the Subcommittee members to the draft agenda for the RTP meeting, which they had received prior to the conference call, and provided an overview of the logistics. She explained that on day 1, following the welcoming comments, an overview will be given of LTG 1 Subparts A and B, followed by a 2-hour poster session and subsequent 1-hour poster discussion session. There will be 21 posters in total and, as stated earlier by Ms. Drumm, the Subcommittee members will be assigned randomly to the posters as a primary reviewer. Dr. Harding noted that it might be advisable to determine in advance how much review time should be allocated per poster. Dr. Harding suggested that it would be helpful to have each of the LTG workgroup leaders head the poster session discussion to provide a synopsis of the work being reviewed. Dr. Harding explained that the lunch break at 12:30 p.m. will be a working session to allow the Subcommittee members to continue their discussions.

The afternoon session will begin with Dr. Gregory Sayles, Associate Director of ORD's National Homeland Security Research Center, providing an overview of LTG 1 Subpart C, followed by a 1.5-hour session to cover 10 posters. A subsequent 30-minute poster discussion will be followed by 30 minutes of Subcommittee working time. Mr. Jim Jones, Director of the Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP), will give the final presentation of the day, providing OPP's perspective of ORD's SP2 research.

The day will end with a private breakout session for the LTG 1 workgroups. Dr. Harding noted that the workgroups will decide how they wish to handle this session, whether returning to the hotel or working elsewhere. These logistics can be determined at the meeting.

Dr. Harding concluded the details about day 1 by mentioning that the event is not providing organized dinners for the participants.

Day 2

Following a review of the previous day's activities by Dr. Harding, day 2 will begin with a Subcommittee discussion of the charge questions and how the rating tool is being used to assess LTG 1. The remainder of the day will include a discussion of LTG 2, followed by a 1.5-hour review session for 14 posters. An overview of LTG 3 will follow, as will a subsequent poster session lasting 45 minutes for six posters. A subsequent 1-hour poster discussion will cover the posters for both LTG 2 and LTG 3. Following 30-minutes of Subcommittee working time, Mr. Jim Willis, Director of the Chemical Control Division, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT), will present OPPT's perspective of ORD's SP2 research. The agenda will include a

designated time for public comments and will conclude with a private breakout session for workgroups addressing LTGs 2 and 3.

Day 3

Dr. Harding explained that day 3 will begin with a preliminary discussion of how the Subcommittee plans to rate LTGs 2 and 3, followed by working time for the entire Subcommittee. By approximately 9:30 a.m., the individual workgroups will share their reports with the entire Subcommittee to arrive at a consensus on the material to be presented in the general report out at 11:00 a.m. Dr. Harding will be asking each workgroup for a written overview of the evaluation for each charge question that she can read aloud during the report out session.

Discussion

A participant asked whether there is any concern with having both a primary and secondary reviewer for a given poster. Dr. Harding responded that likely this will not matter. The posters present a wealth of information so it will be critical that at least one member of each workgroup has a detailed discussion with the poster investigator present.

Dr. Graham expressed concern about reaching consensus among the Subcommittee members on the definitions used for the rating system. Because the workgroups for LTG 1 will be assigning the ratings prior to the workgroups for LTGs 2 and 3, it would be important to have a consistent interpretation on how to apply the assessment terms among all of the workgroups. Dr. Harding agreed that the workgroups will have to be in consensus on how to use the rating terminology. Dr. Graham suggested calling the day 2 morning session the "Preliminary Rating of LTG 1" to avoid having any bias develop in the mode of interpretation and to be clear that the recommendations still are in draft form. She suggested that perhaps the morning of day 3 could include a discussion on having a consensus on the rating of LTGs 1, 2, and 3. Dr. Harding stated that she had raised this concern with Ms. Drumm, and because this is the first time that a Subcommittee has used this new rating terminology, it would be beneficial to provide the opportunity for private conversations to work out any glitches. She added that likely this will not be possible at the meeting. Ms. Drumm stated that it is hoped that the discussion on day 1 will include mention of how the workgroups are progressing toward their decisions using the rating tool.

Dr. Graham commented that Dr. Ryan participated in the BOSC Executive Committee meeting and suggested that he could guide the workgroups during the discussions. Dr. Ryan responded that he would try to help, adding that he agrees that it is important to build consensus across the entire Subcommittee regarding the rating terminology. This can only be achieved, he emphasized, if the members meet early on to agree on the interpretation of the rating criteria.

Ms. Drumm pointed out that with three Subcommittee members in each workgroup, it will not be possible for the workgroups for LTG 1 Subparts A and B to meet in private with the workgroup for Subpart C. Dr. Graham responded that this might not be necessary. She explained that Subparts A and B could be discussed on the morning of day 2, followed by a discussion of Subpart C. On day 3, LTGs 2 and 3 would be discussed, followed by a Subcommittee working time during which the workgroups can discuss their thoughts regarding their interpretation of the rating definitions. Dr. Graham added that she does not mind that these discussions occur in public, as long as it is understood that they are preliminary.

Dr. Harding responded that her concern is having enough time to cover everything on the agenda, considering there are only 30 minutes allotted to the discussion prior to the overview of LTG 2. Dr. Graham suggested that the Subcommittee see how the day unfolds and possibly have additional work time allotted for the breakout session for the LTG 2 and LTG 3 workgroups. Ms. Drumm responded that more time could be included on day 2 if needed.

Dr. Graham expressed concern that Mr. Willis will be speaking after the workgroup for LTG 1 has shared its preliminary opinions. It might be helpful, Dr. Graham suggested, if the workgroup offers its comments after hearing from Mr. Willis. Dr. Harding acknowledged that this is a good point and asked whether it would be possible to place Mr. Willis' presentation earlier in the agenda. Ms. Drumm responded that he could be slated earlier on the agenda, perhaps during the morning session, and followed by the Subcommittee discussion.

Dr. Graham suggested that after the adjournment on day 2, the workgroups for LTG 2 and LTG 3 might also want to get together with the workgroups for LTG 1 Subparts A and B, because all of their comments will need to be synthesized. Would this be permitted under FACA? Ms. Drumm stated that this type of meeting would need to occur in public because those workgroups combined would contain more than one-half of the Subcommittee. Dr. Graham replied that the workgroups could figure out how to abide by the FACA rules at the meeting.

Dr. Harding noted that she likely will not require the allotted time on day 2 for her closing remarks.

In response to Dr. Best, Dr. Harding confirmed that she will require the summaries for all of the LTGs by the end of the meeting for the report out. Dr. Harding also confirmed for Dr. Best that the best results can be expected if the Subcommittee members do their homework and complete their writing assignments prior to the meeting and then make any modifications at the meeting. Dr. Best asked whether the workgroups should provide simple and concise summaries. Dr. Harding agreed, adding that the report out will just present the areas in which the workgroups reached consensus. The workgroups will elaborate on the responses after the meeting.

Dr. Harding reminded the Subcommittee members that they should come to the meeting with a draft of their answers to the charge questions. The questions should be addressed systematically, and the summary should include the questions listed in boldface with their respective answers beneath. She also reminded the members that they must respond to the three criteria—appropriateness, quality, and use—when reviewing the charge questions. In addition, the workgroups will have to provide a rationale for their ratings. After the meeting, Drs. Harding and Ryan will collect the responses and produce a document that resembles the format of the Water Quality Research Program Review Report. The Subcommittee members will be asked for their edits and feedback on the report after it has been synthesized.

Dr. Best asked for an update on the status of the workgroups for LTGs 2 and 3. Dr. Harding responded that those workgroups are in the reading phase and then asked Drs. Blanco, Ryan, and Coats whether they were comfortable with the meeting preparations and expectations. The three members stated that they were fine with the arrangements.

A participant asked for clarification on whether the poster reviewer responses should be oral or written. Dr. Harding answered that the responses would be oral. She stated that the reviewers

hopefully will read the poster abstracts before attending the poster presentations and make notes during the review.

Dr. Harding asked Ms. Drumm whether additional items needed to be addressed before concluding the call. Ms. Drumm responded that there was nothing else to cover. She added that she would e-mail the Subcommittee members with any developments prior to the meeting. She also will e-mail them an updated agenda.

Dr. Graham mentioned that she may have been assigned to the advisory board for a particular STAR grant. If that grant comes up during the meeting, she will need to recuse herself from those discussions. Ms. Drumm asked that Dr. Graham provide her information about the grant.

Dr. Ryan asked whether all of the poster abstracts were included in the materials that the Subcommittee members had received prior to the call. Ms. Drumm responded that she had provided the Subcommittee members with all of the poster abstracts, including three additional ones that were received. She pointed out that poster number LTG 1-0 was one of the ones that was added to the handout. Dr. Francis confirmed that all three of the additional posters were in the listing. She added that only one poster abstract, on asbestos, did not make it into the document. Ms. Drumm stated that she would make sure that everyone received that final abstract.

Public Comment

At 1:48 p.m., 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 reminded the Subcommittee members to bring their binders and poster abstracts to the meeting. She thanked the members for their participation and stated that she looks forward to meeting them next week. The call was adjourned at 1:52 p.m.

Action Items

- ✧ Ms. Drumm will resend the e-mail notice mentioning the online link to the posted materials to Dr. Di Giulio, who did not receive the original message.
- ✧ Ms. Drumm will look into securing workroom space at the hotel for the scheduled breakout session times on February 7-8.
- ✧ Ms. Drumm will confirm with the contractor that a printer will be available onsite at the EPA location and for evening use at the hotel.
- ✧ Ms. Drumm will be sending a travel voucher to each participant after today's call for collection at the RTP meeting.

- ✧ Dr. Francis will provide to the Subcommittee a complete list of peer reviews pertaining to the SP2 Research Program.
- ✧ Dr. Francis will provide information on the proportion of postdoctoral researchers in the SP2 Research Program being funded by NCER or the laboratories.
- ✧ Dr. Francis will include a summary paragraph in the Draft Charge regarding the location of a complete listing of peer reviews and that the SP2 Research Program staff must provide a response to the peer review.
- ✧ The scheduled time for Mr. Willis to speak will be moved to the morning session on February 8.
- ✧ Ms. Drumm will e-mail the Subcommittee members with any developments prior to February 6. She also will e-mail an updated agenda to everyone.
- ✧ Dr. Graham will let Ms. Drumm know whether she is on the advisory board of a particular STAR grant. If so, she will have to recuse herself during the meeting when that grant is discussed.
- ✧ Ms. Drumm will provide the Subcommittee members with the one remaining poster abstract on asbestos for their poster session handout.

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

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

DRAFT

APPENDIX A:
Meeting Agenda



**SAFE PESTICIDES/SAFE PRODUCTS (SP2) SUBCOMMITTEE
AGENDA**

**January 29, 2007
12:00 noon – 2:00 p.m., EST**

**CONFERENCE CALL
Participation by Teleconference Only**

12:00 – 12:15 p.m.	Welcome – Overview of Agenda – Summary of Ongoing Activities	Dr. Anna Harding Subcommittee Chair
12:15 – 12:30 p.m.	Administrative Procedures	Ms. Heather Drumm Subcommittee DFO
12:30 – 1:00 p.m.	SP2 Research Program in the Context of the Charge Questions	Dr. Elaine Francis Office of Research and Development
1:00 – 1:45 p.m.	Subcommittee Discussion – Preparation for Face-to-Face Meeting – Discuss Poster Review Process/Assignments – Discuss Draft Report Outline	Dr. Anna Harding Subcommittee Chair
1:45 – 2:00 p.m.	Public Comment	
2:00 p.m.	Adjournment	