

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

WATER QUALITY MID-CYCLE REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

Conference Call Summary
Thursday, September 4, 2008
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time

Welcome

Dr. Herb Windom, Professor Emeritus, Skidaway Institute of Oceanography, Water Quality Mid-Cycle Subcommittee Chair

Dr. Herb Windom, Chair of the Water Quality Mid-Cycle Review Subcommittee, introduced himself and explained that he had chaired the Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) Subcommittee that conducted the Water Quality program review in 2006. He noted that all but one individual who served on the Subcommittee that conducted the program review are members of this Mid-Cycle Subcommittee. Dr. Richard Sakaji is the only individual who did not serve on the previous Subcommittee. Dr. Windom welcomed the Mid-Cycle Subcommittee members and thanked them for participating on this call. He then asked everyone to identify themselves. The Subcommittee members and other participants on the call are included in the list of participants attached to this summary. The agenda for the call also is attached.

Dr. Windom mentioned that several documents were distributed prior to the call, and he asked if the members had received them. He noted that one of the items was a preliminary analysis of the survey results. Dr. Chuck Noss, National Program Director (NPD) for Water Quality, stated that a more formal analysis of the survey results would be distributed to the Subcommittee members prior to the face-to-face meeting on September 23, 2008. Dr. Judith Meyer asked if the Subcommittee would be provided the actual survey questions. Dr. Noss responded that he could provide those questions to the Subcommittee.

Dr. Windom stated that the objectives of the mid-cycle review are to: (1) evaluate the progress made by the Office of Research and Development (ORD) Water Quality Research Program (WQRP) relative to the commitments it made following its 2006 review, and (2) obtain advice and feedback on issues related to the future directions of the research program and performance and accountability. Dr. Windom pointed out that the mid-cycle review assesses the progress the program has made in addressing the recommendations of the program review. The Subcommittee will address specific charge questions during the review. The Subcommittee also must reach consensus concerning a rating for the program. Dr. Windom noted that mid-cycle review reports range from 6 to 10 pages—about 1 to 2 pages per charge question.

1 **Administrative Procedures**

2 *Ms. Susan Peterson, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and*
3 *Development, Designated Federal Officer*

4
5 Ms. Peterson stated that she is the Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the Water Quality Mid-
6 Cycle Subcommittee. She thanked the Subcommittee members for their efforts in conducting
7 this mid-cycle review. Ms. Peterson explained that the BOSC is a Federal Advisory Committee
8 that provides independent peer review for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA)
9 ORD, and as such is subject to the rules and requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee
10 Act (FACA). The Water Quality Mid-Cycle Review Subcommittee was established by the
11 BOSC Executive Committee to conduct this mid-cycle review. As a subcommittee of the BOSC,
12 the Water Quality Mid-Cycle Subcommittee is subject to FACA. The Subcommittee includes
13 six members and one consultant. The DFO for the Subcommittee serves as the liaison between
14 the Subcommittee and ORD. Ms. Peterson stated that it is her responsibility as the DFO to
15 ensure that the Subcommittee's conference calls and meetings comply with all FACA rules. All
16 meetings and conference calls involving substantive issues, whether in person, by phone, or by e-
17 mail, that include one-half or more of the Subcommittee members must be open to the public and
18 a notice must be placed in the *Federal Register* at least 15 days prior to the call or meeting. The
19 *Federal Register* notice for this call was published on August 15, 2008. The Subcommittee
20 Chair and DFO must be present at all conference calls and meetings. All advisory committee
21 documents also are made available to the public. Ms. Peterson reported that no requests for
22 public comment were submitted prior to the call, but the agenda allows time for public comment
23 at 2:35 p.m. She will call for public comments at that time.

24
25 Ms. Peterson stated that the Water Quality Mid-Cycle Subcommittee has been asked to respond
26 to a set of charge questions for the mid-cycle review of ORD's WQRP. This is the first
27 conference call for the Subcommittee and the face-to-face meeting is scheduled for September
28 23, 2008. The Subcommittee will draft a report that will be submitted to the BOSC Executive
29 Committee. The Executive Committee may revise the report as it deems necessary before it is
30 approved and submitted to the Assistant Administrator, ORD. The rights of decision-making
31 and response to the report remain with EPA.

32
33 Ms. Peterson indicated that the Chair moderates the Subcommittee's meetings and he must
34 recognize EPA staff and others present before they can comment. As DFO, Ms. Peterson has
35 worked with EPA's ethics officials to ensure that all appropriate ethics requirements were
36 satisfied for the Subcommittee members. The members have completed the required ethics
37 training and submitted their confidential disclosure forms. It is her responsibility to ensure that
38 there are no conflicts of interest. She asked the Subcommittee members to keep this in mind
39 during the meeting and to notify her of any potential conflicts.

40
41 Ms. Peterson asked the Subcommittee members to complete their homework sheets and provide
42 them to her at the September 23 meeting. She indicated that members must provide receipts for
43 any expenses exceeding \$75. She mentioned that any questions concerning travel arrangements
44 should be directed to Troy Rutkofske at 202-564-5236.

45
46 Dr. Stephen Weisberg asked about the difference between a Subcommittee member and a
47 consultant. Ms. Peterson replied that the consultant would not have voting rights with respect to

1 the rating. She noted that Dr. Sakaji was added as a consultant simply because of the limited time
2 to form the Subcommittee.

3
4 Dr. Windom clarified with Ms. Peterson that individual Subcommittee members could
5 communicate with him and send him drafts without violating FACA rules. Ms. Peterson
6 confirmed that such communication was permitted, and she reminded him that only
7 communications involving one-half or more of the Subcommittee (i.e., 4 or more members) must
8 be done in a public setting.

9 10 **Material Overview**

11 *Dr. Chuck Noss, U.S. EPA, ORD, National Program Director for Water Quality*

12
13 Dr. Noss stated that several documents were distributed prior to the call, including the agenda,
14 the draft charge to the Mid-Cycle Subcommittee, the August 2008 draft of the Water Quality
15 Multi-Year Plan (MYP), the Water Quality Program Review Mid-Cycle Progress Report, a
16 preliminary analysis of the partners survey results, the status of the WQRP Annual Performance
17 Goals (APGs), and WQRP Long-Term and Annual Measures. He mentioned that the program
18 has been working with the Office of Resources Management and Administration (ORMA), to
19 develop longer-term measures.

20
21 Before the September 23 meeting, the Subcommittee members will receive the following:

- 22
23 ✧ A bibliometric analysis of program publications.
24 ✧ A more formal analysis of the partners survey results.
25 ✧ A report on what was accomplished with respect to the program's APGs and Annual
26 Performance Measures (APMs).
27 ✧ The revised MYP.
28 ✧ The Office of Water (OW) strategy, which identifies the research needs of the Office.
29 ✧ A list of the APMs and APGs for the next 3-year period.
30 ✧ Several reports of workshops that were conducted during the past few years (the
31 discussions from these workshops contributed to the revised MYP and illustrate how
32 priorities were reached in a public setting).

33
34 Dr. Noss added that the program will try to show the Subcommittee where the WQRP fits in with
35 the Ecological, Human Health, Endocrine Disrupting Chemicals, and other programs because not
36 all ORD research on water quality is conducted under the WQRP.

37
38 Dr. Windom commented that there will be a lot of information for the Subcommittee to digest in
39 the next few weeks.
40
41

1 **Overview of the Charge/Rating Program Performance**

2 *Dr. Herb Windom, Water Quality Mid-Cycle Subcommittee Chair*

3
4 Dr. Windom stated that the mid-cycle review will evaluate the progress the program has made
5 since the 2006 program review. The review will address the following specific charge questions:

- 6
7 1. Do the currently planned revisions to the WQRP adequately address the 2006 BOSC
8 review recommendations?
- 9 2. Do the revised long-term goals (LTGs) provide a coherent framework for presenting
10 research needs?
- 11 3. Does the Water Quality Research Plan adequately address critical research to meet the
12 regulatory mandates of the Clean Water Act?
- 13 4. Does the proposed research adequately support watershed management and contaminant
14 source control programmatic needs?
- 15 5. Does the WQRP provide an appropriate balance among its three LTGs?
- 16 6. Do the existing Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) performance measures provide
17 appropriate and quantifiable indices of progress? What improvements does the panel
18 recommend?
- 19 7. Please rate the progress made by the WQRP in moving the program forward in response
20 to the BOSC review of 2006 as exceptional, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or
21 not satisfactory.

22
23 Dr. Windom indicated that a significant portion of the discussion time at the September 23
24 meeting will be devoted to reaching consensus on the rating (Charge Question 7). Once the first
25 six charge questions have been addressed, the Subcommittee will rate the program. He noted that
26 certain efforts of the program move forward faster than others; if the Subcommittee does not
27 think these efforts are moving fast enough, that should be noted in the report.

28
29 For the rating question, the following adjectives will be used:

- 30
31 ✧ **Exceptional:** indicates that the program is meeting all and exceeding some of its goals,
32 both in the quality of the science being produced and the speed at which research results,
33 tools, and methods are being produced. An exceptional rating also indicates that the
34 program is addressing the right questions to achieve its goals. The review should be
35 specific as to which aspects of the program’s performance have been exceptional.
- 36
37 ✧ **Exceeds Expectations:** indicates that the program is meeting all of its goals. It addresses
38 the appropriate scientific questions to meet its goals, and the science is competent or
39 better. It exceeds expectations for either the high quality of the science or for the speed at
40 which work products are being produced and milestones met.
- 41
42 ✧ **Meets Expectations:** indicates that the program is meeting most of its goals. Programs
43 that meet expectations live up to them in terms of addressing the appropriate scientific
44 questions to meet their goals, and work products are being produced and milestones are
45 being reached in a timely manner. The quality of the science being done is competent or

1 better.

- 2
- 3 ✧ **Not Satisfactory:** indicates that the program is failing to meet a substantial fraction of its
- 4 goals, or if meeting them, that the achievement of milestones is significantly delayed, or
- 5 that the questions being addressed are inappropriate or insufficient to meet the intended
- 6 purpose. Questionable science also is a reason for rating a program as unsatisfactory for
- 7 a particular LTG. The review should be specific as to which aspects of a program's
- 8 performance have been inadequate.
- 9

10 Dr. Windom commented that the rating is subjective, but it should be based on the responses to

11 the first six charge questions. He noted that Mr. Phillip Juengst (ORD/ORMA) has taken the

12 lead in implementing this rating approach. Dr. Windom asked if Mr. Juengst was on the phone;

13 when Mr. Juengst indicated he was present, Dr. Windom asked the Subcommittee members if

14 they had any questions for him regarding the rating question. There were no questions about the

15 rating process for Mr. Juengst.

16

17 Dr. Meyer said that one of the recommendations from 2006 was for the program to establish

18 principles for prioritizing research. She asked if the Subcommittee would be receiving these

19 principles. Dr. Noss replied that priorities were established through the Research Coordination

20 Team (RCT) and by working with OW and the regions. He added that OW and ORD

21 management have not yet agreed that the plan addresses their priorities. Upper management will

22 meet in November and come to agreement on priorities. Dr. Meyer asked if there were plans for

23 an external review of the MYP. Dr. Noss responded that the revised MYP will be reviewed by

24 the Science Council (which includes the ORD NPDs, Laboratory Directors, and Center

25 Directors). This is the first step in the review process. No decision has been made concerning an

26 external review of the MYP. He added that LTGs 1 and 3 fell into place rather quickly, but LTG

27 2 did not. The program has spent the last year working to define the research for LTG 2. The

28 LTG 2 research plan is being rewritten and reviewed by OW and ORD. Once there is agreement

29 on this research, the program will have a robust MYP.

30

31 **Overall Progress Review**

32 *Dr. Chuck Noss, U.S. EPA, ORD, National Program Director for Water Quality*

33

34 Dr. Noss stated that ORD responded to the BOSC's report on the Water Quality Program in

35 October 2006. The Water Quality Program Review Mid-Cycle Progress Report, which was

36 distributed to the Subcommittee prior to this call, explains the program's response to each of the

37 recommendations in the BOSC report. Dr. Noss proceeded to summarize those responses.

38

39 **Summary Recommendation 1:** *A more transparent approach to prioritizing research is*

40 *recommended. This should be provided in the next MYP.*

41

42 **Status:** In the 2007 draft of the MYP, the program outlined its processes for collecting

43 information and making transparent decisions. The Water Research Coordination Team

44 (WRCT), with representatives from ORD, OW, and the regions, focused on clarifying the links

45 between the regulatory drivers and the research, identifying criteria for what research will be

46 done, and clarifying the critical paths that lead from APMs to APGs to LTGs. In addition,

47 stakeholder MYP workshops provided a forum for ORD scientists and program office and

1 regional partners to discuss how research priorities should be determined. These discussions
2 focused on the OMB R&D investment criteria and how to apply them to research prioritization.

3
4 **Summary Recommendation 2:** *An annual accounting of Program outcomes is needed that*
5 *includes the following six metrics: research activities completed by a specific date; results*
6 *published in papers, reports, or otherwise made available; transfer and communication of*
7 *reported results; institutional outcomes; management outcomes; and environmental outcomes.*

8
9 **Status:** In 2006, the WRCT developed a suite of formal program measures, which included:
10 (1) annual output measures that assess the percentage of planned APMs delivered on time in a
11 given year, and (2) bibliometric analysis measures that assess the extent to which program
12 publications are “highly cited” and of “high impact.” The program also will track its BOSC
13 ratings and results as overall indicators of the extent to which the program is meeting its
14 institutional outcomes and ultimately contributing to environmental outcomes. The program
15 currently tracks its efficiency by gauging the number of publications produced per FTE;
16 however, based on information gleaned from a recent National Academies report, the program
17 may adopt an alternative measure in the future. The program also is exploring the possibility of
18 creating additional measures to further reflect institutional and environmental outcomes (e.g., a
19 measure of regional utility/use of ORD APMs. To ensure that program research is made
20 available and will be of use to partners, the program posts bibliographic and newsworthy
21 information on the water quality Web site, is developing an intranet Web site to promote
22 communication, and promotes data sharing and collaboration across EPA using the Science
23 Connector. The program also implemented a biannual partner survey to obtain information on
24 the quality, relevance, and utility of its research.

25
26 **Summary Recommendation 3:** *The exploratory part of the Science To Achieve Results (STAR)*
27 *Program should be reinstated and made sustainable. This is necessary to keep the Program*
28 *fresh and flexible to confront emerging issues.*

29
30 **Status:** Historically, the STAR Water Quality budget funded only the Ecology and
31 Oceanography of Harmful Algal Blooms (ECO HAB) program. In FY 2008, EPA lost all
32 extramural resources to support ECO HAB research and the Agency’s extramural water quality
33 resources have not been reinstated. Dr. Noss mentioned that the National Center for
34 Environmental Research (NCER) does fund extramural exploratory research, and the Center has
35 formed a workgroup to solicit input on new topics for exploratory research. This workgroup may
36 seek advice from outside advisory groups like the BOSC.

37
38 **Summary Recommendation 4:** *The Program should include partnering and collaboration*
39 *particularly with the states.*

40
41 **Status:** The NPD has encouraged the ORD laboratories and centers to partner with other
42 agencies when feasible. ORD has sought regional representation to assist in identifying
43 opportunities for collaboration with states and has actively sought new opportunities and avenues
44 for collaboration by identifying states and/or regional individuals who can help create local
45 contributions to national efforts. ORD has developed a pilot program with the Association of
46 State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Agencies (ASIWPCA) to enhance communication
47 of research needs and research findings. EPA also has reached out for input from stakeholders
48 interested in developing criteria for recreational waters. The program has taken advantage of

1 EPA's Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP) to expand its data
2 collection across waters representative of the entire nation. ORD scientists also have worked
3 with regional and program office personnel to collect data to support study site selection for
4 future efforts.

5
6 **Summary Recommendation 5:** *The MYP needs considerable improvement if it is to better*
7 *communicate the goals of the Program as it is intended. It needs to communicate where the*
8 *Program has been, where it is now, and where it is going.*

9
10 **Status:** The MYP has been revised and remains in draft form. The revision sought to provide
11 background information and context, along with a description of future research directions. As a
12 result of the initial MYP stakeholder review comments regarding a greater need for additional
13 watershed management work, however, a workshop was planned for early 2008. This workshop
14 was held in spring 2008 and five research proposals were developed. Because these proposals
15 were not unique to the WQRP, the program worked with the Ecology Research Program and
16 associated laboratory and center personnel as well as program offices and regions to finalize a
17 plan that incorporates the identified research into each research area as appropriate. Upon
18 completion of this effort, the MYP will be submitted for review.

19
20 **Summary Recommendation 6:** *Biosolids should not be elevated to an LTG. This research*
21 *should be subsumed either in LTG 3 or under the same structure as other pollutant sources in*
22 *the frameworks for LTGs 1, 2, and 3.*

23
24 **Status:** The program's LTGs have been rewritten to be consistent with the BOSC
25 recommendations. Biosolids research has been incorporated into the structure of the three
26 existing LTGs. The LTGs were reworded to be consistent with outcomes and measures of use.

27
28 Dr. Windom asked if there were any questions concerning the progress report, noting there was
29 more detail provided in the document. Dr. Weisberg commented that the report was well
30 organized and would be very helpful in conducting the mid-cycle review.

31 32 **Updated MYP Review**

33 *Dr. Chuck Noss, U.S. EPA, ORD, National Program Director for Water Quality*

34
35 Dr. Noss reported that he surveyed regions, program offices, and many individuals about their
36 research needs as input for the MYP. He prepared a series of theme papers about LTGs and held
37 a meeting on each LTG that was attended by about 50 personnel from ORD, OW, and the
38 regions. At these meetings, mid-level managers and staff from across ORD, OW, and the
39 regions provided input into the research plan. The results of those meetings were incorporated
40 into the draft MYP developed in late 2006. Dr. Noss noted that OW requested information to
41 help the Office target areas and set priorities; OW also needed indicators to assess the impact
42 when best management practices are implemented. As mentioned earlier, five research areas
43 were identified at the spring 2008 meeting. The Ecological Research Program has agreed to take
44 the lead on one of the five areas so it will not be included in the revised Water Quality MYP. Dr.
45 Noss noted that the 2008 revisions to the 2007 draft MYP are identified in the first seven pages
46 of the plan (pp. i-vii). These pages explain how the program incorporated input from OW and
47 the regions into the MYP. He plans to track revisions to the MYP on an annual basis as a record
48 of how the plan evolved and what affected the decision processes. Dr. Noss said that the APMs

1 and APGs for LTG 2 are being finalized and the 2008 MYP should be ready for review in 6 to 8
2 weeks.

3
4 Dr. Windom commended this approach, adding that the MYP must be flexible and allow the
5 program to shift resources to address new issues and the Agency's changing priorities.

6
7 Dr. Meyer asked about the language changes in the APMs and APGs that were suggested by OW
8 and the regions. Did the program use this new wording in the revised MYP? Dr. Noss
9 responded that each of the Assistant Laboratory Directors (ALDs) was responsible for a specific
10 area of research; the ALDs contacted OW/regional representatives to work through the language
11 issues and to come to agreement on the final wording of the APMs and APGs. Some of that
12 language is different from that proposed by OW. Prior to the face-to-face meeting, all of the
13 language changes will have been checked and the APMs and APGs document will explain why
14 the language was changed.

15
16 Dr. Meyer commented that LTG 3 research focuses on aging infrastructure and POTWs (publicly
17 owned treatment works) and LTG 2 on watershed assessment. She thought the POTW focus
18 seemed inconsistent. Dr. Noss replied that OW's Office of Wastewater Management has
19 specific research needs, many of which involve wet weather issues and POTWs. There also are
20 concerns about aging infrastructure, and there is separate funding for both of these research
21 areas. He acknowledged that the plan is not as integrated as he would like because it is trying to
22 address the needs of the different OW offices. The program is trying to take a more integrated
23 approach for the other LTGs.

24
25 Dr. Gary Sayler asked about the overall funding trend for the program. Dr. Noss responded that
26 funding has been stable, but the funding has shifted; for example, the program has moved
27 resources to address recreational waters. The total budget and number of FTEs has remained
28 stable, but the funding that was used to fund the extramural ECOHAB grants is being used
29 elsewhere.

30
31 Dr. Sayler asked if the program was involved in biofuels/bioenergy. Dr. Noss answered that
32 there is significant activity in the Global Change and Ecological Research Programs, but not in
33 the WQRP. The only connection is a very small effort linked to energy recovery and fuel cells at
34 wastewater treatment plants.

35
36 Dr. Meyer asked what was meant by balance in Charge Question 5: Does the WQRP provide an
37 appropriate balance among its three LTGs? Is this question referring to budget balance? Dr.
38 Noss replied that the program has a certain level of effort targeted to each of its audiences. The
39 program has to balance how much effort, for example, is devoted to criteria development,
40 production of Web-based tools to be used to achieve environmental outcomes, and creation of
41 watershed management tools. Dr. Meyer asked how the Subcommittee could judge the balance
42 of effort. Dr. Windom replied that the Subcommittee should consider the balance of research
43 among the three LTGs with respect to the APMs and APGs. For example, the 2006 program
44 review found that biosolids was given too much emphasis. The mid-cycle review should
45 determine if each research direction is being given the appropriate level of attention; if an area is
46 not moving forward at an adequate pace, the Subcommittee should examine the reasons for the
47 lag.

48

1 Dr. Laura Ehlers commented that two of the three LTGs have changed since the 2006 program
2 review—only LTG 1 has remained the same. When did these changes occur? Dr. Noss
3 responded that these changes resulted from the meetings with the program’s clients. Different
4 clients have different needs and those needs change over time. These revised LTGs are much
5 more targeted to help the national program offices, regions, and states. He added that LTG 1 has
6 not changed because the program has to perform the research to inform the development and
7 application of water quality criteria.

8
9 Dr. Windom stated that the program review recommended that the program develop a more
10 transparent approach to prioritizing research. It appears that the program has increased
11 transparency and is seeking input from clients. He agreed that the LTGs should change over
12 time. Dr. Noss pointed out that the PART review uses language from the previous draft of the
13 MYP; therefore, the LTGs changes took place after the PART review.

14 15 **Preparation for Face-to-Face Meeting**

16 *Dr. Herb Windom, Chair of the Water Quality Mid-Cycle Subcommittee*

17
18 Because he had another commitment and had to leave the call at this point, Dr. Sayler asked Dr.
19 Windom to notify him about his writing assignment. Dr. Windom replied that he would like to
20 ask each Subcommittee member to take responsibility for preparing a 1-2 page response for one
21 charge question. He will assign a specific question to each member. Dr. Windom made the
22 following assignments:

23
24 Charge Question 1—Dr. Judith Meyer
25 Charge Question 2—Dr. Kevin Kleinow
26 Charge Question 3—Dr. Richard Sakaji
27 Charge Question 4—Dr. Stephen Weisberg
28 Charge Question 5—Dr. Laura Ehlers
29 Charge Question 6—Dr. Gary Sayler

30
31 Dr. Windom asked the Subcommittee members to send their 1-2 page responses to him via e-
32 mail by September 17, 2008. He will compile the responses into a single document and circulate
33 it to the Subcommittee prior to the September 23 meeting. He encouraged Subcommittee
34 members to provide comments on the other questions that were not assigned to them if they
35 desired.

36
37 Dr. Meyer asked about the remaining documents to be sent to the Subcommittee. She did not
38 want to prepare her response until she had the opportunity to review those materials. Dr.
39 Windom responded that he will ask Ms. Peterson and Dr. Noss to send the Subcommittee those
40 materials as soon as possible. Dr. Windom will distribute the combined draft responses by close
41 of business on September 19. He will add his comments to the draft responses when he compiles
42 them. He asked the Subcommittee members to copy Ms. Peterson on all e-mails sent to him,
43 adding that any questions for the program should be directed to Ms. Peterson.

44
45 Dr. Meyer asked if the Subcommittee will receive the APGs in a tabular format, similar to that
46 provided for the 2006 program review. Dr. Noss replied that he will provide that to Ms. Peterson
47 for distribution to the Subcommittee next week.

1 Dr. Weisberg asked if Ms. Peterson wanted the members to identify their interactions with EPA,
 2 particularly ORD, on this conference call. Ms. Peterson responded that this could be done at the
 3 face-to-face meeting.

4
 5 Ms. Peterson asked the Subcommittee members to contact Troy Rutkofske and notify her if they
 6 have any travel issues.

7
 8 **Public Comments**

9 *Ms. Susan Peterson, U.S. EPA, ORD, Designated Federal Officer*

10
 11 At 2:35 p.m., Ms. Peterson asked if there were any members of the public on the call who
 12 wanted to make a comment. No comments were offered.

13
 14 **Preparation for Face-to-Face Meeting (Continued)**

15 *Dr. Herb Windom, Water Quality Mid-Cycle Subcommittee Chair*

16
 17 Dr. Meyer asked if Ms. Peterson could send her the report from the 2006 program review. Ms.
 18 Peterson responded that the report is on the BOSC Web Site ([www.epa.gov/osp/bosc/reports.](http://www.epa.gov/osp/bosc/reports.htm)
 19 [htm](http://www.epa.gov/osp/bosc/reports.htm)) along with the ORD response to the report.

20
 21 Dr. Windom agreed to send out the charge question assignments. He encouraged the
 22 Subcommittee members to review the mid-cycle review reports posted on the BOSC Web Site.

23
 24 Dr. Windom said he looked forward to seeing the members at the September 23 meeting and
 25 adjourned the conference call at 2:38 p.m.

26
 27 **Action Items**

28
 29 ✧ Ms. Peterson will send out the following items to the Subcommittee prior to the September
 30 23 meeting:

- 31
 32 • A bibliometric analysis of program publications.
 33 • A more formal analysis of the partners survey results.
 34 • A report on the status of the program's APMs and APGs.
 35 • The revised MYP.
 36 • The OW strategy.
 37 • A list of the APMs and APGs for the next 3-year period.
 38 • Several reports of workshops that were conducted during the past few years.

39
 40 ✧ Dr. Noss will provide to Ms. Peterson the actual questions for the partners survey. Ms.
 41 Peterson will distribute the survey questions to the Subcommittee members prior to the
 42 September 23, 2008 meeting.

43
 44 ✧ Dr. Meyer will prepare a 1-2 page response to Charge Question 1 and send it to Dr. Windom
 45 and Ms. Peterson by September 17, 2008.

46
 47 ✧ Dr. Kleinow will prepare a 1-2 page response to Charge Question 2 and send it to Dr.
 48 Windom and Ms. Peterson by September 17, 2008.

- 1
2 ✧ Dr. Sakaji will prepare a 1-2 page response to Charge Question 3 and send it to Dr. Windom
3 and Ms. Peterson by September 17, 2008.
4
5 ✧ Dr. Weisberg will prepare a 1-2 page response to Charge Question 4 and send it to Dr.
6 Windom and Ms. Peterson by September 17, 2008.
7
8 ✧ Dr. Ehlers will prepare a 1-2 page response to Charge Question 5 and send it to Dr. Windom
9 and Ms. Peterson by September 17, 2008.
10
11 ✧ Dr. Sayler will prepare a 1-2 page response to Charge Question 6 and send it to Dr. Windom
12 and Ms. Peterson by September 17, 2008.
13
14 ✧ Dr. Windom will compile the responses into a single document and add his comments to the
15 draft. He will provide distribute the document to the Subcommittee by close of business on
16 September 19, 2008.

PARTICIPANTS LIST

Subcommittee Members

Herb Windom, Ph.D., Chair
Professor Emeritus
Skidaway Institute of Oceanography

Laura J. Ehlers, Ph.D.
Senior Scientist
National Academy of Sciences
National Research Council

Kevin Kleinow, Ph.D.
Professor
Comparative Biomedical Sciences
School of Veterinary Medicine
Louisiana State University

Judith L. Meyer, Ph.D.
Distinguished Research Professor Emerita
Odum School of Ecology
University of Georgia

Gary S. Sayler, Ph.D.
Professor of Microbiology and Ecology
Director, The Center for Environmental
Biotechnology
University of Tennessee

Stephen B. Weisberg, Ph.D.
Executive Director
Southern California Coastal Water Research
Project Authority

Subcommittee Consultant

Richard H. Sakaji, Ph.D.
Manager of Planning and Analysis for Water
Quality
East Bay Municipal Utility District

Designated Federal Officer

Susan Peterson
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
Office of Science Policy

EPA Participants

Phillip Juengst
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
Office of Resources Management and
Administration

Charles Noss, Sc.D.
National Program Director for Water Quality
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Bill Russo
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Laurel Schultz
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Contractor Support

Beverly Campbell
The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc.

WATER QUALITY MID-CYCLE SUBCOMMITTEE**AGENDA****September 4, 2008****1:00 - 3:00 pm Eastern Time****Participation by Teleconference Only****866-299-3188****Code: 202-564-1077#**

1:00 - 1:10 pm	Welcome - Introduction of Subcommittee Members - Overview of Subcommittee Objectives	Dr. Herb Windom, Subcommittee Chair
1:10 - 1:15 pm	Administrative Procedures	Susan Peterson, Subcommittee DFO
1:15 - 1:30 pm	Material Overview	Dr. Charles Noss Office of Research and Development
1:30 - 1:50 pm	Overview of Charge/ Rating Program Performance	Dr. Herb Windom Subcommittee Chair
1:50 - 2:10 pm	Overall Progress Review	Dr. Charles Noss Office of Research and Development
2:10 - 2:35 pm	Updated MYP Review	Dr. Charles Noss Office of Research and Development
2:35 - 2:40 pm	Public Comment	Dr. Charles Noss, ORD NPD
2:40 - 3:00 pm	Preparation for Next Call and/or Face-to-Face Meeting - Discuss Writing Assignments - Identify Additional Information Needs	Dr. Herb Windom, Subcommittee Chair
3:00 pm	Adjourn	