

**ECOLOGICAL MID-CYCLE REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE****Conference Call Summary****Thursday, June 28, 2007****10:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon Eastern Time****Welcome***Dr. Jim Clark, ExxonMobil Corporation, Subcommittee Chair*

Dr. Jim Clark, Chair of the Ecological Mid-Cycle Review Subcommittee, welcomed the Subcommittee members to the conference call and thanked them for participating in this review. Dr. Clark stated that this was the third conference call of the Subcommittee, and the purpose was to followup after the face-to-face meeting held in May 2007. At the May meeting, Subcommittee members completed an assessment of the Ecological Research Program and began drafting a report in response to the charge questions from the Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) Executive Committee. The purpose of today's call is to review the draft comments received to date, come to agreement, and produce a draft report. Dr. Clark then asked Ms. Heather Drumm to discuss the administrative procedures for the call.

**Administrative Procedures***Ms. Heather Drumm, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Designated Federal Officer*

Ms. Drumm thanked the Subcommittee members for their efforts in conducting this mid-cycle review. Because she had reviewed the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) procedures in detail during previous conference calls, Ms. Drumm only addressed some of the more important administrative procedures. She explained that the BOSC is a Federal Advisory Committee that provides independent peer review for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Office of Research and Development (ORD), and as such is subject to the rules and requirements of FACA. The Ecological Mid-Cycle Review Subcommittee, as a subcommittee of the BOSC, is subject to FACA as well. As the Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the Subcommittee, Ms. Drumm serves as the liaison between the Subcommittee and ORD. Ms. Drumm stated that it is her responsibility as the DFO to ensure that the Subcommittee's conference calls and meetings comply with all FACA rules. All meetings and conference calls involving substantive issues, whether in person, by phone, or by e-mail, that include one-half or more of the Subcommittee members must be open to the public and a notice must be placed in the *Federal Register* at least 15 days prior to the call or meeting. The Subcommittee Chair and DFO must be present at all conference calls and meetings. All advisory committee documents also are made available to the public. Ms. Drumm reported that no requests for public comment were submitted prior to the call, but the agenda allows time for public comment at 11:30 a.m. She will call for public comments at that time.

Ms. Drumm stated that she sent a matrix to all Subcommittee members for review prior to the call. This mid-cycle review is different from other mid-cycle reviews because of the unique nature of the Ecological Research Program. It is because of this uniqueness that Subcommittee members have received a large volume of material, including information on the strategies for the future of the program. The matrix should prove useful as the Subcommittee members are working on the draft report. Ms. Drumm stated that she had set aside time for Dr. Iris Goodman to discuss how the matrix fits in with some of the other background materials the Subcommittee members had already received.

Dr. Goodman explained that she was filling in for Dr. Rick Linthurst, who was working with EPA regional staff in Ames, Iowa. The Ecological Mid-Cycle Review coincided with the refocusing of the Ecological Research Program. Therefore, materials sent to Subcommittee members included information on the progress made since 2005 under the old structure as well as the draft strategy for the future of the Program. Because of the extensive changes that have occurred, it has become difficult to track Program progress. There are a number of different measures of success, many of which were discussed at the May meeting. Some examples of these include how EPA materials are being used by clients as well as the different types of clients who are using them. Dr. Goodman clarified that under the existing program, certain measures have been approved by ORD and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). There are three sections in the matrix: diagnosis measures, forecasting measures, and restoration eco-services. Information in the matrix includes: partners responsible for the development of a product, clients using the product, how clients are using the product, client feedback on the product, and the Agency contact for the product. The matrix details the progress made to date as well as the work currently being performed to build upon those measures for the future.

Dr. Clark thanked Dr. Goodman and Ms. Drumm for preparing the matrix, adding that the matrix addresses many of the areas the Subcommittee is charged with reviewing. Using the matrix, Dr. Clark was able to identify a number of different activities occurring with a number of different partners regarding restoration ecosystem services tools. While it is helpful to see lists of partners, it is sometimes difficult to understand each partner's level of commitment and cooperation. Dr. Clark asked Dr. Goodman to explain the implication of a partner listing. Does it mean that the partner has made a financial commitment, an in-kind services commitment, or does it simply mean that the partner has expressed interest and downloaded information? Dr. Goodman responded that the partners listed in the matrix had not been separated out by their level of commitment. Dr. Thompson asked if the two diagnosis sheets in the file (diagnosis measure and diagnosis measure [2]) were different or if one was a continuation of the other. Dr. Goodman was not sure and said she would look into the matter and get back to the Subcommittee. Dr. Clark stated that any information to be distributed to the Subcommittee after the call should be e-mailed to Ms. Drumm.

Dr. Clark asked Dr. Thompson if she had any additional questions and she did not. Dr. Clark asked Dr. Giesy if he had any questions. Dr. Giesy replied that he had not had a chance to look at the matrix as he had not yet opened his e-mail that morning. Dr. Clark asked Dr. Turner if he had any questions. He replied that he was only able to download the matrix that morning and did not have any questions.

At Dr. Clark's request, Ms. Drumm identified the individuals who were on the telephone. The list of participants is attached.

### **Subcommittee Discussion – Draft Report**

*Dr. Jim Clark, ExxonMobil Corporation, Subcommittee Chair*

Dr. Clark explained that the BOSC Subcommittee was charged with producing a written report assessing the progress made by the Ecological Research Program in relation to six charge questions. After the May meeting, each Subcommittee member drafted a list of comments and suggestions related to each of the different charge questions and sent them to Ms. Drumm, who compiled the different sections. This document was e-mailed to the Subcommittee members prior to today's call. The purpose of today's call is to discuss the comments submitted, add any additional comments, and come to a consensus. After this call, Subcommittee members will produce a draft report. Dr. Clark pointed out that he had not received comments from Dr. Giesy. He asked Dr. Giesy if he would like to submit his comments or if he would prefer to serve as draft reviewer. Dr. Giesy chose to serve as draft reviewer. After a consensus is reached, Drs. Clark, Turner, and Thompson will draft the different sections of the report. It then will be sent to Ms. Drumm, who will send it to Dr. Giesy for review. Dr. Clark added that another option would be to allow Dr. Giesy to bow out at this point and vet the report for the BOSC Executive Committee. Dr. Clark stated that this second option was not his preference, but he thought it necessary to mention all the options available to Dr. Giesy. Dr. Giesy agreed to continue serving on the Subcommittee and act as a draft reviewer.

Dr. Clark explained the review process. After the Subcommittee generates the consensus report, Dr. Clark will send the report to the BOSC Executive Committee for review. The Executive Committee will revise the report as it deems appropriate and submit it to ORD as a BOSC report. The Subcommittee is performing this review on behalf of the Executive Committee; the final report will list the Subcommittee members as authors on behalf of the Executive Committee. Dr. Clark asked if there were any process-related questions. Dr. Turner asked if the group could discuss the format of the report. Dr. Clark thought this was a good starting point for the discussion and shared his vision for the final report. The report will begin with a brief (no more than 1 page) executive summary that would summarize the review process as well as the findings and recommendations from the mid-cycle program review regarding the progress made since the 2005 program review. Then there will be an introduction with more detail on how the review was conducted as well as the history and context of the review. The next section will list each charge question and the Subcommittee's comments and conclusions (including Program strengths and weaknesses and recommendations for improvement). For Charge Question 6, the Subcommittee will give an overall rating (exceptional, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or not satisfactory) on the Program's progress since the last review. There also will be appended materials, including agendas, the list of charge questions, a list of the Subcommittee members, and information on where to find previous reports. Ideally, the report will be between 5 and 7 pages, with no more than 2 pages per charge question. Dr. Clark asked the Subcommittee members if this was an acceptable format and everyone on the call agreed that it was.

Dr. Clark reviewed the Subcommittee's report drafting process. After today's call, each person with an assigned section will draft a 1 to 2 page summary. These sections then will be compiled

to create one draft document. Dr. Giesy will review the draft document. The draft then will be sent to all Subcommittee members for comment and evaluation. If necessary, there will be another conference call to discuss edits and changes to the report. If there are no major changes at this point, the Subcommittee may be able to communicate via e-mail and finalize the draft without having another conference call. After the draft is finalized, the draft report will be submitted to the BOSC Executive Committee for review. The BOSC has a conference call tentatively scheduled for the week of August 6, 2007. If the final draft report is completed by the end of July, it will be reviewed and vetted at this BOSC conference call in early August. If not, it will be reviewed and vetted at the September BOSC meeting. At the end of the call today, the group will schedule a followup conference call.

Dr. Clark turned the discussion to the draft document that Subcommittee members received prior to the call and began discussion of charge question #1, "How responsive has the Ecological Research Program been to the recommendations from its 2005 program review?" Comments regarding this charge question were submitted by Drs. Clark and Thompson. Dr. Clark's assessment is that there has been a response, but all the suggestions made as a result of the previous program review have not been implemented. Especially regarding indicators and metrics for ecosystem services, there is still much work to be done. Dr. Clark was pleased to see in the matrix a page on ecosystems services and said that he would work that information into the draft response to charge question #1. Dr. Clark then discussed Dr. Thompson's comments, which detailed some of the areas in which more information is needed. In the matrix, there is information on partners, but an important component of that, funding, seems to be missing. Also missing are communication procedures. In addition, some recommendations from the previous review, such as external peer review, technology transfer, and outreach to non-traditional stakeholders, have yet to be implemented. In sum, the Program has responded well to the previous report, but there are still issues yet to be addressed. Dr. Clark stated that he thought approximately 60 to 70 percent of the issues in the previous report had been addressed with approximately 30 to 40 percent yet to be addressed. Dr. Clark asked Dr. Thompson if she was comfortable with this interpretation and Dr. Thompson stated that she was. Dr. Clark suggested that the tone of the draft not be prescriptive; the draft should include details on what the Subcommittee did and did not see in the documents provided for the review and appropriate recommendations. Drs. Thompson, Turner, and Giesy agreed with this approach.

Dr. Clark asked Dr. Turner to take the lead on the discussion of charge question #2, "Are there performance metrics the Program should be using in addition to the current indicators for regularly assessing research progress?" The previous review recommended that the Program identify metrics and suggested a few specific metrics for the Program. Dr. Turner stated that he thought the Program was generally responsive to this recommendation; however, at times the application of metrics was inconsistent across the documents provided to the Subcommittee. Dr. Turner pointed out that he included specific examples from the documents provided to the Subcommittee in his comments for charge question #2. Dr. Clark added that specific examples always prove to be very useful in program reviews. In general, Dr. Turner believes that there is an understanding of the need for metrics in the Program. In fact, metrics have been included in some of the Program's recent proposal abstracts. On the other hand, metrics are not yet institutionalized. This is not something that can be done in 1 or 2 years, but it is a goal to work towards. Dr. Turner noted that budget cuts in recent years have made it especially difficult for

programs to implement suggested changes. Dr. Clark asked Dr. Turner if he saw anything in his or Dr. Thompson's comments that was inconsistent with his assessment. Dr. Turner responded that he did not find anything inconsistent with his assessment and noted that there were some additional points listed in their comments. Dr. Clark asked Dr. Thompson if there was anything in her comments that she wanted to highlight. Dr. Thompson noted that her recommendation for more complete tracking of Web site usage was an important component of enhancing the Program's Web page. In terms of the bibliometric analysis, Dr. Thompson thought Dr. Turner covered the topic well. Dr. Clark asked Dr. Turner if it would be difficult for him to condense the comments into a 2-page draft. Dr. Turner pointed out that the comments filled only 3 pages, and said it would not be a problem to reduce it to 2 pages. Dr. Turner emphasized that he thought the Program was doing well with the Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP). Unfortunately, the EMAP Program was cut. Dr. Clark clarified that EMAP efforts will be implemented by the states with funding from the Office of Water. Dr. Turner wondered if the legacy of the EMAP Program would continue. Dr. Clark suggested that the group recommend that the Ecological Program continue tracking the use of the EMAP tools. Dr. Turner agreed that this was a good idea. Dr. Clark pointed out the importance of being careful with the wording of their recommendations. The Subcommittee must allow for flexibility, especially given recent funding cuts. The recommendation could begin by highlighting the success of the EMAP Program and then suggest that ORD continue to track use of the EMAP tools.

Dr. Clark pointed out that, ultimately, the Subcommittee members would need to agree on a rating. At the May meeting, a consensus on a rating was not reached, with some supporting a rating of "Satisfactory" and some supporting a rating of "Exceeds Expectations." Since then, the "Satisfactory" term has been changed to "Meets Expectations," but the rating criteria have remained the same. Dr. Clark asked Dr. Turner to share his rating for the individual questions as well as his overall rating. Dr. Turner stated that he is definitely satisfied with the Program's progress. Within the context of any large organization, change does not happen overnight. Given the context, Dr. Turner said he may opt for a rating of "Exceeds Expectations." Dr. Clark clarified that he was not asking for a final rating; he was simply trying to get a sense of people's views on the different charge questions. He asked Dr. Turner, with this in mind, if he would like to weigh in on charge question #2. Dr. Turner said he would choose either "Meets Expectations" or "Exceeds Expectations." If the Program's funding had been stable, Dr. Turner would rate it as "Meets Expectations." Dr. Clark asked Dr. Thompson if she wanted to add anything. Dr. Thompson pointed out that "Meets Expectations" is defined as the Program meeting most of its goals. She would rate the Program as "Meets Expectations." Dr. Clark also would rate the Program as "Meets Expectations."

Dr. Clark returned to charge question #1, "How responsive has the Ecological Research Program been to the recommendations from its 2005 program review?" As discussed previously, approximately 65 to 70 percent of the goals have been achieved, some areas still need additional work, and some have yet to be addressed. Given this, Dr. Clark would give charge question #1 a rating of "Meets Expectations." Dr. Thompson agreed with this rating. Dr. Clark asked Dr. Turner for his input. Dr. Turner agreed with this assessment as well.

Dr. Clark began the discussion of charge question #3, “How clear is the rationale for the proposed Ecological Strategy?” The rationale for the change was explained in the documents provided to the Subcommittee. Specifics about the path forward, however, have not yet been articulated. Nor have the specific services and functions of the new research focus been determined. The focus shift raises new questions, such as how to write the Multi-Year Plan to reflect the shift and how to ensure that the short-term goals and Annual Performance Measures are reflective of the shift. In her comments, Dr. Thompson asked if they were behind the eight-ball in terms of ecosystem services research. Dr. Clark got the impression that the Program is working to document its options and determine the appropriate metrics. The matrix sent to Subcommittee members includes a page on ecosystems services that shows the work being performed in this area. With this shift in focus, the Program strategy would have to change from EMAP quantitative characterizations to a more systems dynamic approach. The rationale is there, but how this will be achieved is still a work in progress. Some changes have been made and Dr. Clark thinks the Program is on the right path, so he would rate the Program as “Meets Expectations.”

Dr. Thompson commented on the importance of ensuring that the work of the Ecological Research Program is not duplicating work being done by other groups such as the Nature Conservancy or the World Wildlife Fund. She pointed out that there was no discussion of these types of interactions in the 2005 review. Dr. Goodman asked Ms. Drumm if it would be helpful for her to provide the Subcommittee members with citations and documents that could help clarify some of the questions that had been raised on the call. Ms. Drumm responded that the decision would be up to the Chair and the Subcommittee members. Dr. Goodman clarified that she would not be providing further information, but would simply be highlighting some citations in the materials the Subcommittee had already received. Dr. Clark agreed to this and asked Dr. Goodman to send the information to Ms. Drumm, who then would distribute it to the Subcommittee members.

Dr. Turner asked Dr. Clark to clarify his first sentence on the report, “It is clear that it is time to move from costly data generation focus.” According to Dr. Clark, when the budget cuts were announced, it became clear that ORD’s budget would not be able to sustain any type of national scale data collection and monitoring program. Given this reality, ORD did an excellent job of transferring the management of EMAP to the Office of Water. Dr. Clark said that he would rephrase the sentence to make it clear that he was referring to data collection in terms of recent budget dynamics. Dr. Turner asked Dr. Clark to explain his concerns about having more office-based staff than data-generating staff. Dr. Clark responded that his concern was in having to rely on others to generate the data. Dr. Clark referred back to an earlier conversation about the importance of the ORD staff staying connected to the various programs for which they had developed the models, sampling tools, and analytical approaches. Dr. Turner asked if the importance of not becoming isolated from new data was understood by ORD staff. Dr. Clark suggested including in the draft a point about the importance of R&D staff staying involved with the projects they originally designed; this is essential to ensure the right questions are asked and the right kind of data is generated. Dr. Clark asked Dr. Turner to draft a few sentences on the topic and e-mail it to him and copy Ms. Drumm. Dr. Turner agreed to do so. Dr. Clark emphasized that given recent budget cuts, it is commendable that ORD staff recognized that data

collection could not be continued. The ORD staff came up with a new strategy and moved forward. Dr. Clark would give the Program a “Meets Expectations” rating for this question. Dr. Thompson agreed with this rating.

Charge question #4 asks, “What advice can the BOSC provide to assist in successfully addressing the emerging research in ecological services and their relationship to the selected economic and human health endpoints?” Dr. Clark pointed out that this question is related to one of Dr. Giesy’s areas of expertise—following emergent research. Dr. Clark believes that the communication and outreach activities currently in place will allow for access to emerging research areas. Dr. Thompson suggested reviewing current staff expertise to identify leaders, innovators, and/or future thinkers. Other approaches listed by Dr. Thompson include gathering information through external peer review and through the funding of extramural research programs such as the Science To Achieve Results (STAR) Program. Dr. Giesy noted that since the first program review, the Ecological Research Program has greatly improved in this area. At that time, there seemed to be a disconnect between the regions. Today there appears to be much more effective communication. Dr. Giesy expects that improvement in this area will continue. Dr. Clark asked Dr. Thompson if she had anything to add. Dr. Thompson did not have any additional comments. Dr. Clark asked Dr. Turner if he had any comments. Dr. Turner responded that he would advise that the Program continue moving in its current direction. Dr. Turner added that one area of concern is the current lack of funding for extramural programs.

Dr. Clark asked Dr. Thompson to take the lead on the discussion of charge question #5, “What suggestions can the BOSC offer in best achieving needed partnerships to conduct the future research?” Dr. Clark commented that the Ecological Research Program currently has a number of valuable contacts and he would advise them to continue those relationships and work to build upon them. Dr. Thompson added that in her view, achieving true partnerships is dependent on having two-way communication. In the Ecological Research Program’s communications strategy, she identified many activities that could be classified as dissemination, but not as communication. She noted that some other federal agencies had created models for incorporating feedback into their programs. Dr. Clark stated that, as he read the documents, he had initially been focused on getting the message out, but after reading Dr. Thompson’s comments, he came to better understand the importance of two-way communication. Dr. Clark agreed with Dr. Thompson’s assessment. Dr. Thompson suggested that Program staff be evaluated on their communication activities. Dr. Clark added that the Subcommittee should be careful in how it phrases its recommendation. He suggested that the Subcommittee emphasize the importance of holding employees responsible for communication activities, but not suggest that it be included in employees’ performance evaluations. The Subcommittee also could include examples of how communication skills are evaluated in academic institutions. For this charge question, Dr. Clark did not see a need for a summary, unlike charge question #2. That question requires a summary because there are many different issues to address. He encouraged Dr. Turner, in his response to charge question #2, to include both the specifics and a summary. Dr. Turner suggested that the Subcommittee recommend evaluating work groups, instead of individuals, as some people are more skilled in the area of communication than others. Dr. Thompson stated that she did not mean to imply that communication would be the only criterion for evaluating individuals.

Dr. Clark emphasized that the Subcommittee's charge is to review the Program; thus, the Subcommittee could recommend the inclusion of staff members with excellent communication skills; these types of decisions, however, should be made at the program level. Dr. Clark suggested emphasizing the importance of individual staff members being involved in and contributing to outreach and two-way communication. Dr. Thompson said she would rewrite the section to reflect this. Dr. Thompson asked if she should send the updated text to Ms. Drumm. Dr. Clark responded that all writers should send their sections to Ms. Drumm, who then will compile them into one document. Dr. Thompson asked if edits should be made using the Track Changes feature in Microsoft Word. Dr. Clark instructed the Subcommittee members not to use Track Changes at this point; however, Track Changes will be used at the next stage in the editing process. Dr. Clark asked Dr. Thompson to rate the Program relative to this charge question. Dr. Thompson pointed out that the charge question is asking for suggestions on achieving needed partnerships. In terms of the work EPA is currently performing, she would choose a rating of "Meets Expectations." Dr. Clark asked Dr. Turner for his rating. Dr. Turner found it difficult to rate this charge question and did not give a rating. Dr. Clark assured Dr. Giesy that he did not intend to ignore him regarding these questions, but that he would seek his input on charge question #6. At the May meeting, the group was unable to reach a consensus on a rating of "Satisfactory" (now "Meets Expectations") or "Exceeds Expectations." After each charge question response was written, the Subcommittee members were to assess the strengths and weaknesses of each and use that information as the quantitative basis for the overall rating.

Charge question #6 states, "Please rate the progress made by the Ecological Research Program in moving the program forward in response to the BOSC review of 2005 as exceptional, exceeds expectations, satisfactory, or not satisfactory in accordance with the BOSC Research Program Review Guidance for Rating Program Performance detailed below." Dr. Clark indicated that the Subcommittee members need to agree on an overall rating for this charge question and also generate text explaining the rationale for the rating. He asked if anyone on the call was willing to suggest an overall rating. Given the funding cuts the Program has faced, Dr. Turner suggested a rating of "Exceeds Expectations." If the funding platform had been stable, he would have opted for a "Meets Expectations" rating. Dr. Giesy stated that he was impressed by the amount of detail the Ecological Research Program produced in response to the Subcommittee's questions. He thought that the Program deserved an "Exceeds Expectations" rating. In his view, the Program did a marvelous job, not even factoring in budget cuts. Dr. Thompson reminded the Subcommittee members on the call that the criteria for "Exceeds Expectations" is that the program is meeting all of its goals. Because of this, she was hesitant to choose "Exceeds Expectations" and opted for "Meets Expectations." Dr. Clark reminded all on the call that they should be focusing on the changes made since the 2005 review. Dr. Thompson commented on Dr. Giesy's point about budget cuts. She noted that the Ecological Research Program draft project report from 2005-2007 describes the research under an annual budget of 200 FTEs and \$75 million dollars. It is not until fiscal year 2008 that the Program begins working under a reduced budget of \$68.2 million. Thus, Dr. Thompson did not agree that budget cuts should be considered in rating the Program. Dr. Giesy clarified that his last statement was in reference to the responsiveness of the Program to the comments made by the earlier BOSC Subcommittee; it was not an overall rating. Dr. Clark emphasized the importance of using the criterion in the tool to determine the rating, noting that his rating had changed since the May meeting. At this point, he thinks that the Ecological Research Program has met most of its goals, but there is much work



yet to be done. The Program has made great strides in light of the realities within which they have had to work. Dr. Clark voted for a rating of “Meets Expectations.” Dr. Turner pointed out that the two more experienced Subcommittee members voted for two different ratings and the two less experienced members also voted for two different ratings. Dr. Giesy clarified that he agreed with Dr. Clark. His last comments were in response to charge question #6, which specifically asks if the Program has been responsive to the previous review recommendations. Dr. Giesy stated that he agreed completely with Dr. Clark’s assessment for the overall evaluation of the Program. Dr. Turner stated that he thought charge question #6 was the overall Program assessment. Again, Dr. Giesy explained that his rating was in reference to the response of the Program to the BOSC’s 2005 recommendations. Overall, he would be comfortable with a rating of “Meets Expectations.” Dr. Clark stated that he wanted to make sure that the group reached a consensus; he did not want to override anyone’s vote. He asked those on the call if they would be comfortable with a response to charge question #6 that gave a rating of “Meets Expectations,” but which also noted that the Program had done an exceptional job in the face of many challenges. He asked Dr. Turner if this would reflect the consensus of the group. Dr. Turner stated that he would prefer to review Dr. Clark’s draft before answering that question. Dr. Clark reiterated that the group will need to ultimately agree upon an overall rating. Dr. Giesy suggested pointing out the different criteria for the two ratings to explain the reasoning behind the rating chosen. The response could emphasize that the Subcommittee was quite impressed with the Program’s response to the last review, but still make the point that the Program did not meet all the criteria for a rating of “Exceeds Expectations.” Dr. Thompson thought this was a good idea. Dr. Turner cautioned that the rating itself would be more likely to carry forward than the words written in the Subcommittee’s response.

Dr. Clark stated that he was pleased with the progress the group had made and thanked them for their efforts.

### **Public Comments**

*Ms. Heather Drumm, DFO*

At 11:30 a.m., Ms. Drumm called for public comments. There were no public comments.

### **Subcommittee Discussion – Next Steps**

*Dr. Jim Clark, Subcommittee Chair*

Dr. Clark explained that the next step is to prepare a draft report. The assigned writers will draft or redraft their sections and e-mail them to Ms. Drumm by Friday, July 6, 2007. Ms. Drumm will compile the sections, creating a single document. She then will send the document to the Subcommittee members for review on Monday, July 9, 2007. Dr. Giesy will review and edit the document using the Track Changes feature in Microsoft Word. Any comments or suggestions that other Subcommittee members have for Dr. Giesy should be e-mailed to Ms. Drumm, who will communicate these to Dr. Giesy. The next conference call is scheduled for Monday, July 30, 2007 from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Prior to this call, Ms. Drumm will e-mail the reviewed and edited document to all Subcommittee members. If, after reviewing the updated document, Subcommittee members do not have any major edits, it may be possible to finalize the document via e-mail.

### **Action Items**

- ✧ Subcommittee members will send redrafted sections and comments to Ms. Drumm by July 6, 2007.
- ✧ Ms. Drumm will compile the drafts and send the document to the Subcommittee members for review on July 9, 2007.
- ✧ Dr. Giesy will edit the draft report using Track Changes and send it to Ms. Drumm before July 30, 2007.
- ✧ Subcommittee members will review the revised draft and be prepared to discuss it during the July 30 conference call. If there are minimal comments, the call may be cancelled.
- ✧ Dr. Goodman will highlight certain items in the materials and send that to Ms. Drumm who will distribute it to the Subcommittee members.

## **PARTICIPANTS LIST**

### **Subcommittee Members**

#### **James R. Clark, Ph.D., Chair**

ExxonMobil Research and Engineering  
Company  
Environmental, Safety, Civil & Marine Division  
3225 Gallows Road, Room 3A009  
Fairfax, VA 22037  
Phone: 703-846-3565  
Fax: 703-846-6001  
E-mail: jim.r.clark@exxonmobil.com

#### **John P. Giesy, Ph.D.**

Professor & Canada Research Chair in  
Environmental Toxicology  
Department of Veterinary Biomedical Sciences  
University of Saskatchewan  
44 Campus Drive  
Saskatoon SK S7N 5B3  
Phone: 306-966-7441  
Fax: 306-931-1664  
E-mail: jgiesy@aol.com

#### **Sue Thompson, Ph.D.**

Director, 3 Rivers Ecological Research Center  
Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission  
16 Terminal Way  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
Phone: 412-381-1297  
Fax: 412-481-1019  
E-mail: suethomps@state.pa.us

#### **Robert Eugene Turner, Ph.D.**

Coastal Ecology Institute  
School of the Coast and Environment  
1209 Energy Coast and Environment Building  
Louisiana State University  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803  
Phone: 225-578-6454  
Fax: 225-578-6326  
E-mail: eturne@lsu.edu

### **Designated Federal Officer**

#### **Heather Drumm**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Office of Research and Development  
Office of Science Policy  
Mail Code: 8104R  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20460  
Phone: 202-564-8239  
E-mail: drumm.heather@epa.gov

### **EPA Participants**

#### **Iris Goodman, Ph.D.**

Office of Research and Development  
National Center for Environmental Research  
Mail Code: 8701F  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20460  
Phone: 202-343-9854  
E-mail: goodman.iris@epa.gov

#### **Ben Larson**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Office of Research and Development  
Mail Code: 8102R  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20460  
Phone: 202-564-2001  
E-mail: larson.ben@epa.gov

#### **Mike McDonald, Ph.D.**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Office of Research and Development  
Mail Code: B343-06  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27711  
Phone: 919-541-7973  
E-mail: mcdonald.michael@epa.gov

**Contractor Support**

**Jen Hurlburt**

The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc.

656 Quince Orchard Road, Suite 210

Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Phone: 301-670-4990

E-mail: [jhurlburt@scgcorp.com](mailto:jhurlburt@scgcorp.com)



## **ECOLOGICAL MID-CYCLE SUBCOMMITTEE**

### **AGENDA**

**June 28, 2007**

**10:00 am – 12:00 pm Eastern Time**

**Participation by Teleconference Only**

**866-299-3188**

**code: 2025648239#**

10:00-10:05 am	Welcome	Dr. Jim Clark, Subcommittee Chair
10:05-10:10 am	Administrative Procedures	Heather Drumm Subcommittee DFO
10:10-11:30 am	Subcommittee Discussion - Draft Report	Dr. Jim Clark Subcommittee Chair
11:30-11:35 am	Public Comment	
11:35-12:00 pm	Subcommittee Discussion - Next Steps	Dr. Jim Clark, Subcommittee Chair
12:00 pm	Adjourn	