HAPPENINGS at the SAB

...ensuring a solid technical basis for environmental protection

Volume 7 Number 4 April 2002

DR. VANESSA VU: SAB STAFF DIRECTOR 2002

2002

AND THE SAB

EDITORIAL

Late last year the Deputy Administrator announced a program to rotate members of the Senior Executive Service (SES) at US EPA. The intent is to bring new vision and vigor to Agency programs and to enhance the career development of SESers.

The first round of that SES Rotation Program was announced on March 27 and included the assignment of Dr. Vanessa T. Vu to head up the Staff of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) beginning in June.

Dr. Vu is the Director of the Office of Science Coordination and Policy in the Agency's Office of Prevention, Pesticides, and Toxic Substances (OPPTS). In this capacity, she provides leadership and direction for the management of the FIFRA's Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP) and cross-cutting science programs/policies pertaining to the Endocrine Disruptors Program, Alternative Test Methods Program, and the Biotechnology Program. From 1998-2001, she served as the Associate Director for Health in the Agency's National Center for Environmental Assessment within the Office of Research and Development, where she was responsible for directing a research program to develop and implement improved human health risk assessment methods and to provide management oversight on consensus health effects assessments of major environmental chemicals available in

In this issue...

Editorial 1
Tentative Calendar for April & May 3
Committee Activities in March 5
Committee Activities in April 5
SAB Lecture Series 6
SAB Reports in Progress 10
Abstracts of New Reports 10
Computer News 13
Member/Consultant/Staff News 14
Bon Mot. 15

EPA's Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS). Prior to going to ORD, she served within the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics as the Director of the Risk Assessment Division from 1995-1998 and the Deputy Director of the Health and Environmental Review Division from 1992-1995, where she directed a scientific review program on the evaluation of human health and ecological risks of new and existing chemicals and on the development of internationally harmonized toxicity test guidelines to assess the potential of environmental chemicals that elicit human health and ecological effects.

Dr. Vu serves on many advisory and expert panels both within the Agency – including the Science Policy Council and the Risk Assessment Forum – as well as in the larger scientific community – including the World Health Organization, the National Toxicology Program, and the International Life Sciences Institute. She is a member of the International Society of Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology, the American Chemical Society, and the Senior Executive Association. She is the author or co-author of numerous research articles, Agency scientific reviews, and book chapters in pharmacology, toxicology, and risk assessment.

Dr. Vu received her B.A. degree in Biology and Chemistry from Case Western Reserve University in 1973, and her Ph.D. in Pharmacology from the George Washington University in 1980. Prior to joining EPA, she served in various capacities in the academic world, including as a postdoctoral fellow at the Johns Hopkins University, a Research Associate at the Vincent Lombardi Cancer Center, and a Staff Fellow at the National Cancer Institute.

Dr. Donald Barnes, who has served as Staff Director of the SAB since 1988, will retire from Federal service in early May. He and his wife, Karen, will travel to Central China in June for two months in order to participate in a church-related program aimed at bolstering the skills of in-service Chinese teachers of English. They will then travel to Southern China to teach English among some of the "minority peoples" who live near the Vietnam border. They plan to return to the U.S. next February.

Dr. Vu met with SAB Chair, Dr. William Glaze, Dr. Barnes and Mr. Flaak (Acting Deputy Staff Director) on April 1 to discuss the transition and future plans. It was a very productive meeting.

Donald G. Barnes, PhD
Staff Director

Tentative SAB Meeting Calendar for April & May

Several of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) meetings noted below have been announced in the Federal Register (FR), together with additional background information. Readers can automatically receive e-mailed copies of FR Notices by subscribing to the SAB Listserver; see Section Updates below.

If a series of meetings is anticipated, the number of the meeting in the series is indicated in parentheses; e.g., "(#2)".

APRIL

8F

Committee:	Radiation Advisory Committee (RAC)
Topic(s):	Multi-Agency Radiological Laboratory Analytic Protocols (MARLAP)
Location:	Ariel Rios, Room 6013, Teleconference
Chair:	*Dr. Janet Johnson, Shepherd Miller Inc.*
DFO:	*Dr. K. Jack Kooyoomjian*
Email:	*kooyoomjian.jack@epa.gov*

23-25

Committee:	Radiation Advisory Committee (RAC)
Topic(s):	Multi-Agency Radiological Laboratory Analytic Protocols (MARLAP)
Location:	ICC Building, Room 1153
Chair:	*Dr. Janet Johnson, Shepherd Miller Inc.*
DFO:	*Dr. K. Jack Kooyoomjian*
Email:	*kooyoomjian.jack@epa.gov*

MAY

1F

Committee:	Environmental Engineering Committee (EEC)
Topic(s):	Strategic Planning; Briefing on nanotechnology
Location:	Ariel Rios Building, Room 6528, Teleconference
Chair:	*Dr. Domenico Grasso, Smith College*
DFO:	*Ms. Kathleen White*
Email:	*white.kathleen@epa.gov*

8F

Committee:	Executive Committee Meeting
Topic(s):	Review Meeting
Location:	Ariel Rios Building, Room 6013, Teleconference
Chair:	*Dr. William Glaze, University of North Carolina*
DFO:	*Mr. A. Robert Flaak*
Email:	*flaak.robert@epa.gov*

9F

Committee:	Executive Committee Subcommittee
Topic(s):	Benefits, Costs and Impacts of RCRA Subtitle C & Ust Programs
Location:	TBD, Teleconference
Chair:	*Mr. A. Myrick Freeman, Bowdoin College*
DFO:	*Dr. K. Jack Kooyoomjian*
Email:	*kooyoomjian.jack@epa.gov*

To View a Tentative 6 Month Calendar Click Here
Or Go to the SAB website www.epa.gov/sab/mtgcal.htm

Committee Activities in March

On **March 6-7**, the Executive Commitee (EC) met and acted on four reports from Panels:

a. *The FY03 President's Budget Request for Science & Technology at USEPA: An SAB Review* from the Research Strategies Advisory Committee,

b. *The Contaminant Candidate List Research Plan (CCLRP) for the Office of Water: An SAB Review* from the Drinking Water Committee,

c. *Industrial Ecology: An SAB Commentary* from the Environmental Engineering Committee, and

d. *Policies and Procedures of the Science Advisory Board: An SAB Commentary* from the Policies and Procedures Subcommittee.

In addition, the EC

a. Had a good exchange of views with Deputy Administrator Linda Fisher,

b. Discussed SAB projects for FY02 and the process to be used for identification of FY03 projects, and

c. Explored possibilities for a project at the interface between economics and the enviornment.

On **March 13**, the Environmental Engineering Committee (EEC) held a public conference call meeting. The EEC approved the Surface Impoundments Study Subcommittee report; most of the changes will be addressed through a reorganization of the Executive Summary. Drs. Rittmann and Theis will confirm that the required changes have been made before this report is forwarded to the Executive Committee for consideration.

On **March 27**, the Executive Committee's Subcommitte PM Research Centers Interim Review Panel conducted a conference call to agree on the final edits to its report stemming from the February 11-12, face-to-face meeting in Washington. The call was enhanced by an experiment that holds the promise of on-line, real-time editing that can be viewed over the Internet. The Panel's final report will be posted on the SAB Website in early April and forwarded to the SAB Executive Committee for their review on the May 8 conference call.

Committee Activities in April

On **April 8**, the Executive Committee Subcommittee on MARLAP, will hold a public conference call to discuss the charge, adequacy of the review materials, and etc. There is also a face-to-face meeting scheduled for **April 23-25**. These meetings were referenced in the March 13 Federal Register (Vol. 67, No. 49, pgs. 11328-11330).

Science and the Human Side of Environmental Protection, Dr. Elinor Ostrom

On February 22, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Science Advisory Board (SAB) hosted its third lecture in the third year of its series, "Science and the Human Side of Environmental Protection." The presenter was Dr. Elinor Ostrom, Arthur F. Bentley Professor of Political Science, at the Center for the Study of Institutions, Population and Environmental Change and the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis at Indiana University, Bloomington. She spoke on the topic "Ecological Diversity and the Need for Institutional Diversity." Thirty people from four Headquarters Offices, four regions, and two ORD laboratories participated, as well as three invited guests from outside the Agency.

Dr. Ostrom began her talk by acknowledging the growth of serious and appropriate interest in preserving diversity of ecological systems. Less well known, she stated, that research was documenting the success of local efforts to use resources and preserve biodiversity (e.g., farmer-managed irrigation projects, in- shore fisheries, forest plans) that have been designed by users. In addition, national efforts to address biodiversity issues have sometimes caused major problems. She called for a serious effort to conserve "institutional diversity" as policy makers consider how to preserve ecological diversity.

In her view, the working assumptions of contemporary policy draw on a "narrow model of the individual" for representing public attitudes and a contrasting "enlightened model" for public policy makers. She argued, in contrast, that empirical research shows neither that the public fits the model of *Homo Economicus* (a norm free, short-term maximer of selfish gains), nor that public policy makers know how to maximize public interest through designing optimal rules that work in the public interest. She stated that research shows the assumptions underlying the "Tragedy of the Commons," where an unregulated pool of common resources is assumed to be overused or destroyed if it is not subject to government control or privatization, are incorrect and a poor foundation for public policy.

The Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis has collected thousands of cases that show how local users sustainably manage local resources. The Workshop has also documented local cases of failure. Where users have been successful, they have developed a secure relationship with biological resources through organizing their own rules, rules that frequently are "invisible" to outsiders who do not see how they are embedded in local culture and practice.

To build on this body of research for policymaking, Dr. Ostrom argued that scholars and decision makers should build and use a "better model of the individual." Instead of envisioning the public as a simple *Homo Economicus*, policy makers should have an understanding of the public as "boundedly rational," with a capability to learn social rules; where reciprocity is a key norm supported by trust and

understandings of reputation; and where legal rules can enhance reciprocity.

The case studies suggest that there are attributes of resources and of the appropriators of resources that are linked to the successful sustainable management of those resources: 1) the resources must be perceived as feasible to be improved (i.e., resource units are not at a point of deterioration such that is useless to organize to improve their use, or they are so underutilized that there is little advantage from organizing); 2) reliable and valid indicators of the condition of the resource system are available at relatively low cost; 3) the flow of resource units is relatively predictable; and 4) the resource system is sufficiently small, given the transportation and communication technology in use, that appropriators can develop accurate knowledge of them

In cases where successful management occurs, appropriators (i.e., users) of the resource are most likely to have these characteristics: 1) to be dependent on the resource system for a major portion of their livelihood or value it highly for other purposes; 2) to share an image of how the resource system operations and how their actions affect each other and the resource system; 3) to use a low discount rate in relation to future benefits to be achieved from the resource; 4) to include powerful individuals among those adversely affected by a lack of coordinated patterns of appropriation and use; 5) to trust one another to keep promises; 6) to have the autonomy needed to determine rules without external authorities countermanding them; and 6) to have some prior organizational experience.

Dr. Ostrom described how her workshop has modeled these characteristics mathematically and combined them into models of benefits and costs that describe different cases. She stated that the greatest scientific challenge is to develop accurate measures of the characteristics of resource and people involved in cases. One way the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis at Indiana University is meeting this challenge is by laboratory experiments on groups. A key finding of those experiments, as well as the case studies they have collected, is that communication is the biggest factor that affects people's abilities to manage common pool resources. When information is exchanged and communication happens, appropriators of resources can establish successful rules.

Dr. Ostrom then turned to the topic of how "larger regimes" interact with local systems to manage resources. She suggested that larger regimes would have more success if they acknowledged the long-term benefits of locally established systems; if they facilitated exchanges within and between local systems; if they supported monitoring of local resources and respected local knowledge about the resource. She acknowledged the necessity of "polycentric" regimes that would operate at multiple levels and there is a need to study empirically what leads to successful outcomes when local, regional, national, and global entities interact to manage common resources.

She concluded her presentation with a set of challenges for researchers, policy makers, and resource users.

She called on researchers to conduct in-depth case studies to understand complex interactions in field setting. She emphasized the importance of studies with

a large number of cases to test the relative importance of different variables. She called for experimental studies in the laboratory and long-term studies of individual cases.

She stated that policy makers need to develop: 1) legal environments that enable people to take responsibility; 2) sources of accurate information about resource conditions; 3) fair, low-cost courts that allow quick resolution of differences; 4) policies and programs that enhance benefits for local users; and 5) efforts to find mutual interests across national, state, and local levels.

She called on resource users to: 1) create associations to share information; 2) to search for ways of increasing the benefits of working together and find ways of reducing the costs; and 3) draw on local knowledge to find innovative institutions that fit local conditions.

Mr. John Meagher, Director of the Wetlands Division in EPA's Office of Water, who had been asked to begin the discussion with his comments, made several observations. He commented first on the cyclical nature of policies to protect water quality. After World War II, the nation had turned to national programs involving engineering solutions to address water pollution problems that local and state governments had not solved. In the last 10 years, he noted a growing sense that the nation has reached the limits of those national programs and is turning to watershed management to address problems that range from runoff from farms to sprawl. The U.S. EPA is part of this effort, promoting watershed management against the backdrop of the Clean Water Act.

To make local efforts work within a national and global context, he noted, was a real problem. How do local efforts relate, for example, to global scale problems like Global Warming? Where are global approaches appropriate? Whaling issues came to mind. Can Dr. Ostrom's model works when local needs are extremely basic, so low on Maslow's hierarchy of needs that people cannot meet their basic physiological needs? How can local users be educated about endangered species that might be seen by them as external to the use of local resources? How can governments promote the use of good information for decisions, given local conflicts about the data and information on which decisions are based, such as the disputes between Virginia and Maryland on local fisheries issues?

Dr. Ostrom responded that a key to some of these local issues is empirical information. For example, actual information about who owns lands and how they use it for different purposes may help to solve problems. Assumptions about local values and behavior may not match reality. In Indiana, for example, there was a policy issue regarding chopping large tracts of land into small plots. Researchers in her Department surveyed a sample of 250 landowners who owned more than 5 acres. The research showed that individuals who owned fairly large amounts of land (50-1000 acres) were more responsible to price fluctuations in the timber market; they were land rich and cash poor. Holders of small amounts of land, 5-10 acres, tended to be owned by professional people who managed the land in an ecologically sensitive way.

She suggested that often policy makers have a simplistic view of landholding alternatives as either state forests or industrial uses. She encouraged decision

makers to set up systems, like ecologically friendly zoning, that respond to private needs.

The broader group then joined the discussion. The first question addressed the experience of other countries: has any one other country "got this right?" Dr. Ostrom suggested that the United States could learn a lot from Switzerland, which has sustained a rich mix of public and private institutions for managing resources for 1,000 years. A contrast would be the experience in Canada, where the Canadian Government dismissed local fishermen's concerns about the loss of small fish. Canada is now trying to rebuild local confidence in government data, by sending harvesters out on scientific boats on a regular basis

The next question concerned how the characteristics and attributes Dr. Ostrom described related to experience in urban areas and neighborhoods. Dr. Ostrom replied that she had conducted research on urban policing as a production function of a local public good. She conducted this research in response to a proposal in the 1960's for a massive consolidation of policing within metropolitan areas. Her research showed that complex systems, involving locally provided police services, outperformed simple systems where policing functions were consolidated.

The next question asked about the relationship of environmental issues and policies to the "classic resource" problems addressed by Dr. Ostrom's research. Within Dr. Ostrom's framework, environmental groups were hard to characterize; they were both resource users and decision makers. Dr. Ostrom agreed that environmental groups are indeed hard to classify and would benefit from analysis to understand better what they are and how they work. Dr. Nives Dolsak, a colleague of Dr. Ostrom at Indiana University, who had conducted research on collective action to address environmental issues, stated that her work suggests that it is easier to develop successful institutions to address resource concerns than to manage the "bads" of pollution. There were, however, many cases where users have organized themselves to address pollution; she suggested that a key example is the effort of North East States to address ground-level ozone pollution.

The final question concerned was where was work on large-scale systems successful. EPA staff suggested that the Great Lakes National Program Office has been effective working at a regional and international scale and that the Chesapeake Bay Program has made progress on air issues. Dr. Ostrom responded that Dr. Mark Sprool Jones at McMaster University had studied the Great Lakes experience in detail.

Dr. Ostrom has made copies of her slides available. Please contact Dr. Angela Nugent (email: nugent.angela@epa.gov) for copies.

The SAB plans to host lectures on the social sciences on a periodic basis to highlight how they can help solve actual environmental problems. If you have suggestions for future speakers or topics, Please contact Dr. Nugent.

SAB Reports in Progress

a PROJECTS TO BE REVIEWED AT THE MAY 8 EC TELECONFERENCE MEETING

DWC

1) The USEPA Long-Term Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule Proposal and Stage II Disinfection/Disinfectant By-Product Rule Proposal: An SAB Review

EPEC

2) A Framework for Reporting on Ecological Condition: An SAB Review
3) Southeastern Ecological Framework: An SAB Review

EEC

4) The USEPA Surface Impoundments Study: An SAB Review

EC Subcommittee

5) US EPA Particulate Matter Research Centers: An SAB Review
6) Policies and Procedures at the SAB: An SAB Commentary

b PROJECTS DUE FOR A LATER EC MEETINGS

EEC

1) Risk Reduction Options Report: An SAB Review

c PROJECTS THAT DO NOT REQUIRE EC APPROVAL (CASAC & COUNCIL)

CASAC

1) The Agency's draft Proposed Methodology for Particulate Matter Risk Analyses for Selected Urban Areas: A CASAC Advisory

d PROJECTS THAT HAVE RECEIVED EC APPROVAL AND AWAIT COMPLETION

There are none at this time.

Abstracts of New Reports

a Candidate Contaminant List Research Plan (CCLRP): An SAB Report EPA-SAB-DWC-02-006

The Drinking Water Committee (DWC) of EPA's Science Advisory Board (SAB) met on June 12-13, 2001 to

complete its review of the Environmental Protection Agency's draft *Research Plan for the Drinking Water Contaminant Candidate List* dated February 21, 2001. The charge to the Drinking Water Committee asked if the two-phase decision process described in the research plan has a high probability of providing information appropriate for the Office of Water's regulatory determinations for CCL contaminants. Further, it asked if the Science Advisory Board had any suggestions for improving the integrated planning of research on unregulated contaminants.

The Panel believes that the two-phase process described in the plan was understandable and has a high probability of producing appropriate information for the Office of Water's regulatory determinations on CCL contaminants. However, to be successfully implemented, more complete operational definitions will be required for many terms, concepts and criteria that are incorporated within the process. In particular, more explicit criteria need to be identified for ranking and evaluating contaminants. With regard to the critical need for criteria, EPA should begin their development by tying them to the general statutory criteria for regulatory decision making mentioned above. Finally, it will be necessary for the Implementation Team, envisioned in the plan, to have the authority, resources, time and administrative support needed to play its coordinating role.

The Panel believes that one of the research plan's strengths is in its integration of both the research decision making process with the Contaminant Candidate Listing regulatory process that it supports. This is an improvement in research planning even though it contributes to the complexity of the plan. Integration clearly shows that the two processes, regulatory and research, are inextricably linked and that the criteria to be met to move forward in the regulatory process will significantly influence the criteria for determining research needs and priorities. Because of the link between progress in the research program and movement in the regulatory program there is a need for a richer articulation of how the research and regulatory components of the overall process interact. Terms used to describe the critical decision points that are built into the processes need to be defined and criteria need to be developed for how those decisions are made in the regulatory and research components of the overall process. The Panel believes that developing operational definitions for these key terms, concepts and criteria will contribute to the achievement of the objectives of the research plan.

The Panel also recommended that in carrying out its CCL responsibilities, the Agency use current science research and established science policies to evaluate the basis for its regulatory concerns, employ a transparent decision-making approach, and make an effective use of public participation. EPA should also indicate how the research planning process will balance short-term and long-term investments to maximize public health protection.

b FY 2003 Presidential Science and Technology Budget Request for the Environmental Protection Agency

EPA-SAB-RSAC-02-007

The Research Strategies Advisory Committee (RSAC) of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) met February 20 and 21, 2002 to review the

Science and Technology portion of the FY 2002 Presidential Budget Request for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The Committee notes that both EPA and ORD have specific Strategic Plans that continue to increasingly guide their research activities. It also notes that EPA has made much progress identifying major programmatic needs, and that improvement in coordination between ORD and the Program Offices continues. RSAC observes that there has been satisfactory progress in accounting for the impact of research efforts, and that initial progress has been made to define short-term and intermediate outcomes of the EPA ORD research activities.

RSAC is encouraged by the success of the ORD post doctoral program, but is deeply concerned with the transfer of funds that support the STAR Fellowship program to another Agency. RSAC urges the Agency and Congress to find approaches to continue funding of the STAR Fellowship Program at EPA. The other RSAC recommendations are that:

a) EPA continue with its Science Inventory efforts which catalogue science projects and products, so as to capture and identify the extent of science being done at EPA.
b) EPA identify specific non-regulatory driven issues of high importance to protecting human health, the environment, and ecosystems and in the next budget (FY 2004) request adequate S&T funds to address approaches to mitigate such risks.
c) if Congress adds specific projects or programs for EPA, Congress should also appropriate the funds needed for the successful completion of the projects or programs it adds on to the S&T program budget as was done in the current fiscal year appropriations.

RSAC encourages EPA to maintain and increase the investment in research needed to meet the needs of the Agency. This is particularly important in emerging scientific areas such as genomics, proteomics and bioinformatics. RSAC continues to recommend that the Agency be vigilant in defining and maintaining the core research needed to achieve a balanced S&T research program. Further, the Committee urges the Agency to clearly explain to OMB and Congress that the only way it will be possible to meet its expanded responsibilities while improving the quality of the science used, is for the S&T budget to be maintained and increased over time.

c Review of the Agency's Continuous Monitoring Implementation Plan EPA-SAB-CASAC-LTR-02-001

The Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC) Particulate Matter Review Panel reviewed the EPA draft document *Proposed Methodology for Particulate Matter Risk Analysis for Selected Urban Areas* that outlines part of the procedures to be used in preparing the human health risk assessment for $PM_{2.5}$ that will accompany the Staff Paper on the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for Particulate Matter (PM) that will be released later this year.

In its review, the Panel noted the importance that this risk analysis has in the primary standard setting process for PM. The Panel concluded that the general methodology as described in the report is

appropriate. It recognizes the need to use concentration/response functions to obtain risk estimates in a series of locations. The Panel offered a number of comments that relate to the details of application of the method.

The Panel believes that the basic process is sound and provides a number of suggestions in this report and in the appendix to refine the analyses that are to be done.

d Industrial Ecology: A Commentary by the EPA Science Advisory Board EPA-SAB-EEC-COM-02-002

This commentary on Industrial Ecology was prepared by the Environmental Engineering Committee (EEC) of the EPA Science Advisory Board.

The commentary addresses Industrial Ecology, a systems approach to environmental analysis. Industrial ecology seeks to address not just industrial emissions, and not just specific products, but the complex networks of services, products, and activities that make up our economy. It emphasizes opportunities for new technologies, new processes, and economically beneficial efficiencies.

The purpose of this Commentary is two-fold: first, to bring industrial ecology to the attention of a wider audience within EPA and other agencies as an approach to meeting their missions, and second, to articulate key research needs. The SAB believes that industrial ecology could help EPA to address some of the core challenges of environmental policy, from climate change to waste management to land use policy. Achieving this potential will require rigorous research and a firm grounding in science and engineering.

This identifies the need for better understanding of the potential and limitations of a range of promising approaches including:

a) technological innovation
b) voluntary and cooperative approaches to environmental management
c) substitution of services for products
d) recycling and reuse
e) reduction in the amounts of materials used in products
f) substitution of scarce resources with those that are plentiful

Computer News

(1) Thanks to generous assistance from ORD, the SAB is experimenting with software that will permit on-line, real-time editing of SAB documents during publicly accessible conference call meetings. The EEC and the PM Research Centers Interim Review Panel have enhanced recent editing session's using this PlaceWare capability. While the Staff needs more experience with the system in order to become facile with its use, the procedures hold great promise for insuring that all participants agree to each "jot and tittle" of the report and that the public can see the developments as they occur. In addition to

allowing the Board to work "quicker, cheaper, smarter", such procedures would address some of the concerns about transparency raised by the General Accounting Office in its 2000-01 investigation of SAB procedures.

(2) You are invited to visit the SAB Website at URL: http://www.epa.gov/sab
The site offers such features as:

(a) Full-text reports for FY1994-FY2002
(b) Background information about the structure, function, and membership of the SAB
(c) A projected six-month calendar of SAB meetings
(d) Recent issues of HAPPENINGS
(e) Draft/final agendas of upcoming meetings and draft/final minutes of past meetings.

(3) SAB Listserver - By subscribing to the free SAB Listserver, you will automatically receive copies of all Federal Register notices announcing SAB meetings, together with brief descriptions of the topics to be covered at the meetings. These notices will be e-mailed to you within 24-hours of their publication in the Federal Register.

To subscribe, simply send the following message, inserting your names,

Subscribe epa-sab2 FIRSTNAME LASTNAME
to
listserver@unixmail.rtpnc.epa.gov

(4) Obtaining copies of SAB reports:

Single hard copies of SAB reports are available for distribution by contacting, Ms. Priscilla Tillery-Gadson
Phone: (202) 564-4543
Email: tillery.priscilla @epa.gov
or
by faxing your request to
(202) 501-0256.

Member/Consultant/ Staff News

Staff

At the EC lunch on March 6, there was time for appreciation and recognition for long-time DFO **Sam Rondberg** (who retired in January) and out-going Deputy Staff Director **Jack Fowle**, who officially began his new job with ORD in Research Triangle Park in February--although he is still working to prepare Congressional testimony for Dr. Raymond Loehr, RSAC Chair.

Ms. Stephanie Sanzone has been accepted into the PhD program in environmental science and public policy at George Mason University for the fall semester.

Ms. Kathleen White has accepted an invitation to attend a meeting of the The Health Council of the Netherlands, an SAB-like organization, that will be celebrating its 100th anniversary in The Hague in April. She will serve on a focus group to react to a summary of past activities and future plans for the The Health Council, from the perspective someone with two decades of experience with the SAB.

Members

Dr. Dennis Paustenbach, consultant to the Board, won the Arnold J. Lehman award from the Society of Toxicology.

Bon Mot

A personal, final word from outgoing SAB Staff Director, Dr. Donald Barnes

"Some people have asked whether -- in light of some 'bumps in the road' over the past year; e.g., the report from the General Accounting Office on SAB activities, the aftermath of the SAB's dioxin review, etc. -- I am being 'encouraged' into retirement. Although this is absolutely and unequivocally NOT the case, a part of me wishes it were true. For if it were so, it would give added meaning to my final declaration that 'I leave this job as I entered it; fired with enthusiasm'!"