

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

March 15, 2001

G:\sab\don\nata\0315agd.wpd

**FINAL AGENDA**  
**NATIONAL AIR TOXICS ASSESSMENT (NATA) PANEL**  
**of the**  
**Executive Committee of the**  
**Science Advisory Board (SAB)**  
**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)**  
**Radisson Governors Inn**

**Interstate 40 at Davis Drive, Exit 280**

**PLEASE NOTE MEETING LOCATION CHANGE: Meeting will be at Radisson Governor's Inn,  
instead of the US EPA ERC Annex Rm S-23**

**Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27709**

**March 20-21, 2001**

**TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 2001**

- |      |  |  |
|------|--|--|
| I.   | OPENING<br>8:30-8:35<br><i>Commentary:</i><br>A welcome and overview of the issue  | Dr. Mitch Small<br><i>Panel Chair</i>  |
| II.  | ADMINISTRATIVE NOTES<br>8:35-8:40<br><i>Commentary:</i><br>An overview of the SAB process<br>a. General background<br>b. Conflicts-of-interest issues:<br>1. Review of confidential financial disclosure forms<br>2. Existing exemptions for SAB Members<br>3. Applicable waivers for Consultants<br>c. Anticipated schedule for report production | Dr. Jack Kooyoomjian<br><i>Panel DFO</i>   |
| III. | NATA PANELISTS<br>8:40-9:05<br><i>Commentary:</i><br>The Panelists will introduce themselves, summarizing their relevant expertise, experience, and expression that is being brought to bear on this issue.  | The NATA Panel   |
| IV   | INTRODUCTION OF STAFF AND PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS:<br>9:05-9:15  | The Participants   |
| V.   | AGENCY PRESENTATIONS<br>9:15-9:25    A. Introduction and Overview of the Air Toxics Program<br><br>9:25-9:45    B. Emissions Inventory & Processing<br><br>9:45-10:15   C. Dispersion Modeling & Model-to-Monitor Comparison<br><br>10:15-10:30   BREAK  | Dr. Dave Guinnup<br><i>OAQPS/ESD</i><br><br>Ms. Anne Pope<br><i>OAQPS/EMAD</i><br><br>Mr. Joe Touma<br><i>OAQPS/EMAD</i> |

- 10:30-10:50 D. Inhalation Exposure Modeling Mr. Ted Palma  
OAQPS/ESD
- 10:50-11:00 E. Dose-Response Assessment Dr. Roy Smith  
OAQPS/ESD
- 11:00-11:30 F. Risk Characterization Dr. Roy Smith  
OAQPS/ESD

VI. PRESENTING NATA RESULTS TO THE PUBLIC Dr. Dave Guinnup  
11:30-11:45 OAQPS/ESD

*Commentary:*

As requested by the NATA Panelists at the 2/21/01 Public Conference call, the Agency OAQPS Staff will discuss this topical area.

11:45-12:45 LUNCH

VII. DISCUSSION OF ORD RESEARCH ON THE AIR TOXICS AREA Dr. Chon Shoaf  
12:45-1:00 ORD

*Commentary:*

It is anticipated that a five to seven minute presentation will take place with the balance encompassing comments and discussions by the NATA Panelists.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS *The interested public*  
1:00-2:00

*Commentary:*

One hour has been set aside for comments from the public who have requested time to speak and/or who have submitted written comments. (See Federal Register notice, Vol. 66, No. 29, February 12, 2001, pages 9846-9847). Oral comments should not be duplicative of the written comments, rather speakers should highlight their major points and engage in a discussion with Panelists regarding those comments. Speakers are limited to no more than 10 minutes and may be requested to limit their comments further if more than six members of the public request time on the agenda. Speakers with similar points of view may want to consolidate/coordinate their comments so that their message is delivered most effectively.

The following Organizations and individuals have formally requested time for public comments as of March 15, 2001:

- Acrylonitrile (AN) Group Mr. Chuck Elkins
- Colorado Air Pollution Control Division Ms. Lisa J. Silva
- Engine Manufacturers Association Mr. Joseph L. Suchecki, Director  
Government and Public Affairs
- Ethylene Oxide Industry Council Mr. William P. Gulledege, Manager,  
Ethylene Oxide Industry Council (EOIC)
- Halogenated Solvents Industry Alliance, Inc. Dr. Paul Dugard, Director of Scientific  
Programs, HSIA

Hydrazine Panel of the American Chemistry Council Requested by Claudia M. O'Brien of Latham & Watkins

International Truck and Engine Corporation Dr. William Bunn (Requested by Claudia M. O'Brien of Latham & Watkins)

Residual Risk Coalition (RRC) Mr. Chuck Elkins

U.S. Army Dr. Robert J. Carton, Chief Environmental Protection, U.S. Army Medical Res. & Materiel Command, Fort Detrick, MD (Provided comments, but may not be present to speak)

## IX. CONSIDERATION OF THE CHARGE QUESTIONS

2:00-2:20 A. Charge Question #1 Discussants: Drs. Chien and Gentile

*Given the nature of the National Toxics Inventory (NTI) and the methods by which it was developed and reviewed, have available emissions data been appropriately adapted for use in this assessment? Can the Panel suggest improvements to EPA's application of the NTI for use in future initial national-scale assessments?*

- a) *Can the Panel suggest improvements to the treatment of compound classes (e.g., chromium and compounds), given the nature of the information available in the inventory?*
- b) *Can the Panel suggest improvements to the methods used to spatially distribute area and mobile source emissions?*
- c) *Can the Panel suggest improvements to the methods used to specify default point source emission characteristics in lieu of missing emissions data?*

2:20-2:40 B. Charge Question #2 Discussants: Drs. Georgopoulos, Milford, and Middleton

*Is the approach taken for the geographic aggregation of ambient and exposure concentrations generated by the ASPEN and HAPEM4 models appropriate in the light of the limitations of the models and the available emissions data and in comparison with predictions of ambient monitoring data?*

2:40-3:00 C. Charge Question #3 Discussants: Drs. Bartell and Brown

*Has available dose-response information (e.g., different sources of information, a different prioritization scheme) been appropriately used in this assessment? Can the Panel suggest methods that could improve upon the use of available dose-response information?*

3:00-3:20 D. Charge Question #4 Discussants: Drs. Greer, Henry, and Liu

*What are the strengths and the weaknesses of the overall conceptual approach to risk characterization used in this assessment? Given the underlying science and the intended purposes of the assessment, can the Panel suggest*

*ways in which the risk characterization could be improved?*

- a) Is the method used to aggregate cancer risks appropriate? The aggregation of carcinogenic risk within two categories, based on weight-of-evidence classifications, is of particular interest.*
- b) Is the method used to aggregate non-cancer hazards appropriate? The summation of hazard quotients within target organs, the categorization of sums by ranges of uncertainty factors, and the inclusion of all target organs (as opposed to only the organs associated with the critical effect) are of particular interest.*

3:20-3:35 BREAK

3:35-3:55 E. Charge Question #5 Discussants: Drs. Mauderly and Peterson

*Although EPA has concluded that available data are not sufficient to develop a reliable quantitative estimate of cancer unit risk for diesel emissions, it is clear that this pollutant class may be of significant concern in a number of urban settings. The risk characterization in this report includes a discussion of diesel particulate matter to help states and local areas frame the importance of this pollutant compared to the other air toxics. In the context of this assessment, is the discussion in this report regarding making risk comparisons among other air toxics appropriate? Can you provide any suggestions that would improve upon this approach to comparing the toxic health effects of diesel particulate matter with other pollutants?*

3:55-4:15 F. Charge Question #6 Discussants: Dr. Milford and Small

*Given the limitations inherent in this preliminary assessment, have uncertainty and variability been appropriately characterized?*

- a) Can you suggest ways that the characterization of uncertainty and variability could be improved, made more transparent, or integrated more effectively into the risk characterization?*
- b) Can you suggest methods for quantifying individual as well as composite uncertainties associated with the emissions inventory, dispersion modeling, exposure modeling, dose-response assessment, quantitative risk estimates, and accumulation of risk across air toxics?*

4:15-4:35 G. Charge Question #7 Discussants: Drs Anderson and Peterson

*Have the results of the assessment been appropriately and clearly presented? Can you suggest alternative methods or formats that could improve the presentation and communication of these results?*

4:35-4:55 H. Charge Question #8 Discussants: All Panelists

*The exposure methodology in NATA is being considered as one candidate for providing the basis for a national scale benefits analysis (as required in section 812 CAA). Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of this*

*approach, recognizing the limitations outlined in the NATA report?*

and ...

I. Charge Question #9

Discussants: All Panelists

*Do you have suggestions for research priorities that would improve such air toxics assessments in the future?*

IX. LOOKING BACKWARD; LOOKING FORWARD

Dr. Small

4:55-5:15

*Commentary:*

The Chair will review the Panel's work of the day, re-enforce assignments, and anticipate the activities of the second day of the meeting

5:15 Adjourn

**WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 2001:**

X. RECONVENING

Dr. Small

8:30-8:40

*Commentary:*

The Chair will open the meeting and  
 a. assess the state of development regarding each of the Charge questions.  
 b. make adjustments in the schedule, as appropriate.

XI. WORKING SESSION

All Panelists

8:35-10:30

A. Drafting and compiling

*Commentary:*

The Discussants on a given Charge question will consolidate their individual efforts into an electronic version of a second draft of the response to their question. SAB Staff will compile the responses into a draft of the Panel's report and distribute it for review by the Panelists.

10:30-11:30  
 Panelists

B. Reading time

All

11:30-12:00

C. Identification of "main points"

Dr. Small

*Commentary:* The Chair will lead the Panel in seeking agreement on the major points to be made in the report.

12:00-1:00

LUNCH

1:00-2:30

D. Addressing outstanding points

Dr. Small

*Commentary:*

The Chair will lead a discussion of any areas that still appear unsettled and how they will be resolved.

XII. DISCUSSION WITH THE AGENCY

Dr. Small

2:30-3:00

*Commentary:*

Dr. Small will lead a public discussion between the Panel and representatives of the Agency,  
 a. summarizing the main points that are likely to be made in its report,

- b. identifying any areas that will require further work by the Panel during the drafting process, and
- b. giving his assessment of the time for completion of the report.

XIII CONTINUED WRITING SESSION:

3:00-4:00

*Commentary:*

The NATA Review Panel Members and Consultants are encouraged to complete as much of their writing assignments as possible in the meeting prior to adjournment after the public discussion between the Panel and representatives of the Agency.

XIV NEXT STEPS

4:00-4:15

*Commentary:*

Dr. Small will outline the next steps and expectations for delivery of product to achieve closure by the NATA Review Panel and delivery to the SAB's Executive Committee.

XV. ADJOURN

4:15

\*\*\*\*\*

ACRONYMS

ASPEN	Assessment System for Population Exposure Nationwide (ASPEN) dispersion model
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAA	Clean Air Act Amendments
HAPEM4	Hazardous Air Pollutants Emissions Modeling, Version 4
DFO	Designated Federal Officer
EMAD	Emissions Monitoring and Assessment Division
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESD	Emissions Standards Division
NATA	National-Scale Air Toxics Assessment
NTI	National Toxics Inventory
OAQPS	Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards

**NOTE:** All the Agency OAQPS NATA-related review and informational materials, including the NATA Report, the Appendices, all briefing and presentation materials provided to the SAB may be obtained on the web at the following URL site: <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/uatw/sab/sabrev.html>.