



National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology Teleconference

Call-In Number: 866-299-3188, Conference Code: 2022330068#

**Monday, October 17, 2016
12:00 – 4:00 p.m. EDT**

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

Welcome, Introductions and Overview of the Agenda

Eugene Green, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT), Federal Advisory Committee Management Division (FACMD), Office of Resources, Operations and Management (OROM), Office of Administration and Resources Management (OARM), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); and William Ross, Jr., NACEPT Chair, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Mr. Eugene Green (NACEPT DFO, EPA) welcomed the NACEPT members and called the roll. A list of meeting participants is provided in Appendix A.

Mr. William Ross, Jr. (NACEPT Chair, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill) also extended his welcome to the NACEPT members and other participants. He provided an overview of the agenda, included as Appendix B. Mr. Ross encouraged each member to provide additional feedback on the draft citizen science report.

Mr. Green announced that FACMD's new director is Ms. Monisha Harris, who will introduce herself during a future NACEPT teleconference or meeting.

Public Comments

Eugene Green, NACEPT DFO, FACMD, OROM, OARM, EPA

Mr. Green called for public comments; none were offered.

Discussion on Latest Integrated Draft of NACEPT's Report—Environmental Protection Belongs to the Public: A Vision for Citizen Science at EPA

William Ross, Jr., NACEPT Chair, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

General Discussion

To facilitate the discussion about the draft report, Mr. Howard Learner (NACEPT Vice Chair, Environmental Law and Policy Center) moved that the Council accept the citizen science report. Mr. James Joerke (Johnson County Department of Health and Environment) seconded the motion. Mr. Ross asked each NACEPT member to provide general comments about the report.

Mr. Clinton Woods (Association of Air Pollution Control Agencies) thought that the sections regarding data quality and fostering EPA's ability to accept citizen science data had been greatly improved. The figure highlighting the spectrum of citizen science data uses not only will be helpful for understanding this report but also for many other purposes. It is important to note that the case studies, especially those focusing on air quality sensors and monitoring, focus on using monitors for screening; a future opportunity exists to use these for enforcement. In terms of the discussion of resources, although the

future administration is unknown, the report should include comments about dedicated funding and increased monetary support. The text should underscore the fact that citizen science is a force multiplier for EPA even in strained fiscal times. It is critical that the Agency be receptive to integrating citizen science into its various programs even without increased funding.

Mr. Donald Trahan (Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality) agreed with the above and did not have additional comments.

Mr. David Rejeski (Woodrow Wilson Center) thought that NACEPT's various discussions have been well integrated into the report. Everything that the Council wanted to say is included; the question is how to deliver it and prioritize the recommendations for the next presidential administration and EPA Administrator.

Dr. Graciela Ramirez-Toro (InterAmerican University of Puerto Rico) thought that the report is well-done. She indicated that she would introduce her specific comment about Sections 9.2 and 9.3 at the appropriate time on the agenda.

Dr. Ronald Meissen (Baxter International, Inc.) thought that the report is impressive. He would like Table 1 to be made more powerful and substantive; the benefits to science, engineering, technology, arts and mathematics education should be included.

Dr. Dale Medearis (Northern Virginia Regional Commission) agreed with the others' comments and did not have additional remarks.

Dr. Emmanuel (Cris) Liban (Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority) thought that it would be helpful to have one master U.S. map with the locations of all of the case studies. He also suggested relating the case studies to the key words found in Table 2. Although it is not apparent in the table, the case studies represent a great deal of diversity, and the report should highlight this. He would like the word "franchising" in Section 12.4 to be replaced with an alternate word. It is not apparent how input from local government and EPA's other councils and boards might be incorporated into what the report discusses.

Mr. Karl Konecny (Northwest Motion Products) was impressed with the report, particularly the transmittal letter and executive summary. He submitted specific editorial comments via email.

Mr. Robert Kerr (Pure Strategies, Inc.) commented that the report is dynamic, and he is interested in how to proceed and ensure that the report has an impact. He agreed that Table 1 should be made more powerful and specific.

Mr. Joerke also thought that the report is cohesive and well-done. He appreciates the amount of effort it took to develop the report and enjoyed working on the Community-Driven Citizen Science Workgroup. The report makes a compelling case about why EPA needs to invest in community science.

Ms. Barbara Jean Horn (Colorado Parks and Wildlife) explained that she had wanted the report to be bold. She wishes it was a little bolder but understands why it is not. Some of the members' previous suggestions may help with this. Each draft moved the contents to a higher level.

Mr. Matthew Howard (The Water Council) agreed that the report is well-written.

Ms. Shannon Dosemagen (Public Laboratory for Open Technology and Sciences) thanked everyone for their efforts in developing the report.

Dr. Giovanna Di Chiro (Nuestras Raíces, Inc.) suggested that commentary about the Community Action for a Renewed Environment program be included in the section that details EPA's past and present citizen science. She is interested in the report's idea that qualitative data and storage are important, especially when addressing issues in environmental justice and tribal communities.

Dr. Ramesh Chawla (Howard University) thought that the report reads well. Table 4 replaces the figure that detailed the partnerships, but the figure also highlighted that stakeholders, in addition to EPA partnerships, can enhance citizen science.

Mr. Learner likes the direction the report has taken. He had provided specific comments with suggested changes via email.

Dr. Irasema Coronado (The University of Texas at El Paso) did not have any general comments and promised to submit specific comments via email.

Dr. Patricia Gallagher (Drexel University) thought the report overall is excellent. She will discuss her specific comments at the appropriate time in the agenda.

Ms. Darlene Cavalier (Arizona State University) thought that the report is excellent.

Ms. Lauren Boles (New Jersey Environmental Justice Alliance) thought that the report reads very well, noting that the two numbers in the last sentence of the Ironbound Community case study need to be switched with one another.

Ms. Bridgett Luther (Cradle to Cradle Products Innovation Institute) thought that the document could be made more electronically dynamic by adding additional hyperlinks throughout.

Mr. Jeffrey Mears (Oneida Nation) agreed with the Council members' previous comments, noting that the process of developing the report had been interesting. He echoed Ms. Luther's comments about making the document a more electronic document.

Specific Comments

Following the general discussion, Mr. Ross asked for specific comments about each section of the report.

Transmittal Letter

Mr. Learner suggested the following changes:

Add "continue to" and "sound" so that the second sentence of the second paragraph reads: "First, continue to invest in and use sound science to guide EPA actions and decisions."

In the first sentence of the last paragraph, change "define" to "improve."

Executive Summary

Mr. Learner suggesting revising the final sentence in the paragraph under "Integrate citizen science into the full range of work of EPA" so that it reads: "Ultimately, citizen science can improve the Agency's enforcement processes by helping to identify issues proactively."

Chapter 1

Dr. Coronado noted that the report describes the definition and benefits of citizen science in every section. She suggested defining citizen science once at the beginning of the document so that the flow of the report is not broken by defining the concept in other ways further in the report.

Mr. Woods thought that the last paragraph describing past and present citizen science at EPA needed to be broadened to include examples other than those in the Office of Research and Development (ORD) to highlight cross-Agency efforts.

In response to a suggestion by Dr. Gallagher, Dr. Alison Parker (ORD, EPA) explained that a graphics team will be polishing the report before publication.

Ms. Boles noted that the last sentence in the text box about the Ironbound Community on page 11 is about a different case study and needs to be removed.

Chapter 2

Dr. Gallagher thought that the last bullet point above Recommendation 4 is confusing. Dr. Parker volunteered to revise the bullet point. Dr. Gallagher requested that an alternate term to “sandbox partnerships” be used. Dr. Parker will replace that also.

Chapter 3

Dr. Liban noted that the recommendations are numbered in sequential order regardless of chapter number, which makes some of the section numbers somewhat confusing. Ms. Horn suggested adding a description of the report’s organization, including a discussion of the themes around which each chapter is organized.

Chapter 4

Dr. Ramirez-Toro thought that Sections 9.2 and 9.3, which discuss Quality Assurance Project Plans, need language that acknowledges that citizen science data may not fit certain established criteria, and EPA must develop ways of dealing with these data. Ms. Dosemagen and Dr. Parker will revise these sections based on input that Dr. Ramirez-Toro will send.

Mr. Jay Benforado (ORD, EPA) commented that Table 5 is important in communicating the ideas within but still is somewhat confusing; it almost needs to be read right to left instead of left to right. The table attempts to explain to the reader the following sequence: EPA work where citizen science could play a role, categories of citizen science, and appropriate quality assurance. The columns should be in reverse order, and the categories need to include a description of the level of quality assurance so that readers can understand it.

Chapter 5

Mr. Learner suggested that, in Section 13.2, the phrase, “The goal of citizen science is not citizen enforcement...” be deleted so that the sentence reads: “Citizen science should complement—rather than replace—current regulatory and enforcement processes.” It is important that the report not minimize areas in which citizen science is being used for enforcement (e.g., Clean Water Act [CWA]).

Mr. Learner suggested revising a sentence in Section 13.2 so that it reads: “Currently available low-cost sensors sometimes do not individually provide data of sufficient quality for regulatory or enforcement decisions.”

Mr. Learner suggested revising a sentence in the section describing the report’s conclusions so that it reads: “Citizen science will strengthen EPA science, especially by allowing for spatial and temporal resolution that would sometimes otherwise be challenging.”

Mr. Ross would like EPA’s mission to be included in the conclusions; it is described in the opening of the report and should be reiterated in this section.

A NACEPT member recommended that the title of Section 11.2 be changed to “Ensure that communities are equal and equitable partners.”

Mr. Benforado would like the conclusions to be made bolder. Citizen science is not a choice for the Agency, but the reality of how EPA must operate in the future. Rather than slowly and incrementally engaging in citizen science projects, EPA must be proactive and not reactive, seeking out opportunities in which the Agency can act strategically. Mr. Kerr agreed that the conclusions section should be made bolder. Some readers will only read the executive summary and the conclusions. Dr. Liban would like the conclusions to directly address the EPA Administrator.

Case Studies

Dr. Parker will instruct the graphic designer to develop a summary map per Dr. Liban’s previous suggestion.

Mr. Woods will send followup language regarding National Ambient Air Quality Standards exceedances in the Ironbound Community case study.

Acknowledgments

Mr. Benforado would like Dr. Parker’s and Ms. Dosemagen’s efforts specially acknowledged in the report.

Approval of the Report

The NACEPT members discussed the logistics of approving the report with the proposed changes and whether it was necessary for the members to review the report following the changes. The Council agreed that if the changes were made as discussed during the teleconference, the members did not need to review the report after the changes were made.

Ms. Dosemagen noted that one of Mr. Learner’s submitted comments was in regard to the title of the report, which had been voted on and approved by the NACEPT members. As such, any change to the title would need to be discussed by the Council. Ultimately, the members decided to keep the current title of the report: *Environmental Protection Belongs to the Public: A Vision for Citizen Science at EPA*.

In response to a question from Mr. Learner, Dr. Parker explained that making the editorial comments would be straightforward, but more substantive comments would be more difficult to address before the deadline.

Mr. Learner revised his motion to indicate that the Council is approving the report with the suggestions discussed during the teleconference and sent via email; Mr. Joerke reiterated his second of the revised motion. The NACEPT members approved the report unanimously.

Action Items and Next Steps

William Ross, Jr., NACEPT Chair, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Council Members

Mr. Mark Joyce (Associate Director, FACMD, OROM, OARM, EPA) stated that the deadline to finalize the report is October 31, 2016. This includes the revised text and graphics, photo captions and credits, references, and acknowledgments. The goal is to meet with the EPA Administrator, Acting Deputy Administrator and other senior leadership in December to formally convey the report. More detailed briefings will be provided for the various EPA offices.

Mr. Green explained that a request to meet with senior leadership on December 13, 2016, would be forwarded shortly. The key players will be in Washington, D.C., on that day. It will be necessary to

determine the structure of the meeting. Although the report will be available on December 5, 2016, it should not be distributed broadly before it has been formally transmitted to EPA leadership.

Mr. Joyce would like Ms. Dosemagen and Mr. Ross to attend the official transmittal meeting, and he is hopeful that both the EPA Administrator and Acting Deputy Administrator will be in attendance. It will be important to engage senior career staff because they will provide continuity and be able to move the recommendations forward after the new Administrator is appointed. The goal is to provide a teleconference line so that NACEPT members can join remotely to hear the report presented. Mr. Ross will formally present the report and highlight the major points of the report. Ideally, the transmittal meeting will include a brief discussion with the Administrator, Acting Deputy Administrator and senior leadership about how EPA may go about implementing some of the report recommendations.

Mr. Benforado stressed that it is important for NACEPT to connect with EPA staff outside of the senior leadership team who can carry out the recommendations, such as Regional Deputy Administrators and the senior career person in each region. The Council should pursue being added to the agenda of the regional biweekly teleconference and the monthly teleconference of the Citizen Science Community of Practice, which includes 150 citizen science enthusiasts across the Agency. NACEPT can present through Adobe Connect. Another idea is to hold a second, later meeting on December 13 for those who cannot attend the earlier meeting with the Administrator and Acting Deputy Administrator. Because of the amount of material contained in the report, presenting the report may be challenging. Mr. Ross will need to communicate the critical highlights without providing too many details. A way to organize the material and make it more accessible may be to describe how NACEPT went about answering the charge questions.

Mr. Benforado asked the Council members whether they had any ideas to promote and transmit the report.

Ms. Dosemagen said that, as a citizen science practitioner, she finds the report exciting. She is looking forward to sharing the report with citizen science groups focused on policies and those focused on open science hardware. She encouraged the NACEPT members to think about their networks and who could be influenced by the report. Mr. Joyce asked the Council members to broadcast the report to all of the professional organizations with which they engage and discuss the report at meetings, conferences and forums as appropriate. He is counting on the NACEPT members to disseminate the report. Mr. Ross suggested presenting at the Citizen Science Association meeting in the spring of 2017.

Dr. Liban suggested that one presentation be developed for the Council members to use so that the message is consistent and the members can more easily promote the report. He volunteered to help develop such a presentation. Ms. Horn agreed that this would be helpful. She thought that the presentation should include four slides that describe: (1) what the report is, (2) the recommendations, (3) what individuals and organizations do with the report information, and (4) points of contact. Ms. Dosemagen and Dr. Parker will work with Ms. Kristen LeBaron (The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc.) on developing the slides once the report has been finalized.

Dr. Coronado asked all of the Council members to commit to making a presentation to at least one community-based organization in their communities.

A member suggested that NACEPT pursue press coverage for the report. Mr. Green said that he could contact the Agency's press office about developing a marketing strategy and obtaining press coverage for the transmittal meeting. Mr. Joyce cautioned that, although sometimes the press office is willing to do this, other times the office indicates that it is inappropriate for EPA to market a report that has been developed by an independent committee. The members may need to be responsible for a media push.

Mr. Joerke approved of the idea of the members widely broadcasting the report and NACEPT's work. It is critical that the report be provided to the transition teams preparing for the new administration. News outlets that specifically follow EPA and environmental issues (e.g., Inside EPA, Greenwire) appreciate receiving stories such as this. Mr. Ross could provide interviews to these outlets. He agreed that it is key that the NACEPT members publicize the report.

Mr. Ross asked what the Council's second report on citizen science would address. NACEPT can suggest topics, although the Administrator will provide the final charge. Mr. Joyce said that November is the ideal time to discuss the next charge. EPA will discuss this internally but is looking for thoughts from the NACEPT members. Ideally, the next charge will be complete and approved by the mid-December transmittal meeting so that it can be endorsed and announced. NACEPT will know its focus prior to its March meeting.

Mr. Benforado suggested that a focus of the next report could be the topics within the first charge that NACEPT thinks have not been developed sufficiently. To extract the most value out of NACEPT's discussion, subgroups with interested Council members should be established that will write chapters on each topic. Interested EPA staff also should be involved with the subgroups. He envisions that the next report will look and feel different from this report; it will not be a duplication. The next report should go down one or two levels of detail and address the more substantive topics of how EPA will work on citizen science in particular communities, on particular environmental problems, and so forth.

Dr. Liban asked Mr. Benforado to clarify that NACEPT would explore a "deeper dive" of this topic in the second report. Mr. Benforado responded that this is the case, but the Council must identify the subtopics that are of most value to the Agency and of most interest to the NACEPT members. For example, one subtopic may be learning how to work on citizen science at the community level. The National Environmental Justice Advisory Committee, however, has reported that it is difficult for the Agency to work with communities and build community trust. A subgroup could focus on this particular area.

Mr. Learner thought that NACEPT needed to obtain the Administrator's reaction to the first report, which would allow the Council to calibrate the focus of the next report. Mr. Benforado explained that NACEPT would not receive feedback from the Administrator until next summer, which will be too late. Mr. Joyce and Mr. Benforado stressed that the EPA staff members interested in working with the Council on citizen science will provide continuity, and these are the individuals with whom the Council must engage. They will provide NACEPT with a clear sense of the best focus.

Ms. Boles asked about the CWA 404 Assumable Waters Subcommittee's report. Mr. Green responded that he has contacted the DFO of the subcommittee, and the report should be available in January 2017. That subcommittee will provide an update to NACEPT prior to the report's release.

Ms. Horn noted that opportunities exist to build on current EPA citizen science efforts. She requested that the NACEPT members inform each other via email about the entities with which they have shared the report and where they have presented.

Dr. Liban thought that a compromise in moving forward could be to determine how the Administrator reacts to the current report and then discuss how to move forward at the beginning of the year. He does not want momentum to be lost waiting for something that may not happen. Mr. Ross commented that one recommendation is to appoint a citizen science "czar." NACEPT should "plant this seed" as quickly and effectively as possible. Mr. Benforado explained that it is EPA's responsibility to write the charge, and the Agency would like NACEPT's input on which areas of the current charge still need attention. The goal is for the Council to begin work on the second report in January, so that it will be released for the next administration in 1 year. Senior career staff can help the Council to determine the best focus areas to get the attention of the next administration. Dr. Liban commented that NACEPT has the opportunity to define citizen science for the new Administrator. The next charge should be focused on implementation.

Dr. Parker and Mr. Benforado have discussed the potential process for developing the second report. Mr. Benforado commented that the Council did well in crafting the first report, but the process was not optimized. After the report had been combined and redrafted, it became more difficult for individuals to contribute. It will be important to select topics with smaller subgroups whose members have the interest, knowledge and willingness to help draft the report. Each subgroup will draft a chapter. NACEPT members will need to contribute more to the editing and writing of the report. Ms. Luther noted that these challenges occur in large-group settings. After the smaller subcommittees disbanded, it was more difficult to engage in the process. In the upcoming effort, the subcommittees should be more formalized so that they still meet regularly following the face-to-face meeting at which the draft is discussed. NACEPT should revisit how the smaller committees work offline.

Mr. Konecny cautioned that having separate committees draft each chapter could introduce contradictions among the chapters; it is important to develop a cohesive report. At some point, it will be necessary for the subcommittees to come together to resolve these types of issues. Mr. Joyce agreed that overlap or conflict can be introduced if subcommittees work completely separately and independently for too long. In his experience, it is better to begin working on an integrated report sooner rather than later. The process must be organized so that the workload is distributed more broadly throughout the entire Council. Dr. Liban explained that, as he had entered in the middle of the process, he was unsure of his role and thought that the process had followed a natural progression. Dr. Coronado agreed, as she had joined in the middle of the process as well.

Mr. Green urged the members to keep in mind some of the challenges that the NACEPT confronted during the process. He noted that approximately one-half of the NACEPT membership was reappointed after the charge was issued, which was a considerable challenge.

Dr. Parker encouraged the NACEPT members to provide additional input regarding the next charge. Mr. Benforado approves of the focus on implementation, which would complement the current report. He suggested the following subtopics: how EPA can use citizen science for enforcement, how to enable citizen science by developing tools for nonexperts, and how to address data quality and management issues. He reported that Ms. Deb Szaro of Region 1 is interested in determining how to help the Agency's "front lines" (i.e., regional offices) engage in citizen science. EPA must build relationships and train the front line to recognize and identify citizen science opportunities.

Adjournment

Mr. Green and Mr. Joyce thanked the NACEPT members for their work on the report. Mr. Ross thanked the NACEPT members for a productive meeting and EPA staff for all of their efforts in developing the report. Mr. Joyce thanked Mr. Ross for his leadership. Mr. Ross adjourned the meeting at 2:23 p.m. EDT.

Action Items

- By October 31, 2016, the NACEPT editing team, including Dr. Parker, Ms. Dosemagen and Ms. LeBaron, will make the revisions identified during the teleconference and provided via email and ensure that the graphic designer develops a summary map for the case studies.
- Dr. Ramirez-Toro will provide her suggested revisions to Sections 9.2 and 9.3.
- Mr. Woods will provide language regarding National Ambient Air Quality Standards exceedances in the Ironbound Community case study.
- Mr. Green will invite the Administrator, Acting Deputy Administrator and senior EPA leadership to the transmittal meeting on December 13, 2016.
- After the report has been finalized, Dr. Parker and Ms. Dosemagen will work with Ms. LeBaron to develop a PowerPoint presentation that describes the report for the NACEPT members to use to publicize the report.
- NACEPT members will pursue opportunities to publicize the report, including press coverage.
- Mr. Green will contact EPA's press office to determine whether it can help publicize the report.
- NACEPT members will inform each other about where and with whom they share the report.
- NACEPT members will consider potential focus areas for the second report on citizen science, including areas in the current charge that need more attention.
- NACEPT members will consider how to optimize the process for writing the second report on citizen science.

Appendix A

National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT) Meeting Participants

NACEPT Members

Ms. Laureen M. Boles

State Director
New Jersey Environmental Justice Alliance
Trenton, NJ

Ms. Darlene Cavalier

Professor of Practice
Consortium for Science, Policy, and Outcomes
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ

Dr. Ramesh C. Chawla

Professor/Chair of Chemical Engineering
Department of Chemical Engineering
College of Engineering, Architecture
and Computer Sciences
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Irasema Coronado

Professor
Department of Political Science
University of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, TX

Dr. Giovanna Di Chiro

Policy Advisor for Environmental Justice
Nuestras Raíces, Inc.
Holyoke, MA

Ms. Shannon Dosemagen

President/Executive Director
Public Laboratory for Open Technology and
Sciences
New Orleans, LA

Ms. Barbara Jean Horn

Water Quality Resource Specialist
Water Unit
Department of Natural Resources
Colorado Parks and Wildlife
Durango, CO

Mr. Matthew C. Howard

Director
Alliance for Water Stewardship, North America
The Water Council
Milwaukee, WI

Mr. James Joerke

Deputy Director
Johnson County (Kansas) Department of Health
and Environment
Olathe, KS

Mr. Robert Kerr

Co-Founder and Principal
Pure Strategies, Inc.
Reston, VA

Mr. Karl Konecny

Partner
Northwest Motion Products
Glide, OR

Mr. Howard Learner (*NACEPT Vice Chair*)

Executive Director
Environmental Law and Policy Center
Chicago, IL

Dr. Emmanuel Crisanto (Cris) C.B. Liban

Executive Officer
Environmental Compliance and Sustainability
Los Angeles County Metropolitan
Transportation Authority
Los Angeles, CA

Ms. Bridgett Luther

President
Cradle to Cradle Products Innovation Institute
San Francisco, CA

Mr. Jeffrey M. Mears

Environmental Area Manager
Environmental Health and Safety Division
Oneida Nation
Oneida, WI

Dr. Dale G. Medearis

Senior Environmental Planner
Environmental and Planning Services
Northern Virginia Regional Commission
Fairfax, VA

Dr. Ronald Meissen

Senior Director of Sustainability
Baxter International, Inc.
Deerfield, IL

Dr. Graciela I. Ramirez-Toro

Institutional Director
Center for Environmental Education,
Conservation and Research
InterAmerican University of Puerto Rico
San German, PR

Mr. David Rejeski

Director
Science/Technology Innovation Program
Woodrow Wilson Center
Washington, D.C.

Mr. William G. Ross (*NACEPT Chair*)

Council Member
Gillings School of Global Public Health
Advisory Council
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC

Mr. Donald Trahan

Attorney
Senior Environmental Specialist
Office of the Secretary
Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality
Baton Rouge, LA

Mr. Clinton J. Woods

Executive Director
Association of Air Pollution Control Agencies
Lexington, KY

NACEPT Designated Federal Officer**Mr. Eugene Green**

Federal Advisory Committee Management
Division
Office of Resources, Operations and
Management
Office of Administration and Resources
Management
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
William Jefferson Clinton Building (1601M)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone: (202) 564-2432
Email: green.eugene@epa.gov

EPA Participants**Mr. Jay Benforado**

Office of Research and Development
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
William Jefferson Clinton Building (8101R)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone: (202) 564-3262
Email: benforado.jay@epa.gov

Mr. Mark Joyce

Federal Advisory Committee Management
Division
Office of Resources, Operations and
Management
Office of Administration and Resources
Management
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
William Jefferson Clinton Building (1601M)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone: (202) 564-2130
Email: joyce.mark@epa.gov

Dr. Alison Parker

ORISE Research Fellow
Office of Research and Development
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
William Jefferson Clinton Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20460
Email: parker.alison@epa.gov

Other Participants

James Boswell
Peabody Energy
Flagstaff, AZ

Benjamin E. Kallen
Lewis-Burke Associates, LLC
Washington, D.C.

Patricia McCullough
Koch Pipeline Company, L.C.
Wichita, KS

Stuart Parker
Inside EPA
Arlington, VA

Contractor Support

Kristen LeBaron
The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc.
656 Quince Orchard Road, Suite 210
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
Phone: (301) 670-4990
Email: klebaron@scgcorp.com

Appendix B

Agenda for the August 22, 2016 NACEPT Meeting



National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT) Agenda

**Monday, October 17, 2016
12:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. EDT**

**U.S. EPA William Jefferson Clinton East Building, Room 1132
1201 Constitution Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20460**

Call-In Number: 866-299-3188, Conference Code: 2022330068#

- 12:00 p.m. Welcome, Introductions, and Overview of Agenda**
- Eugene Green
NACEPT Designated Federal Officer
- Bill Ross
NACEPT Chair
- 12:15 p.m. Public Comments**
- 12:30 p.m. Discussion on Latest Integrated Draft of NACEPT's Report—Environmental Protection Belongs to the Public: A Vision for Citizen Science at EPA**
- Bill Ross
NACEPT Chair
- Council Members
- 3:30 p.m. Action Items and Next Steps**
- Bill Ross
NACEPT Chair
- Council Members
- 4:00 p.m. Adjournment**

Chair Certification

I, William Ross, Chair for the National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT) certify the meeting minutes for October 17, 2016 (teleconference) are complete and accurately reflect the discussions and decisions of said meeting.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "W. Ross", is written over a horizontal line.

William Ross
NACEPT Chair

January 10, 2017

Date