From:	Greenberg, Marc
To:	William Benson
Cc:	Goodfellow, Bill; e(b) (6) [redacted] ; Greg Schiefer; Richard T. Di Giulio, Ph.D.
Subject:	Re: Follow-up Pellstons?
Date:	Monday, May 2, 2011 9:01:47 AM

I agree that there is a key role for SETAC in leading the discussion and scoping the research and other related technical needs. I'll add to the string here that two related key needs have been underscored by DWH as requiring documentation. These include trade-off decision analysis and net environmental benefits analysis (NEBA). The trade-off decision analysis seems like it would need its own "lump," whereas NEBA falls as a category under Bill B.'s Assessment (exposure and effects) lump.

For trade-off decision analysis, there is already a well developed scientific practice. My opinion is that has not become widely known or applied (at least knowingly) in the realm of environmental management. However, there are some folks in the environmental sciences who are paying attention and contributing the decision analysis science as well (e.g., Igor Linkov, Greg Kiker, and John Carriger).

I think you are right on with looking at ecosystem services regarding off shore and deep water resources. Let's also include the shoreline and marshes. From my perspective, this needs to be part of the overall NEBA for dispersant use, in situ burning, other response options, and shoreline and marsh cleanup options. The SETAC environmental expertise can inform on the relevant receptors, ecosystem structural components (e.g., marsh habitat, oyster beds, etc.), and functional measures that can be used for meaningful analysis.

This is just a quick brainstorm...we need to flesh this out once the dust from last week settles.

I really enjoyed seeing everyone last week and setting the stage for developing Pellstons.

Marc S. Greenberg, Ph.D.

Environmental Toxicologist

U.S. EPA - Environmental Response Team

2890 Woodbridge Ave., Bldg. 18

Edison, NJ 08837

+ 732 452 6413 (T)

+ 732 321 6724 (F)

greenberg.marc@epa.gov

-----"Richard T. Di Giulio, Ph.D. " <richd@duke.edu> wrote: -----

To: William Benson/GB/USEPA/US@EPA

From: "Richard T. Di Giulio, Ph.D. " <richd@duke.edu>

Date: 04/29/2011 01:45PM

Cc: "Goodfellow, Bill" <bgoodfellow@eaest.com>, Marc Greenberg/ERT/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Greg Schiefer <schiefer@setac.org>, (b) (6) [redacted]

Subject: Re: Follow-up Pellstons?

Hello Bill et al.,

This sounds good to me. Another topic I'd suggest is to clarify requirements, role etc @ NRDA. For someone on outside (i.e., academia), the confidential/litigation aspects of data gathering for NRDA appear inimical to good, open science.

Great meeting - thanks for including me!

Rich

--

Richard T. Di Giulio, Professor

Nicholas School of the Environment

Levine Science Research Center, Room A346

Research Drive

Duke University

Durham, NC 27708-0328

(919) 613-8024 (office)

(919) 668-1799 (fax)

On 4/29/2011 10:51 AM, Benson.William@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

>

> As we were chatting last night with Sarah Gerould and Peter Hodson,

> there may be an important role for SETAC in providing better

> documentation of what we learned through the DWH incident as well as

> what we need to embark upon with regard to research and assessment

> approaches to aid response efforts for future incidents. I suspect

> there are lots of ideas that need to be brought forward, but as a lumper

> (rather than a splitter), perhaps SETAC could consider:

>

>

> Data Management

>

> - Consistency (not sure that is appropriate term) re: biological,

> chemical and spatial (e.g., GIS) data came up time and time again.

>

> - Data management may also work out nicely to begin to address

> concerns regarding QA and availability of data to the scientific

> community.

>

> Assessment (Exposure and Effects)

>

> - Means to better evaluate ecological services lost re: off shore

> environments (i.e., do we have a handle on what should be the services

> for which we focus on re: calculating injury and

> service lost, particularly in off shore, deep water environments?)

>

> - Concerns with regard to both delayed (e.g., reduced capacity to

> tolerate hypoxia) and commutative effects (which may not necessarily be

> additive).

>

> - ??????

>