From:	Greenberg, Marc
To:	Bill Goodfellow; schiefer@setac.org
Subject:	Fw: RE: SETAC: Session 2D Panelists
Date:	Tuesday, April 12, 2011 11:17:24 PM
Attachments:	winmail.dat message_body.rtf

Let's talk about this one and a course of action in the morning. I think our response should focus on Ken's panel and his role on the panel.

Marc S. Greenberg, Ph.D.
U.S. EPA Environmental Response Team (ERT)
609-865-3924 cell

Message sent via EPA wireless device

-----Forwarded by Marc Greenberg/ERT/R2/USEPA/US on 04/12/2011 10:16PM -----

==========
To: Marc Greenberg/ERT/R2/USEPA/US@EPA
From: Albert Venosa/CI/USEPA/US
Date: 04/12/2011 06:43PM
Subject: Fw: RE: SETAC: Session 2D Panelists
==========

Marc,

Can you help Ken with this one? He's going thru hell with his management right now. I'm trying to fund him to do studies on the wave tank at his facility (co-owned by EPA), but his management no longer wants him to accept money from a foreign government unless he can show it's a collaboration. They don't want to give the impression that the Canadian government is competing with private industry for research. Sound familiar? I have a feeling that the press is going to participate in your SETAC meeting a lot, which could cause Ken to bow out.

AV

Albert D. Venosa, Ph.D.
Director, Land Remediation and Pollution Control Division
National Risk Management Research Laboratory
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
26 W. Martin Luther King Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45268
Tel: 513-569-7668
Cell: 513-305-5328
Fax: 513-569-7620
Email: venosa.albert@epa.gov

-----Forwarded by Albert Venosa/CI/USEPA/US on 04/12/2011 07:40PM -----
To: Steve Lehmann <Steve.Lehmann@noaa.gov>
From: "Lee, Kenneth" <Ken.Lee@dfo-mpo.gc.ca>
Date: 04/12/2011 06:54PM
Cc: Albert Venosa/CI/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: RE: SETAC: Session 2D Panelists
(See attached file: winmail.dat)
(See attached file: message_body.rtf)

Steve/Al:

I have been requested by senior management to provide clarification on the scope of the SETAC meeting for for authorization of my travel which is under going an additional last-minute review process. As you probably know, an election has been announced in Canada and our Parliament is closed. There is high sensitivity over the participation of government scientists in events that may have political fall-out and thus effects on the election process.

As far as I know, the SETAC meeting is purely scientific/technical and media, etc. is not involved.

Can you and/or Al or conference organizers send me a note ASAP to address this concern - which I can forward to senior management.

Sorry about the extra work - but I have my hands tied on this one.

Thanks,

Ken

-----Original Message-----
From: Steve Lehmann [mailto:Steve.Lehmann@noaa.gov]
Sent: April 8, 2011 3:27 PM
To: micheal.cortez@bp.com; Lee, Kenneth; Venosa, Albert; Joe Mullin; Francois Xavier MERLIN; Steve Lehmann
Subject: SETAC: Session 2D Panelists
Importance: High

Dear SETAC Session 2D Panelists,

We wanted to remind you of the panel discussion on which you have agreed

to participate and to suggest some topics to address. First, in order to jog your memory:

Response Technology Effectiveness Session: Thursday morning April 28, 2011

Panel Discussion: 90 minutes

Platform Presentations: 90 minutes (20 minutes each presenter)

Panel Discussion (90 minutes)

Panelists:

* Ken Lee, Environment Canada
* Al Venoza, US EPA
* Michael Cortez, BP/GCRO
* Joe Mullin, BOEMRE

Panel Discussion Format: 5 minute presentation by each panelist, followed by interactive discussion with the audience.

Issues to be discussed by the panel and with the audience include the following:

* According to your experience what main evolutions (or changes) did you observe in the choice of response options during the last incident, what could be the reason of these changes and how do you see these choices influencing future choices on response options.?

* Is risk assessment or net environmental benefit analysis (NEBA) explicitly used during the response to guide decisions on tactics as a means to minimize environmental injury?

* Are there quantitative measurements available to evaluate how well response technologies such as dispersants, burns, booms, sorbents, extraction, collection, etc. worked? Is so, what is the standard for success against which these techniques are measured.

* What methods of measurement or observation are available with near real-time feedback in order to determine effectiveness in the field to inform continue/discontinue decision-making?

* What are the key data gaps in the evaluation of response technologies and equipment effectiveness?

* Understanding of the ecological consequences of oil mitigtion techniques--quantification of trade offs.

We are hoping for a lively and productive discussion on these issues.

Please make sure you have registered for the conference.

Please do not hesitate to contact either of us with questions.

Respectfully,

Steve Lehmann, NOAA (978-654-6385)

Francois Merlin, CEDRE (+33 2 9833 6706)