From: Greenberg, Marc
To: Goodfellow, Bill
Cc: Ringwood Amy; Bruce Vigon; charlie.henry@noaa.gov; French-McCay Deborah; E(b) (6) [redacted] Cobb, George; Greg Schiefer; jason@setac.org; Pardue John; murray@nwf.org; Nikki Turman; Peter Hodson; sgerould@usgs.gov; Gala, William (WGala)
Subject: RE: Materials for Gulf Oil Spill Abstract Review
Date: Thursday, March 3, 2011 4:49:49 PM

This is consistent with my thoughts and the preferences that most of us shared on the March 8 conference call. Thanks.

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

From: "Goodfellow, Bill" <bgoodfellow@eaest.com>

To: "Gala, William (WGala)" <WGala@chevron.com>, (b) (6) [redacted] <Ermancini@aol.com>, "Cobb, George" <George.Cobb@TIEHH.TTU.edu>, French-McCay Deborah <dfrenchmccay@asascience.com>, Gerould Sarah <sgerould@usgs.gov>, Henry Charlie <charlie.henry@noaa.gov>, Peter Hodson <peter.hodson@queensu.ca>, Michael Murray <murray@nwf.org>, Pardue John <jpardue@lsu.edu>, Ringwood Amy <ahringwo@uncc.edu>, Marc Greenberg/ERT/R2/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: Bruce Vigon <bruce.vigon@setac.org>, Greg Schiefer <gschiefer16@yahoo.com>, Nikki Turman <nikki@setac.org>, "jason@setac.org" <jason@setac.org>

Date: 03/03/2011 03:58 PM

Subject: RE: Materials for Gulf Oil Spill Abstract Review

Will:

From my experience, I believe that it would be good for us to build the sessions as best we can. My experience is that we lose the control on balance if it entirely built by the session chairs. It is hard for the session chairs to see the overall vision of the meeting that we have been working on the last several months. While the majority of session chairs do an excellent job, it only takes one to upset the apple cart. My recommendation would be for us to build the program in groups of talks and let the session chairs position them in what order that they would like them to be presented in. As a check and balance, the session chairs will see both posters and platforms and they will have the opportunity to push an alternative strategy to us after we make our first cut.

Hope this helps,

Bill

From: Gala, William (WGala) [mailto:WGala@chevron.com]

Sent: Thursday, March 03, 2011 12:08 PM

To: Goodfellow, Bill; Ermancini@aol.com; Cobb, George; French-McCay Deborah; Gerould Sarah; Henry Charlie; Peter Hodson; Michael Murray; Pardue John; Ringwood Amy; Greenberg.Marc@epamail.epa.gov

Cc: Bruce Vigon; Greg Schiefer; Nikki Turman; jason@setac.org

Subject: RE: Materials for Gulf Oil Spill Abstract Review

A request for clarification – Is the goal of our review to provide the session chairs (i.e., moderators) a list of platforms and posters for their session? Thus, the most they are going to do is decide on the order of the platforms. Or are we going to provide a list of abstracts for their sessions and ask the session chairs to decide which get platforms and which get posters? The first involves "ranking" and second is a categorization exercise. My vote is for the second – i.e., we let the session chairs select the platforms and

posters for their sessions from our grouping. Not just because it is less work for us.

From: Goodfellow, Bill [mailto:bgoodfellow@eaest.com]

Sent: Tuesday, March 01, 2011 3:39 PM

To: Ermancini@aol.com; Cobb, George; "French-McCay Deborah"; Gala, William (WGala); "Gerould Sarah"; "Henry Charlie"; Peter Hodson; Michael Murray; "Pardue John"; "Ringwood Amy"; Greenberg.Marc@epamail.epa.gov

Cc: Bruce Vigon; Greg Schiefer; Nikki Turman; jason@setac.org

Subject: Materials for Gulf Oil Spill Abstract Review

Gulf Oil Spill Focus Topic Meeting Steering Committee:

Attached are several files for your review in order to prep for our Abstract Review. The Excel file is the sorting of Marc, Bruce and my reviews of all 88 abstracts into the various session tracks. The three of us immediately reached the same sorting decision on roughly 90% of the abstracts, however, for the few that are highlighted in yellow, we were torn between two or more tracks. Our sorting should be considered as our opinions and Marc and I believe that it is important that everyone becomes familiar with each submitted abstract because we are going to have some tough decision on Saturday as to where to place them in our program. Since all of us are coming from different perspectives, we believe that the more of us that can reach consensus (probably means that where we place it as a group is where it best belongs).

Marc, Bruce and I felt that we did an adequate job in reading the abstracts in about 5 hours (along with taking notes to allow discussion of our perception of where the abstracts should go). Our guess is because we have presorted them for you, it will probably cut at least an hour off of your reviews.

Some general assistance/directions for the review include:

- Try to read the abstract without looking at the authors

affiliation (I try hard to not look at the authors names until I read the abstract body first). Using this technique helps remove some of your immediate bias in the review.

- We will not be editing the abstracts from what has been submitted, so don't worry about grammar or typos. With that being said, we have noticed that several abstracts from the same grouping of authors can be combined to provide one good talk rather than 2-3 divided talks. Marc is taking this action item to see if this is possible.

- We have received a very diverse abstract topics.

- We also know that not everyone is going to feel comfortable in reviewing all of the abstracts due to potential organizational conflict of interest, expertise, etc. However, please review as many as you feel you are able so we can have meaning full discussions as to where they should be placed on the program.

- We currently have 37-38 platform slots and roughly 60 poster slots available. Given that several abstracts can be combined and several others are abstracts for panel presentations, we believe that we don't have to cut any papers for the matter of space on the program.

- We believe that we need to build a platform program that will be exciting and complementary to our panel discussions. All other abstracts will be distributed to posters.

- We can only consider talks that submitted as being considered for platform in the platform slots. Abstracts identified for posters only cannot be elevated to platform without the authors agreement.

- However with that being said, we noticed that one abstract does not fit the meeting at all (Abstract No. 013 is on E85 flex fuel exposed to plants) and we all felt that it should not be accepted to the program (unless others feel differently-please let us know). We also felt that another abstract may have crossed the line as being over commercial (Abstract No. 011-oil dragging), so please look at this one and let us know your opinion.

- The potential session tracks and the first cut at available slots on the program are (each slot is 20 minutes additional to the 90 minutes reserved per session for panels):

    - 1A. Ecosystem effects of Oil Spills-9 slots

    - 1B. Seafood contamination/Safety and Human Health Issues-4 slots

- 1C. Risk and Damage Assessment-5 slots
- 2A. Control and Abatement (includes approaches and equipment)-3 slots
- 2B. Oil Fate and Transport Modeling (includes fingerprinting and biodegradation)- 5 slots
- 2C. Oil Tracking Technology (includes biodegradation measurements)-4 slots
- 2D. Response Technology Effectiveness-5 slots
- Communication Challenges and Solutions-2 slots
- Oil Spill Response Operations & Incident Command Systems-0-1 slots

Please start trying to pick your top abstracts for each of these sessions so we can reach consensus as efficiently as possible. For those not able to be on our Saturday morning conference call, please provide either Marc or I your input so we can represent you as we build the program.

If anyone has any questions or needs further guidance, please let me know. On behalf of Marc and I as well as SETAC, thank you in advance for your thoughtful deliberations and all of your efforts during this abstract review.

Bill

William L. Goodfellow, Jr.

Vice President

EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc.

15 Loveton Circle

Sparks, MD 21152

T: 410-771-4950

F: 410-771-4204

Direct: 410-329-5121

email: bgoodfellow@eaest.com

Before printing, think about ENVIRONMENTAL responsibility