

robert eplee <eplee@weblink.net>  
12/13/2003 07:08:04 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Mabel E. Echols OMB\_Peer\_Review/OMB/EOP@EOP  
cc:  
Subject: Fwd: Peer Review and Information Quality proposal.

>Joshua Bolten, Director, OMB  
>  
>It has been brought to my attention that OMB is considering implementing  
>changes that require extensive time, effort and cost associated with a  
>process of peer review of activities associated with data and findings  
>associated with regulations. My question is WHY?. Change does not  
>necessarily equate to improvement.  
>  
>As a federal employee for 42 years, trying to protect agricultural,  
>managed and natural ecosystems from alien and invasive species of living  
>organisms from being introduced into the USA I certainly see the need for  
>quality inputs into regulation. But by experience as a scientist was that  
>good science was often manipulated or ignored by bureaucrats who were  
>looking out for their own, or some special interest group's interest  
>rather than public welfare.  
>  
>It is my request that those in OMB who have the desire to improve our  
>regulatory system pursue a procedure whereby science is by scientists who  
>provide information to orchestrate bureaucratic activity., rather than  
>bureaucrats attempting to dictate scientific procedure. I rarely met a  
>bureaucrat that exercised expertise in orchastrating scientific activities.  
>  
>The bottom line!. Let science and technology do their thing and let  
>bureaucrats do theirs. We need both, but we do not need a perpetual and  
>unnecessary cat and dog fight. Please do not push forward with the  
>proposed rule on "peer Review and Information Quality" until it is  
>constructive to inhansing public welfare. "No progress is better than bad  
>progress"

Robert E. Eplee, Ph.D.  
USDA, APHIS  
Retired.

---  
Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.518 / Virus Database: 316 - Release Date: 9/11/2003