

Environmental Protection Agency Annual Peer Review Report Background

Purpose

This annual report is a requirement under the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review. The report provides information for peer reviews that EPA conducted in Fiscal Year (FY) 2006 that were subject to reporting under the Bulletin.

Background

On December 16, 2004, OMB issued its Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review. This Bulletin asks all federal agencies to submit an annual report to OMB's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs providing information on peer reviews that were subject to the Bulletin and conducted during the previous fiscal year. The Bulletin establishes minimum peer review provisions for all non-exempt "influential scientific information" and "highly influential scientific assessments." The Bulletin defines "influential scientific information" as "scientific information the agency reasonably can determine will have or does have a clear and substantial impact on important public policies or private sector decisions." A scientific assessment is an evaluation of a body of scientific or technical knowledge that typically synthesizes multiple factual inputs, data, models, assumptions, and/or applies best professional judgment to bridge uncertainties in the available information. The Bulletin considers a "scientific assessment" to be "highly influential" if the agency or OMB determines that the dissemination could have a potential impact of more than \$500 million in any one year on either the public or private sector, or that the dissemination is novel, controversial, precedent-setting, or has significant interagency interest. More information on the Bulletin can be found at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/memoranda/fy2005/m05-03.pdf> or in the *Science Policy Council Peer Review Handbook, 3rd Edition* at <http://www.epa.gov/peerreview/>.

**Environmental Protection Agency
Annual Peer Review Report
Fiscal Year 2006 (October 1, 2005 – September 30, 2006)**

Section I: Summary Page for Department **Section I is not applicable to EPA.**

Section II. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Agency Contact for Implementation of the Peer Review Bulletin:

Name and title: Connie Bosma, Acting Associate Director for Science, Office of Science Policy, Office of Research and Development

Email address: bosma.connie@epa.gov

Phone number: 202-564-6773

URL for Agency's Peer Review Agenda http://cfpub.epa.gov/si/si_pr_agenda.cfm

- What pathway(s) can a member of the public use to find the Agency's peer review agenda if she/he did not have this URL?
 - Link from Departmental or Agency home page - No
 - Link from Information Quality home page – Yes
<http://www.epa.gov/quality/informationguidelines/index.html>
 - Link from science, research, or regulatory pages - Yes
 - Office of Research and Development/Office of Science Policy home page <http://www.epa.gov/osp/>
 - Science Inventory Home Page <http://cfpub.epa.gov/si/>
 - Other (please describe) _____
- Does the agenda provide links to the peer review plans for upcoming peer reviews? Yes
- Does the agenda provide links to peer review reports for all completed peer reviews? Yes. Note that the peer review is not considered complete until the product is completed.

Number of peer reviews conducted subject to the Bulletin in FY06 (note: include all peer reviews conducted, regardless of whether the peer review report has been completed): 15

Number of influential scientific information peer reviews (ISI) (not including highly influential scientific assessments): 11

Number of highly influential scientific assessments (HISA): 4

Peer Reviews Conducted in FY2006 of Influential Scientific Information

	Title	Product Completed	PR Report Completed
ORD	FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSING RISKS OF ENVIRONMENTAL EXPOSURE TO CHILDREN	Yes	Yes
ORD	FRAMEWORK FOR INORGANIC METALS RISK ASSESSMENT (EXTERNAL REVIEW DRAFT)	No	No
OSA	NANOTECHNOLOGY WHITE PAPER	Yes	Yes
OW	ECONOMIC ANALYSIS FOR THE GROUND WATER RULE (GWR)	Yes	Yes
OAR	STERNDRIVE AND INBOARD MARINE SPARK-IGNITION ENGINE TECHNOLOGIES AND COSTS	No	No
OAR	SMALL SPARK-IGNITION ENGINE TECHNOLOGIES AND COSTS	No	No
OAR	MARINE OUTBOARD AND PERSONAL WATERCRAFT SI ENGINE TECHNOLOGIES AND COSTS	No	No
OAR	EPA TECHNICAL STUDY ON THE SAFETY OF EMISSION CONTROLS FOR NONROAD SPARK-IGNITION ENGINES BELOW 50 HORSEPOWER	Yes	Yes
OAR	REVIEW OF THE NAAQS FOR LEAD - EXPOSURE AND RISK SCOPING PLAN	No	No
OAR	MITIGATION IMPACT SCREENING TOOL (MIST)	Yes	Yes
OAR	THE CLEAN ENERGY-ENVIRONMENT GUIDE TO ACTION	Yes	Yes

Peer Reviews Conducted in FY2006 of Highly Influential Scientific Assessments

	Title	Product Completed	PR Report Completed
ORD	AIR QUALITY CRITERIA FOR LEAD	Yes	*
ORD	AIR QUALITY CRITERIA FOR OZONE AND RELATED PHOTOCHEMICAL OXIDANTS	Yes	*
ORD	DRAFT DIOXIN REASSESSMENT	No	No
OPPTS	DISPOSABLE CLEANING CLOTH/WHITE GLOVE FIELD STUDY IN RESIDENTIAL HOUSING	Yes	Yes

* Due to the iterative nature of the process for developing Air Quality Criteria Documents (AQCD), a separate peer review report is not produced. The EPA Science Advisory Board Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC) reviews and related materials, such as revised drafts and Agency responses, are provided on a CASAC website for the document. These sites are linked to numerous EPA web pages to facilitate access. See <http://www.epa.gov/sab/panels/casacorpanel.html> (ozone) http://www.epa.gov/sab/panels/casac_lead_review_panel.htm (lead).

There were no Waivers, Deferrals, or Exemptions invoked or Alternative Procedures used.

No peer reviews included a least one peer reviewer appointed pursuant to any exception to the applicable independence or conflict of interest standards of the Bulletin, including determinations by the Secretary or Deputy Secretary pursuant to Section III (3) (c).

Number of peer review panels that held public meetings:

Number of ISIs (not including highly influential scientific assessments): 4

Number of HISAs: 3

Number of peer review panels that allowed public comment:

Number of ISIs (not including highly influential scientific assessments): 4

Number of HISAs: 3

Number of public comments provided on the agency's peer review plans during FY 06, regardless of whether the peer review was actually completed during FY 06: 3

Number of times EPA specifically solicited peer reviewer nominations from professional societies: 2

If such nominations were solicited, were any recommendations provided? Yes