

Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Comments on the Interagency Science Discussion
Draft IRIS Assessment of Benzo[a]pyrene November 2016
(Date Received December 13, 2016)

General Science Comments:

I didn't have any major comments or issues to raise regarding IRIS B[a]P. I am aware, though, that other agencies will be providing more detailed comments, and I am interested in hearing what those concerns are.

One issue I wanted to raise for discussion is Charge Question #5 on page F-22 and F-23 of the Supplemental Analysis, SAB's comment and EPA's response:

Charge Question 5. In August 2013, EPA asked for public comments on an earlier draft of this 41 assessment. Appendix G summarizes the public comments and this assessment's responses to them. Please comment on EPA's responses to the scientific issues raised in the public comments. Please consider in your review whether there are scientific issues that were raised by the public as described in Appendix G that may not have been adequately addressed by EPA.

The SAB found that most of the scientific issues raised by the public, as described in Appendix G of the peer review draft Supplemental Information document, were adequately addressed by EPA. However, there were some issues for which the SAB provided additional discussion in the report under Charge Questions 2e and 3e, and EPA responded accordingly.

Comment: The SAB recommended that major science issues pointed out by public commenters should be included in the relevant charge questions, allowing the SAB to weigh in on EPA's approach. The SAB recommended that in the future, they should not be asked if EPA has adequately addressed all public comments.

Response: Going forward, EPA will capture major science issues expressed in the public comments within the body of related charge questions.