

**Environmental Protection Agency
Annual Peer Review Report
Fiscal Year 2012 (October 1, 2011 – September 30, 2012)**

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) 2012 that were subject to reporting under the Bulletin. This report contains up-to-date information as of the date of the report.

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.

For the purposes of this report, a peer review was considered completed if the reviewers' final comments were received during FY12, regardless of whether the Agency has completed the response to the comments or incorporated revisions based on the comments into the final product. This report includes the peer reviews identified by the EPA offices as having met the Bulletin's definitions for "influential scientific information" and "highly influential scientific assessments".

More information on the Bulletin can be found at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/memoranda/fy2005/m05-03.pdf> and in the EPA's *Peer Review Handbook, 3rd Edition* at <http://www.epa.gov/peerreview/>.

I. Summary Page for Department (if Applicable)

Section I is not applicable.

II. Agency Report

GENERAL INFORMATION

Agency U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Agency Contact for Implementation of the Peer Review Bulletin

Name and title: Mary Greene, Deputy Director, Office of the Science Advisor

Email address: greene.mary@epa.gov

Phone number: 202-564-7966

URL for Agency's Peer Review Agenda http://cfpub.epa.gov/si/si_public_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 – Link to Peer Review home page (<http://www.epa.gov/peerreview/>), which then links to Peer Review Agenda
- Link from Information Quality home page – Yes <http://www.epa.gov/quality/informationguidelines/index.html>
- Link from science, research, or regulatory pages – Yes
 - Science Inventory Home Page <http://cfpub.epa.gov/si/>
- Other (please describe) _____

Does the agenda provide links to peer review reports for all completed peer reviews?

Yes

INFORMATION ABOUT REVIEWS CONDUCTED

Number of peer reviews conducted subject to the Bulletin in FY 12.

Number of influential scientific information peer reviews (ISI) (not including highly influential scientific assessments): 10

List the title of each ISI. Indicate whether the Peer Review Report has been completed (Y/N)

Office	Title	PR Report Completed
OAR/OAP	CO2 Emissions From Bioenergy and Other Biogenic Sources in Stationary Sources	No
OAR/OTAQ	Economic Impacts of the Category 3 Marine Rule on Great Lakes Shipping	Yes
OAR/OTAQ	Four peer reviews in support of the Tier 3 rulemaking: EPA's DELTA (diurnal emissions leaving to atmosphere) model	No
OAR/OTAQ	Four peer reviews in support of the Tier 3 rulemaking: Eastern Research Group's (ERG) Ken Caryl (Colorado) High Evaporative Emissions in LDV/LDTs draft report	No
OAR/OTAQ	Four peer reviews in support of the Tier 3 rulemaking: Fuel Sulfur Effects Analysis draft report	No
OAR/OTAQ	Four Peer Reviews Supporting Tier3: EPA Act Analysis Draft Report	No
OAR/OTAQ	Peer Review for the Consumer Vehicle Choice Model	Yes
OAR/OTAQ	Peer review of ERG's OBD and High Evaporative Emissions in LDV/LDTs draft report supporting EPA's Tier 3 rulemaking	No
ORD/NCEA	BASINS and WEPP Climate Assessment Tools (CAT): Case Study Guide to Potential Applications	Yes
ORD/NHEERL	Literature review on epidemiological studies of health impacts associated with surface coal mining operations in Appalachia	No

Number of highly influential scientific assessments (HISA): 4

List the title of each HISA. Indicate whether the Peer Review Report has been Completed (Y/N)

Office	Title	PR Report Completed
ORD/NCEA	An Assessment of Potential Mining Impacts on Salmon Ecosystems of Bristol Bay, Alaska (External Review Draft)	No
ORD/NCEA	Integrated Science Assessment for Lead (Second External Review Draft)	Yes
ORD/NCEA	Integrated Science Assessment of Ozone and Related Photochemical Oxidants (Third External Review Draft)	Yes
OW/OST	Materials Supporting the New Recreational Water Quality Criteria for Pathogens	No

Provide the titles of ISIs and HISAs for which Waivers (W), Deferrals (D), or Exemptions (E) were invoked or Alternative Procedures used (A). *If deferral is marked, please indicate the duration of the deferral.*

No waivers, deferrals, or exemptions were invoked.

Number of peer reviews that included at 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)? 0

Number of peer review panels that held public meetings:

Number of ISIs (not including highly influential scientific assessments): 1

Number of HISAs: 2

Number of peer review panels that allowed public comment:

Number of ISIs (not including highly influential scientific assessments): 8

Number of HISAs: 3

Number of public comments provided on the agency's peer review plans during FY 12, regardless of whether the peer review was actually completed during FY 12: 0

Number of times agency specifically solicited peer reviewer nominations from professional societies: 3*

If such nominations were solicited, were any recommendations provided?

3 reviewers were recommended by professional societies.

*Nominations were solicited from the public, including professional societies.