

# **Environmental Protection Agency Annual Peer Review Report Fiscal Year 2013 (October 1, 2012 – September 30, 2013)**

## **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) 2013 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 FY2013, 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, 3<sup>rd</sup> 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](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 2013: 5

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

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

<b>Office</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>PR Report Completed</b>
OAR/OTAQ	Follow-Up Peer review of a Refining Industry Cost Model Used in Tier 3 Rule Proposal	No
OAR/OTAQ	Four peer reviews in support of the Tier 3 rulemaking: Estimated Summer Hot-Soak Distributions for Denver's Ken Caryl I/M Station Fleet	Yes
OAR/OTAQ	Peer Review of ATLAS (Advanced Transportation Limited Analysis Spreadsheet)	Yes
ORD/NCEA	IRIS Methanol (noncancer) assessment (underwent additional round of peer review and resulted in another peer review report in 2013)	Yes
ORD/NCEA	U.S. EPA. Watershed Modeling to Assess the Sensitivity of Streamflow, Nutrient, and Sediment Loads to Potential Climate Change and Urban Development in 20 U.S. Watersheds (Received peer review report in 2013)	Yes

Number of highly influential scientific assessments (HISA): 7

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

<b>Office</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>PR Report Completed</b>
OAR/OAQPS	Lead (Pb) NAAQS Review: Policy Assessment	Yes
OAR/OAQPS	Ozone NAAQS Review: Policy Assessment	Yes
OAR/OAQPS	Ozone NAAQS Review: Risk/Exposure Assessment	Yes
ORD/NCEA	An Assessment of Potential Mining Impacts on Salmon Ecosystems of Bristol Bay, Alaska (First External Review Draft)	Yes
ORD/NCEA	Integrated Science Assessment for Lead (Third External Review Draft)	Yes
ORD/NCEA	Integrated Science Assessment of Ozone and Related Photochemical Oxidants (Third External Review Draft)	Yes

Office	Title	PR Report Completed
ORD/NCEA	IRIS Toxicological Review of Libby Amphibole Asbestos (External Review Draft)	Yes

1. 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.

2. 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 (3 records have not yet answered this question)

3. Number of peer review panels that held public meetings:

Number of ISIs (not including highly influential scientific assessments): 1  
Number of HISAs: 7

4. Number of peer review panels that allowed public comment:

Number of ISIs (not including highly influential scientific assessments): 1  
Number of HISAs: 7

5. Number of public comments provided on the agency's peer review plans during FY 2013, regardless of whether the peer review was actually completed during FY 2013: 0

6. Number of times agency specifically solicited peer reviewer nominations from professional societies: 7\*

If such nominations were solicited, were any recommendations provided?

1 reviewer was recommended by a professional society.

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