Pre-Meeting Comments on SAB Review of EPA's "Approach for Developing Lead Dust Hazard Standards for Residences (November 20th) Draft" and "Approach for Developing Lead Dust Hazard Standards for Public and Commercial Buildings (November 2010 Draft)"

Taylor Eighmy

1. Were the original charge questions to SAB Standing or Ad Hoc Committee adequately addressed?

Yes they were, even in the plan to merge responses for the two documents in most cases and note responses separately where required.

2. Are there any technical errors or omissions in the report or issues that are not adequately dealt with in the Committee's report?

None observed by this layperson.

3. Is the Committee's report clear and logical?

The report is well written and reflects a great deal of effort and good work. It would be helpful to have a brief definitional section given all the similar terms about lead concentrations and loadings.

I believe that the letter drafted to the administrator is very clear, logical and concise. It was easy to read.

However, there is one matter that I am confused by in the letter to the administrator. The last bullet on page iii states "The SAB is not able to provide a recommendation about model selection…" However, earlier in the letter (page ii, line 7) the letter states "For both documents, the SAB supports the overall modeling approaches…"

4. Are the conclusions drawn or recommendations provided supported by the body of the Committee's report?

Yes