

## Oral Statement by John Bachmann

This is John Bachmann. I'm former associate director for Science/Policy in EPA's air office in Research Triangle Park and I'm representing the Environmental Protection Network. EPN strongly supports the SAB working group recommendation that the SAB review EPA's Regulatory Science proposal.

We also recommend that the SAB and CASAC review how the proposed regulatory science rule, in concert with a May 9 EPA memorandum on the process for revising National Ambient Air Quality Standards or NAAQS, could work together to undermine the ability of EPA to identify and consider the full array of relevant scientific information, and compromise the subsequent risk and policy assessments that up until now have been based on a scientific assessment reviewed by CASAC.

- Both the lack of any external scientific review in the development of the regulatory science proposal or the NAAQS process memorandum - and the lack of attention to detail in both - provide further evidence that the Agency is in a hurry to get results, regardless of the untoward consequences.
- Of most concern is the process requirement that EPA "consider combining its integrated science, risk and exposure, and policy assessment into a single review." This is an astonishingly bad idea, one that is inconsistent with EPA staff or CASAC comments on the matter, during the development of the current process over a decade ago.
- The new process, together with the memos goal of having only a single simultaneous CASAC review, places unreasonable demands on EPA staff, CASAC and the public.
- CASAC should immediately review the science/policy and workload issues inherent in the concurrent review requirement before it is implemented, and consider an alternative aimed at the goal of producing sequential documents that might pass the first CASAC review. The process should not depart from the longstanding principle of reviewing the science before completing policy assessments.

- A second major problem is asking CASAC to provide advice on background concentrations and the adverse effects of implementing standards, as well as implementation guidance documents.
- Even though this is based on an Air Act provision, asking the same individuals who make recommendations on the standards to evaluate costs and other factors - that cannot be considered by the Administrator – raises an obvious issue.
- Timing such reviews to occur after the standards review is not enough.
- Because CASAC panels have not contained the expertise needed, both EPA and Congress have looked to the NAS for scientific guidance and insights on implementation issues. These assessments have been influential in producing more cost-effective implementation policies.
- EPA should have heeded the advice given on this matter in a 2014 letter from CASAC – It indicated that if asked, it would be necessary to establish a separate CASAC panel that would review these topics.
- CASAC and EPA should consider establishing an *ad hoc* panel staffed with the range of experts needed for such reviews, who would examine these issues for all criteria pollutants, consistent with our scientific understanding of the multipollutant nature of implementation issues.
- This would create an appropriate division of between those recommending standards and those addressing issues that cannot be considered by the Administrator.