Message

From: EPA Press Office [press=epa.gov@cmail19.com]
on behalf of EPA Press Office [press@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/26/2018 2:50:18 PM
To: Bolen, Brittany [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=31e872a691114372b5a6a88482a66e48-Bolen, Brit]
Subject: Ban On "Secret Science" In EPA Regulation Makes Sense

No images? Click here

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
NEWS RELEASE
WWW.EPA.GOV/NEWSROOM

THE OKLAHOMAN

Ban On "Secret Science" In EPA Regulation Makes Sense

Editorial
March 26, 2018
http://newsok.com/article/5588210/ban-on-secret-science-in-epa-regulation-makes-sense

The Environmental Protection Agency has announced it will now base new regulations only on the findings of scientific studies whose data and methodology are made public so they can be subjected to independent review. That's a sound move in line with basic scientific transparency and professionalism.

Yet it's being treated as a sign of impending apocalypse by some on the left, which says much about the questionable validity of that group's policy prescriptions.

In an interview with The Daily Caller News Foundation, Administrator Scott Pruitt said the EPA will end its use of studies that do not publish underlying data, only conclusions. "Otherwise, it's not transparent. It's not objectively measured, and that's important," Pruitt said.

In the past, the EPA has advanced air-quality regulations that imposed massive costs based primarily on the findings of two studies done in the 1990s that linked fine particulate pollution to premature death. Neither study made associated data public.

U.S. Rep. Lamar Smith, R-Texas and chairman of the House Committee on Science,

Space and Technology, has long criticized the use of “secret science” and authored legislation to curtail its use by regulators. Last year, Smith said the EPA had “routinely relied on questionable science based on nonpublic information that could not be reproduced, a basic requirement of the scientific method.”

“Americans deserve to see the science for themselves,” Smith said. “If the EPA has nothing to hide, why not make the scientific data it uses for its regulations publicly available? What was the EPA hiding?”

That will strike most people as a fair question. But to some activists, the idea that science should involve review and scrutiny is apparently anathema. In response to a prior effort to ban “secret science” at the EPA, Andrew Rosenberg, director of the Union of Concerned Scientists' Center for Science and Democracy, said transparency would “gut the EPA at the expense of public health and safety.”

That same group has claimed release of data would require publicizing the confidential patient data of individuals. But Steve Milloy, publisher of JunkScience.com and a senior fellow at the Energy and Environmental Legal Institute, notes that California already makes similar data available in its “Public Use Death Files,” and that has been accomplished without violating patient privacy.

Other critics object that there are costs involved in scrubbing data sets so patient privacy is protected. Perhaps, but that doesn't mean the public should be kept in the dark about the data and methods used to justify literally billions in new regulatory burden.

Scientific studies are as susceptible to human error and even outright fraud as any other endeavor — particularly when such studies are used in the political realm. Facilitating transparency and independent review will reduce the chances of bad science harming Americans with half-baked regulations, and should enhance the case for regulations when the underlying science has withstood independent scrutiny.

Given the stakes for public health and the national economy, Americans must be assured government regulations are based on sound science, not someone's “trust me” assurances.

Visit The EPA's Newsroom

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest
Washington, D.C. 20004

Unsubscribe