Appointment

From: Jones, Samantha [Jones.Samantha@epa.gov]
Sent: 7/28/2014 6:02:13 PM
To: Jones, Samantha [Jones.Samantha@epa.gov]; Cogliano, Vincent [cogliano.vincent@epa.gov]; Perovich, Gina [Perovich.Gina@epa.gov]; Strong, Jamie [Strong.Jamie@epa.gov]; Gehlhaus, Martin [Gehlhaus.Martin@epa.gov]; Rieth, Susan [Rieth.Susan@epa.gov]; Subramaniam, Ravi [Subramaniam.Ravi@epa.gov]; Hotchkiss, Andrew [Hotchkiss.Andrew@epa.gov]; Chiu, Weihsueh [Chiu.Weihsueh@epa.gov]

Subject: The new IRIS charge??
Attachments: BaP-Charge-public comment draft 07_07_14_clean_sjj.docx
Location: DCRoomPYN7661-South/ORD-NCEA-DC (teleconferenc Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP))

Start: 7/30/2014 7:00:00 PM
End: 7/30/2014 8:00:00 PM
Show Time As: Busy

Required Attendees: Cogliano, Vincent; Perovich, Gina; Jamie Strong; Martin Gehlhaus; Susan Rieth; Subramaniam, Ravi; Andrew Hotchkiss; Chiu, Wuehsueh

Hi all,

After sitting through two teleconferences and two 3-day peer review meetings, Vince and I (and others?) came away with the thought that we had to shake up our charges. We need to help the peer reviewers focus on the major decision points on which we need feedback without having them get lost in the details (and interpretation of the wording) of the charge questions.

Big thanks to Jamie and Marty for taking the first cut with revamping the charges using BaP as the example. The version circulated was really good.

I have been thinking about this for a while and decided to take the edits further, one might argue too far; however, I still think I have too many words!!

Please take a look at the attachment...forget what we've done for the last 20 years, come at it from a minimalist point of view of making sure we've covered the major scientific decision points such that a group of smart people could provide recommendations by topic.

All comments, questions, concerns, suggestions will be considered!!! I would also be happy to set up a meeting for us to discuss.

Have at it!

BaP-Charge-public comment draft 0...