Message

From: D'Amico, Louis [DAmico.Louis@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/20/2021 2:29:39 AM
To: Blackburn, Elizabeth [Blackburn.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
CC: Orme-Zavaleta, Jennifer [Orme-Zavaleta.Jennifer@epa.gov]; Robbins, Chris [Robbins.Chris@epa.gov]; Rodan, Bruce [rodan.bruce@epa.gov]; Frey, Christopher [Frey.Christopher@epa.gov]; Hubbard, Carolyn [Hubbard.Carolyn@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: Questions about particle deposition report and peer review

And I'll also flag that if op is saying that we need to cite a regulatory rule/requirement, that seems to fly in the face of past practice for other ord documents...

Sent from my iPhone
(Please pardon brevity and typos)

On Mar 19, 2021, at 10:22 PM, D'Amico, Louis <DAmico.Louis@epa.gov> wrote:

Well that's a whole level of ridiculousness that I'm glad I could say I was on paternity leave for!

Sent from my iPhone
(Please pardon brevity and typos)

On Mar 19, 2021, at 9:08 PM, Blackburn, Elizabeth <Blackburn.Elizabeth@epa.gov> wrote:

Please see the story below. It seems to be resolved and John got it off his chest ☺

Liz

Liz Blackburn (she/her/hers)
Chief of Staff
EPA Office of Research and Development
202-564-2192
Mobile: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

<image002.png>

From: Vandenberg, John <Vandenberg.John@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2021 10:36 AM
To: Blackburn, Elizabeth <Blackburn.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Jones, Samantha <Jones.Samantha@epa.gov>
Cc: Holt, Kay <Holt.Kay@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Questions about particle deposition report and peer review

Hi Liz,

I'll give you the short version of this sordid story, but would be available anytime today if you want a more nuanced description.

Bottom line: we addressed the FRN issue and the peer reviewers were notified yesterday that a FRN will be published next week announcing the public comment period. Roger should back off.

More detail:

- We recently completed development of materials for peer review of the MPPD (Multi-Path Particle Dosimetry) model. This model will be used to refine estimates of dose to the pulmonary tract for inhaled particles, which is anticipated to be used by OPP, OPP, ORD and states (CA, TX, etc) for risk assessment. This improves upon existing methods to derive a refence concentration, published in 1994.

- ERG, the peer review contractor identified a strong set of reviewers, chaired by Roger McClellan.

- We put forward a FRN announcing the contractor-run peer review of the MPPD model.

- Office of Policy informed us the FRN was pushed back by the FR office because the FRN did not cite a regulatory rule or requirement (that was our understanding of the basis for pushback).

- We replied there is no regulatory requirement, so we decided to pull back the FRN and just use our typical methods to announce the peer review meeting (website, list serve, etc).

- We notified ERG that the FRN was not being published, and ERG notified the peer reviewers (I don't think this was needed, but it happened).

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

- I notified Wayne et al of Roger's call and yesterday morning I called OP to see what we could do about the getting FRN published.

- Caryn Muellerleile (OP) was very helpful and I recommended we reference Pub. L.. 94-475; Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1976 as the legal basis for this work. Caryn agreed and acted quickly to get the FRN office to agree, which they did. I wish we'd have thought of that earlier.

- The FRN office notified us yesterday afternoon that the FRN will be published on 03/23/2021 with the title *"EPA Multiple-Path Particle Dosimetry (MPPD) Model Software (MPPD EPA 2020 v. 1.01) and its associated Technical Support Documentation and User's Guide (External Review Draft)"* and FRL #: 10020-77-ORD. This FRN will tell readers how to obtain the document and software from ERG and how to submit comments to the EPA docket. The public comment period will end 30 days after FRN publication.

- I hope that fills in likely more information than you need, but it was good for me to recap and get if off my mind. We should have better understood what the FRN issue was; Roger overstepped; FRN issue has been solved. End of story.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

John

From: Blackburn, Elizabeth <Blackburn.Elizabeth@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2021 6:10 PM
To: Vandenberg, John <Vandenberg.John@epa.gov>; Jones, Samantha <Jones.Samantha@epa.gov>
Cc: Holt, Kay <Holt.Kay@epa.gov>
Subject: Questions about particle deposition report and peer review

Hi John and Samantha,

Roger McClellan reached out to Chris Frey about a particle deposition report that he was supposed to chair a contractor-led peer review of. Apparently he was displeased that he thought the report was being stopped and that his services would no longer be needed. IOAA folks knew something vague about a process glitch with OP but could you let me know what the issues are please? Also, it was noted that the contractor should get back to Roger and other panel members to be clear about what was happening, if that hasn't happened already.

I appreciate your help – thank you.

Liz

Liz Blackburn (she/her/hers)
Chief of Staff
EPA Office of Research and Development
202-564-2192
Mobile: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

<image004.png>