



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

September 29, 1995

EPA-SAB-EEC-COM-95-005

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR
SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD

Honorable Carol M. Browner
Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street SW
Washington, DC 20460

SUBJECT: Commentary on Appropriateness of SAB Reviews of
Computer Environmental Transport and Fate Models
Developed for Regulatory Decisionmaking

Dear Ms. Browner:

The Environmental Engineering Committee (EEC) of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) presents this Commentary in order to clarify its role as peer reviewer of new and modified computer models developed by the Agency. Specifically, the EEC plans to focus on the peer review of the following:

- a) Substantially new models;
- b) Technically significant advances/adaptations of existing models;
- c) Novel and/or controversial applications of existing models; and
- d) Situations in which applications of models could have significant impact on major regulatory decisions.

The Committee will work with the Agency to identify those fundamental models and model developments that should receive close scrutiny by the SAB. At the same time, an even larger number of more evolutionary developments will be identified for review by alternative peer review mechanisms. This type of distinction--with the SAB maintaining a "right of first refusal"--was first envisioned in the Board's favorable 1993 review of the Agency's proposed model review process (EPA-SAB-EEC-LTR-93-008, July 1993).

The Environmental Engineering Committee has nearly a decade of experience in reviewing computer transport and fate models for the Agency. This Commentary is a result of that experience, including deliberations and discussions associated with the EEC's most recent report: *Review of EPA's Composite Model for Leachate Migration, Including Transformation Products* (EPA-SAB-EEC-95-010, August 1995).



Recycled/Recyclable
Printed on paper that contains
at least 75% recycled fiber

In sum, the EEC continues to believe that mathematical models are important tools for incorporating scientific understanding of environmental processes into regulatory decisionmaking.

The EEC has rendered model-specific advice on several different computer transport and fate models. In addition, the Committee has offered generic advice (e.g., the Board's very first commentary--EPA-SAB-EEC-89-012) on how the Agency could organize itself to review models--and improvements in models--in a more systematic manner. Recently, the Committee favorably reviewed the Agency's generic approach for conducting peer review of such models (EPA-SAB-EEC-LTR-93-008), which includes reviewing the mathematical equations, verification processes, and real-world applications of models for regulatory decisions. In an associated action, the Agency has moved forward with the implementation of the Agency's Peer Review Policy for all major scientific and technical workproducts (issued in July, 1994), including computer models.

In light of these developments and the increasing number of alterations in and applications of existing models, the EEC perceives its future institutional role as focusing on the peer review of the following:

- a) Substantially new models.
- b) Technically significant advances/adaptations of existing models.
- c) Novel and/or controversial applications of existing models.
- d) Situations in which applications of models could have significant impact on major regulatory decisions.

Other matters related to models are likely to be more incremental and evolutionary in nature and should be reviewed through other mechanisms described in the Peer Review Policy.


For the next several months, the Committee would like to work with the Agency in making these distinctions. Such an exercise would enable the SAB and the Agency to generate a common understanding of the types of issues that should come to the Board and those that should be handled by some other mechanism.

In addition, the Committee would like to be kept informed of--and, as warranted, provide advice on--the process and progress of the alternative peer review mechanisms established for models.


In short, the EEC compliments the Agency on the steps it has taken to respond to recommendations concerning peer review of computer environmental transport and fate models used in regulatory decisionmaking. The Committee will work with the Agency to exercise those new mechanisms, while focusing EEC involvement on the most significant issues. At the same time, the EEC has a continuing commitment to insuring that there is adequate and appropriate peer review of major changes/ applications of such models.

The Committee looks forward to working with the Agency on these issues and to your reaction to the projected future role of EEC in peer review of computer models.

Sincerely,



Dr. Genevieve M. Matanoski, Chair
Executive Committee
Science Advisory Board



Dr. Ishwar P. Murarka, Chair
Environmental Engineering
Committee

NOTICE

This report has been written as part of the activities of the Science Advisory Board, a public advisory group providing extramural scientific information and advice to the Administrator and other officials of the Environmental Protection Agency. The Board is structured to provide balanced, expert assessment of scientific matters related to problems facing the Agency. This report has not been reviewed for approval by the Agency and, hence, the contents of this report do not necessarily represent the views and policies of the Environmental Protection Agency, nor of other agencies in the Executive Branch of the Federal government, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute a recommendation for use.

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Science Advisory Board
Environmental Engineering Committee

CHAIR

Dr. Ishwar P. Murarka, Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA

MEMBERS

Dr. Linda M. Abriola, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

Dr. Calvin C. Chien, duPont Company, Corporate Remediation, Wilmington, DE

Dr. Hilary I. Inyang, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Massachusetts, Lowell, MA

Dr. James H. Johnson, Jr., School of Engineering, Howard University, Washington, DC

Dr. Wayne M. Kachel, Martin Marietta Corporation, Oak Ridge, TN

Dr. Jo Ann Lighty, Department of Chemical and Fuels Engineering, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT

Dr. James W. Mercer, GeoTrans, Inc., Sterling, VA

Dr. Frederick G. Pohland, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA

Dr. Robert B. Pojasek, Cambridge Environmental, Inc., Cambridge, MA

Dr. Wm. Randall Seeker, Energy & Environmental Research Corp., Irvine, CA

SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD STAFF

Mrs. Kathleen W. Conway, Designated Federal Official, U.S. EPA, Science Advisory Board, 401 M Street, SW (1400F), Washington, DC 20460

Mrs. Dorothy M. Clark, Staff Secretary, U.S. EPA, Science Advisory Board, 401 M Street, SW (1400F), Washington, DC 20460

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Administrator
Deputy Administrator
Assistant Administrators
Regional Administrators
Deputy Assistant Administrator for Science - ORD
Deputy Assistant Administrator for Management - ORD
Director, Office of Science Policy
Directors, Mega Laboratories and Centers
Directors, Research Laboratories
EPA Headquarters Library
EPA Regional Libraries
National Technical Information System
Library of Congress