

October 10, 2024

Michal Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Assistant Administrator
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20460

Re: Extension Request of the Deadline to Submit Names to the ad hoc Science Advisory Committee on Chemicals for the Draft Risk Evaluation for 1,3-Butadiene Under the Toxic Substances Control Act; Docket ID EPA-HQ-OPPT-2024-0425

Dear Dr. Freedhoff,

On behalf of the American Chemistry Council (ACC¹) 1,3-Butadiene TSCA Risk Evaluation Consortium (Consortium), I am requesting an additional 30 days for the submission of nominees to be *ad hoc* reviewers on EPA's Science Advisory Committee on Chemicals (SACC) which will review EPA's 1,3-Butadiene risk evaluation under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA²).

The Consortium supports EPA seeking nominations of scientific and technical experts that EPA can consider for service as *ad hoc* peer reviewers on the SACC. Thirty days is not an adequate window for us to coordinate among our members and develop a robust list of independent experts to help inform your review. EPA has provided a list of eight highly technical and important scientific questions that will be addressed by the SACC, and it is critically important that *ad hoc* members with sufficient knowledge base and expertise are identified to inform the SACC review. Additional time is also needed to help ensure that our nominees are free from conflicts and willing to provide the necessary ethical and financial disclosures to EPA. Therefore, the Consortium requests that the agency extend the date to submit names of prospective *ad hoc* SACC Peer Reviewers for an additional 30 days, to November 18, 2024.

¹ The American Chemistry Council's mission is to advocate for the people, policy, and products of chemistry that make the United States the global leader in innovation and manufacturing. To achieve this, we: Champion science-based policy solutions across all levels of government; Drive continuous performance improvement to protect employees and communities through Responsible Care®; Foster the development of sustainability practices throughout ACC member companies; and communicate authentically with communities about challenges and solutions for a safer, healthier and more sustainable way of life. Our vision is a world made better by chemistry, where people live happier, healthier, and more prosperous lives, safely and sustainably—for generations to come.

² [Federal Register: 1,3-Butadiene; Draft Risk Evaluation Under the Toxic Substances Control Act \(TSCA\); Science Advisory Committee on Chemicals \(SACC\) Peer Review; Request for Nominations of ad hoc Peer Reviewers](#)



The Consortium also encourages EPA to convene an in-person public meeting of the SACC, instead of the virtual public meeting that the agency is planning, and to ensure that the SACC conducts a review of the entire risk evaluation and the totality of its scientific inputs. The notice soliciting nominations indicates that “EPA is focusing its charge to the SACC on methods and analyses that are novel and have not been reviewed in other venues.” An in-person public meeting covering the totality of the scientific evidence and its application in this risk evaluation will result in an open, robust peer review of the science that is consistent with Section 26 of TSCA, the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), EPA, and the White House peer review requirements. EPA is required under the White House Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB) [Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review](#) and its own information quality guidelines to post on their website a [Peer Review Agenda](#) that includes all planned and ongoing “influential scientific information” developed by EPA and an attendant “Peer Review Plan,” in part to provide the public an opportunity to comment on the peer review timing as well as which peer review bodies will be engaged.

These requirements are also discussed in detail in EPA’s [Peer Review Handbook](#). “Influential scientific information” is defined as “scientific information the agency can determine will have or does have a clear and substantial impact on important public policies or private sector decisions. A virtual meeting on select pieces of evidence does not allow for the deliberations that make panel meetings the preferred form of peer review for complex and influential scientific assessments. EPA’s 1,3-Butadiene risk evaluation is clearly a “highly influential scientific assessment” that should follow EPA and OMB peer review and information quality guidelines. Such comprehensive deliberations are necessary to help inform and independently validate the TSCA risk evaluation of 1,3-Butadiene, and an in-person meeting is preferable.

Thank you for your consideration of our requests.

Sincerely,

Neeraja Erraguntla, Ph.D.; DABT | American Chemistry Council
Director, Chemical Products & Technology Division
Neeraja_Erraguntla@americanchemistry.com
700 2nd Street NE | Washington, DC | 20002
(202) 249-6712
www.americanchemistry.com

cc: Alie Muneer, DFO, Mark Hartman, Elissa Reaves, Brooke Porter, Marc Edmonds