

Scientific Review Panel Process for Evaluation and Response to Submittals
of New Scientific Information as Evidence for
Review of Toxic Air Contaminant Risk Assessments

I. Statement of need

It is anticipated that submittal of information pertaining to a toxic air contaminant (TAC) risk assessment could result in a request from the Chairperson of the ARB, for the SRP to provide a formal evaluation and recommendation. A procedure is needed for the SRP to process the submittal and evaluation of such information. The following elements have been identified by the SRP for inclusion in such a procedure:

- Screening submittals of new scientific evidence.
- Performing SRP/DHS* analysis of newly submitted scientific evidence to determine the need to review an original TAC risk assessment.

II. Process

A. Screening submittals of new scientific evidence

To prevent a misuse of valuable SRP time and resources, the submittal of new scientific evidence should first be screened by the staff of the ARB and DHS to determine whether the material contains the necessary elements to warrant the SRP's attention. The screening criteria shall include the following:

1. The submittal shall describe specifically what in the original risk assessment will be qualitatively and/or quantitatively changed. At a minimum, the following three points shall be addressed:
 - a. Does the new evidence, if accepted, change the determination of the health effects of the compound?
If so, how?
 - b. Does the new evidence, if accepted, change the threshold determination adopted by the Board and contained in the regulation? If so, how?
 - c. Does the new evidence, if accepted, change the potency which was the basis of the original risk assessment?
If so, How?
2. The submittal shall describe the importance of the new evidence as it relates to the science (e.g. evidence, data, calculations, assumptions, and procedures) used to establish the original risk assessment.

*DHS: Changed in 1991 to Office of Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA).

3. The submittal shall demonstrate that the new evidence is peer reviewed, either in the form of acceptance for publication by an academically or scientifically reputable journal, or documented acceptance by a recognized group of scientific experts (such as the International Agency for Research on Cancer, National Cancer Institute, National Toxicology Program, Environmental Protection Agency, or National Academy of Science).
- B. DHS review of newly submitted scientific evidence.
1. If DHS finds in its review of the submitted material that there is not a need for review of the original risk assessment, that finding may be used in future evaluation of the submitted material by the SRP.
 2. If DHS finds in its review of the submitted material there is a need for further review of the original risk assessment, this finding will be transmitted back to the ARB Chairperson.
- C. Process for SRP/DHS review of newly submitted scientific evidence to determine the need to review an original (TAC) risk assessment.
1. If the submitted material meets the criteria in II A above, and the DHS staff finds that the material does not warrant a need for further review of the original risk assessment, the ARB Chairperson would formally request the SRP to review the material, and the evaluation by DHS, and advise the ARB Chairperson whether, in light of the quality of the new information and the effect the new information would have on the original risk assessment, there is a need to review the original TAC risk assessment.
 2. The SRP Chairperson would assign a leadperson(s) to evaluate the new material.
 3. The leadperson(s), after consulting with DHS and other appropriate agencies and individuals, would submit his/her evaluation to the SRP Chairperson for full Panel review and discussion at the next scheduled meeting.
 4. The Panel would review the leadperson's evaluation along with supporting material and recommend to the ARB Chairperson, through the SRP Chairperson, whether on the basis of the submitted material a review of the original risk assessment is warranted.