

Message

---

**From:** Jeffrey Brainard [jbrainard@aaas.org]  
**Sent:** 1/17/2018 9:32:10 PM  
**To:** Press [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b293283291dc44e0b5d1c36be9281d8a-Press]  
**Subject:** comment about report on EPA science advisory committees

Hello. I am a reporter at Science magazine, and I am planning to cover a report by the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) due to be published at 10 am Thursday (Jan. 18) about federal science advisory committees. The report mentions advisory committees of the EPA, and I would like to give you an opportunity to comment on these findings. UCS provided me an embargoed copy of the report. Among the findings:

- In 2017, the number of members on EPA science advisory committees and the number of meetings of those committees were the smallest since 1997, when the federal government began tracking these data through the Federal Advisory Committee Act / FACA database.

- 70 percent of the EPA's scientific advisory committees did not meet in 2017 as frequently as their charters dictated they should.

- The report notes that in any new administration, it can take time to get scientific advisory committees fully up to speed; however, the decline in numbers of meetings and of members of such committees during the first year of the Trump administration was larger than the declines during the first years of the George W. Bush or Barack Obama administrations.

- UCS concludes from these and other findings that EPA and other federal agencies are neglecting or rejecting valuable input from scientists relevant to regulation and public policy.

Science plans to publish my online article at 10 am Thursday, when the UCS embargo lifts, so I would appreciate receiving your comment about these findings before then.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Brainard  
Associate News Editor  
Science Magazine  
1200 New York Ave. NW  
Washington, DC 20005

**Ex. 6**