

NOTICE: This is a compilation of individual quality review comments. These comments do not reflect consensus advice or recommendations, have not been reviewed or approved by the chartered SAB, and do not represent EPA policy. **Do not Cite or Quote.**

Quality Review Comments from Drs. Marjorie Aelion and Florence Anoruo on the SAB Draft Report: *Review of the EPA’s Draft Fifth Contaminant Candidate List (CCL 5)*

July 19, 2022

<i>Comments from Dr. Marjorie Aelion</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Comments from Dr. Florence Anoruo</i>	<i>2</i>

NOTICE: This is a compilation of individual quality review comments. These comments do not reflect consensus advice or recommendations, have not been reviewed or approved by the chartered SAB, and do not represent EPA policy. **Do not Cite or Quote.**

Comments from Dr. Marjorie Aelion

Please find below my updated responses to the quality review questions for the consultation with EPA on: Review of the EPA's Draft Fifth Contaminant Candidate List (CCL 5) DRAFT REPORT, dated May **10, 2022**.

1) Were the charge questions to the Committee adequately addressed?

Yes, the charge questions to the Committee were adequately addressed.

2) Are there any technical errors or omissions or issues that are not adequately dealt with in the draft report?

I found no technical errors of omissions in the draft report. Based on the Panel discussion of July 18, 2022, I agree with the lead reviewers that changes should be made to the report, particularly in regards to manganese.

3) Is the draft report clear and logical?

Yes, the draft report is clear and logical.

4) Are the conclusions drawn or recommendations provided supported by the body of the draft report?

Yes, the conclusions drawn or recommendations provided are supported by the body of the draft report. As stated previously, based on the Panel discussion of July 18, 2022, I agree with the lead reviewers that changes should be made to the report, particularly in regards to manganese.

Comments from Dr. Florence Anoruo

1. Were the charge questions to the Committee adequately addressed?

Yes, the charge questions were thoroughly discussed. Addressing the gaps and inadequacies in CCL1-4 and incorporating updated and new peer reviewed scientific findings, particularly expanded list of toxic compounds and their health hazards in preparation of CCL5 was very relevant.

2. Are there any technical errors or omissions or issues that are not adequately dealt with in the draft report?

Although the adverse health effects of screened CCL that pose greater risk to life stages and other sensitive groups that represent meaningful section of the population was discussed in draft report, economically, socially disadvantaged, and vulnerable populations that are more likely to be at higher risk of exposure and have co-morbidity were not discussed. Also, cumulative impact from multiple exposures should be considered in future draft reports.

NOTICE: This is a compilation of individual quality review comments. These comments do not reflect consensus advice or recommendations, have not been reviewed or approved by the chartered SAB, and do not represent EPA policy. **Do not Cite or Quote.**

3. Is the draft report clear and logical?

Yes. The grouping of the recommendations in Tiers was very helpful in understanding the draft report.

4. Are the conclusions drawn or recommendations provided supported by the body of the draft report?

Yes.