

Scott Pruitt's about to end EPA's long-standing use of 'secret science' to justify regulations

March 20, 2018 | BPR Wire (<http://www.bizpacreview.com/author/bpr-wire>) |



President Trump just wiped out the
Obama climate change agenda.
Do you support this order?

VOTE NO

Michael Bastasch,

THE **DAILY CALLER**
NEWS FOUNDATION

DCNF (<http://dailycaller.com/2018/03/19/epa-scott-pruitt-secret-science/>)

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Scott Pruitt will soon end his agency's use of "secret science" to craft regulations.

"We need to make sure their data and methodology are published as part of the record," Pruitt said in an exclusive interview with The Daily Caller News Foundation.

"Otherwise, it's not transparent. It's not objectively measured, and that's important."

Pruitt will reverse long-standing EPA policy allowing regulators to rely on non-public scientific data in crafting rules. Such studies have been used to justify tens of billions of dollars worth of regulations.

EPA regulators would only be allowed to consider scientific studies that make their data available for public scrutiny under Pruitt's new policy. Also, EPA-funded studies would need to make all their data public.

"When we do contract that science out, sometimes the findings are published; we make that part of our rule-making processes, but then we don't publish the methodology and data that went into those findings because the third party who did the study won't give it to us," Pruitt added.

"And we've said that's fine – we're changing that as well," Pruitt told TheDCNF.

Conservatives have long

criticized (<http://dailycaller.com/2015/07/20/republicans-question-the-secret-science-behind-epas-300-billion-regulatory-agenda/>)

EPA for relying on scientific studies that published their findings but not the underlying data. However, Democrats and environmental activists have challenged past attempts to bring transparency to studies used in rule making.

Texas Republican Rep. Lamar Smith pushed legislation to end the use of what he calls "secret science" at EPA. Pruitt

instituted (<http://dailycaller.com/2017/10/31/trumps-epa-takes-steps-to-ensure-independence-among-science-advisers/>)

another policy in 2017 backed by Smith against EPA-funded scientists serving on agency advisory boards.

"If we use a third party to engage in scientific review or inquiry, and that's the basis of rulemaking, you and every American citizen across the country deserve to know what's the data, what's the methodology that was used to reach that conclusion that was the underpinning of what – rules that were adopted by this agency," Pruitt explained.

Pruitt's pending science transparency policy mirrors Smith's

HONEST Act (<https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/1430>), which passed the House in March 2017. Smith's office was pleased to hear Pruitt was adopting another policy the House Committee on Science, Space and Technology chairman championed.

"The chairman has long worked toward a more open and transparent rule-making process at EPA, and he looks forward to any announcement from Administrator Pruitt that would achieve that goal," committee spokeswoman Thea McDonald told TheDCNF.

Junk science crusader Steve Milloy also called on EPA to end its use of "secret science" in rule making, especially when it comes to studies on the toxicity of fine particulates in the air.

EPA has primarily relied on two 1990s studies linking fine particulate pollution to premature death. Neither studies have made their data public, but EPA used their findings to justify sweeping air quality regulations.

Reported benefits from EPA rules are "mostly attributable to the reduction in public exposure to fine particulate matter," according to the White House Office of Management and Budget

report (https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/draft_2017_cost_benefit_report.pdf)

. That's equivalent to billions of dollars.

In fact, one of EPA's most expensive regulation on the books, called MATS, derived most of its estimated benefits from reducing particulates not from reducing mercury, which the rule was ostensibly crafted to address.

EPA estimated MATS would cost \$8.2 billion but yield between \$28 billion to \$77 billion in public health benefits. It's a similar story for the

Clean Power Plan (<https://www.epa.gov/energy-independence>), which EPA estimated would cost \$8.4 billion and yield from \$14 billion to \$34 billion in health and climate benefits.

Democrats and environmentalists have largely opposed attempts to require EPA rely on transparent scientific data. Said data would restrict the amount of studies EPA can use, but a major objection is making data public would reveal confidential patient data, opponents argue.

"A lot of the data that EPA uses to protect public health and ensure that we have clean air and clean water relies on data that cannot be publicly released," Union of Concerned Scientists representative Yogin Kothari told (<https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060076559>) E&E News.

"It really hamstring the ability of the EPA to do anything, to fulfill its mission," Kothari said.

Milloy, however, countered and argued it's a "red herring" to claim that forcing regulators to use public science data would harm patient privacy.

"The availability of such data sets is nothing new," said Milloy, publisher of JunkScience.com and senior fellow at the Energy and Environmental Legal Institute.

"The state of California, for example, makes such data available under the moniker, 'Public Use Death Files,'" Milloy said. "We used such data in the form of over two million anonymized death certificates in our recent California study on particulates and death."

"Opponents of data transparency are just trying to hide the data from independent scrutiny," Milloy added. "But the studies that use this data are taxpayer-financed, and they are used to regulate the public."

Follow Michael on Facebook (<https://www.facebook.com/MichaelBastaschDCNF>) and Twitter (<https://twitter.com/MikeBastasch>)

For licensing opportunities of our original content, please contact licensing@dailycallernewsfoundation.org (<mailto:licensing@dailycallernewsfoundation.org>).

Popular In the Community



Sponsored

GOOD GUY WITH A GUN

JUDGE NAP BUSTS OUT



Champ Frehmel

39m

tsigiliadonvdo

20m

CA is basically trying to take away free spec...

Conversation (14)

Sort by **Best** ▾

Log In

Add a comment...

Al Balabu ★ Leader ▾

It is a ^{Edited} pattern of Democrat secret science where the underlying data of the so called research is secret in other word fraudulent, withholding voters list and voters records to hide wide spread voting fraud, publishing secret news where the sources are anonymous but taken from thin air, suppressing real news if it does not suit their agenda

Reply · Share · 10 Likes ·

George A Watson III ★ Leader ▾

This is what I call WINNING!

Reply · Share · 8 Likes ·



walter.johanson@verizon.net ▾

So the EPA is junking junk science? Is that permitted?

Reply · Share · 7 Likes ·

George A Watson III ★ Leader → walter.johanson@verizon.net ▾



No, they're really junking the secrecy rule - now the EPA will be FORCED to share with the public all of their "science" which will result in leftists being summarily dispatched with all their LIES.

Reply · Share · 7 Likes ·

tsigiliadonvdo ★ Leader ▾

The corruption of fake science to justify their actions, is exactly what the

Demcorats have been doing for decades. That is a UN initiavtive, to garner control over our government, and the Dems have been supporting that fake science for years.

Reply · Share · 5 Likes ·  

Don Morris ★ Leader 

"A lot of the data that EPA uses to protect public health and ensure that we have clean air and clean water relies on data that cannot be publicly released,"

What utter BS! How stupid do they think we are? This isn't a military secret, it's environmental data that probably does NOT fit your agenda, and that is undoubtedly why you won't release it.

Fire this lying clown and clean out the rest of the Obama appointees at this agency.



Reply · Share · 4 Likes ·  

Duke Vektor ★ Leader 

President Trump should disband and/or cut staffing at the EPA by about 75% and eliminate many of the other worthless welfare formed Organizations in the Government. Eliminate and at a minimum reduce staffing by 75%. This would save Hard Working Tax Payers money and significantly reduce our debt, incompetent and government corruption significantly.





Reply · Share · 3 Likes ·  

LOAD MORE

Copyright © 2018. All Rights Reserved. BizPacReview

