

# EPA Survey Essays

How could the integrity of scientific work produced by the EPA best be improved?

Political interference.....	2
Funding and Staffing.....	17
External Interference.....	31
Openness.....	37
Scientific Review.....	42
Organizational Improvements.....	45
Respect for Science.....	52
Other.....	57

*Also available at [http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/scientific\\_integrity/All-EPA-essays.pdf](http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/scientific_integrity/All-EPA-essays.pdf)*

*Last updated April 22, 2008*

## Political interference

REGIONS	Get a new, honest administration in place! Blunt OMB interference! Make the legal environment truly supportive and safe for whistleblowers! Make whatever changes in the law are necessary to do this. Stop the award of contracts to administration insiders (such as CSC, which also has the sole management contract for our strategic oil reserve). Thank goodness for our court system that arbitrates much of the hanky-panky of this administration. One comment on this survey, however There are two EPAs that I think Regional employees all know- their Regional office and EPA Headquarters. It was hard to answer the survey questions because there was no distinction between the Regional EPA office and EPA Headquarters. My Regional office is full of honest, hardworking people who are dedicated to their mission, from the top on down. The D.C. scene is a different story! So many in top and in scientific positions appear to be forced to compromise their integrity. We are disgusted here with the administration's attempts to derail environmental protection. The EPA is a big ship and I'm afraid it will take a long time to steer it back on its true course.
OAR	Reduce the power of OMB over EPA scientific products.All communications between EPA and OMB during the development of Agency technical products and actions should be preserved for the public record.Stakeholders should demand an end to "paralysis by analysis" strategies to prevent EPA from doing its job. In particular, implementation of OMB's risk assessment guidelines would be disastrous.The position of EPA's Science Advisor should be a career appointment and not a political appointment, and should also have authority.Whistleblower protections should be preserved and strengthened."
REGIONS	1st - Fully enforce whistle blower protections. 2nd - Create a decision process that recognizes both political inputs and science inputs that make up the entire decision process. They both have validity. But make sure that there is no way that you can change the science to accomodate a political "need." Currently I think EPA's credibility is in the tank due almost entirely to trying to make the science fit a political need rather than openly admitting that both paradigms exist and then deal with the realities of both politics and science to make the decision. 3rd - Bring back FOIA to inform the public. The premise should be that all documents (except enforcement related stuff) start out as public documents unless EPA has jumped through a lot of legal hoops to be able retain them. 4th - There has to be a way that scientists careers are not penalized for doing good science that ends up conflicting with bad politics.
OAR	Apply basic and technically sound scientific and engineering principles in regulation development, risk assessments, pollution prevention, and innovative strategies. Make our work fully and completely transparent to the public. Minimize the influence of special interests groups and associations. Stop the practice of relying on ""fox-guarding-the-hen-house"" data and analysis without independent assessment and evaluation. End the practice of OMB dictating environmental regulatory and enforcement policy. More rapid and consistent decision-making by senior EPA managers"
OSWER	EPA needs dynamic, scientific leadership interested in the well being of the environment and public health. EPA should not be the political agency it has become, the right hand of industry and short economic gain. EPA now moves in the direction of voluntary cleanups such as voluntary mine tailings cleanup, provider of community tea parties, not science based actions.
ORD	1. Reduce the number of political appointees; there are too many and they run too deep into the Agency.2. Change the SES system. Too many SES mgrs are operating way outside of their areas of technical expertise and they refuse to listen to experts. We need more leadership and less ""management"". 3. Change our culture from command and control into a culture of trust and collaborative decision making4. Stop allowing SES mgrs clone themselves. The only way to reach SES is by being a blindly obedient yes person"
ORD	Let the scientist get back to conducting science. There is too much planning and re-planning going on. There is too much micromanagment from above going on. There is too much administrative burden being heaped on the scientists. EPA administration does not know what science should be done, or how to do it, but they certainly seem to interject themselves into the day to day process more and more. Then whenever we bring information to them they discount our findings and choose to rely on outside entities and give thier work more credibility than they do the work of thir own scientists. We have a serious lack of leadership in the upper managment areas of EPA and it is killing us. I have never seen morale at a lower point than we currently have in EPA. Good scientists are leaving because they can no longer put up with all the micro-managment that is heaped onthem in lieu of effective administrative leadership. Our upper level managers need to be focused on the big policy pictures not on the day to day activities of the scientists. Another area that we are moviing to is a centralization of all services. It reminds me of the model the Soviet Union employed. It is couched as

	<p>being more cost effective, but it is really about command and control of resources and power consolidation. All of our IT is being centralized and the end result is we can not get the items we need to do our jobs effectively, and the level of customer service when we need help is diminishing greatly. But the biggest problem that is driving all of this is OPM and the whole PART (Performance Assessment Rating Tool) Process that is couched as being based on sound fiscal principles of monetary stewardship, but it is applied with non-scientific people deciding how or what research should or needs to be done. We do not tell OPM how to do their job, they need to get out of the way and stop telling us what science is important and how to do our job's. OPM has gotten WAY, WAY OVER-BURDEN-SOME and I think has stepped way over their boundaries!!! There have been some real draconian budget cuts heaped on all the government environmental research agencies, with EPA probably being the front runner. We are well past being cut to the bone and we have been cut through the bone. If effective environmental protection is wanted in this country then this ever decreasing budget scenario has to be reversed. "</p>
ORD	<p>I (and others) have been prevented from performing certain experiments--so that the data on sensitive topics (such as World Trade Center dust from 9/11 and Hurricane Katrina water/soil) would not be generated. This is interference right from the beginning--far worse than preventing data from being included in a report--these actions have prevented data from being generated in the first place. The integrity of science at the EPA could be improved if all of the top managers (especially the career scientists as well as the political appointees) were world-class scientists such as are found at NIH. That, alone, will solve the integrity problem. "</p>
OPPTS	<p>While discomfiting, the political process is nevertheless essential. Experienced government scientists are aware that science is not the only reason to make a decision. Only when science is intentionally ignored, rather than considered in balance, is there a cause for outcry. Since most of the misrepresentations I have experienced seem more inadvertent than deliberate, I personally have not seen malicious misuse of science. However, I have been made aware of such in other places in EPA. The higher the profile of an issue, the more likely the misuse, at least in the last 5 years. Improvement in integrity starts at the top. Being honest that political reasons can trump science is essential, rather than attempting to couch decisions in questionable science. "</p>
REGIONS	<p>My experience is the opposite of what I believe the intention of this survey is. As an EPA scientist, during high profile situations, I have been asked by senior managers (direction likely coming from political appointees) to take on specific environmental assessment activity with no objective-based hypothesis (i.e. "go collect 12 samples at property xyz"). As staff members, we jokingly call this "appeasement sampling". Unfortunately, the resulting data is usually useless, other than to be able to make a statement that EPA took action."</p>
ORD	<p>1. By allowing scientists and engineers to do their work and publish the results without political oversight, interpretation, or intervention. For example, we sampled the air in New York after 9/11, knew it was unsafe to breathe, and so informed Agency and Administration leaders. The responders and the public received just the opposite message from these leaders. 2. By enforcing the Agency's Quality Assurance requirements in all EPA organizations that perform scientific work and making it clear to all PIs that their work will not be accepted or published unless it adheres to Agency QA policies and requirements. This is a management issue. Some managers scoff at the EPA QA requirements and others enforce it. Only management support, leadership, and oversight can improve this situation so that the Agency is able to produce data of known quality."</p>
REGIONS	<p>Reduce the amount of political pressure on senior and lower level management. Get poor managers out of the agency.</p>
OTHER	<p>Get rid of political appointees and allow the science to proceed as they should.</p>
REGIONS	<p>Make the administrator a non political appointee and a true scientist. Make the EPA a cabinet level department and not agency. Clear policy and direction on keeping science science.</p>
ORD	<p>EPA's scientific work already is of the highest integrity. The critical issues are more along the lines of what research can be done and how it is used. Both the Administration and the Congress bear equal responsibility for the misuse of scientific information and the inappropriate targeting of certain areas for funding (or not) based on political expediency rather than scientific justification. The key fix would be to give ORD a non-political Assistant Administrator and a budget that doesn't compete with the budgets of the policy offices.</p>
REGIONS	<p>Restore the libraries Make the Office of Research and Development's budget less dependent on the Agency's media program budgets (thereby preventing media program senior managers from refusing to fund studies that might lead to conclusions that they don't like). Reward senior managers for taking risks rather than punishing them for following a line to its logical conclusion, no matter whether or not that conclusion challenges past practice, current policies, conventional wisdom, an industry's claim,</p>

	etc."
ORD	Allow the EPA scientist to publish findings in peer reviewed journals without lengthy review by people from managers to political appointees in DC that know nothing of your science before it is even sent out. In addition no longer allow political lobby groups such as the American Chemistry Council to help OMB to determine what studies to fund here at the EPA. We should not be accountable to any industry folk that whisper in the ears of those who control our budget. It is an outrage how long it takes to get any scientific findings out here and whom controls what we do or do not do.
OPPTS	Have access to tech resources and in a timely fashion (includes library/lit search issues), be allowed to consider additional health endpoints in risk assessment (incl. sens. pop issues), have more robust search/analysis of hazards for (new chemical) risk assessment, be allowed to bring in more robust trainings (leadership and tech issues), facilitate cross-program communications (stovepipe issue), reward forward development and not stultification (keeping a programmatic low profile), improve help desk and other support services (plus more flexibility for staff to retaining software that works for their program), be a model agency (not one that continues to ""grow"" its own handicapped population and then to continues non-accommodation and harassment against these staffers). Most of all, of course, would be a good housecleaning of obstructive bureaucrats from both inside the Agency and ABOVE. (New elections may be requisite, but far from sufficient, as a first step.) Need new environmental values in the voting population. "
REGIONS	More resources (time, staff, training) to do scientific work. Less intrusion of political orientations into choosing and reporting on scientific studies."
ORD	the current management is openly corrupt, incompetent, and top heavy in the ratio to scientists 1/3. Scientists are not able to do research (no technicians/students/resources) and it has been suggested that we no longer need resources to publish research (you go figure!). We are required to do more and more secretarial/administrative/technical responsibility and science and what one needs to do science is secondary. management talks a nice tune to the public but the situation is thoroughly out of control."
REGIONS	Less political interference, additional funding for critical positions, training, and succession planning.
ORD	Develop a policy whereby EPA research scientists are required to publish their findings in at least one if not two papers a year in a peer-reviewed journal outside the agency. I work in ORD and feel that the integrity within this branch of the EPA is fairly high with career-track scientists; I think many of the issues raised in this survey are targeted more at the regulatory and policy side of EPA. I do think that political appointees have the power to ""steer"" the focus of ORD away from ""politically sensitive"" research towards more the more mundane; I feel like at times the focus within the EPA overlaps too much with ""human health"" issues and has been pulled away from ""environmental"" or ""ecosystems"" health issues."
OAR	Stick to well-known and accepted methods of scientific product scrutiny1- Peer review2- No ethical grey-areas tolerated (e.g., no asbestos industry scientists allowed on the asbestos expert team)3- No non-scientists allowed to monkey with scientific documents4- Clear delineation between POLICY and SCIENCE; EPA is a political organization tasked with a Scientific duty. These two are juxtapositioned and as long as decision makers can accept their duty to POLICY notwithstanding the SCIENTIFIC work product, this is a defensible position. However, recently politicians and political appointees have gotten mixed up in attempting to change the scientific recommendations; or worse yet, to alter the scientific results. This is an obvious and glaring disservice to the American taxpayers. However, we recognize that policy decisions must be made, particularly in situations in which the science is unclear. In these situations we recommend, as has been our longstanding position, that a conservative decision be made that is protective of human health and the environment when that decision is not informed, or is ill-informed by scientific data."
ORD	1) Improve transparency in government by requiring comments from OMB and other agencies on science documents to be made public2) ensure science decisions on conclusions contained in EPA science documents are made by EPA career scientists3) require political appointees to post summary of discussion (including any documents provided) and attendees when they meet with external stakeholders4) encourage accountability in EPA political appointees through Congressional inquiry regarding basis for decisions and role of science versus political considerations in decision making

ORD	External oversight groups need to conduct regular, periodic interviews, surveys and on-site visits with EPA scientists. Contact with scientists needs to be done without attendance by, or prior filtering being done by any level of line management. Oversight groups must not rely on statements from managers on ""official"" policies regarding undue influence over scientists, censorship or generally how things are going, are done, within EPA. Setting (deciding) the course of science to be done by EPA scientists should be done by impartial, non-governmental entities (e.g., NAS) with the requirement that EPA management implement the course until non-governmental entities state otherwise. EPA is too political of an agency to decide what science needs to be done."
ORD	1. Most problems reducing my effectiveness are unintentional consequences of bureaucratic meddling by middle managers. 2. Support for my research comes from regulatory offices, who in turn are controlled by political processes. Despite their best intentions, I believe these regulatory programs are politically incapable of adopting scientific practices that threaten the status quo. 3. Career scientists tend to resist changes in the scientific practices they're accustomed to. Not sure how to solve this, other than to remove seniority entitlements. Good luck with that one!3. External scientific advisory processes associated with risk assessment should not incorporate industrial perspectives. In other words, ""risk management"" should be recognized as a human values problem, and should be more explicitly separated from risk assessment. "
REGIONS	Put checks and balances in place to insulate EPA scientists from undue influence by politicians, business interests, and activists.
OAR	Stop political appointees from changing policies in order to appease certain industry groups like the petroleum and electric utility sectors.
REGIONS	For upper management within the Region and HQ to start listening to scientist and staff and respond legally and environmentally, without industry and political bias."
OAR	By keeping politics and undue industry influence out of decision-making
REGIONS	By maintaining integrity, vs political or economic factors."
ORD	Never cave to industry or political pressures.
REGIONS	Base decisions on science - not politics or industry concerns.
ORD	One of the best current safeguards is review of Agency documents and policies by independent advisory boards including the Science Advisory Board, the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, and the Board of Scientific Counsellors. Much EPA work in human health risk assessment is now subjected to Inter-Agency Review by other Federal entities which appear to be more closely aligned with private interests than with the public health community. Rumors abound that some sensitive assessments have been modified by external entities, e.g. the risk assessment for perchlorates by DoD and DoE, for particulate matter by DoE, and for assessing residential health risks for children living in lower Manhattan following 9/11. It is not clear that reviews of chemical risk assessments for perchlorates and TCE by NAS have been more objective or better science, but it is very clear they have delayed EPA action by years. Maybe more Congressional oversight would help the Executive Branch straighten its priorities."
OPPTS	The issues that I am most concerned about are clean air issues where politics trumps science, global warming, and nutrient contamination of our waters. The power industry and the farm lobby wield tremendous political power. The science is there, it is just ignored.
ORD	Return to bottom up flow of scientific data and research findings Improve integration and cooperation between program offices Reduce unnecessary and repetitive review processes Research findings as reported in peer reviewed scientific journals free from regulatory review processes Require managers to support quality research efforts under objective, truth finding conditions - this requires separation of science reporting from management decision making and political constraints Restore commitments to solving environmental problems on time frames that minimize delay Emphasize a more prospective approach to prevention of anticipated environmental problems such as climate change Less compartmentalizing of environmental science - recognize the inherent linkages between the narrowly defined environmental and socioeconomic considerations"

REGIONS	Have no privatization of EPA work;Have no political interference re outcomes;Be allowed to apply the scientific findings directly to regulations without interference;Have no alterations/dilutions of language that soften the impact/significance of comments;Remove procedural barriers that increase our workload and make it more difficult for us to freely and appropriately rate and comment upon projects;Quit suppressing/reassigning and discouraging the science and scientists that pursue work that is distasteful to this administration (this results in fine scientists that leave the agency);
ORD	The scientific mission must be removed from the rule and decision making mission. This can be accomplished by making the scientific work (ORD) a semi-independent entity in the Agency. the ORD head should not be a political appointee nor must congressmen be allowed to inject the types of research carried out by the agency. The funding for particular research must be provided for appropriate periods of time and not be terminated or applied to other projects at the whim of the EPA administration. ORD must increase the number of post-doctoral positions and graduate students. We have seen the programs supporting graduate student training by EPA scientists all but disappear during the last six years. Cooperative studies with educational institutions have been cut to the point of being non-existent.We need more than the offerings of the EPA administrators that we "have to do more with less" EPA has some of the best scientists working today...many with honors from their peers. presidents of scientific societies, but the research mission of the agency is regarded as "second rate" because of mismanagement and inadequate financial support. ORD should be made independent or semi-independent from the Agency as a whole or melded in with NIH's National Institute of Environmental and Health Sciences.
REGIONS	Let us use our best science to list chemicals of concern - update MCL list - revise TCE MCL value - use appropriate perchlorate values for sensitive subpopulations and promulgate an MCL. Remove the gag orders on perchlorate.Return our press policy to the previous case where, "if you know what you are talking about, you can talk to anyone at any time" - rather than the current, "questions on perchlorate are to be referred to this (sic) phone number at the Whitehouse" Pull programs which have been delegated to the states back to the Agency where they will be more resistant to local political pressures."
REGIONS	Keep scientific work separated from policy/politics/management decisions.
ORD	Let the scientists be scientists--Ph.D. trained and allowed to pursue issues of important environmental health concern by their design. Integrity goes hand-in-hand with being a scientist. Let the management and political appointees figure out how to fund scientists without meddling in the study design, implementation, and interpretation. "
ORD	A combination of clearer and agreed upon protocols for risk assessment (and other decision making) and review that is based in large part upon the science (e.g., external peer review) and less review by EPA management and OMB that is clearly a policy implications review. This could involve requiring a sign off by the entire risk assessment team, managers, and reviewers that they agree with the decisions made in the document based on the available scientific studies.
ORD	Currently the office of the AA of ORD generally has been having direct scientific input in the nature of NCEA documents. The progress of our documents has been held hostage to his direct pressure on scientists to take a document along certain specific directions. The AA who is subject to considerable political interference should not be allowed to have such a significant role in the outcome of our documents.The OMB is being allowed to have a significant role in the outcome of documents. This also needs to stop.There is at present a SAB peer-review process for NCEA documents which, in principle, is all that should be needed in addition to internal Agency review from Program Offices. "
WATER	Set up an arm of EPA that provides independant non-political data and analysis on the state of the environment. Something akin to the Energy Information Administration or Bureau of Labor Statistics etc. This would be separate from the political arm and could serve as the basis for decisionmaking. Reduce the role of the Office of Public Affairs in releasing information to the public. Change the role of the Office of General Counsel to be more supportive of programs. OGC does not provide information to programs to help stay within the law or meet the requirementof the law when developing new programs. It seems to only tell you when something you propose may be in violation of the law with no advice on solutions. This siffles innovation particularly when you are looking for new and innovative ways to solve and environmental problems. Scientists and engineers are not often familiar with the intricacies of all the laws impacting Federal workers and having access to CONSTURCTIVE upfront advice would be helpful. OGC is often adversarial with the programs and there appears to be no recourse. Everything in EPA is set up around regulation. For programs that use innovative methods such as partnership or volutary criteria these rules serve as unnecessary constriants since the goal of these programs is to imlement mutually beneficial solution.

REGIONS	Admit scientific findings into the administrative record without manipulation so they are available to the public (who paid for this work and should have access). Clarify the role of scientific work (among all decisional influences) in management decisions instead of changing the scientific work to support the decision.
OPPTS	Require immediate supervisors to have technical competence equal to or better than the average of those being supervised. We presently have some branch chiefs and a division director who are not respected by much of the staff. It may sound arrogant but someone who has undergone the significant expenditure of time and effort required to obtain a Ph.D. does not take well to being treated like an inferior by someone with less education and also less experience. This is not to say that only Ph.D's should be promoted into managers of scientific units (many Ph.Ds, myself included would not be good managers), but whoever gets those promotions needs to have the respect of those who will be supervised. It is not good when it is perceived that the way to a Division Director position is to have spent time following around a higher level manager as a 'special assistant.' People who have followed this path are always looking to see what answer those above want to get, not what is scientifically defensible. We have also had imposed on us a requirement that we refer all outside inquiries from reporters and such to our communications people. I expect that if someone calls me for information that I will trust enough not to disseminate incorrect or misleading information. I also think that it is reasonable that I report such contacts to my management. "
ORD	Oversight of political appointee actions by Congress. Objective appraisal of research -- too often there is a political agenda, both by the Bush administration and by their opponents (e.g., Barbara Boxer's rants in Congress). It doesn't help when neither side will listen to facts / data because their minds are already made up to make a political point."
ORD	Make a more distinct and explicit separation between results of analyses and the risk-management and regulatory decisions made on the basis of analytical results. There is a tendency in federal government for regulatory and policy decision-makers to shift the burden and blame for difficult science-policy decisions onto the results of scientific and expert analysis. Perhaps the area of greatest abuse is cost-benefit analysis. OMB and Agency political appointees exert an inappropriate degree of influence in shaping regulations and the supporting administrative records (which may selectively represent the relevant scientific, economic, and technical analyses). "
ORD	Remove political appointees from OMB, and significantly change the ""PARS"" evaluation technique to determine ""effectiveness"" of research programs - In my opinion, this has been selectively misused to eliminate or scale back politically unpopular research."
WATER	Allow scientific findings to solely dictate scientific decisions instead of allowing political influences to skew outcomes.
OPPTS	Some separation between risk assessment and risk management would be most needed. Currently, risk management controls, often in subtle and creative ways, risk assessment and hazard characterization. Often times, branch chiefs are acting as risk managers ensuring that, regardless what the data say, complete approval is granted. And often times, there is a feeling that politics (in subtle ways) plays a big role in risk assessments. For instance, there is some degree of selective judgement and cherry picking practices for selecting risk assessment reviewers (or changing them midway) as well as for selecting studies, endpoints, and interpretations for risk assessments. While integrity of the process was paramount in the past, the culture has changed (in the past 5 years) in favor of quick resolutions and acceptance of all registration requests irrespective of quality or completeness of specific studies or requirements. Employees who comply and find creative ways (at all cost) to approve the pending registrations are rewarded positively while those who want to place scientific integrity in the driver's seat are passed on when it comes to promotions. "
OTHER	Political bias has entered EPA from the bottom up rather than the top down. This situation/condition might seem counter intuitive and politically biased. However, over the last 20 years, I have observed a hiring pattern that excludes objectivity and rewards political correctness particularly with the enactment of the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) - 1996. This statement alone might be interpreted as environmental heresy but consider a situation where hiring and rewards might be skewed to strict obedience to "proving" the tenets of an act or law rather than testing the null hypothesis. The EPA is not at fault here and the administrations have changed over the years (liberal/conservative - come and gone) such that administrative manipulation cannot explain the abandonment of the scientific method for a cause or pursuit. "
OAR	Backbone by political appointees to present EPA's best scientific judgement, not tempered by outside influences"

OPPTS	We are being forced to register pesticides rather than regulate them. We are pressured to use incomplete and faulty data so that the registration can go on. The contracting-out process is expanding so that the politicians will be able to get the results that they want.
REGIONS	Continually work at keeping political misinterpretation out of neutral, factual scientific findings.
REGIONS	A requirement for EPA scientists to write memos into a specific case or rule file that explains the original scientific basis for the action (rule/case). There must be a rule that prohibits managers' retribution of scientists based upon the content of such a memo.
REGIONS	Keep environmental politics out of science.
REGIONS	There are still good scientists producing good science at USEPA. The main problem I see is an administration that considers science only if it supports its agenda. As in other areas, science is used only if it furthers preexisting policy; otherwise it is ignored, marginalized or suppressed (e.g. climate change). Also the survey structure forces single responses when more than one response can be appropriate; e.g. "The EPA is acting effectively to clean-up and/or mitigate existing pollution or environmental problems"; this is sometimes true (e.g. for specific cleanup sites) and sometimes false (e.g. climate change). Please acknowledge this.
REGIONS	Compel a scientific factual and judgement record that is discoverable and FOIAble. Provide cross regional peer review at scientific level with no interference from political level. Improve hiring and contract practices. Invest more in monitoring and data analysis, especially in house"
OAR	Keep OMB out of our regulatory process. Re-open libraries. Have independent scientific review of agency findings - right now, findings go up through political appointees and meanings may be changes, documents and information withheld or delayed, key information omitted. Provide EPA with adequate resources to do its job. Give EPA Cabinet-level status so we are out of the direct Executive Office line."
REGIONS	Studies should not be altered in any manner and even if the results do not match one's own preconceptions the results should be written up and sent for peer review and publication. Management should not be able to suppress study results which do agree with their preconceived notions of what is actually happening or how a chemical reacts in the environment or what the Agency should be focusing on.
REGIONS	Full and open disclosure with the public. Tell the entire truth (instead of always working for a particular spin and only reporting that info which supports the spin). Decrease the influence of political appointees. Open up decision-making meetings to career civil servants, and actively engage people with different perspectives in the planning/design and decision processes. Control the power of OMB to a reasonable level - OMB does more to waste time and taxpayer dollars than any other organization in the government."
OTHER	1. Reduce interference of other federal agencies (and white house offices) in the development of scientific documents. Legitimate scientific comments should be part of the process, but comments motivated by other agencies' policy or budget concerns must be treated differently. In instances where other federal agencies are in effect part of the regulated community, they should be treated as such. 2. Broad acknowledgment that there is a science policy element to risk assessment. Scientific data can never give policymakers all the information they need to make decisions. Risk assessment inherently involves application of judgment. All parties involved in the process need to allow EPA the leeway to make those judgments necessary to produce risk assessments; otherwise, EPA will never be able to complete risk assessments, with the consequence that there will be even less of a role for scientific information in the policy process. Endless review processes and more and more analytic requirements are slowing the whole process down to a near-stop. I strongly urge that the report that comes out based on this survey explicitly address these issues - i.e. the key scientific work products from EPA are not 100% science, their purpose is to bridge the gap from science to decisionmaking. "
OPPTS	Change the Agency data quality act procedures so that the final arbiters in disputes are chosen from career professionals rather than political appointees. Change the culture among the SES staffers so that they are encouraged to stand up for good science instead of dancing to whatever tune they hear being whistled by the political appointees. Find a way to keep OMB from being the driver of policy adoption through its oversight of regulation, and keep OMB from steering policy through budget decisions.
REGIONS	New political appointees and senior management that support the EPA mission. Less administrative burden, especially that coming from the Deputy Administrator. Get OMB less involved. Congress do major analysis and release information - do it quick before all the good scientific staff leave the agency."

ORD	Let the scientists determine the research direction and not the special topic of the week or year as determined by the political power or congress. Provide support (Staff, instruments, and travel) to do the research. Stop Earmarks and appropriations to various special groups, associations and universities. "
REGIONS	EPA is by mandate a regulatory agency charged with protecting human health and the environment. To restore the integrity of scientific work at EPA, political appointees must be removed from all levels within the Agency. Those appointees influence ranges from subtle to direct manipulation of statutory/regulatory actions. Further, the influence of other agencies, particularly OMB significantly affects the actions of specific individual program offices, which amounts to direct oversight of almost everything EPA does. These influences, are not limited to manipulation of the results of basic scientific work, but from everything from how vigorously the Agency pursues oversight, weakening guidance and enforcement of statutes/regulations that are detrimental to human health and the environment.
WATER	Decrease number of political appointees that are in EPA. Increase funding in monitoring all media and increase oversight of the large amounts of grant funding that goes to states.
OTHER	Do not allow managers to interfere. Hire good scientists and managers based on their merit and not perpetuate mediocrity. Reward scientists whenever timely and good work is done and not who plays the game best,"
OPPTS	Stop listening to politicians, the Agency has performed some incredible turns on issues when feeling pressured by the powers that be. Increase the morale of the employees by providing incentives for growth. New hires, at least among scientists in my area are few and far between (no hires in almost 10 years)and the shrinking and aging employee population is more looking forward to retirement than providing ideas that work and will make a difference, because nobody seems to really listen. With almost 20 years of service and experience, I am still one of the youngest employees in my area. Science management, when existing, is bogged down in administrative chores and doesn't seem to provide any effective scientific guidance."
WATER	Scientists, specially senior scientists, should be allowed to do their scientific work without interference and then asked to explain to the management how they came to the conclusions that they did. The managers should not micro-manage scientists."
REGIONS	Reduction in EPA HQ oversight
OSWER	Eliminating routine reviews and opportunities for rewrites by political appointees
OSWER	stronger penalties for violations of the EPA Order on Scientific Misconduct.
ORD	ORD AA should not be a political appointee.
REGIONS	The current administration has declared war on EPA in one particularly effective and subtle way. The paperwork requirements, particularly surrounding money, has become so burdensome so as to keep us from actually doing our "real jobs". The pressure to toe the line the administration has drawn on many scientific issues is pervasive. This has been the worst I have seen things in 20 years."
ORD	The White House and very upper management does not listen to their own scientists.The PhD researchers have extremely few support people remaining, since none have been hired for many years. This results in the researchers having to do everything, when in the past they had someone working for them as lab or administrative support, or both."
REGIONS	Political appointees being held accountable by an ombudsman-type person who will make public instances of political over-rides of scientific/engineering judgements/recommendations.
REGIONS	independance from political influence, and from business pressures to senior management"
REGIONS	EPA needs more managers with science and engineering backgrounds. Over the last ten years, there has been a definite trend to hire and promote managers that do not have technical training and know little about the subject matter they manage. These non-technical managers are easily influenced by politics."
REGIONS	Make EPA a commission like the SEC so that there are no political influences.

OPPTS	Take the politics out of it! As in any institution, allow people to develop and respect institutional knowledge and culture that is keyed to the objectives and mission of the institution. EPA has had administrator who worked toward these goals; but of recent, we have lost ground. Why, I believe we have been making change to accommodate the new generation of managers and workers. "
REGIONS	Remove the politics. We all jump whenever a congressperson calls. Make the EPA head and Regional administrators non-political appointments. It's been much worse under the current administration. At least in the previous administration, it was clear that the administrator wanted us to do good work at improving the environment and applying scientific principles to it. The EPA administrators under this administration seem to look at the work as a stepping stone to higher political ground, and it's not too clear that they even care what we do. The other, non-political problems are administrative. We have a bizarre management structure that is designed to count beans, and if there are no beans to count, we invent a system to count something. And our administrative help (e.g., ""secretaries'") don't actually provide any administrative help, at least not in my division. We could use a management system overhaul. Thanks for asking!"
OTHER	Allow the Agency to have the authority to make the decisions. For the past six years, the White House has made most of the decisions that EPA should be allowed and is qualified to make.
REGIONS	EPA policy should be driven first by science, and political interference should be made more transparent. The problem can be improved by putting in place clear policies regarding the review and editing of EPA guidance, policy, and regulations. Over the last few years it has come to pass that OMB typically provides non-sensical political edits to every technical guidance coming out. (Not just the ones we hear about in the news, but ALL of them.) This is often done behind closed doors--after the document leaves the control of technical staff (even after final sign off by the official FAR committee), OMB/White House request EPA management to make their requested political changes as EPA technical edits, before officially submitting to OMB for review. For an example that was thrown back by the court--see 316(b) Phase II rule. EPA technical staff could not justify many aspects of the rule, because they were last-minute OMB changes with no basis in science or the policy development contained in the Rule development documents. This rule was remanded by the 2nd Circuit, and EPA has stayed the rule now. Clandestine political interference has severe consequences, by hampering EPA's ability issue regulations that can stand up in court, for example.
ORD	Currently, in the program I'm in, inordinate delays in the finalization of Agency documents is the biggest problem. In some cases, it seems that documents never get finalized, particularly due to the many review steps that have been added -- senior agency officials (political appointees), inter-agency (including potentially responsible parties) and OMB reviews, and extended peer reviews with repeated calls to go to the National Academy of Sciences for additional review. Thus, the integrity of the scientific work can be best improved by removing the additional layers of review and keeping to the most basic and necessary -- review within the EPA by agency scientists and decision-makers, independent external peer review, and public comments."
ORD	INVESTIGATE THE ROLE OF POLITICAL APPOINTEES AND OMB IN INTERPRETING SCIENCE AND TECHNICAL PRODUCTS OF THE AGENCY SCIENTISTS TO SUIT THEIR POLICIES TO PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT INSTEAD OF SPECIAL INTERESTS.
REGIONS	More funding to support research that is independently peer reviewed. No interference from political appointees.
REGIONS	Adequate staffing so that employees have time to do thorough, high quality work is important. Proper facilities, including re-establishing EPA's network of libraries is essential to give staff sufficient access to information. There needs to be a mechanism such as an independent panel of scientists to shield the results and conclusions of scientific research from being compromised by political pressure, but I do not have any more specific suggestions as to how this could work."
OAR	Distinguish the science from the policy, so that there is less reason to ""adjust"" the science to fit the policy desired. Muzzle OMB, or at least require them to put their ""scientific"" concerns into writing."
REGIONS	more reliance on independent peer review; distance political appointees from influence in scientific inquiries
REGIONS	Allow publication of scientific work that has been peer reviewed to be published without other federal offices' concurrence.
REGIONS	Peer review processes rather than political appointees' review of the science. When decisions are made for political reasons (which is sometimes the case) the politicals should assume the responsibility for the decisions and not try to change the scientific findings.

REGIONS	Reduce extent of OMB involvement/input and review in Agency policy; Strengthen FOIA implementation -require much faster response, revise and minimize exemptions; Revise process of populating SAPs to engage broader range of perspectives, not just Agency favorites; Pursue realistic measures of success that are grounded in biological process time, not political time. "
OAR	The integrity of EPA's work (regulatory, scientific, and at the intersection of the two) is impaired by the ease with which interested parties are able to use OMB, the White House, and Congress to intervene in EPA actions at a variety of levels. Such intervention is frequently not transparent and is thus off the radar screen of the public, interested NGOs, etc. Aggressive and attentive use of the Freedom of Information Act by NGOs and members of the public, however irritating it may sometimes be, may focus much-needed light into the dark corners of bureaucratic process where scientific integrity may sometimes suffer."
OTHER	By removing the layer of political appointees that insulate the hard scientific facts EPA has found with that of the real world. Significant budget cutbacks have also hampered the ability of scientists to complete their work and possibly even the quality of work.
REGIONS	Maintain or increase resources; facilitate best available outreach for dissemination of information; ensure politics don't come into play in decisions that would detract from the conclusiveness of scientific findings
ORD	Depoliticize this "independent" agency! Strengthen rules requiring EPA to follow technical advice. Significantly increase funding -- and mandates -- for EPA to support public education about its mission. The more people know, understand, and care about what EPA is here to do, the more pressure there will be for EPA to do the right thing. Provide a research budget that is good for five years rather than two. Significantly decrease the amount of pressure to demonstrate immediate and direct relevance of each project's findings to current agency goals. Restore EPA's ability to fund exploratory research. Thank you for this survey.
REGIONS	A note on my response that EPA sometimes provides misleading, inaccurate, or incomplete data. My only experience has been incomplete data. I have never been directed to falsify anything but have objected on several occasions to a lack of candor and/or failure to include all information so that the public can make an informed decision. The integrity of EPA scientific work could be best improved by removing politics from the process. Political appointees and administration policies create most of the fluctuations I see in EPA's approach to presenting and interpreting scientific data."
REGIONS	In the process of setting national environmental standards, the consensus opinion of scientific committees should not be overruled by political appointees. Management should not assign staff to write technical reports, requiring significant time and effort, and then fail to approve the documents for public release. This is a waste of resources and very demoralizing to staff. Management should not direct staff to water-down responses to FOIA inquiries from community groups and citizens. Currently managers opt to restrict information rather than release it, whenever this option is available to them. "
REGIONS	Allow the publication of research in peer-reviewed literature without internal review by political appointments.
ORD	Make EPA an independent agency without regulatory authority; eliminate political appointments. Make EPA's mission to acquire relevant information/data that addresses current and future environmental problems. All EPA studies and research are to be open to the public unaltered by management. That is, separate in completely different government agencies risk assessment from risk analysis."
OAR	the Bush appointees are still stopping and altering new (proposed and final) regulations that have or appear to have a connection to climate change and stopping the posting of routine information on the web in accessible forms Only a sea change in the administration's policy would help to allow us to promulgate statutorily permitted/required regs (see Clean Air Act Section 615 and its legislative history) to effectively reduce emissions of greenhouse gases. We had the clear authority BEFORE the Supreme Court ruling. No one wants to use it. No one wants to admit it is there. But it is.
REGIONS	By external groups highlighting inconsistencies in the findings of scientists versus how these findings are represented by political appointees for policy purposes. Also, OMB and the White House have, in some cases, compromised the integrity of EPA rules and policies; their influence, largely hidden from the public and driven by industry lobbying, has decreased the stringency of proposed regulations for non-scientific, political reasons. Because the real reasons can't be stated, the regulations contain a scientific rationale with little or no merit.

ORD	Reduce/remove obstructions to work flow in the production of health assessments. There is too much internal review before work products are released for public review and too many attempts to change scientific conclusions before peer review.
OTHER	Reducing the arbitrary involvement by OMB in every document or scientific finding EPA attempts to produce. Reducing the number of political appointees with ties to OMB and the white house who have an agenda hostile to the EPA's goals and mission. Increasing funding and reducing strictures placed on EPA scientists to allow them to continue doing the best environmental work possible.
OAR	Improve funding of all EPA work, especially emissions monitoring and emissions factors development- Hire vacant positions- Listen to and work with ALL stakeholders- Lessen the influence of political appointees and groups with an inordinate and inappropriate amount of input, such as OMB and OPEI- Institute fair, honest, and open hiring practices
OPPTS	More resources, less political influence, especially from WH, including OMB & CEQ"
REGIONS	Scientific work should be fully-funded, with results communicated in a timely fashion, and without ANY political interference from within or outside the agency."
ORD	Keep OMB within their range of authority and to their deadlines.Prevent top-level management from editing draft documents that end up either being delay tactics or completely unnessessary given the next stage of review by the public before becoming final.
REGIONS	Leave the politicians out of it (especially during the World Trade Center disaster)
REGIONS	Move EPA HQ out of the Beltway.
OPPTS	The integrity of the scientific work is fine. "Oversight" and interference by political appointees in the executive branch, e.g. OMB and by Congress (both sides of the aisle) are what comprmise and delay moving the scientific work into policy and regulation.
REGIONS	Don't let politics get in the way of sound science. Examples are the EPA HQ stand on Climate Change and the Dick Cheney Cutthroat trout endangered listing reversal
OAR	Reduce polictal interference at high levels. Restrain Office of Management and Budget. This Administration has not only watered down important rules protecting public health (I've see this happen first had with the PM2.5 Implementation Rule), they have also altered internal proceedures so that scientific findings are accorded less weight. For example the staff paper used previously in setting the NAAQS review has been eliminated."
ORD	Administrators would be elected based on merits and not political affiliation. OMB would not have the power to comment on and delay EPA scientific assessments. Laws would be passed to make it more difficult for members of congress, industry, and non-profits to hold up EPA assessments (though they would be allowed to comment).
ORD	Stop allowing political employees and OMB to be allowed to 'regulate' what EPA scientists do. Just let EPA scientists do their job, we are well qualified and be trusted. "
ORD	Eliminate OMB and CEQ interference in EPA science, prevent political appointees from inserting themselves into controversial science issues. "
ORD	EPA scientists do a good job of producing high quality, objective scientific data and conclusions and are generally supported by Agency officials. Obstruction comes from political influences and oversight by the Office of Management and Budget."
ORD	Let scientific results stand as they are
REGIONS	The integrity of EPA's scientific work could be best improved by shielding, to a greater degree than at present, scientific documents from being modified or blocked due to content conflicting with administration political positions. New executive level restrictions on the issuance of new scientific/technical guidance must also be removed.
WATER	By not letting political pressure, economics or any other external factor influence the work.
REGIONS	Limit influence by political appointees and OMB
OPPTS	Remove OMB from scientific reviews. Limit number of political appointees in scientific organizations. Allow data to drive conclusions, separate politically motivated policies from results and conclusions offered in scientific materials. Politics are not science.

ORD	Remove review any review by political appointees and their ability to punish through means such as redirection of funding
REGIONS	Get rid of all political appointees.Fund the scientific work.
OTHER	Take the politics out of science. Senior EPA leaders and White House officials over the past 6 years have use "junk" science along with biased opinions to make bad environmental decisions. EPA needs to be fully funded to perform its mission.
REGIONS	Adequate funding for studies and personnel and a hands-off policy by political appointees not not acquainted with science or the scientific method.
OSWER	Less political involmnet and an increased budget.
OAR	As long as the political process is highly influenced by those interests with huge sums of money to fund political campaigns and the Agencies mission includes the regulation of those entities that belive they have the most to lose from those regulations, there will be a significant pressure on the political appointees in EPA to listen to the concerns of those lobbyists representig those entities. Also, since the Agency does not have the funding to conduct the scientific work needed to conduct the quality of scientific work needed to support the conclusions in the scientific work, the Agency is partially dependent on work by others including the regulated entities. This is not a problem with the EPA but also with HHS, OSHA, DOE, DOA, FDA and other Agencies engaged in Public Health and Welfare projects. If the US wants to have an independent objective evaluation of the Public Health Impacts of products where commercial interests are involved the US can not rely on the fox to study how to protect the hen house."
OAR	More funding and less political oversight - our ability to implement programs based on the best science ebbs and flows with who is in the white house.
OPPTS	Reduce the use of contractors.Increase resources by 10% a year.Hire more scientists.Reduce the number of political appointees, and influence from the White House."
REGIONS	Minimize political interference. Stop rewarding SES and other senior managers for hampering integrity of scientific work. Some oversight and disincentive for malfeasance is appropriate. Bring back numerous employees that have left or have been reassigned because they wanted to display integrity of scientific work. Provide better protections and rewards to environmentally minded civil servants that display integrity inspite of the risks to their career.
REGIONS	Increase the percentage of professional staff who have advanced scientific training and industry work experience. Require that EPA supervisors have the scientific background needed to make decisions about the projects and programs which they and their staff manage. Insist that all appointed EPA officials be environmental experts of some sort with demonstrated management skills--political hacks need not apply.
OPPTS	Removing political appointees and ensuring adequate staff and funding levels.
WATER	Keep the political hacks out of the decision-making process.
OPPTS	Remove politics, but that is never going to happen."
REGIONS	Remove political appointees from science management.
REGIONS	Less interference of all types in using data to make policy decision
REGIONS	Keep political appointees from interfering in scientific decisions or publications. Do not allow political appointies to pressure authors to withdraw from publication or pressure their supervisors to carry out actions that inhibit publication. Further, attempts to foment inappropriate reviews to prevent publication.
REGIONS	Remove the political factors
REGIONS	No editing for political reasons.
OTHER	Reduce the political influence from those decisions.
ORD	Severely limit the numbers of- and the roles of political appointees.

OTHER	Replace the political level managers
REGIONS	Stop the political meddling. For example, as soon as Bush took office, Bush directed EPA Admin Whittman to rescind the newly issued arsenic drinking water standard (I believe he used the term 'take another look at the science') not knowing that she had signed the exact same arsenic standard when she was Governor of NJ. No science - just politics."
REGIONS	So much deference is given to delegated programs to the states. Some of these agencies are run by elected individuals (like commissioners) and are highly political. EPA is very reluctant to strongly confront states on issues or policies that are scientifically questionable.
ORD	No Bush and/or Cheney in the White House.No political appointees --especially non-scientists -- in key positions that influence EPA policy.
REGIONS	Keep the hands of politicians or political appointees off scientific reports, but allow divergent scientific opinion. Encourage amicable discussions between scientists of divergent views and encourage them to develop jointly a research or testing program that would provide compelling evidence for one view or the other. "
ORD	Base funding decisions for resources and promotions on science and productivity rather than politics and favoritism.
REGIONS	Keep the politicians out of it.
REGIONS	Change of political administrations so that issues like global warming can receive the full attention that they deserve. Also, don't use political hacks to subvert the process. Why are we appointing someone who works for a business council to oversee our mission. See the most recent of Bush's political appointees to EPA.
ORD	Get rid of the political appointees.
ORD	Less pressure by the administration determining appropriate areas of research for scientists.
ORD	The scientific work at EPA has integrity. The political climate that keeps the research from being reported and/or tones down the results, and the political decisions that keep important research from being planned and implemented has increased significantly"
ORD	Eliminate censoring of science by management
OTHER	less political pressure and carriers dependent on obedience to political appointees
REGIONS	The question implies a lack of integrity of scientific work. I disagree with the premise of the question. Prior to 2001, there appeared to pressure from political appointees to interject specific extremist political views into scientific decisions, which finally stopped in January 2001."
REGIONS	By decreasing the amount of political influence on decisions that should be based on the preponderance of scientific facts
REGIONS	No big deal--just let us do our work. The problem is the EPA is part of the political process where there are different interests, needs, budgets, and issues--someone has to pay, someone will feel ignored and some things will or won't get done"
REGIONS	Keep politics out of it.
REGIONS	Have more integrity at the political appointee level
REGIONS	By setting specific measures by which political appointee's cannot interfere directly with the results of the peer-reviewed scientific work.
OAR	Political appointees should stay out of it. I'm at a low enough level in the agency that I see little of that sort of interference, and I think there is relatively little in my division. But I am aware of the problem, especially in the current administration.
REGIONS	Allow the scientists to publish their findings without recourse and without input from any political party.
REGIONS	keep the politics out of scientific research. Allows the work to stand on its own merits
OPPTS	Adjust regulatory timelines to allow for the best scientific input - decisions are often made without full science input due to deadlines. Removing sources of potential political influence from the science-based decision-making process would also be beneficial.

OPPTS	reinforce the ideal of environmental stewardship
REGIONS	Leave out the politics.
WATER	Managers need to learn to trust the expertise of the technical staff. I don't know how to accomplish trust in an environment of distrust and uncertainty, so I have no expectations that this will change. It is the nature of politics to be distrustful, and we are a part of the Executive Branch of government.
OAR	decouple politics from science as much as possible (the political appointees wield much power).
REGIONS	By keeping the political appointees out of the decisions.
REGIONS	Politics outside of the EPA have a great effect on the ability of the EPA to achieve important goals of environmental and health safety. EPA is not the sole organization in charge of establishing new regulations against companies that are a severe threat to public health and environmental protection. If EPA was the sole organization, this country would be much safer than it is today--as far as industrial accidents, pollution, human health hazards, etc."
REGIONS	EPA's scientific work is still good. Overall policy is interpreted differently by each administration. Political considerations should not trump environmental stewardship, and the EPA should not be forced to be silent on the environmental consequences of policy shifts."
ORD	reduce the influence of political appointees
REGIONS	Eliminate White House interference. It is obscene to have all EPA decisions, papers and press releases go through a highly charged political machine whose first objective is to squash anyone or anything that disagrees with their partisan objectives. They have set back the reputation of EPA and the environmental objectives of this country a decade(an example is the Global Warming issues).
REGIONS	confining political influence to the levels/positions where they have to manage it. in recent history, career managers & executives at epa are trying to anticipate the demands of the political appointees/pressures. the result is that the political influence is now within the ranks of epa where it does not belong."
REGIONS	Eliminate the politics. ?Reduce the fear of pleasing upper management. The opportunity needs to be there to educate the political appointees as well as the politicians who are often requesting information or action without complete knowledge.
REGIONS	We have experienced harassment from congressmen but not to the level of changing results, only greatly impeding our work. "
WATER	Keep the political appointees and THE WHITE HOUSE from micro-editing and/or changing text and wording.
OTHER	Sans politics.
REGIONS	The findings of scientific investigations should not be influenced by politics or the interests of wealth and power.
ORD	The integrity of scientific work produced by the EPA could best be improved if there were less layers of politicians and managers between the scientist and the regulations; less paperwork, more facts."
REGIONS	Allow scientists report their findings without interference from political appointees. Develop and implement laws that would allow for criminal prosecution of political appointees that interfere with or try to suppress or distort scientific truths for political purposes.
OAR	I believe there could be less wordsmithing, particularly in regards to climate change issues."
ORD	Elect a new administration in Washington D.C., and make political appointments to the EPA of individuals who believe in scientific integrity, and actually believe in protecting humans and the environment."
ORD	Remove or retrain the one manager that caused the one problem that I know about.

OPPTS	I believe EPA would be more effective if it weren't so heavily scrutinized by politics...protecting human health and the environment is vital, not political. Unfortunately, it seems as if some EPA scientists wait for law suits to be filed to finally achieve success. "
REGIONS	Remove pressure to arrive at pre-conceived conclusions
REGIONS	Protect staff scientists from political interference and retaliation of political appointees.
WATER	Stop using political appointees.....
REGIONS	Remove political influence on the dissemination of scientific findings or other information
ORD	Clearly science is being politicized unlike any time that I can remember. It's not just a problem at EPA but throughout government. Perhaps a change in leaders at the highest level of government might help.
OSWER	Getting rid of the political appointee process (and the political appointees along with it)
REGIONS	Remove the Bush administration. Have Senate reject political appointees with clearly partisan experience/credentials, plus approve only those with appropriate technical credentials."
REGIONS	Prevent political appointees from forcing an administration's agenda on career federal employees and stop contracting out work to the private sector.
REGIONS	Reduce (or eliminate) the number of political appointee's that are in senior management positions. Legislate limits on the influence the OMB has on EPA science.
REGIONS	EPA needs to be an independent agency and the amount of political interference needs to be curtailed. Science and technical information needs to be given more weight in decision-making rather than just seen as a background information.
WATER	By removing "merit-based" pay (as determined by the political appointee) for the Office Director level---the last non-political/career level of Service. By having Office Directors dependant upon the views of political appointees with regard to their salaries/compensation it creates an environment that subtly encourages "going along" with the political spin. The OD level at EPA used to reinforce strongly with DDs and below that their job was to be objective in their analyses and in their recommendations---and that we should leave politics to the political appointees. It's not so any longer.
WATER	Training for scientists on legal defensibility. Less blatant political involvement from Executive representatives such as OMB and CEQ.
REGIONS	less political influence from both political parties
OPPTS	Remove political appointees from the process. Give the Agency the quasi-judicial, quasi-executive and quasi-regulatory authority it needs in order to protect human health and the environment. Reinvigorate the protect the environment portion of EPA's mission (relative to protecting human health).
REGIONS	let science speak for itself, try to keep politics out of it.
WATER	More trust of staff findings and less inappropriate risk management.
REGIONS	Don't let politics dictate to science.
OAR	eliminate the oversight/ tampering of the White House CEQ

## Funding and Staffing

REGIONS	<p>1. Adequate funding for both core regulatory and research programs - do away with earmarks that reduce effective agency funding in a ""stealth"" manner.2. Overturn the recent presidential Finding on whistleblower protection NOT extending to gov't workers under CWA, NEPA, etc.3. Reverse current political bans on new regulations."</p>
ORD	<p>Upper management is horrible. We don't have any resources to develop scientific collaborations, and when we try to recruit resources externally, or work with colleagues either within or outside the government, there are just endless bureaucratic obstacles. Its virtually impossible. There is near zero help internally to navigate an endless maze of senseless obstacles to doing research. Our division doesn't have a single person that understands the rules that actually drive collaborations with our colleagues. And a lack of understanding always translates into ""NO"". I find the only way to do science is to pretend your not doing science. And the trend it towards more bureaucracy, more management, and less science, even when resources overall are declining. I do not feel free to work for protection of the environment. Everything has to be driven by layer after layer of non-scientific planning. Our system is just a huge mess. My best work is done on my free time, at home. I try to keep my head down as much as possible, and what I know regarding political influencing of Agency decision making is from the news media, not from personal experience. But I can say from personal experience that the trend is in the wrong direction -- resources, integrity, and moral are deteriorating. "</p>
ORD	<p>1. By a management that values science and scientists more than administrative and budgetary issues.2. By fewer daily distractions from time spent by EPA scientists on Science. 3. By a funding mechanism for science that is simpler and more stable (quit "sweeping" 2 year funds after one year or less). 4. By a management that listens to the needs of scientists and actually does something about what they hear. 5. By reducing regulation of the scientists (specific areas include speaking to media and requirements for animal studies). 6. Empower principal investigator scientists.</p>
OSWER	<p>By diminishing EPA's reliance on contractors and grantees to perform scientific work; for the last five years or more, only about 17% of EPA's annual budget is to fund the salaries of EPA staff; the other 83% of EPA's annual budget is used to fund contractors and grantees. The use of contractors and grantees to perform scientific work introduces cost- and time-inefficiencies into EPA's scientific work, compared to conducting the same work by EPA employees. Such inefficiencies can arise from at least six sources (a) because of physical dislocation of the work outside of EPA, EPA staff are unable to micro-manage on a daily or weekly basis the extramural scientific work, which thereby places all micro-decisions on the progress of the scientific work in the hands of contractors and grantees, rather than EPA staff; when it comes to conducting science, micro-decisions often can have huge impacts on determining the direction and ultimate success or failure of any given project; (b) contract and grant approaches to conducting scientific studies are inherently biased towards the "deductive" methodology orientation, because EPA staff are required prior to initiation of the work to provide contractors and grantees with a statement of work that prescribes the scope, analytic methods, datasets, and level of resources for any given scientific worktask, prior to its start. Consequently, this pre-start requirement crowds-out the "inductive" methodology orientation which is often more fruitful than deductive approaches in generating new scientific knowledge, by avoiding overly prescriptive instructions at the onset of work which thereby frees the scientist to follow unanticipated discoveries and pathways in conducting the science, including constructing new knowledge from inspection of data and phenomena, rather than collecting data to meet existing knowledge; (c) all EPA contracts and grants require EPA staff administrative time to initiate, oversee, and close-out each and every contract and grant worktasks, which automatically adds overhead costs (e.g., of at least 10%, and in some cases over 50%) to the scientific work, compared to conducting the work in-house at EPA which would avoid most of the added administrative paperwork costs, (d) because most of EPA's scientific work is authored by contractors and grantees, EPA can easily, but unfortunately for US taxpayers, avoid responsibility for its scientific work products as well as deflect scientific controversy surrounding its work products by making disclaimers "this scientific work product is the product of EPA contractor XYZ; its findings and conclusions do not necessarily represent the policies or opinions of EPA"; (e) by regaining ownership of EPA's scientific work away from contractors and grantees, EPA will re-acquire the critical scientific knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) in its own in-house staff, which will enable EPA staff to be much more time-responsive and cost-effective in formulating and communicating answers to public questions about its scientific work, by avoiding the need to route such questions through external contractors to generate answers; and (f) regaining EPA staff ownership of EPA's scientific work away from contractors and grantees, will reinvigorate (restore) the excitement and prestige of EPA staff as world-class scientists, rather than as bureaucratic dullards</p>

	managing contract and grant administrative paperwork.
ORD	Less top down control of research. More stability in research direction, mission and funding. More stability in leadership. "
OTHER	provide increased funding for high-quality research on ecosystems and water quality, and on risks to both from point and non-point source water pollution, especially biological pollution;- remove from positions of senior authority those who direct agency human and financial resources to support a free market, politically-conservative, ideologically-driven approach to environmental protection. This approach severely underfunds and constrains agency staff from conducting the kind of research that could result in policies and actions that more effectively prevent and/or mitigate critical national and international environmental problems like (1) global warming and sea-level rise, (2) increased agricultural use of fertilizers and pesticides, causing non-point source run-off and high nutrient loads to waterbodies,(3)limited understanding of risks from many chemicals to which everyone is exposed; the agency needs to promote a spirit of free inquiry about basic scientific questions while directing many more resources than it currently does toward better understanding the risks to human and ecosystem health of many chemicals making their way into our food supply, drinking water, and wastewater streams via vectors like personal care products and prescription medications.
ORD	more funding and oversight from Congress better responsiveness from ORD to program officeseliminate OMB better managers at the Center level in ORD
REGIONS	Changes in political leadership, support from Congress, budgetary appropriations and allocations, political appointees, regulations, guidances, policies.
ORD	Make the EPA head a nonpolitical position, and fund basic research to a greater extent with the budget being independent of senate or house interference. (pipe dream!)"
ORD	1. EPA should fund the various parts of the Agency based not on competition among/between the divisions and offices but on activities and outcomes that are the result of cooperative work. An overall competitive-based model for all workplace efforts should be replaced with a cooperative model. This is a belief I have that I know is not championed by our male dominated Agency. For more success and greater integrity--work cooperatively, not competitively.2. Use more of a bottom up approach for EPA officials (decision-makers) and rely more on the highly experienced and professional personnel (both scientists and policy-based) that are present in the Agency. This would help keep politics out of policy-making activities and keep the infusion of the best and most current science coming from the scientists.3. Somehow the driving force for EPA personel should NOT be for their own career advancement, but rather for service to better the Environment (with a capital E), afterall we are the Environmental Protection Agency. I see too much focus by staff from the lowest to the highest ranks to be for their own careers and NOT on advancing the best science and policies. This latter problem causes the integrity of the scientific work and environmental policies to be compromised."
ORD	We have far too many non-technical or semi-technical exchangeable managers, many with a propensity to micro-manage. They are clueless in understanding critical scientific points. The current crop in our Laboratory are determined to emphasize getting patents and doing buzzword-driven research, and are incapable of caring about or understanding the fundamental missions of EPA in protecting public health, giving state-of-the-art advice to the public. They totally overwhelm senior staff with menial and mundane paperwork that costs us 20-30% of our work day time, doing QA plans that are thicker than the research projects, ordering lab supplies ourselves, constantly working on ""research plans"" to mollify some fuzzy-headed non-science managers who are afraid to let scientists and engineers do work. EPA used to (20 years ago) have the reputation of being the first place to go for new info. Now it's off the map and below anyone's radar in many fields because it has fallen into this rut of ""me, too"" research that's too late and too superficial. That is the hallmark of weak and ill-equipped managers, who push an ""interchangeable"" staff model. You can't have

	cutting-edge science if all of the staff can be shuffled around. That means no expertise. There is also zero hiring of mid-level professionals, so it's a hollow shell. Top-level researchers, and low-level technicians or contractors needing hand-holding. There is no mentoring of a new generation of scientists. The managers don't understand how scientific teams work--many equal researchers with complementary skills, bringing their strengths to bear on a research problem. All of the burden is on the senior people to do everything from fixing instruments, ordering supplies, doing graphs, figures, statistical analyses, modeling, graphics, word processing, etc."
ORD	Improve support for science activities Hiring new Federal (NOT Contract) staff including administrative support staff. Reduce administrative burdens and allow us to concentrate on science. Reduce contracting (our in house tech lab support, IT support and administrative support is a mess because of hiring contractors instead of federal employees) Get rid of political appointees and PART"
REGIONS	Decrease influence of political appointees, who may mean well but have not enough knowledge and understanding to make the right decisions. (I haven't seen any alteration of data and findings on purpose.) Provide adequate funding for environmental research. Provide technical training to scientists to help them keep up with science and technology. Provide more travel funds to allow scientists attend major conferences in their area at least once a year. Reduce administrative training and reduce red tape. "
REGIONS	1. An honest commitment to maintaining and enhancing technical capability; travel funds to attend meetings, symposia, etc.2. Return of the sabbatical.3. Refuse to make permit decisions when there is insufficient data/information to support a good reasoned decision. WE have poor regulatory decisions being made AND we are demoralizing our technical experts...""who cares if we are technically competent or develop better data sets, they aren't going to look at any data anyway..""4. Agency culture that actually embraced diversity, people who thought differently and actually acted on those thoughts, not just the PC acceptably diverse."
OTHER	Your questions are oriented towards how science that must be done is carried out. A more critical issue is what's not getting on the EPA agenda -- like global warming. The best single thing would be to stop OMB's meddling. The next thing would be to improve the budget so, for example, the measurements and monitoring can be done to support decisions on needs and progress. This is currently being cut. The next step is to reduce the administrative burden on scientists and engineers which wastes so much time and good will. Accountability is one thing; growing demands for documentation, shrinking support, and un-friendly software is a very devious way to cut the effective technical staff of the EPA in half. Or worse."
REGIONS	More accountability/infrastructure/funding in our peer review, quality management and information quality guidelines programs. With heavy emphasis on programs and data generated by our state delegated programs. Too many state agencies/scientists are influenced much greater by the political process than government scientists and much of their data is used in regulatory development. Yet they seldom have travel dollars, training and quality infrastructure to get the job done right."
WATER	Allow for a larger budget for training opportunities. Encourage ALL staff to interact with one another in order to obtain a basic understanding of what others within EPA are doing. Provide field experience to rule makers so they know as to what exactly they are regulating.
ORD	Stop the micromanaging of the research and the smoke and mirrors. Hire non self-serving senior and mid-level management. Provide adequate funding for projects, research equipment and travel. Stop dictating politically correct research and let the scientists work on issues important to the science. What is really needed is an over haul on how EPA plans and conducts research. "
ORD	USEPA needs to hire more people to replace the many people who are retiring, get more money to do more in-house and less extramural work, and streamline all administration functions so that these duties occupy as little of researchers time as possible. USEPA produce objective scientifically sound work. USEPA is able to hire the most technically sound people and give them the monetary, IT and equipment resources to perform good work."
REGIONS	Increase staffing and resources to support the work we do; decrease all the administrivia (redundant reporting requirements, etc.) that is put on our shoulders because we no longer have adequate administrative support staff.

ORD	Less bureaucracy. Also, most of the so-called ""support"" (e.g. funds, contracts, grants, QA, etc.) are ""gotchas."" They are not designed to be helpful, but just another ""hoop"" for scientists to jump through. This seems to have worsened since we converted a bunch of secretaries to ""administrative"" positions. A well run program would have the administrative people do the paperwork and support the scientist. At present, I seem to be working FOR them."
OSWER	Establish independent review board to oversee.- Congressional/Official investigation.- Conduct review of EPA upper management decisions/actions during last 10 yrs.- Encourage and provide support/funding for staff participation in professional scientific organizations; establish tracking system to ensure.- Make upper management accountable.- Make findings available to the public.
ORD	1. Funding increase for tools/basic new scientific equipment -state of the art.2. Building more lab space as opposed to administrative space to help us address/solve real world problems as encountered to help us deal with current and future issues whatever they may be.3. Improved dissemination of information out from the agency useful to the public i.e. through websites, guidance materials for assisting communities, training aids.4. Library system improvements/increased library facilities. Taking away library facilities is ludicrous.
OTHER	The scientific integrity of EPA scientists could only be improved by attracting and retaining more - or better trained employees. Generally, it is not the integrity of EPA scientists at issue - rather the integrity with which responsible action is taken or mitigation efforts are implemented.
ORD	As the work force retires, hire the best possible scientific minds to replace the aging scientists and researchers and provide them with highly trained technical assistants to achieve top quality research results. Emphasize the importance of good quality control to ensure results are accurate and reproducible. Include the technical assistants in the project planning in order to get practical information up front to avoid problems and issues in the implementation of the project plan later on."
REGIONS	More funding for relevant field work. More in-house training for EPA staff to conduct scientific efforts and projects.
OTHER	Executive delineation of EPA's primary areas of responsibility (where EPA is the ""go to"" authority on issues).Congressional funding with less administrative burden.Increased opportunities for collaboration between scientists in government, education and industry."
ORD	1. Stop cutting EPA's research budget and intramural research staff. 2. Improve hiring and recruitment of research and support staff. 3. Reduce administrative burdens on scientific and science management staff.
OPPTS	The agency needs more financial resources in training/IT areas to more systematically and efficiently archive its records and provide access to scientific articles and other similar databases. There does need to be some more external scrutiny of what the political appointees in this and all other regulatory agencies are doing/have done - but their impact in the pesticide arena is much less (in my opinion) than in others...
REGIONS	I think that EPA scientists and most of their work is regarded as having integrity. Perhaps that perception could be improved if EPA scientists had even more resources and encouragement to work with academic scientists and the most objective and respected scientists from the private commercial sector.
REGIONS	A larger budget to fund helpful research and data gathering, allow replacement of staff who leave, provide training opportunities, allow participation in conferences and meetings in US and abroad, etc.
REGIONS	Give us back our library and ensure that we have enough funding for training, workshops, travel, and classes. Also, ensure that we have funding to hire outside contractors to perform work that cannot be performed in-house, be it technical or administrative."
OAR	increase funding to allow for well designed and implement studies; promote publication of results in high quality, peer reviewed journals; promote collaborative investigations with other Federal agencies and with academic and other research organizations.
REGIONS	adequate funding, increased cooperation, less contracting"
REGIONS	Provide training and travel dollars together to send personnel to scientific training/classes/meetings. Require a certain amount of training per person every two-four years.

REGIONS	<p>1. Requiring meetings between special interest groups/stakeholders and EPA appointees and/or high level staff to be public.2. Funding EPA so that there are enough staff persons to cover the work load. This removes the appearance of inconsistency that occurs due to our current inability to cover regulatory and oversight responsibilities consistently.3. Increase public relations funding so that EPA can effectively communicate with members of the public at the regional level. Most PR funding is held and controlled by HQ.4. Creating a national database of environmental monitoring data that is available to the public. These data would include atmospheric, water, waste, and soil measurements required by all regulatory programs. EPA Reports would be based on these data that the public could see.</p>
ORD	<p>Get the White House, industry and OMB out of what is suppose to be science-based decisionmaking. Honesty from political appointees such as Steve Johnson about the based for decisions, rather than reinterpreting the science to support the decision. Stop having OPPTS funded by industry via the EPA's registration or reregistraion of toxic chemicals and pesticides."</p>
OSWER	<p>1. By adequate funding of projects.2. By reduced OMB interference in develoment and application of scientific analyses in EPA decisions.3. By reducing the cozyness with and pandering to industry by senior EPA managers.</p>
REGIONS	<p>More actively seek, support development of and implement environmentally beneficial actions with more emphasis on enforcement and compliance to complement the current cooperative collaborative industry inclusive approach. More clearly recognize and articulate the likely environmental consequences of continuing current developmental, industrial and cultural practices. Additional resources (staff, travel and extramural funding) to promote environmentally beneficial outcomes. Greater attention to public outreach concerning the significance of and solutions to environmental issues. Less linkage to and support for maintaining existing energy/industrial paradigm while recognizing the natural and expected role of government to regulate and balance unchecked resource use and consumption.</p>
ORD	<p>Increase resources (funding and personnel). Decrease the number of political appointees. Reduce influence of White House and OMB on decision making. Recognize costs of new regulations are easy to estimate, while costs of improvements in health and the environment are much more difficult.</p>
OPPTS	<p>Relying more on science and less on politics for decision making.Better planning of research to meet programs' needs.Less paperwork.Larger budget.</p>
OSWER	<p>EPA management needs to be much more knowledgeable about the science they are supposed to be directing. Some of the problems stem from complete ignorance about the underlying science of the programs they manage, which makes even well meaning managers susceptible to influence by faulty information..Often the purpose of the bureaucracy seems to be just to perpetuate itself, not to make a difference. Turf battles and competition between middle managers ensure that true programmatic progress seldom occurs..Within the my program, there is a very dysfunctional relationship between the HQ and Regional programs—all sides contribute to the problem, but there seems to be little effort to address underlying issues to attempt to improve the situation. These dysfunctional relationships damage the Superfund program as a whole. I've seen decisions made by HQ management just as a way of taking the path of least resistance when dealing with a "difficult" Region, no matter what the science said or how much money will be wasted by following the Region's wishes, which incidentally were developed by, and for, the benefit of the Regional contractor. And HQ management knew all this. .As our division loses technical staff thru retirement, etc., we are not allowed to replace them, severely compromising our ability to accomplish our work. Altho our amount of work continues to increase, our resources we need to do the work is constantly decreasing. .I know of a current instance in another office where a highly technical position (that is critically vital to the mission of the waste programs) is soon to be vacated by retirement. An appropriately educated &amp; experienced GS-13 person was identified and found suitable for the position. However, before the hiring was finalized, EPA management decided that hiring someone straight out of school as a GS-7 would be much cheaper, and that the pending retiree could provide training before leaving, which is completely unrealistic. It is like saying "we don't need a real astronaut to fly the space shuttle, just let an astronaut sit down and explain everything to a college grad, and the grad can fly the shuttle." As a consequence, the expertise that supports adequate measurements of contaminants in the waste programs is being gutted. The purpose of this expertise is to ensure that analytical chemistry methods stay current with science advances and keep up with emerging contaminants. Now that capability is being lost from the Superfund, RCRA, Brownfields, and Underground Storage Tank programs). .New directives &amp; administrative procedures are being handed down from above as ""cost-cutting measures,"" but which actually have the opposite effect and make our jobs even harder and more stressful..I participated in an internal EPA study on what EPA needs to do to ensure a competent</p>

	workforce in the future. There is no promotion potential for scientists and other technical people (even those recognized as international experts) unless they are willing to give up doing science to supervise other workers and fill their time with administrative duties. Yet, the personnel policy says there should be..Many project-level managers do not have the education & experience they need to supervise the quality of the science & engineering that EPA contractors are supposed to be doing on EPA's behalf. Contractors make project decisions that benefit themselves by being as inefficient as possible, and the project managers let them get away with wasting massive amounts of money, even tho this means taking funds away from projects that really need it. It is an "open secret" among project managers and other staff that this routinely happens."
ORD	We need a considerable decrease in the middle manager positions in ORD. Take a look at the increases in FTE positions at RTP vs. the bench scientists positions at RTP and the remote divisions over the last 15 years. Way too much shifting of focus from actually doing science to doing nothing but planning and dog/pony shows conducted to impress the clients (OW, OPPT, OWOW, etc) but provide very little substance. EPA needs to return to supporting true science for the creation of sound policy. Being supportive of complex research projects for only 1-2 years before changing courses is not enough."
ORD	To appoint senior managers based on expertise and not political connections. To have money budgeted for research that is not tied to line items (which we have no discretion or oversight) and take money from base research programs.
OSWER	Increased funding. Increased ability/flexibility to conduct surveys and other data collection activities.
REGIONS	Hire more experienced scientists from a diverse selection of high-level institutions and backgrounds.Promote a more rigid and onerous standard of science, as the FDA once did.Terminate the policy allowing or encouraging non-EPA government representatives to publicly contradict EPA findings without citing independent studies of equal scientific rigor."
REGIONS	Implementation of existing policies for peer review applied to state water quality monitoring and assessment programs.Use of more effective water quality indicators in Clean Water Act listing decisions. Many decisions are based solely on comparison of water column chemistry to numeric criteria, although this is probably the least effective water quality indicator.The National Surveys of water quality conditions are a big step in the right direction."
REGIONS	1) Better support for ORD, libraries (regional and others), for projects to review data sets and data quality. 2) There's a disconnect at the regional level between policy makers and scientists and little credit given to data review and assessment to feed into decisions. 3) Lack of congressional support to up-date, reauthorize environmental legislation is a shadow over all work. 4) Hdqtrs push for ""measures"" without acknowledgment of need to assess data collections breeds panic and lots of make work assignments turning out meaningless indicator documents."
REGIONS	For one, stop cutting back on the scientific work that is being done."
OPPTS	More support of in-house research and development. I am in a program office that deals with applied science, but research should not be contracted out. Cutbacks in the number of positions in EPA laboratories (technicians for example) and the cuts in the grants program that fund research for cutting edge research in academia have hampered our mission. "
OAR	Increased budgets to do more science related work, either with EPA staff, or contracted. Insufficient funds to answer science questions for the public is the biggest challenge we face. For example, we don't know the health impacts of Green products, but we don't have the budget to find out. So, we continue to use cautionary language when advising industry and the public about IAQ & Green issues.
REGIONS	Study and act on relevant issues with sound methods and adequate resources. Policymakers, even political ones, still should have the latitude to make policy decisions, but they should acknowledge when and why their choices may fall short of what the science tells us. For example, instead of ignoring climate change, senior officials should acknowledge what science is telling us, but acknowledge that the tough and costly choices should be made by Congress.

REGIONS	Allow staff scientists the freedom to strive toward meeting the agency's mission - to protect human health and the environment. Stay focused on the core programs and apply environmental protection evenly throughout all states - no exceptions. Allocate appropriate level of funding and resources to protecting the unseen resource - groundwater.
WATER	More scientific independence and resources
ORD	Fear of delays required to accommodate OMB review influences what we do. OMB reviewers are not qualified/do not have the mechanisms to appropriately review our work. Excessive costs associated with external review taxes money spent on doing the science. We need staff/post docs.
ORD	Provide sufficient resources to allow the scientific staff to do their job without undue administrative burdens being imposed on them. Also provide sufficient staffing for communications and public outreach to better educate the public on environmental science and the outcome of human actions on environmental conditions and services.
ORD	1) Remove OMB from the process of deciding what is good science. 2) Restore funding so that we can replace retiring scientists 3) Reduce excess review of research plans 4) Restore funding of ecological programs
REGIONS	My division of EPA should more effectively use its resources to leverage more environmental cleanup using scientifically appropriate techniques. A lack of resources and motivation leads to a lack of effort toward doing cleanups (specifically) and taking actions that consider diverse environmental implications. This could be improved if my division spent less time on training and large policy directives and more time on actual projects that serve to improve the environment, directly addressing pollution incidents."
OAR	Independent funding & staffing for assessment projects could make them more independent of the regulatory process. But our real problem isn't interference, it's lack of data. EPA is no longer funding substantial data collection in my area, so we pick up a data point here and a data point there from studies designed for other purposes. Then, of course, there is lots of interpolation & extrapolation, and more room for bias. While I'm wishing, getting a budget before the fiscal year is more than half done would really help our planning."
ORD	In my position it would help to have more tech level scientists (GS 11-12) to help with bench work which would leave more time for experimentation and analysis of data. It would also be useful to have a person in the branch specifically designated to manage requisitions. It would be most helpful to be able to feed information about your PR to a person and have them manage the PR process. I spend entirely too much time with paperwork and contracts along which causes me to be behind in my lab work.
ORD	Seeing studies through to their "real" completion as opposed to projected timelines -- seems as if the moment we are really getting somewhere the funding is being rerouted to another issue du jour. Science takes time!
ORD	We seem to have a continual reduction in resources. Many of the EPA staff that I work with have been with the agency for 20-30 years and want to retire but haven't due to financial reasons/personal reasons. This results in a demoralizing work environment since many of them do not want to work here any more. In addition, a frequent occurrence in EPA is major shifts in research directions (at times outside the expertise of the existing staff), this has resulted in bitter EPA staff. Working at the EPA we have lots of rules to follow, which are time consuming and delay publication, but I have not experienced EPA officials trying to suppress or change my work. It is more just bureaucracy since our agency has a regulatory component. Overall in my experience EPA is a good place to work if you like working on applied problems. "
ORD	As with many federal organizations, more resources are needed. These resources would support more research performed by committed EPA scientists rather than by inappropriate contracts. Further, more resources would allow current EPA staff to train the next generation of EPA scientists to conduct scientific research of high integrity. Currently, many EPA scientists are forced to serve as scientists and contract managers in order to accomplish the minimum amount of work."
OPPTS	additional time for scientific work- additional resources (library, informational)- additional connectivity with other federal offices (eg USDA, FDA)- additional computational and report generating tools to automate routine work- additional computer tools to automate administrative duties "

ORD	Funding EPA scientists is decreasing while funding external scientists is increasing through an academic grants program, and is currently out of balance."
OPPTS	Competent management and adequate funding
ORD	Reduction in bureacracy that slows/hinders science, increased funding/staffing to address larger issues"
REGIONS	Restore budget cuts, library and other research resources and eliminate duplicative, time-consuming administrative burdens!"
REGIONS	Remove roadblocks to issuing or updating technical guidances. Remove roadblocks to updating toxicity information on common contaminants (IRIS). Increase funding -- some of the strange cleanup decisions at regional levels are being driven by reduced funding and there's a lot of pressure to make and justify cleanup decisions that are cheaper but which we know are technically inadequate. Technically-based policies are gradually being either ignored or undergoing subtle re-definition to support weaker decisions. Also, gradual staff reductions due to attrition are making it so everyone is too overloaded to do good work. These are the things I've noticed happening in the past 5 years.
ORD	By taking scientific work more seriously and making the EPA Science Advisor a much stronger position, rather than being a dual position as head of ORD. Ideally, the Science Advisor would have independence similar to the Inspector General. Some regulatory offices ignore peer review, use contractors instead of working with EPA scientists, or work with scientists in their own groups rather than with ORD scientists. The perception is that they would prefer to have control over the scientific content rather than subject it to more objective scientific scrutiny. The budget for science within EPA has been slowly eaten away by inflation and higher personnel costs. Highly experience people are leaving, and there is no way to fill those positions except through post-doctoral positions, which are temporary. There has been, and will continue to be, significant loss of capability unless this trend is reversed. It is death by a thousand cuts, and because the cuts are not drastic in any one year, they largely go unnoticed."
OAR	The Agency is producing best science possible for the available resources, that means adecuate science. EPA could do better science and regulationd if proper resources and infrastructure are provided. The resources available and opportunities in that institution clearly are reflective in the kind and quality of science performed. There will always be a political factor in a regulatory agency. It is up to us to allow, or not, factors other than science to influence the overall process."
ORD	My experience is that there are increased administrative hurdles and more time and positions spent on defending our existence. These really seem to be stalling tactics or tactics which intended or not take resources away from science and put them on the administrative side.
REGIONS	Funding for peer review.
REGIONS	More resources devoted to quality assurance and peer-related reviews of in-house data would improve the integrity of the EPA information.
ORD	1. Restore and increase the budget for research, development, and application of science--significant cuts have been made throught the guise of OMB's PART2. Restore and increase the budget for research grants (STAR grants) here also, significant cuts have been imposed because of OMB's PART3. Take action to act on findings from independent expert panels that review EPA science and research (such as CASAC and BOSC). Increasingly in the past 6 years, these panels routinely issue written reports about the need to strength EPA's scientific workforce--and yet EPA leaders and Congress appear to ignore recommendations from these independent experts. "
OTHER	The EPA internal review of scientific related documents could be improved. Perhaps because of the lack of staff/time, internal feedback from one EPA office to another is challenging and often request feel like an imposition on another's time. "
OPPTS	Increase resources used to develop data. Increase time to review data and conduct analysis. Increase personnel assigned to research. Maintain independence.
REGIONS	Adequate funding, better communication to the public."
REGIONS	Briefings on findings should be public noticed and published. Libraries with the technical support staff should be restored. Recommendations from NACEPT, SAB and other FACA committees should be acted on in a timely manner."

WATER	Get rid of many of the administrative and procedural roadblocks in administering grants and contracts that have been imposed over the past five years.
ORD	Strong independent peer review, attention to conflict of interest, transparency of process, and explicit rationales provided for final decisions.
ORD	Current funding of research within EPA is becoming too small to adequately protect the people and environment of the US. In addition, larger and larger parts of the research budget are set aside for the "earmarks" of legislators. Why do these lawyers think they understand science better than real researchers? Both lack of funding and earmark projects compromise the ability of EPA ORD to do our job to protect the environment."
ORD	Budget resources consistently with value that is verbally indicated by management in response to scientific reviews, e.g., NACEPT. Too many outside scientific reviews can significantly reduce the amount of progress achieved by EPA researchers. It takes an incredible amount of resources to complete each scientific review. Although the OMB PART process does help the Agency to focus on the impacts of its research, it is designed to evaluate types of goals that are not necessarily part of effective research. EPA research is not like some MBA's evaluation of the effectiveness of service by an agency like social security. At best, the process is inappropriate. Many times it is desired to calculate an important outcome such as lives saved as a result of some basic research that is undertaken. Rarely is there a direct cause-and-effect relationship. The evaluation of impacts requires the use of several +/- 30% estimates to get to the end point. The result of this calculation may not be meaningful. The individual researcher or team of researchers is forced to find and use estimates to evaluate cause-and-effect that are well outside their field of expertise as inputs to the evaluation. This is another bureaucratic black hole for expenditure of Agency resources. The OMB reviewer uses the resulting input from the researchers to recommend program funding. Since the results of such a calculation could be totally incorrect, the resulting funding recommendations could have nothing to do with the inherent value of the research. Given such imprecise input, the OMB reviewer could be easily driven by political pressure within OMB or could make their own subjective decision. The administration could kill anything it wants in such a situation.
REGIONS	A dedicated stream of funding. If there are congressional earmarking for projects, then those projects should be funded with a separate pot of money and additional staff should be hired to address staffing needs. Reducing bureaucratic hurdles, for example, it is a tiresome procedure to buy equipment for projects due to fears of external questions, for scientist buying things from professional scientific suppliers, this should be as simple as a phone call, if the funds are there, instead of several pages of documentation and forms."
OPPTS	(1) Systematically hire more scientists who are highly qualified in critical disciplines to accommodate the loss of senior scientists who will be retiring over the next several years.(2) Keep EPA an independent agency.(3) Continue to provide rigorous oversight of EPA by the U.S. Congress, GAO, and EPA Inspector General's office.(4) Provide EPA with annual budgets that are at least adequate to support the many missions and responsibilities of the Agency.
WATER	Include broader range of stakeholders in advisory committees. External review of OMB influence/impact.
REGIONS	Hire more scientists and engineers
OPPTS	Need more staff, more time to think, less hectic schedules. Generally, our scientists base decisions on sound science.
REGIONS	Hire and support a stronger technically trained staff.
OPPTS	Change of political administration PLUS significant increase in funding
WATER	More funding to support research work
ORD	MORE FUNDING! We do NOT have the resources to meet our mission. My division has seen its resources - in purchasing power- cut over 50% since 10 years ago. I have lost 20% of my staff due to attrition with freezes on hiring because EPA does not have the money to cover people's salaries and benefits. My ability to work with outside grantees, collaborators, and contractors has been cut by more than 80%."

ORD	Provide more money and positions to all the research to be done to get answers to inform regulators
ORD	The limited staff and funding of the Office of Research and Development is insufficient to address all the technical needs of our main clients the Program Offices and Regions. As a result, there are times when ORD does not have time to address problems in sufficient depth."
REGIONS	More money in the budget to get the job done right.
REGIONS	More funding to help bring in new and highly motivated scientist. In my time with EPA I has seen the agency move away from hiring highly technical scientist and engineers to more generalist that manage contractors to get work done.
ORD	Provide sufficient funds for scientists to actually do the work.
OPPTS	Embrace & seriously recruit more experienced & qualified "real" scientists w/ significant, current, hands-on laboratory experience into the mgmt. positions, especially the laboratory areas, not these "25 years ago" scientists ( ie; the last time they were actually working or employed in a laboratory setting, doing lab work) Better utilize the experience & institutional knowledge of the Agency, across the board, thru mentoring newer hires, especially P H of Ds. The worse thing that has happened, especially in our laboratory, is the hiring of too many PHDs at higher grades who may have 'book smarts' but no real real world experience. They are untutorable & don't know their way around the labs plus their work is suspect since they won't take instruction nor have good lab techniques. They are sloppy, fast & quick & dirty. Their data may not stand up under quality data audits, etc. "
ORD	I believe the current QA/QC requirements by the division I work in are sufficient to retain integrity of scientific work, as long as the scientists in question are honest. Funding is a major issue for getting research accomplished in a timely manner. Cuts are not helping the environment, nor are they helping the scientists to do their jobs. Short cuts should not be taken, in any regard, and I have not seen personally that they have been."
REGIONS	adequate funding of EPA and it's resources in-house (i.e., travel dollars, appropriate levels of available shiptime
REGIONS	Have more scientists and engineers (instead of Environmental Protection Specialists - which have no required formal education).
ORD	An increase in funding, even a modest increase, would allow for increased work hours and better quality assurance measures."
ORD	Hire more scientists and engineers into the federal civil service work force. Currently, the existing group of federal employee scientists/engineers is stretched thin."
OPPTS	Increased resources/money from Congress.
ORD	By providing sufficient resources to allow the researcher to do an effective job. There has been a steady erosion of both dollars and funds over the past 5 years, effectively diminishing the ability of our workforce to meet the environmental challenges we as a nation face."
REGIONS	This statement assumes that the EPA scientists are not producing work that is credible. I beg to differ. The integrity of the work is fine. The problem is that the senior management does not always allow the scientific results to actually impact a decision; instead, they make politically based decisions. The only possible answer to this question would be that the scientific work could be improved if it were fully funded. This is a real problem (besides ignoring the scientific results)."
OTHER	More resources, more autonomy, more scientists training in public policy/political and other social sciences"
REGIONS	more resources
ORD	In my area of work, the main problem is that the amount of effort expended is woefully inadequate to take on the task at hand. Therefore, we are not able to provide an adequate scientific basis for regulation."
ORD	Improved ability to hire young, highly-qualified new PhD's"

ORD	more time, more money, more people
REGIONS	Increase the budget allocation of ORD-sponsored or commissioned scientific research and development.
ORD	increase funding to allow EPA to do enough work to protect the environment and public. change administration to make favorable to environmental protection
REGIONS	More internal EPA scientific work force (e.g., ORD scientists) doing the science needed for the Agency, rather than over ""outsourcing"" such research to academic and outside organizations (e.g., through STAR grants). Also, more funding support is necessary for our own ORD scientists in the Agency so that they can do similar level research for which other organizations seem to have more opportunities through EPA grants and contract solicitations."
WATER	If more resources were given to EPA scientists to complete their studies, then the integrity and credibility of their work would be greatly enhanced."
ORD	Provide adequate resources
REGIONS	stronger legislation, more resources for basic environmental data collection and analysis"
REGIONS	EPA needs to do more of the actual scientific work. We are often pressured to contract scientific work (monitoring and analysis) out. We could also use more EPA scientists with no profit motivation involved. Also, we need better analytical equipment to provide the best results with the most up-to-date tools. Lately we have not had enough funding. The integrity of our work would improve when we have funding to hire young scientists who can be trained to fill the void left by senior scientists who retire."
REGIONS	more resources
OTHER	by encouraging the recruitment and retention of qualified EPA employees who could build institutional expertise, instead of having environmental professionals manage contracts. EPA should have more discretion to spend its budget on FTEs instead of contracts and grants."
ORD	Provide adequate tools and resources for conducting researches.
ORD	(The integrity of the scientific work I have produced is equivalent to that of a major research university or governmental agency such as NOAA or NCAR.) Increasing the staff of productive scientists, particularly in the physical sciences, would probably help the most."
OTHER	By providing sufficient resources to conduct core research, and provide sufficient resources to retain core competencies. Some core research areas do not have sufficient resources to retain core competencies. "
ORD	Improve the ORD research budget to support intramural research. We need more technicians and small support contracts. Attention to Quality Assurance (QA) would improve with more support. Also, beef up the ORD Research Report to be of the high quality of the USGS Report series.
OSWER	Provide adequate resources and oversight by EPA scientists.
OPPTS	Bring back the two EPA libraries at Headquarters that were closed. Many journal articles are now available online, but these go back only about 20 years. Unfortunately, a large number of bound journals from the collection were discarded. The RTP Interlibrary Loan facility has been very good in obtaining articles and pages in books as the need has arisen."
OPPTS	The integrity of scientific work produced by the EPA can best be improved by hiring more educated scientists and keeping the work in house rather than sending it out to contractors.
OSWER	Emphasis on hiring folks with a scientific background.
OPPTS	More funding and scientific staff

OTHER	Provide the financial and human resources for scientists. For example, we don't attend conferences because of financial constraints. How would one keep in touch with research? We used interns in the past to do basic data gathering and secondary research. Funding for interns has been slashed and we can't have interns any longer. Therefore in addition to the burden of EPA work, one is stuck with the lit reviews etc and no money for hiring a contractor. The library must also be re-opened. Since its closure, some journals are just no longer accessible. Accessing books and documents is a no go area."
OAR	Better funding for more research.
REGIONS	Reduce or minimize top management political agenda imposed to lower technical levels. Increase top managers scientific background. Increase congress budget and appropriations to EPA. Allow EPA employees rather than contractors to perform critical scientific findings and recommendations. Top managers should equally devote time and efforts to management issues as well as scientific issues. The combination of science and management where science drives management determination is not exercised at EPA on a day to day basis. Unknown political agendas seldom drives EPA's top managers to deliver determinations ignoring some scientific based recommendations.
OAR	Quit cutting the budget and staff.
ORD	Provide adequate research funding and resources, including FTEs for laboratory support staff. Restore funding and support for graduate and postdoctoral training programs through cooperative agreements with local universities. Restore a proper balance between laboratory staff and administrative staff. The admin side has continued to expand at the expense of the lab side."
OAR	More resources to the scientists; collaboration with other scientific agencies in gov't
ORD	Stop doing continuing resolutions and fund programs on a consistent basis. Stop slashing services that made the EPA what it was (library closings are just one of many, this facility no longer supplies hot water to individual labs to clean glassware) This is too small a space to get on the ""soap box"". D.C. has given approval or made decisions directly opposite of what the ""experts"" (scientists most familiar) in the satellite-regions recommend. "
ORD	Scientific Integrity has always been the best at EPA. Additional funding will help in improving the the productivity.
OSWER	Provide more funding to do thorough analyses and job.
ORD	The basic problem with EPA-ORD is not necessarily integrity but scientific productivity, innovation, and vision. One way to fix this is to hire managers that are nationally and internationally recognized technical experts. Unfortunately, most of the managers/supervisors from branch-chief up in my Lab/Center were never great bench scientists. If you look at their publication record and citation impact of their publications you would find that most are not well published and their papers are in second/third tier journals. Actually, this is not unique to my lab but to ORD in general. Most high level gov research centers (NIH, DOE, DOD, CDC) are managed by folks that developed high profile research programs prior to becoming division/lab directors. If this is not addressed in the near future it will have an impact on the integrity. Another problem is accountability (researchers can spend funds for many years without real research products, including publications) and the lack of technical support (too many PhDs and few technicians). We have hired too many PhDs in recent years but management does not provide them with techs nor the necessary infrastructure and funds to develop competitive research programs. Moreover, managers seem to be hiring more immediate office assistants rather than researchers/techs. As a result we end up subcontracting lab work. With extramural funding predicted to go down in the years to come, this option will not be available to the researchers. We will end up with lots of PhD spending more time doing dishes and administrivia (this is another area that has increased significantly in the last 5 years) rather than focusing on research. We need more managers that understand the many tasks associated with developing a research program; many of the common duties of bench scientists (reading and writing papers, developing proposals, analyzing data, communicating findings with colleagues, etc) and the time it takes to tackle them seem to be foreign to them. Overall this has an impact on the integrity of the research from the standpoint of the robustness of the results and the applied value of research program.

OPPTS	Typical budgetary constraints that plague all Agencies.
REGIONS	funding, of course"
REGIONS	Hiring more experienced personnel from industry instead of so many young fresh out of college kids...pay retention bonuses to keep the best scientists here instead of losing the best to industry where they get paid more.
ORD	Hire the best and the brightest
OPPTS	More resources! The agency needs additional staff, and especially scientific staff to preserve the institutional knowledge that will be lost with upcoming retirements. Better integration between policy and science people will also help immensely. "
ORD	provide EPA with a budget adequate to do the work required.allow the EPA to hire full-time permanent staffrequire that senior ORD management have relevant education and experience
OPPTS	Additional resources in terms of FTEs and contract support.
REGIONS	While this comment may not be common, the best way to improve the integrity of scientific work at EPA is to examine the Agency's hiring practices. For example, you will find there are a vast majority of non-scientists working on technical issues. These non-scientists may report to a supervisory non-scientist who doesn't think to receive qualified peer review from within the Agency. Bottom line the EPA needs to clean-house and hire qualified technical individuals from accredited universities with advanced graduate degrees. A \$90,000 per year salary for a high school diploma is a disgrace when the deliverables are not of high quality. The entire civil service needs to be reevaluated and accountability needs to be the norm, not the exception. Years of service is not a reason to promote a person; rather, their qualifications and ability to perform quality work should be. The EPA is caught in a troubling circle right now where many non-scientists (non-degreed individuals) are promoting others like them. It is more rare for a qualified, well-educated modern individual to be hired. Not to mention that several attorneys and engineers are allowing their professional licenses to expire while they continue to purport themselves as professionally licensed. The administrators (not the SES or the senior managers) are looking the other way on these issues...but that's another issue."
REGIONS	Less contractors more qualified EPA staff
REGIONS	Provide additional resources, FTE and funds to implement projects. Catch up on climate change data and take a leadership role in promoting energy efficiency.
ORD	Stabilize research funding
ORD	More resources and FTEs! We continue to be expected to do more and more work, with less and less staff . . . Whenever one is forced to be ""a mile wide and an inch deep"", the quality of the work suffers."
ORD	More funding and staff are needed to allow more research and more comprehensive research to be performed. Recent budget limitations and unreplaced staff retirements have reduced the amount of basic research that can be done and has forced research more towards the applied needs of EPA program offices who have funds for research that addresses their regulatory needs.
REGIONS	Groups such as the Ground Water Forum and Engineering Forum through the TSP and NARPM should be better funded as these groups involve ALL regions. We need the contact among scientists and specialists to ensure integrity and consistency of our work across the country. The groups are getting more and more squeezed for funds as training budgets also dry up. This is of utmost importance as it will be a few years before the effects of these cuts accumulate enough to show that resultant site decisions were more costly or ineffective than intended.
WATER	Increase funding

OPPTS	1)EPA research needs to be much more mission oriented. The vast majority has little impact or utility for the Program Offices.2) Libraries - EPA program offices (OW, OSWER, OPP, etc.) don't do much research and little development, but they use a lot of scientific information. Reduced library access is crippling.3) resources - we currently do not have enough resources to do the job. Deadlines must be met, so quality suffers. Junior staff do not stay because the work intensity is relentless and no longer rewarding.4) So much work is contracted out that some offices have become contract clearinghouses and there is no in-house expertise in the subject area. Good management and decisions become impossible because no one knows the basic science anymore."
REGIONS	Providing more intramural funding for EPA scientists to be able to do Quality Assurance type activities on studies that produce data generated by non-government scientists , which includes College professors who are not always very good at producing quality data due to their not wanting to be bothered by quality control procedures on their own work. Whomever pays for a study gets to have a large control over the results because of the way you set up the study.
ORD	S&T funding has been slashed by nearly 40% in the past 6 years. This does not hurt the integrity of the science per se, but it undermines the ability of the Agency to support its mission with scientific integrity.
OAR	By better compensating scientists for their hard work to further the Agency's mission.
REGIONS	Increase resources and funding to employ the most qualified people to perform the work.
OSWER	More extramural funding for contract support.
REGIONS	political climate that promote environmental protection so that funding can be provided to support scientific work

## External Interference

REGIONS	Do not allow other entities, such as OMB, to interfere with, or suppress the publication of, EPA's scientific work products. Maintain an open peer review process, that may involve credible panels or groups such as the SAB or the NAS. Strengthen whistleblower protections for civil servants."
ORD	We have somewhat acceptable management but very poor scientific leadership (with a few notable exceptions); so, the replacement of current ORD scientific management (AA, Directors of NERL and NHEERL and some division directors and branch chiefs would help. Also, there has been a big tendency to hire the scientific leadership from those who had previous positions in industry or industry sponsored organizations, e.g., CIIT and this has caused to go from supporting public health to supporting industry views and attitudes."
OSWER	Scientific findings and conclusions are supported by senior EPA management and/or decision makers; publication of scientifically sound technical documents or guidance are not withdrawn or being delayed due to industrial influence.
ORD	Have "peer review" actually consist of review by peers--not lawyers, not people hired specifically to repeatedly object to our work until we're just worn down, not people who won't believe us no matter what we say because they're anti-regulatory agency, not managers without scientific background (or who have been told what to say), not white house weenies. Scientific peers. Once we have real science again, have decisionmakers own the real decision The science said one thing but they chose to ignore it. When I was first at EPA (1988) we did good work but it was sometimes ignored. That was frustrating, but at least the work was there. Now it seems like they want the scientific work to match the preordained conclusions. In case you are wondering, I think peer review is a good thing--I've seen people too invested in their beliefs to see what their data are really saying--but OMB, with John Graham at the helm, seemed intent on rendering EPA and every other regulatory agency (FDA, OSHA, Mine Safety, CPSC ...) utterly powerless with its "Information Quality Guidelines." And although the administration chose Steve Johnson (a career scientist) as EPA Administrator, they sent Graham henchman Marcus Peacock over to keep a close eye on EPA as Deputy Administrator. Then there are asbestos, lead, New Source Review, regulating carbon dioxide from power plants and mobile sources, and ... And what's up with the ozone and particulate matter standards?
REGIONS	By returning the running of the Agency to a strong Administrator who is an effective manager who is trusted by the current administration. The current Administrator is a puppet operated by CEQ and OMB.
ORD	-Get some leadership that has the backbone to stand up to other's in the Executive Branch. -Get OMB out of the business of reviewing science--they do not have adequate staff or adequately skilled staff to provide a scientific review of everything EPA does
REGIONS	Administrators, Assistant Administrators, and Regional Administrators of EPA should hold degrees in science or engineering with proven experience and reputations for integrity at high levels of administration outside of EPA. The role of OMB is completely out of hand. The stranglehold that OMB has on agency rulemaking must be released. "
OPPTS	Trickle down integrity...Reduce management pressure on staff to make the desired outcome
OPPTS	Give Scientists more freedom to conduct risk assessments as they see fit. Stop pressure from managers to change risk assessments for industries' convenience.
OSWER	Sounds assessment of conflict of interest on incoming scientists. Hold same employment/work rules to scientists brought into EPA as those exiting. A scientist from industry who wrote against work EPA performed should not be able to come into the Agency and in less than a year lead that very same work.
OPPTS	i observe our scientists (health and eco) doing a good job and reporting the risks that they find. it is my opinion that the risk managers who use this scientific information work too closely with industry to make final decisions. it is like the industry position overtrumps the positions of our scientists. i am very encouraged by the recent selection of our new office director. i believe that this industry influence will now be more balanced.
OTHER	If work is conducted by universities, that that university department and none of its involved researchers, are receiving related private sector money or serve on boards funded by related companies. The full life-cycle impacts and the different pathways be as fully studied as possible, such that future studies don't discover unexpected impacts that weren't previously considered and hopefully studied.

ORD	Surveys such as this one are useful because they bring about awareness of the many subtle ways politics and science intertwine. I am still somewhat junior in my career to have witnessed much of this 'personally'. The 'en libra' principle ('balance'), put forth under the previous administrator, is somewhat of a euphemism for working closely with industry in my opinion. The agency is young and has adopted conservative approaches to err on side of safety, so it is due now to work with more closely industry, because they are quite frankly a depot of tech/science that can not be ignored. However, real balance requires maintaining interaction/presence of envr/health interest groups. Rosters left in meeting rooms with overwhelming presence of industry are evidence of skewed balance.
OPPTS	By not having private business influence.
WATER	Prohibit industry lobbyists, scientists, lawyers, and spokespeople from meeting privately with EPA managers, especially those at the division director level and above. This is particularly important in the Pesticides program, where all major decisions essentially require the blessing of the "regulated" industry. As an aside, there is the feeling among staff that individuals are not selected for advancement, especially to the SES level, if they have not demonstrated a sufficiently strong pro-industry bias. That is to say, industry has undue influence not only on major Agency decisions, but on the actual careers of EPA employees at the staff level. Being too "conservative" or protective can cost you any chance of advancement in OPP.
REGIONS	The kind of inappropriate activities you are talking about may go on at HQ, or on highly political, sensitive topics, but our regional office far away from HQ, and I have never experienced any of the inappropriate activities you have listed. Our management in our regional office has always acted with integrity, in my experience. I have noticed disturbing trends from HQ or above, like guidance needing OMB review, and sometimes a perception in our office that HQ staff feel the need to protect industry from those crazy enviros in our office, but I try to stay away from highly controversial, political, or sensitive projects, so I haven't experience any problems or concerns of this nature on my own projects."
OPPTS	EPA should be allowed to function independently of the political pressure/influence placed on it by the White House, Congress, and industry. Totally science based - free of bias.
WATER	Eliminate the political influence (largely via OMB, SBA and industry groups) that has created a general environment of always needing to caveat reports, policies, etc. so that they will not become lightning rods (and then EVERYTHING is lost). The general philosophy here is damage control, and trying to minimize back-sliding. There's absolutely no way to move forward. There are 2 operational paradigms 1) ""Under the radar"", or 2) put out something so ridiculously inconsistent with regulations that we'll be successfully sued by environmental groups, and new bad policies will not stand."
ORD	Less restrictive publication requirements and fewer delays, heeding staff scientists more, more application of probabilistic risk assessment practices (as OMB has recommended, but NOT in its draconian, inflexible manner)."
ORD	The Office of Research and Development has recently reached out to the Program Offices (those who write the regulations, policies and guidance) to help guide the research for the purposes of making decision that included scientific research results. This outreach is responded to positively only when an individual staffer takes on the responsibility of doing so. The Managers of the Program Offices claim to be too busy to work more effectively and closely with ORD. Few scientist work in many of the Program Offices and those who do are ignored over the dictates of lawyers and policymakers. Further, when rules are not supported with good scientific data, OMB takes a heavy hand in diluting the effiveness of the rule. OMB is an advocate of commerce, not the environment. The Program Office MANAGERS need to be help accountable for bringing science in early to the process. The Agency has a regulatory agenda on the timing of regulations that in many cases provides enough time for good research. Actually, the research should be leading the regulatory agenda -- ie, not the other way around. That is, if it is found through research that a regulation is not addressing the risks or harm, then the rule should be amended. I am currently working in ORD on Peer Review where science is given the highest priority and the process is working very well. My morale his risen because of this new venue in which I work."

REGIONS	Less specific direction from Congress and more focus on broad accountability for protection of public health and the environment. Fewer earmarks.- More accountability throughout the Agency management structure. - Budgets delivered on time (at the beginning of the fiscal year) with fewer restrictions on how resources can be used. This goes back to ""accountability"" The Agency can't be accountable for Congressional micromanagement. Conversely, if the Agency has broad goals and significant latitude to manage resources then Congress and the Administration can and should expect accountability to a long term plan (5 year plan with updates every 2 years) to effect improvements to public health and the environment. - Better recognition on the part of management that solid scientific data is fundamental to good policy making. - Recognition that EPA can only contract out services where it is competent and staffed to oversee the contractor. All too often the contractor is the ""expert"" and EPA and the public are poorly served because the Agency doesn't have the staff or the expertise to direct the contractor effectively."
ORD	We could be allowed to pursue avenues of research (specifically global climate change) that are currently off limitsWe could be given relief from the crushing administrative burden and allowed to actually conduct science and research rather than continually rejustifying our existence for OMB
REGIONS	In my work interference has come primarily in the form of imposing additional administrative requirements so that decisions I used to make in the field now must be made in Washington DC. In addition policy on thresholds for EPA action have been raised so that they ignore ecosystem processes. If such policies continue ecosystem collapse will result. The administration needs to let the science speak for itself in setting threshold levels of action.
ORD	It would be a good idea to have scientific work simply provide information. If a decision is political then that decision should be made based on the total honest and complete information available. I have heard that the OMB will force revisions upon published work until they get what they want. That's not science. That's not providing information. That's putting scientists into the politics of decisions by controlling the ""facts"". Most scientists want only to do science. That's why scientists withdraw from the business world and let MBA's control the other aspects of business that lead to large personal monetary rewards, even though it's the scientific advancement that leads to large profits for companies. The same is true of EPA scientists. They want only to do science. They withdraw from their work when they are confronted by a world that doesn't value their science. In the end scientists hold science as a good or truth, and it's not surprising, nor should it be surprising, that many leave when political force and maneuvers (e.g., in scientific revisions from OMB) are used control them. "
WATER	1. Limit OMB review of, and influence on, content of scientific/engineering data and information (e.g., in rulemaking and guidance development).2. Require more transparency in OMB review process.3. If we are going to have to justify all environmental policy/regulations/guidance through cost/benefit, allow us to develop methodologies to quantify nonuse and ecological benefits.
OPPTS	This perspective comes from my having played all the roles, scientist, risk assessor, regulatory manager, reg-writer. There are few "pure" scientists at EPA -- mostly in the Research Labs. There needs to be a different dynamic between the scientists, the risk assessors, the regulatory managers, and the rule writers. The scientists give the results of their findings. The risk assessors rate the quality of the findings and then combine all the information, and then weight of evidence the information to give recommendations to the risk managers. These two groups need to write clearly, and be clear about the strengths and weaknesses of the information. The regulatory manager combines the science with other perspectives such as cost and benefits. Science doesn't always win, but sometimes it is hard to figure when science should win - because the writing is bad, and the scientists take the questions asked to understand as a personal attack. The regulatory manager usually is the one preparing the materials to brief management. If the scientists are too busy on their next project, and haven't written clear rationales and don't participate, then the briefing gets muddled, and the wrong decision gets made. Then the scientists scream. Then the reg-writer is left with a mess, because as the rationales are put in the context of legal terms to meet the statutory mandates, then the arguments are weak. The scientists do very good work, but many of them write without clarity. They must understand that science is not the only driver at EPA. And, when you are competing, you have to play it smarter and harder. BTW - while I loved the library, the new service that was set-up for requesting materials via the internet is great, quick and responsive. Also, for your next survey look at OMB. That is a true source of frustration. They truly interfere and want to stamp the White House Agenda over every document that is sent to them for review. Truly few realize the impact that they have. They have hired their own scientists and play the my scientist is better than yours game. EPA has to accept a lot of **** from them to get any documents out."

REGIONS	Reduce all the administrative counting for counting sake rather than public health, and OMB second guessing regulatory standards and regulatory language needed to correct previous regulatory language."
ORD	More expeditious/efficient process (Clearance/review) to get important risk assessments completed. Less influence by other governmental agencies that run counter or try to change the science (my work hasn't personally been effected yet, but am aware of this occurring elsewhere periodically with high profile issues)."
OSWER	Remove the interference of OMB in the issuance of technical guidance. Mandate release of more data and draft documents to the public.
OPPTS	by having an administration that is really dedicated to protecting the environment, and by having less oversight by OMB."
REGIONS	The unprecedented and unwarranted influence of the EPA's scientific work and findings by the White House and OMB must end.
ORD	Keep OMB off our backs. They meddle in anything when it suits their political goals.
ORD	Get rid of OMB involvement entirely
REGIONS	Getting rid of the Office of Management and Budget and the Bush administration. Integrity in our regional office does not seem to be a problem - it's an issue at the national level.
OPPTS	By not permitting the OMB to get involved in vetting the decision-making process that we in OPP have made when we get around to issuing our post-Reregistration Eligibility Decision (RED) Data Call-Ins (DCIs) to the registrants for developing certain critically needed confirmatory data. The OMB seems to be slow-walking the process, even when ""everyone"" (including the registrants) has already agreed the data are critically necessary for final-decision making."
OPPTS	A few observations which are clinically important for the need to assess (validate) the relevance of laboratory studies for humans 1) Be less politically influenced by Congress, environmental groups and other. The studies we rely on are often misleading. Because of the lack of clinical human experience and backgrounds in scientists and managers, we have a tendency to exaggerate the importance of laboratory experiments as they might apply to the human situation. We use animal and laboratory data without validation (relating to human health) this hazard information in humans. In contrast, FDA spends much time testing in humans after they have done the preclinical laboratory studies. We use mathematical models to estimate exposures in diets, water media, occupational setting, residential settings, etc. without ever attempting to validate the information. We regulate on the bases of NOAELs which are very much below adverse threshold levels which are conservative estimates of safety which evolved from the safety assessments developed last century at FDA. However, we present adverse effects from high dose laboratory experiments and then discuss these effects in the media and scientific circles as though they have direct low level effects in humans at subthreshold use exposures. This is contrary to my medical training and the general use of medications and thousands of environmental chemicals when they are properly contained. Thus, many individuals assume adverse effects to low-level chemical exposures and then have psychogenic adverse based on the stress (fear) they have that they are being poisoned. The stress from these mind-body interactions is real for many of these individuals but would be preventable and treatable if the media hype was controlled. 2) I might note that many of the unanswered questions above as written do not apply to me and I could not answer them based on the choices given. "
REGIONS	Eliminate OMB interference.
OPPTS	OMB should stop interfering in EPA Science.
ORD	Remove OMB from the scientific and regulatory decision making process.
ORD	The agency's scientific work should not be beholden to OMB. For example, the cost of a life-prolonging regulation should not be considered; a budget agency should not force their particular risk assessment framework on a science-based agency; research programs should not be evaluated on their immediate (and impossible) outcomes. Highly trained scientists should manage the science programs and laboratories at EPA, not untrained individuals or cronies."

OAR	Through less politically-motivated interference, particularly from OMB. OMB is increasingly interfering in earlier stages of projects (as opposed to review of draft documents and conclusions), sometimes insisting on methodologies that are less credible than those selected by EPA scientists."
REGIONS	Change the administration. Close OMB. Ensure that political appointees have enough spine and intelligence to understand that sometimes they have to live with and act responsibly in the face of scientific facts that are complicated and uncomfortable.
REGIONS	Remove the OMB influence from impacting Agency decisions
OAR	I am more concerned about the policy interpretations and actions that are taken based on EPA findings than I am about the straight forward scientific integrity of EPA work. The role of OMB in terms of policy review and coordination is a problem. Economists, or whatever they are, "playing" scientist and/or engineer is troublesome and a real annoyance. They lack the basic credentials to make scientific or engineering judgements. It is typical inside the beltway crap.
OAR	take away OMBs "veto" power
ORD	Get OMB and their inexperienced staff out of the review and decision making process. they create time delays and have inappropriately stopped agency work that has been in progress for years due to their lack of scientific understanding.
OAR	Require more transparency regarding involvement of OMB, CEQ, and other federal agencies when they comment/pressure EPA to make revisions in proposed and final actions."
WATER	Remove oversight and review by OMB.
OPPTS	Increased Congressional oversight into Administration influence on Agency statements, rulemakings, and policies.
REGIONS	Be better prepared to respond to legal outcomes (i.e. Supreme Court and Circuit Court decisions) that now seems to direct our use of science in the regulatory arena. It seems that Judges and attorney's know the science better than scientists when they are trying to reinterpretate the laws.
ORD	Remove OMB from the clearance process.
OPPTS	reduce/eliminate the influence of omb in scientific decisions. equalize influence of environmental advocates and commercial interests
OAR	limit the interference of other federal agencies (e.g., OMB, CEQ)
WATER	Remove or reduce OMB interference in EPA actions.
OAR	Integrity of scientific work is high. OMB has been "granted" authority beyond what I understand has been traditional to impact final decisions. It is not clear who, or how, or what initiated this change or increase in power, but it is absurd. A non-scientific body who does not have legal deference is foreceing final decisions that may not be palatable by staff, and even political officials at EPA. Watch out for this on the upcoming Ozone NAAQS decision. Solution, OMB must not step beyond its authority, and return to traditional review of regulations.
REGIONS	Prevent or minimize oversight and control of EPA by OMB and other Executive Branch appointees.
OPPTS	Eliminate scrutiny of scientific products by OMB
WATER	OMB would withdraw from the review of scientific and technical documents and science-based decisions.
ORD	By the Office and Management and Budget stopping its interference in EPA science.

WATER	Change the administration. Although in this administration, self-censorship is almost as powerful as the political censorship. Options that OMB or the White House wouldn't like aren't even put forward. "
WATER	Reduce the role of OMB in micro-managing development of EPA regulations and guidance documents. Increase the documentation required for OMB to alter or reject EPA draft documents. (Currently EPA is often directed by OMB to make changes in documents, and there is no record of who at OMB directed the changes and for what reason.)
REGIONS	OMB OIRA needs oversight as well as the participation of the Small Business Administration in EPA policy. They have undo influence on EPA's regulations, and are a direct conduit for industrial interests that overshadow EPA's scientists."

## Openness

ORD	Can't be effectively answered in this small space. However, the Agency's leadership thrives on secrecy and the full knowledge that they will not be held accountable - nor will their actions be made known outside of their small cadre of co-conspirators (yes, that's what I wrote). I've witnessed conditions momentarily improve (several instances) when a danger of disclosure outside of the organization appears or seems possible (they fear having others know what is being done). This leads me to believe that strong, independent oversight and protection of ""whistleblowers"" (real protection - not what is there now) could stem the most damaging practices. I'm under no illusion that this will happen - I think permanent and irreversible damage has occurred."
ORD	EPA needs a more stable senior management team. The political appointment system does not work well. Because the top 4 layers of people are always changing, the career managers spend their time trying to ""re-invent"" EPA to please the ""new"" team. It can be very discouraging to continually having to change directions."
OAR	Accept reality and all things can not be controlled. In the past mercury was not officially a problem since there was no good control, there officially no problem. Downtown Manhattan may have not been inhabitable after 9/11, but that conclusion was not politically acceptable, therefore officially there was no problem. Recognize the need of health based standards even when there is no known way to meet the standard.
REGIONS	Open communication and resistance to political coercion, especially when it trickles down to influencing senior management"
ORD	Let scientists objectively present data whether it supports or refutes the administrations political view.
WATER	Encourage EPA Scientists to publish their work in Scientific Journals as part of the outcome of any resources spent on any scientific study. Just publishing EPA documents is not enough. The peer review outcome may be different.
ORD	-Less administrative tasks so that more lab or field studies can be planned & accomplished-More freedom to speak to the media about our findings without having to obtain permission from administrative PR folks; and also not be told what to discuss and not
OPPTS	Simply put, if true representatives of the people of the United States, rather than only representatives of chemical companies, were actively allowed/encouraged to witness the presentation of important information and to participate in decision-making, the input of scientific judgement in the decision-making process would likely increase."
WATER	More transparency in linking risk management decisions to the science of the risk assessments. More public/stakeholder oversight. The relationship of Office of Pesticide programs with the pesticide industry is suspect. Industry provides huge sums of money to the EPA for the risk assessments with the implication they will have the risk management decisions (registration or re-registration of a pesticide) that industry wants. The financial relationship makes one question the integrity of the decisions since the scientific results are often ignored. EAT ORGANIC.
OPPTS	Remove the political screening step in science at the Agency. For example, we are not allowed to talk to the press when they call but must refer them to a person in the front office. Often this results in the press not getting the true facts but only those that don't make the Agency look bad. Remove the influence of the chemical industry from high level decision making. Industry members and associations have regular meetings with senior managers that technical staff are not allowed to attend. The results are that we spend much of our time trying to convince the management that our view of the science is not wrong just because it is different than what the industry has convinced them it right."

REGIONS	1. More of the Agency managers need to have education or experience in the sciences or technical fields they manage. 2. Proposed and final Regulations based on scientific findings need to be field tested by Federal, State and local enforcement officers and by the regulated community to determine if the regulations are practical, understandable and achieving the intended results. 3. The Agency has to place more value on science while, at the same time, soliciting input from the general public. All too often there is little to no public involvement in the way they Agency conducts its scientific work and sets priorities. Although people who are not scientists may not be able to help EPA with the science part of its work, the questions they ask and the issues they raise could help the Agency better focus its scientific efforts. 4. The Agency needs to be more honest, direct, and blunt about scientific uncertainty in many areas and the need to go forward and issue regulations despite such uncertainty. We need to do a better job communicating the uncertainty that exists and the reasons why it is better to move forward despite those uncertainties."
REGIONS	Require political appointees to address their agreement or disagreement with scientific data and recommendations within their decision documents.
OTHER	I believe the integrity of the work is generally ok. However, the information is not adequately factored into the decisions being made. In cases where integrity of the scientific work is the issue, reduce 3rd party contracting, ensure the studies are designed to answer the right questions, ensure complete disclosure to the public before decisions are made and have better oversight by scientific staff."
REGIONS	Some may assume that assaults on scientific integrity in government are a hallmark of a particular political party, or that these pressures come only from outside a particular regulatory agency, this is not the case. While the news media has reported instances of political influence on high profile issues, this type of activity is not unique to the current administration. This is disconcerting at the very least. However, of equal or greater concern are examples of where day-to-day environmental decisions vary from individual to individual (from insufficient to excessive). This leads to arbitrary and uneven application of rules and regulations, which is antithetical to the way government is expected to operate and compromises the Agency's scientific integrity. One way of addressing the issue of scientific integrity is to establish procedures to elevate technical issues/disagreements beyond first and second line supervisors without fear of reprisal to individual(s) making the request. This should include procedures to identify the importance of an issue and to resolve it on a technical basis. Currently, it is difficult to take an unpopular position by calling attention to problems of inadequate or improper information used as a technical basis for a pending management/regulatory decision. Scientific integrity can also be enhanced by fostering greater communication, coordination, and collegiality among staff by improving or instituting regular in house staff meetings. These meetings provide opportunities for improved training and mentoring. Collectively the staff represents a wide variety of educational and environmental protection/regulation backgrounds, yet the breadth and depth of this expertise remains underutilized. In house staff meetings could also provide opportunities for critiquing and improving the quality and consistency of programmatic decision making. In so doing both programmatic and individual excellence can be better identified and deserving individuals given opportunities for advancement.
ORD	more open communication of scientific results- environ. policies should be based on sound science to benefit the public health the environment not to benefit certain political or special interest groups
REGIONS	EPA should be required to make important policy decisions (e.g., levels at which to set water or air-quality standards, "safe" levels of pollutant exposure, methodology for characterizing risk, delineating wetlands, etc. ) that are consistent with recommendations made by scientific experts. These expert groups, which can include scientists and engineers from both inside and outside of EPA (including regional EPA offices), should be chosen using a process based solely on scientific/engineering credentials and experience. Panels should also have authority to certify that decisions are consistent with agency final decisions."
ORD	Encourage unfettered disclosure of all findings and opinions of EPA researchers and full obligation of all EPA personnel to completely disclose rationale for any decision they may have made as a public employee
REGIONS	Greater transparency - better access to information, including pre-decisional reports, for the non-scientist / general public.
REGIONS	Include data qualifiers with reported data.

REGIONS	Require that the decision maker sign a certification stating that "after reasonable inquiry, the statements in this document are true, accurate and complete." This is similar to what EPA requires regulated industry to sign when submitting compliance information to the agency under a permit such as a Title V air operating permit. The point of such a certification is that if found to be untrue, misleading or inaccurate, the decision maker could be liable for some legal or disciplinary action (perjury, removal, poor performance rating or other action)."
OTHER	By actively engaging affected stakeholders in the activities from concept to completion. My experience has led me to believe that much of the research conducted in the agency tends to be driven by personal researcher interests rather than true needs of the intended customers (EPA On-Scene Coordinators, state or local officials, etc.). Much of the research conducted within the agency needs to be held accountable by showing how it IMPACTS the environment or customer uses."
OAR	Ensure objectivity, effective communication and transparency of results, promote value-added science-to-policy engagements on new science and important areas of concern."
OPPTS	Close and vigorous Congressional and media oversight and attention. Strengthened union bargaining rights dealing with scientific integrity. Put more teeth into EPA's Principles of Scientific Integrity (PSI) Mandatory training for all employees/managers in 1) EPA's PSI; and 2) the law(s) under which their program operates Require notification to all interested parties of meetings between EPA employees/managers and other parties interested in a particular subject. Election of a Chief Executive truly dedicated to protecting the environment and public health, who would appoint an Administrator to carry out such an agenda."
REGIONS	ensure peer review and allow the public to participate. this policy has been adopted within the past 5 years.
REGIONS	The Agency would benefit from a panel of peers with a public peer review group who can balance any documents or releases be scientifically correct and if comments not included prior to release panel allowed to voice an opinion representing the Agency's scientific arena.
REGIONS	Let the scientific conclusions stand up to peer review and then get the conclusions out to the public - on clean air and water regulations and on climate change science in particular.
OTHER	better transparency including publishing peer review comments on line
ORD	Reports on sensitive issues are subject to protracted review periods. This should change. I have received multiple requests for interviews from the press on a sensitive scientific issue. Our public affairs office has been so poorly responsive that almost all of these requests have been abandoned and given-up upon by the requesting reporter. During the interview preparation process, public affairs reps have left me feeling censored."
REGIONS	Allow peer reviewed information and findings to be released to the public.
OTHER	Outside review; but that would slow up the whole process too much so this is not a realistic suggestion
REGIONS	Possibly stronger research links (co-investigators, leads for example) with independent, highly credible faculty and researchers at universities would help to boost the status of basic and applied science underpinning agency programs. Providing for outside peer review by credible independent scientists (or thru NAS) might help. More programs/funding for visiting researchers from universities, post-doctoral work. (Maybe this occurs at RTP?) And, as counterpart to preceding suggestion, programs/funding to allow EPA scientists to spend time (e.g., sabbatical) at an outside univ./institute. We need ways of insulating the agency's scientists and science-based reports, regs, etc., from the interference of political appointees and private sector special interests (access thru appointees).
REGIONS	EPA's scientific work has a demonstrated level of integrity. The question to be asked is "How many of EPA's published scientific studies been discredited?" Few if any is the answer. Where information is withheld or delayed it is usually to avoid confusion rather than for political gain, because it is widely understood in the Agency that the truth will come out, especially given the EPA's philosophical diversity. EPA science should strive to be as open as possible as a priority in order to maintain its professional credibility, without fear of the political consequences. If the public cannot trust EPA, there's no one it can trust."

OAR	EPA needs to be more forthcoming on why they make certain decisions. If an organization wants to spin the truth, it indicates to me that they know they aren't doing the right thing."
WATER	Make OMB/EPA meetings open to the public.
ORD	Divide the risk assessment process (document preparation) into clearly defined steps e.g., (1) scientific synthesis,(2) management review in division (3) management review in office, or (4) management review in AA level. The time allowed for management review should be pre-determined before scientists submit a document to manager. Reasons for delaying the process should be documented, to prevent someone from holding a draft document with no documented reasons. "
ORD	Use decision support systems (such as Region 3's MIRA) to make transparent the basis for decisions.
ORD	Do what the public requests, what the public needs."
OSWER	Have the laws regarding the keeping of government records enforced. Records of Agency actions and correspondence are required to be kept, they are not. Records of material presented on Agency web sites are required to be kept, they are not. After the record retention requirements are complied with, someone would have to review them to ascertain the correctness of Agency actions. Posting on the internet of the old documents that have been previously presented, but then censored, would provide for wide oversight of this illicit censorship activity.
OAR	Having transparent system for selecting and hiring outsiders - not friends and cronies of management (at any level). In addition to having the EPA Administrator report semi-annually in a televised session on PBS, to the American public at large, if not the world, the state of environment (similar to the State of the Union). The purpose of this is to inform and galvanize the masses on the importance of environment and how citizens could work with EPA to achieve the country prescribed goal(s)."
OAR	Allow staff recommendations regarding the limitations of risk and/or cost-benefit analyses as completed to be clearly presented to the public without modification by management, even if these suggest that a particular regulatory approach, as strategized by management, is weak or incomplete in terms of potential public health protection.
OPPTS	Publish all supporting reviews
REGIONS	More training and resources.
WATER	More transparency is needed
OAR	Through close and active participation of the affected public.
OAR	I perceive that there is a gag rule that prevents government employees from being allowed to tell the public what they have learned on the job, as well as their job-informed and educated opinions. This work, and knowledge gained during that work, is paid for by the taxpayers. If there is a legal gag rule, I think it should be legally eliminated, by Congress, with the support of the Supreme Court. "
ORD	Better dialog among the people.

OPPTS	In my program, the success is based upon whether or not a pesticide is registered and getting it done by some specified date - no matter how difficult or simple the action is. If it is not registered than it is not a success. The science and risks and benefits need to be honestly and fairly considered. The decisions that are made should be justified and be transparent as to why a decision was made and the risks and benefits be clearly and honestly presented. It is often easy to identify the scientist that were involved with an action, but it is not always clear who made the ultimate decision - perhaps if the individual made the final decision was held more accountable, perhaps there would be more honesty and integrity in the work at EPA. I would also like to make note that not all decisions made are necessarily bad when they go against scientific evidence. But the rationale should be clearly explained. "
REGIONS	EPA could make more transparent its protocols for making decisions that take into account scientific information.
REGIONS	Removal of unnescerary oversight authorities by EPA Headquarters. For instance, at the Regions we are no longer ""allowed"" to write our opinion of what NEPA document is most appropriate for a federal action, especially if we think an EIS is appropriate. Any NEPA language in our letters has to be reviewed by HQ. Also, our enforcement group is no longer aggressively pursuing enforcement cases on intermittant or ephemeral streams due to the latest supreme court decision. HQ also requires review of all water division ""ARNI"" determinations where scientists determine whether impacts to aquatic resources would cause substantial and unacceptable impacts. They have indicated that relatively few ARNI's from our region will be accepted by HQ if we put them forward. Our regulatory tools have been severely retriected during my work experience here. "
REGIONS	I think work could be improved by better communication between EPA headquarters and Regions and better communication between program offices. This would help reduce the conflicts that often appear in regulations and guidance documents.
ORD	Get OMB out of the Risk Assessment business. They aren't qualified and do their best to compromise EPA's process and drag out actions based on EPA's determinations. Demanding that things be referred to NAS, which inevitably slides any decison out 3-4 years, is one of OMB's favorites.
OTHER	Openess
OAR	We need to get information out to the public in a more timely manner. Especially during emergency situations.

## Scientific Review

OTHER	Establish - perhaps reestablish - an office for policy analysis and evaluation that is separate from the Office of the Administrator.
REGIONS	Regional scientists are over-burdened with administrative tasks and requests for information that could be more efficiently obtained from existing databases and webpages. These requests for information frequently come from Headquarters, and it is not clear how the information is interpreted or used. Frequently the same information is requested by multiple individuals, though used for different purposes. These requests reduce the work time available for regional scientists to stay abreast of scientific developments. Also, it is not known whether the information is re-worded and re-interpreted by HQ.
ORD	Less burdensome review and clearance procedures for works intended for publication
ORD	Continued outside peer review of programs and research products Outside peer review at the research planning level. We would benefit tremendously from receiving outside critical evaluations of our research plans, similar to the reviews of a grant proposal. Removing barriers to collaboration with academic scientists. In particular, we are not currently allowed to participate as a co-PI on grant proposals. This effectively removes us from the collaborative process at the research planning level and makes it difficult for us work with academics. "
REGIONS	Have management encourage more time spent on scientific work and arrange for peer review, but not make it a burdensome bureaucratic exercise."
ORD	Bring science into the regulatory process earlier in the rulemaking process and rigorously peer review (in addition to the public comment process)ALL technical material that bears on the regulation.
OSWER	Give greater weight to relevant findings by respected scientific organizations (NSF, Natl. Acad. of Sci.)More peer-review of the scientific basis of Agency decisions by science-based organizations."
OAR	Make peer review the final review of work prior to release.
ORD	an independent body, like the SAB, review agency regulatory decisions for their adherence to agency and other best available science
OPPTS	with continued support from a wide range of peer review methods to vet scientific issues in as large an audience of scientists as practicable. To carefully delineate scientific verses other aspects of issues i.e. political, economic, or other interests. Probably need more oversight, adjustment and updating of environmental statutes"
ORD	Greater reliance on external review. Adoption of review practices used at other government agencies engaged in research or at universities.
ORD	Streamline processes to eliminate unneeded reviews by parties in and out of government.
OPPTS	Make sure the scientific review is accurate and defensible/documented and stick with it.
WATER	It could be improved by increasing the diligence in performing peer reviews and the adherence to the review methodology.
OPPTS	In my experience, the work being done by my division is of the highest integrity. There are numerous peer review processes in place to ensure scientific accuracy and integrity.
ORD	Revamp the "clearance" process - allow purely external peer review."
WATER	Make sure that managers who review scientific study results are educated as scientists themselves.

ORD	Consistent Peer Review requirements across the agency
OPPTS	Let the review of science work products be reviewed by subject matter experts. Example, have chemist do secondary reviews of chemistry/residue chemistry, toxicologist do secondary reviews of tox studies, etc. Not chemist doing secondary review of chemistry reviews, toxicologist doing secondary review of tox reviews, etc."
OAR	Independent peer review of work products
WATER	more EPA Office of Research and Development (ORD) review and concurrence on other Offices' work products before release from the Agency
WATER	Scientific work could best be improved by allowing others (outside organizations, agencies, etc) to review the work provide comments, but letting EPA scientists ultimately have the final say in what is or is not included in the final product."
ORD	Through continued use of the peer-review process
OTHER	Independent outside review that would prevent change
REGIONS	Better peer-review screening before a research project is initiated and more scrutinized peer-review of the product before its publication or public use.
OTHER	scientific work should be released into peer reviewed journals versus white papers.
REGIONS	Through peer review
ORD	The integrity of science produced by EPA scientists is already high. Continued outside peer-review, such as that which occurs when EPA scientists submit research for publication at peer-reviewed journals, is the best way to keep it that way."
ORD	More external peer review.
REGIONS	allow peer reviewed national & international guidance/research faster influence and changes on our guidances/policies
OAR	Continued and increased technical/scientific peer review.
OAR	Through oversight by independent advisory panels.
REGIONS	The integrity of scientific work produced by EPA is not a major problem. There are sufficient peer review panels and outside checks which help to ensure the quality of scientific evaluations and conclusions. However, it is the application of the work produced that is of concern, and most likely will never be fully addressed, since EPA is by its charter a blend of science, law and politics. The best we can hope for is that the scientific work produced is given fair hearing, and used to the maximum extent feasible to guide the decision making process. "
ORD	Have good scientific peer review and less from an administration policy standpoint.
ORD	Actually have independent review by scientists without conflict of interest, scientists who are currently receiving NO funding from EPA and will receive NO funding from EPA for a period of 3 years after their review. In more than 20 years at EPA I have yet to see an independent review conducted by peers with no conflicts of interest."
OAR	Consistent Congressional oversight, persistent and objective journalistic investigation."

REGIONS	Do not allow political appointees into the process of scientific review. Their job is to make management decisions, not influence the data and information before it is collected and presented.
REGIONS	I think it would be helpful to have science review boards with regional representation to provide oversight or aid on technical issues such as vapor intrusion, technical impracticability, hydrogeologic modeling, etc.
REGIONS	I am still relatively new at EPA. My opinion of EPA has changed since being here. Specifically, I had believed EPA was more scientific in its approach. Now I realize that EPA has politically driven agendas that sometimes, not always, affects decisions of scientific nature. I believe an outside scientific oversight group that has more authority and public accountability than say the SAB could help."
REGIONS	Ensure adequate review of proposed rules and actions by people with expertise in all media (i.e. rulemaking under Clean Water Act or Safe Drinking Water Act should be reviewed by air experts, solid waste experts to fully assess potential impacts to these media.
REGIONS	Implement a scientific peer review process.
OSWER	Unsure - Bulk of my work is policy related. Use conventional scientific principles to review documents, etc. in one aspect of my job.
OPPTS	Hire qualified folks to assess the science, situation, etc. Hiring non-scientists to analyze reports from scientists (who have no clue what they are reading) hampers the scientific integrity of the reports they in turn write.
OSWER	Improve the peer review process by not making it so cumbersome and by allowing those with real experience to participate. Some conflict of interest requirements are too restrictive.

## Organizational Improvements

ORD	An independent science organization.
ORD	appoint someone who is not an administration yes man, and has the intelligence and leadership to do right by the public."
REGIONS	mass resignation of senior leaders.
REGIONS	Wholesale removal of entrenched managers who have been promoted into areas that they have little or no knowledge of what they regulate. This has been the greatest impediment to the agency in the 20 plus years I have been here. The EPA has turned from one time being a scientific based organization into one that is responsible now for just getting out federal grants to States.
WATER	Rewrite the Clean Water Act. It is a very old law, attuned to the thinking and the problems in the early 1970s. The water regulatory program takes its direction from the law, and the scientific program is geared to support the regulatory program. The problem is not lack of integrity in the scientific effort, but lack of appropriate direction toward analyzing and solving many of the current environmental problems that the law provides little authority over."
REGIONS	Ensure that competent administrators are appointed and that the Agency mission is recognized as non-partisan in nature.
ORD	Promote executives and managers who have more integrity and commitment to the agency's mission. Unfortunately, most managers care only about personal ambition. Need more openness to debate issues. Dissent is too often viewed as being disloyal. "
ORD	better scientific leadership from division directors up with improved cohesion and clear direction
OAR	By having leadership that believes in putting the best scientific and technical analysis out for all to see and let the policy arguments stand (or fall) on their own.
ORD	Make the administrator an elected official.
OAR	new leadership at every level
ORD	The government efficiencies and shift to streamlining has effectively moved workloads to scientists, and impacting the time they can work on ""science"" itself. Management news rarely flows to staff level through our management and the intensity of the program planning involving all staff is non-existent. I feel that our division has less visibility, the management is less involved with each staff and our links to program offices has really declined dramatically.We need staff level discussions to develop programs."
OTHER	Less burdensome internal reviews of scientific products, and trust from upper (above direct supervisor of active scientists) management. "
OAR	Better low to mid level managers
REGIONS	Less time on policy matters, more on science; educate the bureaucrats to use basic statistics in decision making vs local policy issues."
REGIONS	Managers that treated all employees on a professional bases. Provide managers that would not have favorites. Increase promotions and awards.
ORD	less review by management prior to publication

ORD	The problem with integrity overall is not with the scientists, or their immediate supervisors. 1)The political appointees and the SES managers of science (mainly in ORD) need to be selected for their technical competence and balanced view of environmental issues and research. Some have been excellent in this regard. (Current AA/ORD, George Gray) Overall, it might be better to make the AA/ORD a career employee. 2) Having a strong Inspector General (like Nikki Tinsley) also helped (she left). 3) The National Institute for Environmental Research is suggested occasionally, to separate the politics from the science. That approach needs further consideration, but greater separation of regulators and scientists might lead to less focused research and poorer integration of results. Applied science is EPA's main focus. Institutes seem to do more basic research. 4) SES managers may be able to manage activities and budgets, but when it comes to setting an agency's scientific direction and priorities, they usually are not technically qualified, making them very susceptible to political influence. They don't know how to find consensus or identify needs and priorities inside or outside their agencies. A new type SES position, Science Director, would help legitimize this career path. 5) Within ORD we have implemented Principles for interacting with each other. I believe these principles should be taken Agency-wide, and that we need to measure how well we are collectively applying them. This would need to apply to the appointees as well as the career staff. The best way to monitor their implementation is through independent questionnaires, like this one! 6) Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this questionnaire!
OTHER	Refrain from putting managers in programs they know nothing about and who are more interested in their careers than the mission.
OPPTS	Yes, but the motivation by management to ""get things done"" invariably conflicts with management's desire to ignore or downplay evidence that contradicts the basis for the rule or guidance that is being promulgating. Rulemaking is such a protracted and tedious procedure that the emergence of new and contradictory evidence (to that rule) is invariably downplayed or minimized by management so as to not jeopardise progress on the rule."
REGIONS	High level managers with professional technical backgrounds.
REGIONS	Hire EPA managers with integrity that have a scientific education and understand the science, rather than managers that are just "yes" people and do what upper management wants them to do. Hold managers accountable when they coerce employees to fudge the science.
ORD	Recognizing that differing opinions exist among EPA scientists and allowing that to be shown, with management taking responsibility for their role in making decisions, given that plurality."
ORD	Make sure senior management has the scientific background to understand the work that needs to be done.
REGIONS	The integrity of scientific work produced by EPA can best be improved by continuing to hire well qualified personnel. The EPA management should foster more collaboration with academia in research matters. The EPA staff should be provided resources both technical and equipment within the agency for improved work product.
REGIONS	Better management. Less resistance by management stray from the administration's line.
REGIONS	Provide for True Leadership [as opposed to Management] potential &/or training for the Second & Third Line Supervisors. This will empower the highly educated and qualified technical, scientific, & engineering staff at EPA to do their jobs with an emphasis on applying new and innovative methods or techniques.
REGIONS	Smart (non-religious, non-political) people at the top would help. "
OTHER	Better training. More scientists brought in at the political level.I thought you questions were seriously flawed.
OSWER	If someone would make a policy decision with out the run around. No one wants to make a stand or change the regulations to better capture the real world and how waste is managed from cradle to grave. I'm so tired of excuses for regulation determination. Who side are we on, protecting the environment or helping industry? This job is very frustrating and it is not enforcement but my own management not moving forward with promoting consistency with the regs. and better waste management!"

ORD	1. By making EPA political appointee a cabinet member. 2. By making sure line supervisors are trained in the sciences for which products they are responsible. 3. Stop appointing 'yes' men & place thoughtful scientists in decision positions at lower levels and on top too. Be intellectually honest. 4. Stop working from the answer backwards but build a scientific case using scientific rules of evidence and epistemology, not legal rules of WOE. 5. Separate the science part from legal regulatory part. Different buildings & different pay scales too. 6. Require the EPA lab scientists to work on problems that beset the agency and assist headquarters scientists to gain and acquire data useful for decision making.
REGIONS	By adhering to the EPA mission's policy and adhering to the Goals of the Agency. Having a double standard rule for managers and staff is the divide in the system that is tearing EPA down on the integrity issue. There is no accountability in the work process.
ORD	Improvement would come from managing science as is successfully done in other Agencies (e.g. NOAA, USGS) Require scientists to compete for research funding, and require collaboration with other Agencies and academic partners."
ORD	I work at a research lab in ORD. While our work is supposed to inform decision makers, I can't say that in the 16 years I have been there that I have ever seen it do so. If anything, ORD research is seen as less applicable by Region and Program offices compared to research they contract out. The research at our lab is not at all innovative or forward thinking which I believe reflects putting people that are more science managers rather than scientists into positions that define the problems and direct the best resources to address them, including available scientific expertise. At our lab, mid career Ph.D. scientists have ancillary roles in research. I don't think I was afforded the opportunity to continue my scientific development, stay current with my field, and make my best contribution to the agency's mission. "
ORD	Reducing the administrative burden and cut the red tape. Relax excessive rules that hinders (effective) collaboration with Academia. Raising the bar and demanding that scientists produce publications in high quality scientific journals in lead authorship capacity.
ORD	I have never been influenced or pressured by Managers at the Research Laboratories or elsewhere within EPA to publish or disseminate questionable results/research. Ever. However, the issue of integrity of research can extend to the conditions under which it is produced, more pressure + less time = lower quality (etc.). Therefore, the following recommendations are suggested, 1. Allow scientists the time to conduct the rigorous work required in research. Do not continue to place red tape, unnecessary paperwork, arbitrary deadlines on research projects, and impose unrealistic publication criteria for promotions. 2. The focus of the research mission should not be changed with the whim of "science review or advisory panels" or by some high level administrator. Changes in EPA research directions should be implemented after healthy debate within the EPA scientific community. Let the Researchers finish projects that they started. This will increase productivity and morale. "
OPPTS	Phase out "Environmental Protection Specialist" (EPS) positions, which one can qualify for by having a bachelor's degree in ANY field or with equivalent other experience. EPS personnel are hired and promoted preferentially, allegedly for EEO reasons but it also helps that many of them don't know enough to identify problems and to object to expedient but ill-conceived policies. Increase in-house technical staffing (at expense of EPS positions) and allow enough personal development and expression by scientists so that the Agency's best foot can be put forward, including at international, interagency meetings, where the EPA is often represented only by EPS personnel who seem to go along with what other nations and/or multi-national corporations put forth. "
OSWER	Only by separating the science function from policy functions, lifting unnecessary and burdensome requirements, enabling a culture of ethics in science, allowing the free interchange of ideas, and funding science activities based on merit. This may not be possible in EPA's present form.
REGIONS	Facilitate just and equitable promotion opportunities to minorities more frequently. Improve overall training of all scientific staff at EPA and engender continuous good morale. Expect quality deliverable and outcomes from all EPA staff. Continue forging current programs for improvement of staff that develop personal and professional growth.
OPPTS	I work in OPP where outside stakeholders pay the EPA for service (PRIA). PRIA is a bad idea because it gives the agency mandated deadlines (sometimes unreasonably set), and so a product is being "pushed out the door" just to meet the deadline. PRIA also gives the stakeholders leverage to influence decisions (shouldn't be so, but it is). Stakeholders influence (direct or indirect) in Agency decisions needs to be removed completely.

OPPTS	Better managers, fewer meetings where the influence is from registrants and consultants who have only the financial interest of their employers, stockholders, etc. in mind."
OTHER	Centralize science into one department. The best science should inform decision-making, and not be overruled. "
ORD	More rigorous QA/QC of the scientific work done and more influence of scientific findings on regulatory outcomes.
OAR	Let scientific personnel retain complete ownership of their work. Reviews by internal offices at EPA may hamper communication of scientific work.
OTHER	An independent body that approves only the most significant products, but without creating another layer of protracted delay in releasing major products."
OPPTS	By adhering to the science, not politics. Managers appear to be selected on their willingness "to go along" rather than their scientific integrity "
REGIONS	1) by staying true to the pollution laws that congress gives us (which means much more frequent revision to reflect the latest science) 2) by leaving less discretion to the executive branch, and 3) by giving the scientific advisory boards more weight to make decisions. "
OSWER	make information(data)-based or fact-based policy decisions- environmental issues are not standing alone; collect data using multi-agency efforts; review and improve the data collection periodically; apply up-to-date technology- issue regular environmental statistics to the public
ORD	Clean out the current group of managers. They lack true concern for the environment and simply function as bureaucrats and lackeys. The value of the scientists input has been marginalized and the organization is really a series of fiefdoms and dictatorships. The agency needs to be totally restructured, revitalized and the scientist reenergized and empowered or it needs to be dismantled."
ORD	Middle management in Office of Research and Development (associate lab directors, division directors) should be primarily scientists with managerial skills, not managers with some (or no in some cases) science background. Political appointees should actually have some knowledge of environmental problems beyond what they read in the paper. Less programmatic planning, vision statements, strategic plans and more science at ORD."
ORD	I personally think EPA as an agency works very hard to maintain its integrity, but if I had to write a suggestion I would encourage the agency to collaborate with other scientific organization to expand its knowledge and resources.
ORD	Better communication between scientists and non-scientists.
ORD	EPA should hire capable scientists in management positions on ORD and eliminate decision making by program offices such as Office of Solid Waste (OSW), Office of Water (OW) etc. The staff in these offices lack scientific competency to make sound decision about the nation's environmental challenges."
OPPTS	Collection of actual data to develop and validate environmental models would be of best use. Many models are not validated or have been shown to be variable in their accuracy, and some parameter values are based on "best guesses." ORD does not support the mission of OPP very well, and could serve us better in terms of collection of environmental data.
OAR	1. My office needs outside oversight. 2. Management needs replacement - it's a "club."
ORD	Hire administrative personnel so lab workers can go back to doing lab research. Hire purchasing agents so lab workers are not on the phone all day placing orders.
ORD	As far as I can tell, the integrity is not in question. The increased burden of administrative nonsense hinders the generation of the research that is supposedly the function of the Laboratory."

REGIONS	The EPA could use better coordination with other agencies, both Federal and State, that collect environmental data. More environmental contaminants should be monitored and assessed for continued use. The number of compounds that should be monitored would require the combined capacity of all these agencies. Better investigation into the probable environmental fate of chemicals in the environment before they are released. Or at least a measured release with a continual assessment until it is deemed to cause minimal harm. It takes too long to remove them after the fact (if they can be). Assignment of allowable chemical tolerances in soil, water, air for all man produced compounds, even if the tolerances are interim. This is in line with what the Europeans are doing, and increases the expectations that they will be monitored and assessed."
OAR	Do not promote people with limited or little knowledge, experience or insight, into supervisory positions - get rid of the "policy" people who are afraid of the scientific staff. Impose accountability on managers for failure - demote or dismiss the incompetent, and unethical, rather than promoting them out of the organization to get rid of them - this tactic is government wide and results in management that is largely self-serving, incompetent and unethical - government is the biggest reservoir of mediocrity and incompetence in the country."
OPPTS	Reorganization into science only Divisions with managers having both a science background and experience within a program.
REGIONS	New management selected for technical abilities instead of willingness to please.
ORD	If we were allowed to work with less administrative impediment, that would be great. Also, getting rid of the old school government work mentality in both the administrative and technical part of ORD would greatly benefit the overall productivity of ORD. Scientists need to spend more time performing their expected job functions and not finding ways of avoiding work (i.e., publishing in journals)."
ORD	Allow us to fully complete a research project without pressure of starting a new project while in the middle of the current project. If PhD programs take at least 3-5 yrs, so does a defensible scientific research project. And take away the extra admin duties. Scientist cannot devote hours to the bench (generating and analyzing data) while being pulled to attend to the menial admin tasks (purchasing, timekeeping, clean the freezer, etc)."
REGIONS	The management at my Regional office has very little knowledge of the regulatory programs they are managing, and my management ignores the advice of the people who have many years of experience in those programs. If staff questions the decisions management makes, they are told they are being insubordinate and are labeled as troublemakers. There are very serious problems with ethics in the Division management. Management wastes resources and uses staff to make themselves look good. They don't seem to care what our real mission is!"
REGIONS	In Superfund, allow project managers independence to determine the proper comments to include in 5 year review report and other decision documents. There are currently too many administrative, policy, and legal reviewers of project documents. These parties also often require project managers to include their comments when they are not responsible to or experts on the long-term oversight of the projects. "
REGIONS	Increase the communication between Offices within the Agency.
ORD	Remove some layers of managerial review that slow significantly the production of scientific work at EPA.
OTHER	The record keeping of all projects (including research) in some office's databases, manager's ""tracking spreadsheets,"" etc.. is often redundant, tedious and burdensome. The level of scrutiny of new research is directly proportional to the impact it may have on policy."
REGIONS	If the technical staff that does the work could give opinion on how the environmental data is provided to the public.
REGIONS	so many things are micromanaged and have to be decided at the highest levels. the only good way is to take political appointees out of the decisionmaking process, which is doubtful.
OPPTS	Extend statutory deadlines for completing risk assessments (e.g. PRIA deadlines)
ORD	Allow investigators in ORD to follow a consistent line of research to its logical conclusion and not simply react to the latest ""hot topic."" Also allow ORD to proactively anticipate future environmental problems and develop the data needed to address these problems."
REGIONS	Organize technical staff separate from policy staff (i.e., in separate offices/divisions)"

ORD	Reduce the number of political appointees. Make the Head of ORD a Career Scientist not an appointee.
REGIONS	EPA scientific and technical staff must understand that we all have to work just as hard at developing, practicing and honing our communication, political awareness, informed decision making, persuasion, influencing and leadership briefing skills as much as, or more than, our technical skills. I have occasionally observed scientific and technical staff perform and behave poorly by proposing research topics, budgets and schedules for decision making and rule making that are laughable. Some have been based on obvious personal grudges, personal agendas, career goals, obsessive and narrowly focused views, and result in a discrediting the scientific community, and the Agency's reputation. The focus on this topic, via this survey, seems paranoid, or at least reflects a state of personal victimization by an otherwise incredibly strong community within EPA. Using a survey such as this, without detailed analysis, or specific focus on real world examples, is limited, one sided, and somewhat dismissable. This survey does not include questions that inform the Agency, or its oversight entities about specific examples, nor does it reflect the reality of global societies, economies and political systems. It is a rather basic set of questions, whose total scores may not be informative enough about the specifics of the concerns the survey addresses, and risks being insignificant. The integrity of scientific work is determined on a case by case basis, on the merit of the individual scientist, or group of scientists, that have performed their task and effectively communicated the results of a specific finding in an effort to influence policy and decision making. The integrity of scientific work produced by EPA can best be improved by helping to make our scientific and technical staff effective communicators, leaders, or better informed team players with those who have these skills. Then, each case is elevated for decision making in the most effective way possible. When enough of these cases have been brought to final decisions, the Agency's reputation is then evaluated. It would be better to specifically study the decision making track record of the Agency over five year increments, in context with the type of environmental challenges it faces. To compare the Agency's effectiveness from the 70's or 80's, while it was in its basic program development and implementation phases, to recent times, is inappropriate without a companion analysis of the types of challenges facing us now (e.g. cumulative impact analyses from energy development under NEPA, or climate change vs end of pipe/smokestack/dump truck regulatory programs). The unsophisticated nature of this inquiry is the antithesis of what the scientific community in EPA would like to be respected for, its ability to address decision making around very complicated, very challenging global issues of the day. Thanks for asking question number 44."
ORD	lots of data is integral, some critical points are ignored in favor of a ""democratic"" sense, there is a lot of racial discrimination and minorities in management position are ""trying to be more white male than a real white male"" lot of talent misused, ignored, and data that go with them ignored as well."
REGIONS	For one thing, a more robust and direct communication of scientific information within EPA itself, particularly the recommendations of various advisory bodies such as the SAB. As a user rather than producer of technical and scientific information, I find it very frustrating that I have to search out myself research findings and recommendations that directly affect the management of my programs. By the time the reports filter down to the staff program levels, they have either mutated beyond recognition during intervening manager reviews, or have simply been lost in the fog of the bureaucracy.
REGIONS	By maintaining good communication and mentoring leaderships of our charter and Senior Staff with new young professionals. Maintaining high standard of ethics that makes everyone proud of being part of the team
REGIONS	Bring back someone like Ruckleshaus (sp?) to rebuild the EPA management structure.
OTHER	Mid-level, Senior, and especially, Political Management at EPA are, for the most part, not technically qualified (in education or experience) to scientifically understand the work they supervise. Many are lawyers, or have a liberal arts background, and confuse being familiar with scientific terms with understanding them. Managers of technical divisions, Programs and Offices, should be scientists or engineers."
OPPTS	Exercise some management accountability, which has never happened. Enforce EPA's Principles of Scientific Integrity instead of using them as guidelines which can conveniently be ignored."
REGIONS	I feel that work is stalled a bit and important topics take longer to get through the review process and out of the agency than before. However, I do not have as many years of experience at the agency as many of my peers."

REGIONS

The integrity of scientific work could best be improved by allowing it to be part of the normal work expected of employees. Instead there is too much policy and regulatory thought put into decisions, and little time to explore the scientific basis or the underlying data for actions. This is especially true of oversight activities. In addition, all the newly minted electronic requirements (bean counting, ethics courses, travel documentation, time sheets, grant requirements, etc., etc.) are cutting into time and sustained thought processes necessary to research the scientific basis for decisions. Things are done on the fly, and given the often quicker method of looking into legal reasons for decisions, that is often the way things are done. Too much process, too little content.

## Respect for Science

ORD	By restoring the Agency's public role as a faithful advocate for and protector of the environment, as opposed to publically downplaying the need for action in so many instances. Such a stance would communicate from the top that we are all about scientific excellence because, at heart, we sincerely care about environmental protection."
OAR	By placing individuals in AA-ships, RA-ships, and Office Directorships that understand and value scientific integrity."
ORD	Fundamental and applied research needs to be integrated into policy and management decisions and the limited resources for internal research available better managed. Almost all of the ORD managers, especially in Washington, and down to the branch level should be strictly limited to 2-3 year tenures. Only highly competent managers should be retained on the basis of results evaluated by panels of self selected ORD scientists. I know of only one lab director or senior ORD manager that seems to be competent to manage scientists. The Agency needs to train scientists in ORD who are competent, focussed, and motivated and from a competent corps of scientists, science advisors for each program office and regulatory project should be trained by this corps. No ORD manager should come from program offices until the Agency masters the use of science in decision making. When scientists and engineers are nurtured and supported professionally as well attorneys and other professionals, the Agency will make rational, defensible decisions."
OAR	Career Managers at EPA need to be more visionary and forward thinking so that staff understand where their work is headed. Managers also need to have more courage of conviction. Many, many times I have been told "we can't do that" when I have proposed creating educational/outreach programs or products on climate change, no matter how well-researched and based in solid science they are. It is my sense that career managers are more concerned about their own personal careers than they are about our programs being effective or appropriate or current. Thanks for the opportunity to voice these concerns.
OAR	Ethics training could include integrity training and the importance of being fully truthfull at all times. Management could create an atmosphere that both encouraged and resolved differences of opinion. Scientists could better understand and self-enforce their own and association standards of conduct. Publication in professional journals could be encouraged.
OPPTS	Allow for continuing education of scientists by providing funding for additional training and through attendance of professional conferences, meetings, and workshops. "
WATER	provide more resources for scientists to actively participate in meetings and activities of professional organizations- allow scientists to address the scientific merits of technical issues rather than non-scientists- involve the Agency's senior scientists more actively in advising decision makers on the scientific merits of their decisions
REGIONS	Have scientific/professional staff be active in organizations in their field.Promote training
OTHER	Support membership in professional organizations, and the time to prepare manuscripts for publication.
OPPTS	Provide more time and personal so the work isn't compromised by short deadlines
REGIONS	support participation in scientific industry and engineering symposiums and meetings
OAR	By allowing scientists with internationally acknowledged expertise to work and publish in their fields, instead of withholding suport and restricting activity."
ORD	By giving EPA scientists the time and resources to do the science, instead of severely restricting their efficiency through counterproductive Agency policies, useless planning, and other such idiocies. Last year I had to take ""two-sided printing"" training. We have very little time to do research anymore."
REGIONS	The use of contractors, in my opinion, leads to EPA personnel ineffectiveness. A scientists have to spend more and more time overseeing the contractor's work instead of doing the work themselves, there is a diminishment of their own skills; as well, the expertise that comes from many years of experience is lost in the Agency, and generally diluted into the many contractors. We need to keep long term employees so that their experience can develop and mature - THAT is how the staff expertise necessary for solid governing decisions by management can be developed and maintained.

ORD	give scientists less administrative work
OAR	Spend more time and energy on peer conferences and sharing of new findings as they occur.
OPPTS	In many cases scientific work will stop at a certain point when policy makers are satisfied. However, more research was needed to scientifically complete the work. I hope this would change and let scientists decide when the work is complete.
ORD	By creating clear (unpolitical) rewards for EPA scientists By reducing number of political appointees
REGIONS	Strongly encourage scientists to keep up with academic research and peer journals. Contract out less environmental assessment work and have staff conduct the actual investigation.
OSWER	More time for full and proper analyses.
REGIONS	Provide specific funding for GS-13 staff to attend one profession conference every year.
OPPTS	insure more time to prepare adequate work products; insure that new employees understand how the overall progam functions and what the current statutes, regulations, and policies are.
OPPTS	Get rid of the idiologes
OTHER	Encourage EPA analysts and researchers to participate more fully in the standard scholarly research activities, such as attending conferences, serving as peer reviewers, and publishing articles in peer reviewed journals. Perhaps also collaborate more directly with outside researchers, including those on EPA's science advisory board, researchers at other agencies, the National Research Council, etc."
OPPTS	By allowing the scientists to attend scientific meetings and allowing scientists to rate their managers (360 evaluations) as a part of their yearly performance ratings.
WATER	Professional development to keep pace with science would be helpful.
REGIONS	Enhanced training and development opportunities.
ORD	By creating/facilitating collaborative activities with external scientists and organizations.
REGIONS	Support the findings of its scientists once the findings have been quality assured and proven to be correct.
OSWER	It would be helpful to allow lower level employees to develop the required institutional knowledge needed by the EPA, catering to their needs and allowing them to spend more time on certain topics will help develop their careers. Succession planning is needed and is a very important responsibility to the Agency as the majority of employees here have reached retirement age.
REGIONS	More opportunities for cross training. More recognition of the work we do.

OTHER	The environmental justice office needs a say in agency policy making. They need a high level director who has a track record of proven research and advocacy and understands how community level impacts and research and can relate it the Agency's day to day activities. The office is too small to cover a large agency is under funded and not emphasized. Yet environmental risks and disparities in exposures and risk outcomes do exist. And remedies for subpopulations may differ from the general population. Often, analysts fro other offices with little experience are tasks to analyze disparate impacts of policies so their work is not well integrated with the existing body o work or scholars in the field. This under-represents a key class of constituents, subjects that whose perceives themselves as not being heard. Credit is seldom given for scientists and social scientists who publish in peer reviewed journals. Publications and research on areas related to improving environmental performance of underserved communities is seldom if ever recognized. In fact, the entire subject of environmental equity, despite an executive order 12898 and statutory provisions (title IV) does not get serious consideration in the agency. It is fringe even though this topic represnets at least tens of millions of subjects nad thousands of communities."
OPPTS	More independence of science staff in determining chemical hazards and risks and management of those risks
ORD	Scientists are more aware of the needs of the environmental scientific community than are managers at EPA. Scientists should be provided the opportunity to pursue important environmental research whether or not it meets a "specific Agency need". There is currently too much of a client orientation in EPA's Office of Research and Development.
REGIONS	EPA needs support from an Administration in Washington that believes in science first, not religion. Support from an Administration in Washington in the area of decreasing pollution, increasing protection/prevention, while at the same time valuing the environment more than big business would also improve the work we do here at EPA."
OPPTS	At least in my divison, almost no science is done. The scientfc staff is not listened to. The only thng that seems important is pleasing industry. Most of the managers are not scientistsand scientific integrity is not valued but is actually frowned on.
OPPTS	Regulated industry, like pesticide manufacturers, should have less direct involvement in and influence to EPA's regulatory decisions. The Agency's risk managers (decision makers)need to pander less to the regulated industry and politicians, and pay more attantion to the recommendation by the Agency scientists. (Note that the risk managers are usually not themselves scientists.)"
WATER	I cannot speak definitively, for I am still learning to navigate through challenges posed by either 1) the personal values or career aspirations of my managers, 2) my own inability to handle the bureaucratic workload, and/or 3) the sheer attractiveness of shallow, expedient solutions. I am also trying not to lose my job. Integrity? -- I find that my supervisors and colleagues mouth the right words, but take concrete actions that are not necessarily consistent with critical day-to-day actions (which cumulatively constitute the Agency's execution of its own mission). I do not actively press forward my own technical analyses due to my very junior status and the general inability of certain managers to understand, accept, and/or believe certain science or engineering concepts. How to improve? Make sure that job security and career status are not dependent (blatantly or implicitly) on whether one toes the "corporate" line. [Why "corporate"? It is my impression that the Agency is run like a business whose main objectives are to look good, make money, and acquiesce to special (commercial and political) interests.]
ORD	There are too many layers of management who are not scientifically trained; scientists are rarely consulted in high-level budget decisions. EPA has lost its core research agenda and has gone to a business model for outputs, effectively eliminating exploratory science and the opportunity to identify future environmental problems. "
ORD	replace contractors with term appointees and have risk-based research plans agreed to up front by all levels of EPA
OPPTS	Let scientific findings be the base of the regulatory decision.
ORD	Strong support for the scientific program both extramural and intramural.
ORD	Create a workplce to forster innovative thinking and open deliberations on the interpretation of scientific data in evluating risks and less reliance on adhenrence to defaults and policy choices.

OTHER	Spend more time using science to make recommendations, rather than justify decisions.
ORD	Some scientists could use some ethics and QA/QC courses, for some complex Superfund sites the decisions should be made by technical people rather than non-technical managers, good scientists should be treated better to better retain them within EPA"
REGIONS	by keeping the science as independent of the policy/politics as much as possible. Policy has to enter in to decisions in a regulatory agency, but it should be considered independently of the science, rather than be allowed in influence the science."
REGIONS	Care about science more than about politics
OTHER	More science, less politics.
REGIONS	Include traditional ecological knowledge in scientific work. Conduct studies on the environment to see how the regulations are either helping or hindering. For example, what is the impact from the State of Alaska being exempt from portions of the Clean Water Act? What is the impact of allowing mixing zones? What is the impact of all of the discharges to the Cook Inlet? What is the impact of allowing log transfer facilities to cover acres of the ocean floor with debris? What is the impact on the ocean and its community of marine life from dumping fish waste at deep levels where monitoring is not required? "
REGIONS	Much of the work from technical personnel is simply ignored and therefore much of the technical expertise of the agency (which in many regional offices is rather limited compared to managers, non-technical staff, etc.) is simply wasted or very inefficiently used. Many times work is simply done by one person, ignored by managers if not providing the "right answer", and then redone by another person, and maybe ignored again. Not a good use of the limited number of field scientists and engineers in the EPA."
REGIONS	insulate the scientist from political and outside pressures.
REGIONS	More striving for the truth and less reliance of the voodoo science of risk assessment
REGIONS	If the administration/agency and Congress would develop laws and regulations that reflect the influence of the best current science. This would better motivate staff.
OSWER	EPA could provide more information on the confidence level we have around results. Increase efforts to reconcile modeling results with real world measurements.
REGIONS	Use the scientific method correctly rather than use the method only if it supports preconceived conclusions
OPPTS	In every administration there has been a need for the nonscientists to listen to the scientists - and for the scientists to learn how to translate what they say into lay language! We do currently have an Administrator whose background is science - our first. That can be a benefit if he translates effectively, and an obstacle if he second-guesses."
ORD	replace political appointees with scientists- allow more bottom up input from scientists for setting research agendas, programs and budget priorities"
REGIONS	Design a system where scientifically based decisions are not altered, ""watered down,"" or ignored because the technical basis for these decisions are not understood by Agency decision makers (or the public)."
REGIONS	Better inclusion in the process. Often we are asked to provide input later in the remediation process (after data is collected) when our expertise would have been useful in collecting better data.
ORD	Incorporate scientific research findings into regulatory decisions. Design research that specifically addresses recent policy decisions or forthcoming policy decisions, and incorporate those results into policies."
WATER	More work could be initiated. The problems are in lazy and incurious program operations, and poor understanding of science by managers. One doesn't see overtly hostile actions that are an affront to science very often. "
REGIONS	Set clear boundaries between science and policy; encourage scientists to inform policy based on science rather than setting policy implicitly and then selecting science to fit it.

OAR	I don't know, but it would involve letting the individuals most closely associated with developing data being more involved in explaining the meaning and significance of the data. It would also involve free communication between scientists with differing opinions to resolve discrepancies in the data. I also believe that experiments should be set up carefully and the importance of the results of one study should not be exaggerated until those results can be confirmed independently."
OPPTS	continue generating sound, defensible and reproducible scientific data "
OPPTS	As I have observed, the science staff have not been asked to change, alter, or misrepresent the facts. Therefore, the integrity of our work is well maintained. However, the regulatory staff and managers may make decisions that are not exactly in sync with the conclusions of the science memos. Thus, the scientific work really doesn't need improvement in terms of integrity; it's the regulators / decision makers' work that may need improvement but I don't see that side of the job so I don't have any specific suggestions. "
REGIONS	Open discussion of role of science in decisions versus role of other factors (e.g. legal requirements.)
REGIONS	Allow for requirement of best available technology to minimize pollution
WATER	The largest problem at EPA in evaluating science is caused by the staff in drive to justify their work. Problems increased significantly when the enforcement effort was separated from the program offices. The enforcement staff and DoJ drive Agency decision-making, with their biggest concern being enforcement ease, not scientific information. "
WATER	Be clear and honest about which conclusions are based purely on scientific aspects, vs other considerations may come into the decision making process (e.g. assessment of the environmental risk, vs how that risk is managed)."
OAR	Let scientists talk. Do not muzzle them.
ORD	Integrity of EPA science work may be improved by different factions within the agency having the capacity to include all of its interested scientists in various research programs. At this time, and in the past, different factions of the agency have a tendency to exclude various members who may have different views on how to help solve different EPA related science questions. It also happens that when these factions run out of new ideas to help address their interests, they retreat to those they have ignored before. This type of selective recognition makes it difficult to have faith in those who only give recognition when there is no other alternative for them. "
OAR	We require more respect for science (and objective information generally) in the nation's senior leadership.
REGIONS	My impression is that the issues described above usually occur at the National Level. I see another problem that impacts our Mission. The national policies and lowering ceilings for the number of people at the grass roots technical levels has steadily whittled away at the number of scientists in the EPA with actual experience performing analysis of environmental samples. EPA was created and began recruiting scientists in the 1970s; many have retired or will shortly do so. The inability to fill technical vacancies along with the loss of EPA libraries are bleeding down the EPA's technical knowledge base and our ability to provide or share the skills and knowledge that are critical to overall mission success.

## Other

OPPTS	No comment on this - as long as management continue not to put pressure on scientists who are doing their best to complete what is needed to be done and in a timely manner, morale will continue to be good."
ORD	more commitment to doing projects with multiple team members with different points of view.
REGIONS	In my position as a project manager, I have not encountered problems with the integrity of scientific work that need to be fixed. "
OPPTS	Improve the skill mix for public health, statistics, and epidemiology. There are too few epidemiologists for the amount of relevant science that needs to be reviewed for sound regulatory decisions. There are too many layers of weak or non-existent science people in upper mgmt."
ORD	Change in administration. Hopefully it will happen in 2009.
WATER	EPA needs to have their employees more involved in the science rather than contracting the work out.
ORD	Many of the controversies in chemical risk assessment revolve around cancer assessments. EPA has historically used a very conservative approach to such analyses. Some scientists and managers within EPA strongly object to acknowledging that these assessments are not necessarily very accurate or realistic assessments of public risk regardless of the strength of scientific evidence indicating that, at a minimum, a range of risk estimates are plausible. This has led to serious polarization among the scientific staff. Efforts to resolve this could be beneficial. However, it is not clear that those who prefer the traditional assessments are interested in listening to other positions regardless of the evidence supporting them."
REGIONS	I don't do pure scientific work...but on the grant side the administrative burdens for very small grants less than \$40,000 are disproportionate to the funding....both on the project officer side and the grantee. "
ORD	The EPA Scientific work has a great deal of integrity with many professional reviewers looking at the data and reports to ensure the highest quality data and information is produced. We also have work and final products go through Quality Assurance/Quality Control which defines exceptional quality work.
REGIONS	I believe the integrity of scientific work needs no improvement. Obviously, some employees may disagree with decisions that are made by administrators, etc. but I have not seen implications of forcing changes to scientific information to political pressures - external or internal."
WATER	Give us back our library
ORD	the agency should ensure that they have qualified and competent people running their laboratories.
REGIONS	Introduce scientific expertise as a criterion for selecting managers.
REGIONS	while I use my science, my work is not "pure" science. also, we are spread so thin that I work rather independently and the type of work I do is less subject to scrutiny than many projects might be. while I feel what I do is very important, it is not mandated in the usual sense, and has no regulatory ties, so management seems less concerned with getting involved."
ORD	I have found the integrity of scientific work done by the EPA to be very high. When problems arise they usually come from different interpretations of this good scientific work. Getting everyone to agree to the questions to be answered may be difficult, but it is essential to producing work of high integrity."
REGIONS	Not have the EPA's integrity questioned by horribly biased surveys like this one.
ORD	Pray more often
REGIONS	No Opinion

OAR	A constitutional amendment? I do not understand your question. Are you implying that the work is being sabotaged or purposely produced with error? Or are you implying that that the results are purposely misinterpreted, misapplied or miscommunicated? This is a much more complex subject than this box or my time will allow for.
OPPTS	Less contracting out - more work conducted by EPA scientists.
OPPTS	It can't!
OTHER	EPA scientists need to be more involved in scientific work that is being contracted out, given to grantees or through other assistance agreements. Too often the people managing scientific efforts have little or no scientific background. Each Office (AA'ship) should form a science team to address this broader issue and the minutes from the meetings should be made available at a minimum on the EPA intranet for all EPA employees to see."
OSWER	The only way to improve the work is to have more quality data on which to base decisions. We currently try to obtain the best data that are available and draw the best conclusions that we can from that and other available information. We do not conduct "schlock science" in my office. It would not be countenanced.
OPPTS	No comment
OPPTS	Currently, EPA is hamstrung by overly zealous interpretation of human studies guidelines. In one case a toxicologist had to delete "human studies" information from a risk assessment of an antibiotic because it was based upon side effects observed during 50 years of clinical use and was therefore considered to be a "Human Study". The assessment of worker risk has also been greatly hampered by the human studies rule. We are no longer allowed to measure worker exposures because they are considered "human studies" despite the fact that such exposures occur whether or not they are measured. "
OSWER	Hire engineers/scientists to make scientific decisions, not a history major"
OAR	OK
REGIONS	Better risk assessments that define the actual exposure to humans
ORD	By hiring technically competent managers
ORD	I do not have any personal experience in this area, however...I feel that too often, the scientist, who by the nature of their intimacy with the subject matter is the best able to represent the science (whether it be findings from an EPA study, or that from the global scientific community), is asked to provide summaries and sound-bites to upper management, who in turn present the findings to policy makers. Whether deliberate, or not, information is not presented thoroughly. Perhaps it the ever-so-important subtleties of the research that get lost (devil in the details). There is simply a disconnect between the experts and the politicians. I think this is probably true in all large work-places (e.g. supervisors taking credit for the ideas of their subordinates)."
OAR	not sure
OPPTS	At my level, nonsupervisory, and in my division, I have not experienced inappropriate influences. I don't know about such influences at higher levels or other parts of EPA."
REGIONS	Frankly I'm not sure that it can given that EPA is a regulatory agency and that involves politics.
OPPTS	This is a young and small agency that has, since its inception, been under enormous pressures. The ability to protect the environment is often also bound by the laws that govern the agency. So, the best way to improve the scientific work at EPA is to ensure that appropriate governing laws are enacted so that with reasonable interpretation the goals of protecting the environment may be met."
OAR	appointment of scientists

WATER	Hard to say, I've never been exposed to this problem"
ORD	Integrity begins and ends with the individual. Without an understanding of professional and personal ethics, the individual cannot be depended upon for reliable information. We have controls associated with the generation of scientific information that I believe work. "
OPPTS	Better advancement policy for scientists
WATER	Get rid of the entire Bush Admin and all Republicans.
REGIONS	I have no idea.
REGIONS	Much of the work for programs is done from a desk and very few have actual field knowledge to accurately make decisions. Too much time behind a desk and decisions are made by those who have no practical field knowledge to understand the types of delays and issues that arise from scientific work.
REGIONS	no opinion
OTHER	Have educated supervisors make decisions
ORD	Go back to the E in EPA and leave human health to NIH.
OPPTS	Hiring senior managers who have direct and current work experience in EPA-related missions
REGIONS	Through open communication of scientific results, open discussion of policy options, and transparent decision-making "
OPPTS	Change the Administration. I personally am very satisfied with my work situation, but from what I read about other areas, esp. global warming and air pollution, A LOT more needs to be done."
ORD	Of the work that is done, I do feel it is of the highest integrity. This, I feel, is not the issue. The issue is adequate resources to adequately complete the job. From my understanding the EPA's science budget has steadily decreased over the last decade or so. Along with this, the workforce had declined as well. Within the National Lab that I am a part, it has been said (this is hearsay and not official, although it is widely known) that 6 employees must leave EPA (e.g. through retirement) for one new hire. Considering the decline in the EPA workforce over the last several years, the increase in age of the current workforce, and the rather restrictive hiring it will not be long before the labs and divisions will be staffed at a level that makes it near impossible to conduct our work. Increased resources and FTEs would be the single improvement that would improve EPA science.
OTHER	Get rid of politicians
ORD	better political appointees.
REGIONS	In many cases the time frame of an issue, such as landfilling or dredging is based on engineering-type timeframes...100 years etc. It makes no sense to me to pretend that a landfill will be a permanent disposal site if no effort is made to evaluate its future over say, 10,000 years. It's not too hard. There are reasonable ways to get a handle on the 1000 year or even the 10,000 year story. 100 years is truly misleading.
OAR	No political appointees. Fewer lawyers (maybe just one) and more scientists/engineers in upper management including top EPA positions.
REGIONS	A new administration that values environmental protection would be the best way to improve our work.
OTHER	A new president who will reinstate the EPA at a cabinet level
REGIONS	Make it an independent agency.

OTHER	Tie work to real world situations, reinforce importance "
OAR	By establishing stricter hiring standards and by incorporating checks and balances in the hiring procedures so that appropriate people with scientific background are hired for positions where understanding of technical issues is important. The present system where every job description is written loosely to leave hiring at the whim of the management cannot bring in qualified people to make any difference.
REGIONS	First of all, EPA should hire well qualified scientists and well qualified contractors to conduct research studies. The scientific work produce by EPA's scientists should be reviewed by non-governmental well qualified scientists (or by EPA's contractor(s)). Similarly, a scientific research study conducted by EPA's contractors should be reviewed and approved by well qualified EPA scientists. oversight entific Research study conducted by EPA scientist(s) must be oversight fic There should be a oversight EPA should hire best scientists to oversight the scientific work produced by EPA's contractor(s) and its labs or conrtahir
WATER	political appointees should have a strong background in science and/or engineering.
OPPTS	Removal of politically-appointed decision makers in favor of independent, ostensibly objective review of the risk v. benefit paradigm subject to Judicial (rather than Executive) oversight."
OSWER	No suggestions.
ORD	the 'integrity' of the work is fine
OPPTS	Promote managers (branch chief, DD and OD) with specific science background, ideally with high education degrees."
OAR	Increased knowledge and competency of staff and less dependence on contractors. Purchasing, grants and contracts have all become so time consuming and onerous that it is becoming impossible to do any scientific work.
REGIONS	This is the difficult one, but to not have political appointees be the final decision makers for the agency."
WATER	More collaboration on multimedia issues
ORD	This survey was very biased in its conception. By lumping questions that include administrative limitations in publications with out and out scientific misconduct, it is inherently flawed. There is a big difference between having bureaucrats review policy-sensitive research results to make sure the researchers aren't making policy and having the researchers actually change the results. For a so-called scientific survey about scientific integrity, your agenda to embarrass the administration sure showed through. The fact is that EPA research is supposed to support regulatory efforts, and the research results are not supposed to contain policy statements. It is not unreasonable to have policy people review documents to make sure that the researchers aren't making policy. It is not unreasonable to limit researchers' interactions with the press so that they focus on the scientific issues."
REGIONS	Hopefully things will improve under the new administration.
REGIONS	I believe the integrity of scientific work in the EPA's Superfund program is sound, and does not need improving.
ORD	Put REAL SCIENTISTS in charge at all levels of management including the ADMINISTRATOR
REGIONS	By eliminating negative press and surveys such as this one.
ORD	More oversight by independent reviewers SAB, CASAC, etc."
REGIONS	Remove Cheney and Bush and all thier appointed representatives.

OPPTS	Rather than having us always overwhelmed with trying to meet deadlines to get assessments out, allow us more time to put towards improving the tools we use to do our work, such as models, GIS tools, programs, etc, and to keep up to date on advances in our field- get rid of lazy, incompetent people who do poor quality work, if they do any work at all, but are kept on because of the difficulty in firing anybody in the government and the fear of discrimination suits- have better integration of the work of separate divisions who deal with different aspects of the same issues
REGIONS	EPA needs a cabinet level position. The administrator should not be a politically appointed position.
ORD	By developing a hiring policy that focuses on recruiting new scientists at the forefront of their scientific fields. Too many EPA employees are being asked to work outside of their areas of expertise and are not capable of producing high quality work. In addition, EPA division directors and decision makers need to be scientific visionaries rather than bureaucrats or politicians. Finally, information technologies and policies need to be improved to allow EPA employees to more easily work with outside researchers."
ORD	By being fully vetted across a broad swath of the scientific community. Some EPA science is insular, only addressing EPA needs without regard to its value and validity to the broader scientific community"
OAR	Make EPA an independent agency
ORD	Eliminate PART Reviews
ORD	The shifting of responsibility for scientific research to outside contractors negatively impacts the integrity of work produced by EPA. This is because scientists care more about the research when they are personally invested in it (through direct involvement or the involvement of their research group).
ORD	Less planning more doing. Fewer reviews, but make sure recommendations from review panels are followed. Decentralize bureaucracy."
ORD	Reduce Administrative Burden and Influence
OAR	It seems our particular program is open and honest.
ORD	The research work is of high integrity. There is little relationship between the research work within EPA and the regulatory decisions made by the program offices and regions.
OPPTS	No comment
ORD	1)We need a new administration. This administration decides what it wants to do and finds the evidence to support that. Science is used selectively in decision making. This administration is anti-science in the sense that science doesn't guide decisions...rather decisions guide science.2) Improve resources. The budget cuts have had the desired effect...to halt scientific progress at the agency. My budget is down 50%. There is no money for new projects.
ORD	Change of party running the presidency that will actually listen to experts and not have pre conceived answers
OTHER	leave approval of content at the branch level
OPPTS	Rewrite the policy to reflect meaningful measures that addresses the totality of stressors in the environment in its myriad interactions, much of which is unknown."

REGIONS	RMRR rule was very inappropriate. Refusal to address market based CO2 trading or regulation is very undermining to the actual science. Refusal to direct new activities to Climate Change. DOJ's work load is substantially higher than those assigned to the Utility litigation cases. They need more Attorneys. The management's attention to employee adverse actions has been very inappropriate. They tend to discipline employees and operate immune from accountability of their own behavior. There seems to be an era of oppression to keep themselves free of hassle. Very oppressive. For Example the guards patrol the employees and to a lesser degree, for their security. Computers are searched for potential discipline possibilities. They tend to find who they want to oppress and then find the supporting evidence. Word has it that they have a list of employees to discipline, as time goes on, those employees get more and more actions. Word has it that the managers get feathers for removing an employee. Awards go to those on the A list and not for environmentally productive activities. Please keep this highly anonymous."
REGIONS	Always get the contractors involve with the EPA scientist especially in a project on regulatory decisions.
OAR	Keep hiring and promoting motivated and morally-based scientists
ORD	I have not seen any lack of integrity in the lab I work in, at least at my level. The incidences you requested information on may be occurring at higher levels in the halls of regulatory decision making offices of EPA, but I have not heard any such incidences through the grapevine. EPA is always sandwiched between the industries and the public advocacy groups and every decision makes one of these groups unhappy. I agree that the budget cuts or freezes have made research at EPA difficult and less attractive
ORD	Allow the science to drive policy rather than the other way around. This approach should take into account social and economic impacts as well.
OAR	Much better in last 1-2 years.
REGIONS	no comments
REGIONS	a change in the white house to a president who adheres to the constitution of the united states and who has even a modicum of concern for future generations.
REGIONS	EPA needs to catch up with chemical testing. There are so many chemicals in commerce that haven't been fully tested for toxicity and non-lethal endpoints. The U.S. is way behind in this regard and we really should be a worldwide leader. Developing and implementing this program would improve pretty much everything EPA does.
ORD	The integrity of most science at the EPA is fine; its the meddling by management that provides the appearance of non-sound science. Also, with the trend of moving research in-house and away from contracted-out research, there are many mid- to late-career researchs that do not have the capability to develop and manage a research program."
OSWER	By using research when making every day policy decisions.
OPPTS	Have managers that are scientists
REGIONS	Only upon the election of a new President in the United States.
OSWER	I have never considered this to be a problem in the program areas within which I have worked.
WATER	Let EPA scientists do the work instead of contractors.
REGIONS	I don't know personally anyone who has been denigned the ability of doing proper work

ORD	I am not aware of work at EPA having low integrity, therefore I would not know how to improve it."
OAR	change in administration
REGIONS	I'm not sure...much of what EPA relies upon is not necessarily produced by EPA, but by academia."
ORD	N/A
OAR	More attention to details, sufficient time put into schedules
ORD	Fewer contractors Require managers to have previous research experience. The most competent managers I've encountered had a strong research background.
OPPTS	I can't think of any.
ORD	In general, the integrity of scientific work at the EPA is on par with that of academic institutions and other similar entities. "
OPPTS	When IPA becomes EPA.
ORD	In my part of the agency (ORD) I think there is no problem with the integrity of scientific work. I do fear that there is a problem in other parts of the agency that have regulatory and policy responsibilities, but I have no personal knowledge about these."
REGIONS	This survey seems very biased by asking a number of leading questions. I'm not sure you are going to obtain effective, useful information. A small but vocal number of employees are distressed over the EPA library closings. Yet in my experience, no one has been able to demonstrate what exactly they have been unable to do since the library closed. As in any large organization, there is room for many diverse opinions. Just because an individual is a scientist/engineer does not prevent that person from "using" their own views of scientific results to state a political opinion of their own. In my experience, there have been individuals that always see the negative, never offer up meaningful solutions, and do not work towards a realistic solution to an environmental problem. After a while, this sort of person loses their credibility. Just because this individual may or may not be a scientist/engineer does not make them always absolutely correct in their opinion. Submitting your survey to this sort of disgruntled employee should obviously show high scores of management and politics interfering with scientific decision making, when it actually did not take place. I opted to place no opinion to a number of your questions, because this survey seems to direct a person to somehow indicate a negative is taking place. Good Luck!"
REGIONS	No comments
REGIONS	no comment
REGIONS	No Comment
OTHER	Make managers and key staff accountable for not following Agency policies on quality assurance of data and information.
ORD	equitable work distribution and recognition.
REGIONS	By getting the environmental wacko's to stop all their bullshit agenda's
OPPTS	I really do not see any problems with the integrity of EPA work. What I do see is that this survey has a very narrow view of what constitutes "science." It clearly excludes the social sciences. In doing so, it fails to recognize that "science" is not the only factor in addressing the problems and issues faced by society. I do see this reflected in a desire by EPA management to obtain "scientific" backing for it's decisions, sometimes at the expense of clearly explaining the trade-offs between two or more "scientific" approaches.
ORD	Encourage collaborations with universities, or atleast minimize the roadblocks to do so"
OPPTS	Managers should be required to take science ethics training.

OPPTS	My only experience is with the Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP). I am not aware of a lack of integrity in scientific work within OPP.
REGIONS	Hiring more scientists and allowing them to conduct the necessary studies.
OPPTS	More regulatory program supervisors who are actual (i.e., Ph.D.) trained scientists would be a good start. And much more weight really given to scientific outcomes -- they are most typically relatively a side-show to the many other factors that are much more important to EPA's regulatory program decision-makers.
OAR	Unknown from my perspective and position. The people I work for and with are some of the best in the world at their jobs and I have the utmost respect for their integrity.
OPPTS	the integrity of EPA-produced scientific work could be best improved by reevaluating the performance and abilities of the contractors, determining if they are indeed capable of performing difficult risk assessments and or if they possess the level of scientific knowledge needed to conduct a risk assessment.
OPPTS	By always telling the truth in matters.
OAR	Reducing the amount of administrative work imposed on scientists and engineers by the ever-increasing bureaucracy and oversight activities. A simple pass-fail performance appraisal system that enables supervisors to encourage team efforts that produce high synergies amongst peers versus the current artificial system, which encourages individual work/recognition and non-productive competition."
ORD	less OMB and DOD involvement. More NIH, CDC and HHS cooperation.
REGIONS	Greater use of EPA's Data Quality Objectives process (which is often ignored or not emphasized).
REGIONS	Allow EPA staff to gather scientific information such as surface water monitoring of mines in Nevada that is held in state files or take surface water samples directly.
REGIONS	Examine the role of OMB and develop better checks on their influence.
OPPTS	None necessary.
REGIONS	Of course, scientific objectivity should be encouraged and consensus should be respected
WATER	I do not share the implicit judgment in the survey that one can distinguish ""scientific"" and ""other"" decisions. As a result, it was difficult to answer some of the questions."
OTHER	It could be put into practice by robots who are given a preference mapping that is clear and conclusive (no greys, just black and whites).
REGIONS	Change the current administration.
REGIONS	My opinion is that the decisions that I, my local Division office, and, to much degree, my local Regional office are involved in, are carried out in a scientifically responsible manner. Fortunately, I myself have not been subjected to political pressure to change my findings. I worry most about national guidance and national policy and national regulations, when it comes to political pressure to change scientific findings and the resulting recommendations. I worry about headquarters offices, lack of support for some regional decisions on permitting and prevention, due to fears of political blowback from congressional committees (when republicans were in majority). I have not personally worked with these programs, so I cannot give you detailed recommendations. I hear bits here, but hear much on Public radio. (Thank goodness someone reports nationally on the EPA). If I were in a position to focus attention on scientific integrity issues at EPA, I would focus on the national decision-making level for permits, national guidance and policies, and regulations. I would focus on the willingness to pursue climate change issues (THIS has improved greatly since November). Thanks for asking the questions. The work you are doing is very important."
OPPTS	The integrity is fine at the Office of Pesticide Programs
OTHER	Not applicabal

REGIONS	<p>Integrity of any organization should flow from the top down. The current administration is very corrupt with respect to this issue. As long as they are in power, they will continue to appoint senior mgt. officials who will carry out their agenda. Under the democratic system of government where corrupt politicians appoint people of low to no integrity, the result will always be the same. The answer to this issue comes from a previous environmentally corrupt Republican Administration. The answer is that Congress will have to make the President and the Administrator of EPA be accountable. This actually happened under the Regan Administration when Gorsuch was EPA's Administrator. Congress made her be accountable for her lack of enforcement against polluters and the controversy which followed led to her removal. Regan was heading into his 2nd election and wisely did not want to have the ""EPA Controversy"" to deal with. So, he asked a person of integrity, Bill Ruckelshaus, to return as Administrator to quiet the storm. Bill was overwhelmingly confirmed by both Republicans and Democrats and he made Regan agree to two conditions (1)He would report directly to Regan and not to those criminals at the Whitehouse and OMB...they would not interfere with him or EPA, (2)the EPA budget would be restored to the level that it was under Jimmy Carter. Unless Steve Johnson's balls suddenly drop and he stands up to ""W"" and his OMB/Whitehouse goons, Congress will have to take the ""bull by the horns"" to improve the integrity of scientific work. Otherwise, we'll stay the same course for the next 17 months. "</p>
REGIONS	<p>New administration both in HQ and in my Regional Office that believes in EPA's mission of protecting human health AND the environment.</p>
REGIONS	<p>Work openly with high-profile and respected environmental organizations like UCS and Environmental Defense to contribute ideas for changes in regulations.</p>
OPPTS	<p>I believe that scientific work produced by the Agency is of the highest integrity. Regulatory decisions are based on a number of factors, all of which are important to government and to the American people. I believe that there is an extremist fringe element taht believes otherwise, however, and I also believe that people with extreme negative views about the Agency's science policies are most likely to respond to this survey.</p>
REGIONS	<p>Do not trust the Environmental Protection Agency to protect your environment. Ask questions. Be aware of political and economic motives. Become politically active. Elect officials with motives to protect the environment and hold them accountable. EPA management (at the HQ and regional level) should be rotated out with each presidential administration. The agency functions at this level more so than at the level of current political appointees. Provide more administrative help for scientists and engineers. I spend the bulk of my time not on scientific and engineering work but on administrivia. This has changed drastically during the current administration. The current performance evaluation process is a complete fraud. It is an avenue to promote those who hold with the current administration's political and economic views. It bypasses efforts to protect the environment. Currently EPA leaders are chosen not for their ability to lead, but to follow.</p>