

2024 Current Fiscal Year Report: Environmental Health Sciences Review Committee

Report Run Date: 04/25/2024 12:00:30 PM

1. Department or Agency

Department of Health and Human
Services

2. Fiscal Year

2024

3. Committee or Subcommittee

Environmental Health Sciences Review
Committee

3b. GSA

Committee No.

857

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

5. Current Charter

02/18/1991

6. Expected Renewal Date

7. Expected Term Date

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

No

8b. Specific Termination Authority

8c. Actual Term Date

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Continue

10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

Not Applicable

10b. Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority Authorized by Law

12. Specific Establishment Authority

42 U.S.C. 282(b)(16)

13. Effective Date

11/20/1985

14. Committee Type

Continuing

14c. Presidential?

No

15. Description of Committee Grant Review Committee

16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for
this Fiscal Year

17a. Open

0

17b. Closed

0

17c. Partially Closed

0

Other Activities

0

17d. Total

0

Meetings and Dates

No Meetings

Current Next
FY FY

18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Total	\$0.00	\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.00	0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary...shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -- (A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts... This Committee consists of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications and training activities in areas relevant to factors in the environment that affect human health, directly or indirectly . During this reporting period the Committee reviewed 17 applications, requesting \$78,035,647.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

Members are selected from outstanding authorities in the scientific disciplines which are of primary importance in environmental health research and manpower needs and include the fields of toxicology, pharmacology, epidemiology, pathology, genetics, biochemistry, and other fields as necessary and who are familiar with the program goals of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

The committee met twice during FY23.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

This Committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications and contract proposals. These evaluations and recommendations cannot be obtained from other sources because the specialized, complex nature of the applications and proposals requires a unique balance and breadth of expertise not available on the NIH staff or from other established sources.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

The meetings of the Environmental Health Sciences Review Committee were closed to the public for the review of grant applications. Sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6) of the

Government in the Sunshine Act permit the closing of meetings where discussion could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

21. Remarks

Website: This committee does not have a website.

Reports: This committee did not produce any reports during this fiscal year. The DFO and the Committee Decision Maker positions are held by the same individual based on the assignment of duties within this Institute. Chair: Dr. Diane Stearns was reassigned as Chair until her term ended on 6/30/2023. As of July 1, 2023, Dr. Lauren Aleksunes has been reassigned as Chair for the remainder of her term, retiring in June 2025. Affiliation: Due to the larger number of members serving on this committee, NIH staff are unable to provide additional information on Affiliation. Additional information on an individual's affiliation may be obtained by contacting the designated federal officer listed in this report. In general, initial/integrated review group (IRG) members serve up to six years, which is documented in the Members list. The permanent membership of this IRG may be supplemented at any meeting with temporary members who have experience or expertise in the disciplines and fields related to the IRG's function and are appointed to review some or all of the applications considered at that meeting. Therefore, the Members list reflects meeting dates, not appointment start and end dates for these members. While only one meeting date is listed as an appointment start and end date, an IRG temporary member may have attended several

meetings throughout the fiscal year. Meeting rosters, including members' affiliations and zip codes are available online at <https://public.era.nih.gov/pubroster/>.

Designated Federal Officer

Varsha Shukla Scientific Review Officer

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Aleksunes, Lauren	05/18/2022	06/30/2025	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Alshawabkeh,, Akram	03/12/2021	06/30/2024	George A. Snell Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Anderson, Brooke	06/08/2022	06/30/2025	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Bernstein, Kara	01/05/2023	06/30/2027	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Brown, Jared	07/01/2023	06/30/2029	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Elder, Alison	01/17/2023	06/30/2026	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Fuller, Christina	05/23/2022	06/30/2025	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Gangnon, Ronald	07/01/2023	06/30/2029	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Greenwald, Roby	01/03/2023	06/30/2026	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Harville, Emily	03/29/2021	06/30/2024	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Irudayaraj, Joseph	01/03/2023	06/30/2026	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Meeker, John	01/03/2023	06/30/2026	Professor and Senior Associate Dean	Peer Review Consultant Member
Morello-Frosch, Rachel	05/19/2022	06/30/2025	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Qian, Zhengmin	03/25/2021	06/30/2024	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

Rai, Shesh	06/01/2022	06/30/2025	Professor and Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
Ramirez-Andreotta, Monica	01/11/2023	06/30/2026	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Rao, Praveen	03/14/2021	06/30/2024	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Scammel, Madeleine	03/29/2021	06/30/2024	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Sheppard, Elizabeth	03/17/2021	06/30/2024	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Tighe, Robert	07/12/2023	06/30/2028	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Zheng, Tongzhang	07/01/2023	06/30/2029	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 21

Narrative Description

NIH's mission is to seek fundamental knowledge about the nature and behavior of living systems and the application of that knowledge to enhance health, lengthen life, and reduce illness and disability. NIH works toward that mission by supporting the research of non-federal scientists in universities, medical schools, hospitals, and research institutions throughout the country and abroad. Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary... shall by regulations require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -(A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts...

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if
Applies

Improvements to health or safety

☐

Trust in government

☐

Major policy changes

☐

Advance in scientific research

☒

Effective grant making

☒

- Improved service delivery ☐
- Increased customer satisfaction ☐
- Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements ☐
- Other ☐

Outcome Comments

Not Applicable

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- None ☒
- Unable to Determine ☐
- Under \$100,000 ☐
- \$100,000 - \$500,000 ☐
- \$500,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐
- \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000 ☐
- \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000 ☐
- Over \$10,000,000 ☐
- Cost Savings Other ☐

Cost Savings Comments

NIH supported basic and clinical research accomplishments often take many years to unfold into new diagnostic tests and new ways to treat and prevent diseases.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

562

Number of Recommendations Comments

NIH Grant Reviews

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant

applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes ☐ No ☒ Not Applicable ☐

Agency Feedback Comments

Information resulting from closed initial peer review meetings is subject to the Freedom of Information Act. The public can view information on research projects funded by NIH on the RePORT (Research Portfolio Online Reporting Tool) website located at <http://report.nih.gov>.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities ☐
Reallocated resources ☐

Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Action Comments

An action of approved or recommended for grants receiving initial peer review by this committee does not infer that the grant will be or has been funded. Research grant applications submitted to NIH must go through a two-step review process that includes the initial peer review for scientific and technical merit and a second step of review and approval by a National Advisory Council for program relevance. In addition, prior to an award or funding being made, NIH staff must conduct an administrative review for a number of other considerations. These include alignment with NIH's funding principles, review of the project budget, assessment of the applicant's management systems, determination of applicant eligibility, and compliance with public policy requirements. After all these steps have been completed, NIH officials make funding decisions on individual grant applications.

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes

What is the estimated Number of grants reviewed for approval 17

What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval 17

What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval \$78,035,647

Grant Review Comments

N/A

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Agency Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Committee Web Site	<input type="checkbox"/>
Online GSA FACA Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Publications	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Access Comments

N/A