

JunkScience.com

September 8, 2016

Dr. William Farland
Chairman
Board on Environmental Studies and Toxicology
National Research Council
The National Academies
500 Fifth Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20001

Re: Committee on Assessing Toxicologic Risks to Human Subjects Used in
Controlled Exposure Studies of Environmental Pollutants

Dear Dr. Farland,

I am writing to express my concern about the above-captioned Committee's review of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) human experiments involving air pollutants. I am asking that describe how you will ensure that personal, professional and institutional conflicts of interest on the Committee and on the Board on Environmental Studies & Toxicology (BEST) will not result in a whitewash of the EPA's unethical, if not illegal experiments on human subjects.

The EPA appears to have quietly (if not actually covertly) contracted with the National Research Council to rehabilitate the image of the EPA's human experiments program, which had been criticized in a March 2014 report by the EPA Office of the Inspector General. The details of this unchallenged allegation are more thoroughly discussed in the attached July 24, 2016 *Washington Times* commentary, "The EPA's Secret Whitewash."

The Committee attempted to remedy the non-public nature of its review by belatedly accepting public comments to its docket and convening an additional public meeting on August 24, 2016. Copies of my comments submitted to the docket and presentation made to the Committee are attached. Based on a review of the documents the EPA had previously submitted to the Committee, virtually all the information presented by others and myself at the August 24 meeting was both material to the Committee's review and entirely new to Committee members. Nevertheless, only one Committee member had any questions (two) for the presenters.

While I appreciate having had the opportunity to present my information about the EPA human experiments to the Committee, I remain concerned that the Committee will simply rubber-stamp the EPA's unethical, if not illegal human experiments. To the extent the BEST is involved in the report — the BEST is, after all, the

Committee's parent organization — I have concerned that BEST may itself have a built-in bias toward the EPA as evidenced by board members' past and current associations with the agency:

William Farland (Chair) – former EPA deputy assistant administrator for science

Praveen K. Amar –PI on EPA extramural research grants worth \$2,999,230

Dominic M. DiToro – develops regulatory criteria for EPA

David C. Dorman - PI on EPA extramural research grants worth \$18,750,000

Charles T. Driscoll – PI on EPA extramural research grants worth \$7,437,921

Linda Greer – official at the Natural Resources Defense Council

Steven P. Hamburg – Chief Scientist of the Environmental Defense Fund

Philip K. Hopke - PI on EPA extramural research grants worth \$17,596,104

Scott H. Matthews - PI on EPA extramural research grants worth \$10,000,000

Joan B. Rose - PI on EPA extramural research grants worth \$16,564,742

Gina M. Solomon – member of EPA's Science Advisory Board

Robert Sussman – former Senior Policy Counsel to the EPA Administrator

Deborah L. Swackhamer - PI on EPA extramural research grants worth \$6,296,996

- PI = Principal Investigator

Thus, 13 of the BEST's 19 members have demonstrably significant professional and/or financial ties to the EPA and/or to EPA-funded activist groups. I am looking for your assurance that these relationships will have no undue influence on the Committee's final report.

Thank you for your attention. I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Steven Milloy
Publisher

Attachments

cc: BEST members