

Date: Thu, 12 Dec 2013 10:25:06 -0800
To: "Michael R. Ransom" <ransom@byu.edu>
From: "James E. Enstrom" <jenstrom@ucla.edu>
Subject: Important Request re BYU Professors Pope & Bickmore

December 12, 2013

Michael R. Ransom, Ph.D.
Professor and Recent Chair
Department of Economics
Brigham Young University
130 FOB
Provo, UT 84602
ransom@byu.edu
(801) 422-4736

Dear Dr. Ransom,

I am writing because you have published epidemiologic papers on particulate matter and mortality with BYU Professor C. Arden Pope, III, and because you are aware of the scientific and economic concerns about the regulations that have resulted from PM2.5 epidemiology. Largely because of these scientific and economic concerns, the US House Science Committee issued an August 1, 2013 subpoena of EPA "secret science" data used in key PM2.5 epidemiologic studies, particularly those published by Dr. Pope. In response to this subpoena, BYU Professor Barry R. Bickmore wrote the August 27, 2013 Climate Asylum blog "SL Trib: Chris Stewart and LaMar Smith Conspiracy Theorists" (<http://bbickmore.wordpress.com/2013/08/27/sl-trib-chris-stewart-and-lamar-smith-conspiracy-theorists/>). He ended his blog by citing these sentences from the Salt Lake Tribune: "For Barry Bickmore, a BYU geochemist, the attacks on air-pollution science are the latest examples of "nutty beliefs" about scientific issues from the GOP. Bickmore, who takes on "climate deniers" in his Climate Asylum blog, said this controversy is the latest example of the manufacturing of uncertainty to accomplish political aims, just as politicians have done in the past to discredit the science surrounding secondhand smoke and the addictiveness of nicotine. "This is just par for the course," he said. "This is the same thing going on some of the same people, too."

These sentences are an insult to me, several of my scientific colleagues, and the twenty distinguished members of Congress who voted for the subpoena. The subpoena is not about "nutty beliefs" from the GOP or "the manufacturing of uncertainty," but about EPA "secret science" data that has been used for multi-billion dollar PM2.5-related regulations. Three recent examples in California and Utah of these multi-billion dollar regulations are described in the December 7, 2012 comments of Randy Thomas of Watts (<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/Thomas120712.MP3>), the November 27, 2013 City of Redding letter (<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/Redding112713.pdf>), the December 5, 2013 Salt Lake Tribune article (<http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/politics/57180623-90/utah-plan-emissions-quality.html.csp>).

On November 15, 2013 I send an email message to Dr. Bickmore regarding his offensive sentences and I asked him to personally evaluate my 10-page, 5000-word November 15, 2013 document "Scientific Misconduct in Fine Particulate Matter Epidemiology by Dr. C. Arden Pope, III, in Collaboration with Drs. Daniel Krewski, Michael Jerrett, and Richard Burnett, with the Complete Cooperation of the American Cancer Society" (<http://scientificintegrityinstitute.org/Pope111513.pdf>). Instead of giving me his evaluation of my document, which I have meticulously prepared over the past eight years, he sent me a November 15, 2013 email message that stated "I am unwilling to comply with your assignment" and he called my document "a poorly written mess that sounds like a diatribe by someone who is a bit unhinged."

Thus, I request your assessment of my November 15, 2013 document regarding scientific misconduct by Dr. Pope. Second, I request your opinion on the appropriateness of Dr. Bickmore's comments about the subpoena and me. Finally, I want to know if you consider the economics costs associated with PM2.5-related regulations are justified by the PM2.5 epidemiologic findings of Dr. Pope. If I do not receive a response from you to the contrary, I will assume that you consider my November 15, 2013 document to be entirely invalid, Dr. Bickmore's comments to be quite appropriate, and the economic costs associated with PM2.5-related regulations to be well justified.

Thank you very much for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.
UCLA & Scientific Integrity Institute
jenstrom@ucla.edu
(310) 472-4274