

From: Dan Greenbaum <DGreenbaum@healtheffects.org>  
To: "James E. Enstrom" <jenstrom@ucla.edu>  
CC: ACohen <ACohen@healtheffects.org>,  
Rashid Shaikh <RShaikh@healtheffects.org>,  
"Robert O'Keefe" <RO'Keefe@healtheffects.org>  
Subject: RE: Request re 2000 HEI Reanalysis Report & 2013 AJRCCM Article  
Date: Fri, 4 Oct 2013 20:37:30 +0000

Dear Dr. Enstrom:

We are responding to your request concerning the HEI 2000 Reanalysis of the American Cancer Society Study.

- First, as I noted in my timely earlier response to you of September 22, 2010 (attached), we do not have the information you seek about the HEI 2000 Reanalysis and had suggested you contact Dr. Krewski and his colleagues directly for that (which it appears you chose to not do). We HAVE recently placed all of the "available upon request" appendices from the 2000 Reanalysis report, including for example the "Computer Programs and Output Used in the Replication of the Original Analyses of the American Cancer Society Study," into electronic form (they had always been available in hard copy) and can make those available to you.
- Second, and more importantly, all of our activity, and that of most of the air pollution scientific world, is no longer focused on the 2000 Reanalysis, but on the 2009 extended analysis which we funded and published (and for which we had Dr. Krewski conduct California-specific requests at the request of the California Dump Truck Owners Association which are also referenced in the attached email). As a result, we would not prioritize at this stage for Dr. Krewski or any of his colleagues to go back to data analysis questions for work conducted 13 – 15 years ago and which is not currently being used for scientific or regulatory impact analysis purposes.
- Finally, we are aware of the recent activities of the House Science Committee to access the data, and have been providing advice both to them and to US EPA on the best and most effective means to accomplish data sharing in situations like this.

Thank you for your interest in the work of HEI.

Sincerely,

Dan Greenbaum  
President  
Health Effects Institute  
101 Federal Street, Suite 500  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110 USA  
Tel: +1 617 488 2331 (Direct)  
Tel: +1 617 488 2300 (Main)  
Fax: +1 617 488 2335  
[dgreenbaum@healtheffects.org](mailto:dgreenbaum@healtheffects.org)  
[www.healtheffects.org](http://www.healtheffects.org)

**From:** James E. Enstrom [mailto:jenstrom@ucla.edu]  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 22, 2013 8:42 PM  
**To:** Dan Greenbaum  
**Cc:** ACohen  
**Subject:** Request re 2000 HEI Reanalysis Report & 2013 AJRCCM Article

September 22, 2013

Daniel Greenbaum, President  
Health Effects Institute  
101 Federal Street, Suite 500  
Boston, MA 02110-1817

Dear President Greenbaum,

I am writing as a follow-up to your September 22, 2010 email message (<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/Greenbaum092210.pdf>). On August 15, 2013 I proposed to Susan M. Gapstur, Ph.D., American Cancer Society Vice President of Epidemiology Research Program, a collaborative analysis focusing on the relationship of fine particulate air pollution (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) and mortality in the ACS CPS II cohort. I proposed that this analysis be done in accord with the ACS Cancer Prevention Studies Data Access Policies and Procedures (<http://www.cancer.org/acs/groups/content/@research/documents/document/acspc-039148.pdf>). Following a subsequent exchange of emails, I requested on September 16, 2013 that she alone perform the following three well-defined tasks by September 30, 2013:

- 1) Produce a table showing the mortality risk (MR) and 95% CI for PM<sub>2.5</sub> each city in Figure 5 and Figure 21 of the 2000 Krewski HEI Reanalysis Report (<http://pubs.healtheffects.org/view.php?id=6>), as per my August 3, 2002 request to Dr. Aaron Cohen of HEI (<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/Cohen080902.pdf>) and my September 13, 2010 request to Daniel Greenbaum of HEI (<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/Greenbaum092210.pdf>). My requests to HEI and others have gone unanswered for over 11 years, in spite of the fact that the results I am seeking have been available for over 13 years. If you cannot locate the original Figure 5 and Figure 21 calculations, please redo them immediately using the same methodology specified in the 2000 Krewski HEI Reanalysis Report.
- 2) Using the same CA CPS II data and programs that were used to calculate the relative risk (RR) results for 1982-2000 presented in your September 1, 2013 AJRCCM paper, please calculate a RR and 95% CI for total (all cause) mortality for two follow-up periods, 1982-1989 and 1990-2000, for the PM<sub>2.5</sub> LUR, NO<sub>2</sub> LUR, and Ozone IDW models in Table 4, for the three two-pollutant models in Table 5, and for the California, National Level, and Los Angeles Only models in Table 6.
- 3) Based on the evidence from Tasks 1) and 2), state whether you still agree that the following two concluding statements in your September 1, 2013 AJRCCM paper accurately describe the totality of the CPS II-based findings on the relationship between PM<sub>2.5</sub> and total mortality in California: "Using the first individualized exposure assignments in this important cohort, we found positive associations of fine particulate matter, O<sub>3</sub>, and NO<sub>2</sub> with mortality." and "In sum,

the associations observed here reduce key uncertainties regarding the relationship between air pollution and mortality and confirm that air pollution is a significant risk factor for mortality."

Unfortunately, on September 20, 2013 Dr. Gapstur denied my request for a collaboration and she has not performed any of my three specific tasks. Since Daniel Krewski, Ph.D., Michael Jerrett, Ph.D., and Richard T. Burnett, Ph.D., are primary authors of both the 2000 Krewski HEI Reanalysis Report and the September 1, 2013 AJRCCM article "Spatial Analysis of Air Pollution and Mortality in California"

(<http://www.atsjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1164/rccm.201303-0609OC>), I request that you ask them to perform these tasks by September 30, 2013. Task 1) is a repeat of my August 3, 2002 request to Dr. Aaron Cohen and I believe that the table I am requesting has existed for over 13 years and is possessed by at least one of these authors. This table was essential for the preparation of Figures 5 and 21. Task 2) may take somewhat more than a week to complete, but I believe that the authors already have an answer to Task 3).

In formulating your response to me regarding this request, you and the three Canadian Ph.D. scientists should be aware of the US House Science Committee subpoena to US EPA for the ACS CPS II "secret science" data that underlies both the 2000 Krewski HEI Reanalysis Report and the September 1, 2013 AJRCCM article (<http://science.house.gov/press-release/smith-epa-stands-default-subpoena>). If the three Canadians are not familiar with the US House of Representatives, then they should read the Constitution of the United States (<http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/constitution.html>). Finally, in my opinion, the completeness, accuracy, and timeliness of your response to me will be a direct measure of the scientific integrity and basic credibility of ACS, HEI, and the three Canadians.

Thank you very much for your prompt consideration of this important request.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.

[jenstrom@ucla.edu](mailto:jenstrom@ucla.edu)

(310) 472-4274

From: Dan Greenbaum <DGREENBAUM@healtheffects.org>  
To: "James E. Enstrom" <jenstrom@ucla.edu>  
CC: ACohen <ACohen@healtheffects.org>, Rashid Shaikh  
<RShaikh@healtheffects.org>, Robert O'Keefe <RO'Keefe@healtheffects.org>  
Subject: RE: Request for City-Specific Relative Risks in HEI Reanalysis Report  
Date: Wed, 22 Sep 2010 15:29:57 +0000

Dear Dr. Enstrom,

Thank you for your recent request concerning the HEI-sponsored Reanalysis of the Harvard Six Cities and American Cancer Society studies which was conducted by Dr. Daniel Krewski and his team and which we published in 2000. As you requested, I have enclosed a copy of Appendix F of that report (as noted on Page 238 of the report) which contains the detailed descriptions of the metropolitan statistical areas used in the analysis.

HEI does not have the city-specific point estimates you request, and as Aaron Cohen suggested when he responded to your request several years ago, we would suggest that you contact Dr. Krewski directly to see if his team can provide those results. I might note that although these individual city estimates may not be readily available, we did recently provide to the California Dump Truck Owners and ARB the California specific results for Tables 33 and 34 of Dr. Krewski's more up-to-date HEI-funded analysis (published in 2009). These results, which were requested by the Dump Truck Owners, do include California-specific results for follow-up through 1989 which would be similar though likely not identical to the results in the reanalysis. If you were not aware of these results, ARB has now posted them as supplemental information on their PM Symposium website at:  
[http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/health/pm-mort/pm-mort-ws\\_02-26-10.htm](http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/health/pm-mort/pm-mort-ws_02-26-10.htm).

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

**From:** James E. Enstrom [mailto:jenstrom@ucla.edu]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 13, 2010 11:39 AM  
**To:** Dan Greenbaum  
**Cc:** ACohen  
**Subject:** Request for City-Specific Relative Risks in HEI Reanalysis Report

September 13, 2010

Daniel Greenbaum, Ph.D., President  
Health Effects Institute  
101 Federal Street, Suite 500  
Boston, MA 02110-1817

Dear Dr. Greenbaum:

I am writing regarding the "Reanalysis of the Harvard Six Cities Study and the American Cancer Society Study of Particulate Air Pollution and Mortality: HEI Special Report. July 2000" (<http://pubs.healtheffects.org/view.php?id=6>). I am requesting the city-specific relative risks, including 95% confidence intervals, for fine particles and sulfates in the ACS CPS II cohort that are shown in Figure 5 on page 161 and Figures 19-21 on pages 195-197 of Part II: Sensitivity Analyses (<http://pubs.healtheffects.org/getfile.php?u=275>). I understand that a list of these relative risks by city has been available since the publication of the HEI Reanalysis Report, although it is separate from the regular Appendices. Also, I am requesting the precise geographic definition associated with each city, particularly the cities within California. If the precise definition is not available, then I request the best available definition. Please let me know if you need any further details regarding these requests.

Finally, I request that you and no one else send this information to me as soon as possible via email and/or regular mail. I never received this information following my initial August 3, 2002 request to Dr. Aaron J. Cohen (<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/cohen080902.pdf>).

Thank you very much for your valuable assistance in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.  
University of California, Los Angeles  
Box 951772  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1772  
<http://www.cancer.ucla.edu/>  
jenstrom@ucla.edu  
(310) 825-2048



[Krewksi 2000 Appendix F.pdf](#)