

From: **James E. Enstrom** <jenstrom@ucla.edu>
Date: Thu, Jan 26, 2023 at 5:00 PM
Subject: Delay RSC Decision on CARB PM2.5 Life Expectancy Proposal
To: Suzanne E. Paulson <paulson@atmos.ucla.edu>
Cc: Yifang Zhu <yifang@ucla.edu>, Roya Bahreini <roya.bahreini@ucr.edu>, Francesca Hopkins <francesca.hopkins@ucr.edu>, Mary Prunicki <prunicki@stanford.edu>, Sam J. Silva <samsilva@usc.edu>, Aly M. Tawfik <tawfik@csufresno.edu>

January 26, 2023

Suzanne E. Paulson <paulson@atmos.ucla.edu>
Yifang Zhu <yifang@ucla.edu>
Roya Bahreini <roya.bahreini@ucr.edu>
Francesca Hopkins <francesca.hopkins@ucr.edu>
Mary Prunicki <prunicki@stanford.edu>
Sam J. Silva <samsilva@usc.edu>
Aly M. Tawfik <tawfik@csufresno.edu>

Re: Delay RSC Decision on CARB PM2.5 Life Expectancy Proposal

Dear CARB Research Screening Committee Members,

Because of several existing scientific and ethical problems, I request that the Research Screening Committee (RSC) delay its funding decision regarding the CARB Research Proposal Solicitation for "Study on Effects of Air Pollution Across Time and Generations" (<https://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/CARB/bulletins/34023e3>).

First, the very short time-line suggests that this solicitation is a rigged process designed to yield one predetermined award. The first announcement was made December 30, letters of intent were due on January 10, full proposals were due on January 23, and the RSC will select the winning applicant by January 31. There was not enough time to develop a detailed and responsive proposal unless an investigator knew about this solicitation before December 30.

Second, you were just appointed to the RSC on December 16. You have no formal training in epidemiology or statistics and you cannot objectively and properly evaluate proposed epidemiologic research on PM2.5 and mortality. Also, you have no historical perspective on the PM2.5 deaths controversy, which dates back to 1993 (<https://reason.com/1997/08/01/polluted-science/>). RSC Member Paulson knows the controversy best because she attended the February 26, 2010 CARB 'Dr' Tran Symposium on PM2.5 Deaths (https://cal-span.org/meeting/carb_20100226/). The 'Dr' Tran Symposium was held in response to the CARB fraud described in the November 16, 2009 letter by former CARB Member John Telles, MD (<http://scientificintegrityinstitute.org/Telles111609.pdf>). These three links provide detailed evidence that CARB, in conjunction with EPA, has systematically and dishonestly exaggerated the relationship between PM2.5 and total mortality in California since 1993.

Third, CARB Research Planning notified me on January 25 that the January 23 Enstrom Proposal to CARB on CA PM2.5 Deaths & Longevity "is not eligible to be considered for this research project". I requested that my Proposal be reviewed by the RSC, so that the RSC could determine its eligibility. The fact that my Proposal has not been shown to the RSC is direct evidence that this CARB solicitation is a rigged process designed to yield one predetermined award. Please examine the attached seven-page Enstrom Proposal, particularly Tables 1-3 on the last two pages. These Tables provide OVERWHELMING evidence that there has been NO relationship

(Relative Risk RR = 1.00) between PM2.5 and total mortality in California since 1960. While small positive relationships have been found in other parts of the US and in other countries, there is NO relationship in California. The refusal of CARB and EPA to cite the NULL evidence from many peer-reviewed publications is the form of scientific misconduct known as “falsification of the research record.” It is important that you examine the text and links in my proposal at least to the extent that you understand the essential elements of the PM2.5 deaths controversy.

If CARB selects a winning applicant on January 31, I will immediately challenge the validity of the CARB award. I will solicit help in my challenge from California business groups, appropriate University officials, appropriate members of Congress, and media that oppose CARB’s dishonest exaggeration of PM2.5 health effects in California (<http://scientificintegrityinstitute.org/SCAQMDSES110222.pdf>).

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

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, PhD, MPH, FFACE
Retired UCLA Research Professor (Epidemiology)
<http://scientificintegrityinstitute.org/biography.html>
[https://co2coalition.org/teammember/james-enstrom/
jenstrom@ucla.edu](https://co2coalition.org/teammember/james-enstrom/jenstrom@ucla.edu)
(310) 472-4274

Key Items from January 23, 2023 Enstrom Research Proposal to CARB:

Title: Study of PM2.5 and Life Expectancy in California, 1960-2020

Abstract:

The relationship between fine particulate matter (PM2.5) and mortality in the United States and California has been highly criticized and controversial since 1993. All aspects of the controversy were presented in the February 26, 2010 CARB ‘Dr’ Tran Symposium on “**Estimating Premature Deaths from Long-term Exposure to PM2.5**” (https://cal-span.org/meeting/carb_20100226/). Unfortunately, the criticisms of this relationship have been ignored by CARB. My recent critiques of the epidemiology of PM2.5 death claims in California are the November 2, 2022 Enstrom Criticism of the SCAQMD 2022 Air Quality Management Plan (<http://scientificintegrityinstitute.org/SCAQMDSES110222.pdf>) and the December 10, 2021 Enstrom Public Comment to the EPA CASAC PM Panel (<http://scientificintegrityinstitute.org/PMPanel121021.pdf>). A recent critique of the statistics of PM2.5 death claims is contained in the May 15, 2021 Young “Shifting Sands Report I--Keeping Count of Government Science: P-Value Plotting, P-Hacking, and PM2.5 Regulation” (<https://www.nas.org/reports/shifting-sands-report-i/full-report>). The long-term controversy regarding PM2.5 science and regulations has similarities to the emerging controversy regarding COVID-19 science and public policy (<https://www.dailynews.com/2022/12/31/the-shameful-suppression-of-pandemic-public-policy-dissidents/>). This study is in response to the December 30, 2022 CARB proposal solicitation “**A Study of Pollution Exposure and Life Expectancy Across Time in Different Generations in California**” (<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/study-pollution-exposure-and-life-expectancy-across-time-different-generations>). This study will evaluate the two Hypotheses stated below.

Hypothesis 1: PM2.5 is Not Related to Total Mortality or Life Expectancy in California

Hypothesis 2: Current Personal Exposure of Californians to PM2.5 is Below the Level of Health Effects