From: **USC Provost** <uscprovost@usc.edu>
Date: Fri, Feb 15, 2019 at 4:23 PM
Subject: RE: Request to Discuss USC Professors and SCAQMD Regulations
To: JAMES E ENSTROM <jenstrom@ucla.edu>
Cc: Presidents Office <president@usc.edu>

Dear Dr. Enstrom,

Thank you for reaching out again. I appreciate your thoughts. I wish I had the time to discuss this matter further with you and our colleagues here in the Department of Preventive Medicine. Unfortunately, my schedule is incredibly tight. I will not be able to take a phone call or meet with you. However, I continue to support your right to advocate for your findings, just as I support our faculty and others to do the same.

I wish you well in your research.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Quick, Ph.D.
Provost and Senior Vice President
for Academic Affairs
Shelly and Ofer Nemirovsky Provost's Chair
University of Southern California
3551 Trousdale Parkway, ADM 102
Los Angeles CA 90089-4019
(phone) 213.740.2101
uscprovost@usc.edu

From: JAMES E ENSTROM <jenstrom@ucla.edu>
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2019 12:45 PM
To: USC Provost <uscprovost@usc.edu>
Cc: Presidents Office <president@usc.edu>
Subject: Request to Discuss USC Professors and SCAQMD Regulations

February 14, 2019

USC Provost Michael W. Quick
uscprovost@usc.edu

Dear Provost Quick,

I greatly appreciate your response to my February 13, 2019 email message. I request the opportunity to speak with you in person or on the telephone regarding the issues described in my email message. These issues are directly relevant to academic freedom and scientific integrity at both USC and UCLA and to the Southern California economy.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, PhD, MPH, FFACE
jenstrom@ucla.edu
(310) 474-4274

From: USC Provost <uscprovost@usc.edu>
Date: February 14, 2019 at 10:25:45 AM PST
To: "James E. Enstrom" <jenstrom@ucla.edu>, Presidents Office <president@usc.edu>
Cc: Duncan Campbell Thomas <dthomas@usc.edu>, "Kiros T. Berhane" <kiros@usc.edu>, Edward Lawrence Avol <avol@usc.edu>, William Gauderman <jimg@usc.edu>, "Frank D. Gilliland" <gillilan@usc.edu>, Rob Scot McConnell <rmcconne@usc.edu>, Constantinos Sioutas <sioutas@usc.edu>, "'Andrea M. Hricko'" <jfroines@ucla.edu>
Subject: RE: USC Professors Support SCAQMD and Costly Unjustified Regulations

Dear Dr. Enstrom,

Thank you for your email dated February 13, 2019. As academic colleagues of yours, President Austin and I respect your career and value your PM2.5 research. We support and encourage your right to speak out in defense of your findings. We also support and encourage our faculty and others to express their views as well.

We wish you the best as you continue your research.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Quick, Ph.D.
Provost and Senior Vice President
for Academic Affairs
Shelly and Ofer Nemirovsky Provost's Chair
University of Southern California
3551 Trousdale Parkway, ADM 102
Los Angeles CA 90089-4019
(phone) 213.740.2101
uscprovost@usc.edu

From: James E. Enstrom <jenstrom@ucla.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2019 3:56 PM
To: Presidents Office <president@usc.edu>
Cc: USC Provost <uscprovost@usc.edu>; Duncan Campbell Thomas <dthomas@usc.edu>; Kiros T. Berhane <kiros@usc.edu>; Edward Lawrence Avol <avol@usc.edu>; William Gauderman <jimg@usc.edu>; Frank D. Gilliland <gillilan@usc.edu>; Rob Scot McConnell <rmcconne@usc.edu>; Constantinos Sioutas <sioutas@usc.edu>; 'Andrea M. Hricko' <jfroines@ucla.edu>
Subject: USC Professors Support SCAQMD and Costly Unjustified Regulations

February 13, 2019

Interim President Wanda M. Austin
president@usc.edu
Provost Michael W. Quick
uscprovost@usc.edu
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90089

Re: USC Professors Support SCAQMD and Costly Unjustified Regulations

Dear President Austin and Provost Quick,

I am an accomplished epidemiologist who has had a long academic career at UCLA. In particular, I am an expert on air pollution health effects in California. Since 2005 I have published strong evidence that fine particulate matter (PM2.5) is NOT harmful to Californians and that multi-billion-dollar CARB and SCAQMD PM2.5 regulations are NOT justified. On January 30, 2017 I submitted very detailed null evidence to SCAQMD showing that there is NO scientific, public health, or economic justification for the costly new SCAQMD PM2.5 regulations contained in their 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (http://scientificintegrityinstitute.org/GhoshAll013017.pdf).

However, instead of engaging in a professional dialog in order to understand my detailed null evidence, key USC professors simply ignore it and continued to support SCAQMD and its regulations. For example, twelve USC Preventive Medicine professors signed a March 4, 2016 SCAQMD support letter (https://junkscience.com/2016/09/university-of-california-profs-demand-continuation-of-air-pollution-gravy-train/). The September 5, 2016 JunkScience analysis of these USC professors reveals that seven of them have received at least $268 million in air pollution research funding from EPA and NIEHS. I believe that this massive amount of research funding has influenced their research findings and their continuing support for SCAQMD regulations. My belief is reinforced by USC Preventive Medicine Professors Duncan C. Thomas and Kiros T. Berhane, who have failed to respond to my January 3, 2019 and June 27, 2018 email messages shown below. These messages summarize the latest epidemiologic evidence that PM2.5 does not cause premature deaths and that there is NO justification for new SCAQMD regulations.

We are now at a critical point where all Southern California taxpayers may be forced to comply with new unjustified SCAQMD regulations that are paid for with the a one-half-cent sales tax being promoted by SCAQMD (http://www.dailybulletin.com/aqmd-considers-seeking-a-one-half-cent-sales-tax-in-four-counties-for-clean-air-programs). If a new regressive sales tax is approved, it will hurt every Southern California taxpayer, particularly the struggling blue collar workers who surround the two USC campuses.

Thus, I request the opportunity to discuss the above issues with you or an appropriate person within your offices. I have copied the relevant USC Preventive Medicine Professors with the hope that they will finally examine and understand my null evidence and publicly oppose the proposed SCAQMD sales tax.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, PhD, MPH, FFACE
UCLA and Scientific Integrity Institute
http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/
jenstrom@ucla.edu
(310) 472-4274

cc: Duncan C. Thomas <dthomas@usc.edu>
Kiros T. Berhane <kiros@usc.edu>
Edward S. Avol <avol@usc.edu>
W. James Gauderman <jimg@usc.edu>
Frank D. Gilliland <gillilan@usc.edu>
Rob S. McConnell <rmcconne@usc.edu>
Constantinos Sioutas <sioutas@usc.edu>
Andrea M. Hricko <jfroines@ucla.edu>

From: **James E. Enstrom** <jenstrom@ucla.edu>
Date: Thu, Jan 3, 2019 at 10:44 AM
Subject: Request to Assess Evidence of NO PM2.5 Deaths in US
To: Duncan C. Thomas <dthomas@usc.edu>
Cc: Kiros T. Berhane <kiros@usc.edu>

January 3, 2019

Duncan C. Thomas, PhD
Department of Preventive Medicine
USC School of Medicine
dthomas@usc.edu

Re: Request to Assess Evidence of NO PM2.5 Deaths in US

Dear Dr. Thomas,

I request that you ask Dr. Berhane to respond to my unanswered June 27, 2018 email message regarding my overwhelming evidence of NO PM2.5 Deaths in the US. On October 1, 2018, I presented six sources of null evidence to the PM2.5 Working Group in Washington, DC (http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/PM25WGJEE100118.pdf). If Dr. Berhane continues to refuse to reply, then I request your assessment of this evidence. This request is important because the multi-billion-dollar PM2.5 regulations imposed upon Californians by EPA, CARB, SCAQMD, and SJVAPCD are

scientifically and economically unjustified. USC professors have played a major role in the research and interpretation of evidence that has led to these unjustified regulations. If I receive no response from you or Dr. Berhane, then I will assume that your unwillingness to address unethical PM2.5 science and regulations is consistent with the recent lack of ethics at the USC School of Medicine (https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-usc-dean-harassment-20171005-story.html).

Thank you very much for your serious consideration of my serious request.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, PhD, MPH, FFACE
Current EPA SAB Candidate
UCLA and Scientific Integrity Institute
jenstrom@ucla.edu
(310) 472-4274

Subject:FW: Request to Examine Enstrom Evidence of NO PM2.5 Deaths in US
Date: Wed, 27 Jun 2018 14:00:38 -0700
From: James E. Enstrom <jenstrom@ucla.edu>
To: 'Kiros T. Berhane' <kiros@usc.edu>

June 27, 2018

Kiros T. Berhane, PhD
USC Department of Preventive Medicine
HEI Review Committee
kiros@usc.edu

Dear Dr. Berhane,

Dr. Steven N. Goodman, Co-Director of METRICS, has declined my June 13, 2018 request below to have METRICS examine my strong evidence of NO PM2.5 deaths in the US, in spite of the fact that he spoke at the April 30, 2018 HEI Session "Can We Rely on Environmental Health Research?" Since you co-chaired this HEI Session and have extensive expertise in air pollution biostatistics and epidemiology, I request that you examine my evidence, as explained below and in the two attachments. Please let me know if there is a convenient time when we can discuss this evidence via telephone.

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

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, PhD, MPH, FFACE
UCLA and Scientific Integrity Institute
jenstrom@ucla.edu
(310) 472-4274

From: James E. Enstrom <jenstrom@ucla.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 12:11 PM
To: 'Steven N. Goodman' <steve.goodman@stanford.edu>
Subject: Request to Examine Enstrom Evidence of NO PM2.5 Deaths in US

June 13, 2018

Steven N. Goodman, MD, PhD
Co-Director, METRICS
steve.goodman@stanford.edu

Dear Dr. Goodman,

I am writing as a follow-up to my telephone call Tuesday afternoon regarding your April 30, 2018 HEI Presentation "What Does Research Reproducibility Mean?" Your Slide 3 shows that the first "Criteria for reproducible epidemiologic research" is "Analytical data set is available." As explained in my attached March 28, 2017 Dose-Response article, I obtained an analytical data set for the ACS CPS II cohort and showed that there is NO robust relationship between PM2.5 and total mortality in the CPS II cohort. My findings challenge the validity of the 1995 AJRCCM Pope article, the 2000 HEI Reanalysis Report, and the 2009 HEI Research Report 140, as described in the attachment. The April 30, 2018 HEI Presentation by Richard T. Burnett "Particulate Matter Reproducibility and Air Pollution Epidemiology" OMITS all reference to my Dose-Response article and other relevant research since 2005. His Slide 12 deliberately exaggerates the relationship between PM2.5 and total mortality in the US. My second attachment presents my reanalysis of Burnett's Slide 12 and shows that there is NO current relationship between PM2.5 and total mortality in the US. I want to present my Dose-Response article to HEI staff and affiliates, but HEI will not allow me to do so.

All of this casts doubt upon the reliability of air pollution epidemiology which has been used to establish EPA regulations. Please make a preliminary assessment of my attachments, both of which are relevant to the proposed EPA Rule "Strengthening Transparency in Regulatory Science." Hopefully, a METRICS Team Member can examine these attachments in detail and give me their assessment.

Thank you very much for your consideration and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, PhD, MPH, FFACE
UCLA and Scientific Integrity Institute
jenstrom@ucla.edu
(310) 472-4274

Date: Thu, 03 Jul 2014 16:22:41 -0700
To: Duncan Campbell Thomas <dthomas@usc.edu>
From: "James E. Enstrom" <jenstrom@ucla.edu>
Subject: Enstrom Explanation of Secret Science Reform Act
Cc: Stan Young <young@niss.org>

Thank you for responding to me and asking about H.R. 4012. You have already received the explanation below from Jon Samet. My explanation is that you should read the two attached commentaries by Lamar Smith: July 30, 2013 WSJ Op-Ed "EPA's Game of Secret Science" and June 24, 2014 WSJ Op-Ed "What is the EPA Hiding from the Public?" Also, you should read my September 28, 2012 ASA JSM Proceedings Paper "Particulate Matter is Not Killing Californians" (http://scientificintegrityinstitute.org/ASAS092812.pdf). Finally, statistician Dr. S. Stanley (Stan) Young, ASA Fellow, will explain the importance of H.R. 4012 to you. Stan is one of the 87 experts who signed the letter in support of H.R. and you should recognize his name because he spoke at the July 15, 2011 @ 3 PM USC Biostat Seminar and met with some of the USC professors who received my email message.

Please let Stan and me know your assessment of H.R. 4012 after reading the links in the House Science Committee press release, the WSJ Op-Eds, my paper, and Stan's paper. Transparent and reproducible science will remain an important issue no matter what happens to H.R.4012.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

From: "Samet, Jonathan" <jsamet@med.usc.edu>
To: "Andrea M. Hricko" <ahricko@usc.edu>
CC: Duncan Campbell Thomas <dthomas@usc.edu>,
"James E. Enstrom" <jenstrom@ucla.edu>,
"Scott A. Fruin" <fruin@usc.edu>,
William Gauderman <jimg@usc.edu>,
"Frank D. Gilliland" <gillilan@usc.edu>,
Rob Scot McConnell <rmcconne@usc.edu>,
"Samet, Jonathan" <jsamet@med.usc.edu>,
"Wu, Anna" <Anna.Wu@med.usc.edu>
Subject: Re: story on Secret Science Reform Act
Date: Thu, 3 Jul 2014 21:36:02 +0000

all, there is a long story here that dates to the 1996 PM Standard and use of the Harvard and ACS data on particles and mortality. At that time, there were efforts to obtain release of these data sets (to industry) that resulted in the HEI re-analysis led by Krewski. This is about the same story--EPA has been subpoenaed for these data once more, even though they don't have them. The last episode led to the Shelby Amendment and mandated data sharing under some circumstances. Another mixing of special interests, science and policy. Jon

Jonathan M. Samet, MD, MS
Professor and Flora L. Thornton Chair
Department of Preventive Medicine
Keck School of Medicine
Director, Institute for Global Health
University of Southern California
Soto Street Building, Suite 330A
2001 N. Soto Street, MC 9239
Los Angeles, CA 90089
Phone: 323.865.0803
Fax: 323.865.0854

For FEDEX deliveries use zip code 90032

For appointments and scheduling please contact:

Luz Moncayo
Email: moncayo@USC.edu
Phone: 323.865.0401
Sent from my iPad

On Jul 3, 2014, at 12:40 PM, "Andrea M. Hricko" <ahricko@usc.edu> wrote:

http://www.eenews.net/stories/1060002292

From: Duncan Campbell Thomas
Sent: Thursday, July 03, 2014 10:11 AM
To: James E. Enstrom
Cc: Andrea M. Hricko; Scott A. Fruin; William Gauderman; Frank D. Gilliland; Rob Scot McConnell; Jonathan M Samet; Anna H Wu-Williams
Subject: Re: Request to USC to Support Secret Science Reform Act

Huh??? Since when does EPA use "secret science"??? I don't recognize a single name on the 87 experts list, other than Enstrom. So what's the back story? Sounds like another Republican anti-science, anti-regulation ploy. I couldn't get to the WSJ op-ed article, so if one of you has it, maybe worth circulating.

On Jul 3, 2014, at 9:57 AM, James E. Enstrom <jenstrom@ucla.edu> wrote:

July 3, 2014

Dear USC Professors,

Since you are scientists with extensive expertise in air pollution epidemiology and the EPA, I strongly encourage you to support the *Secret Science Reform Act of 2014* (H.R. 4012). This bill was approved by the U.S. House Science Committee on June 24, 2014 (see below) and it will be taken up by the full House of Representatives later this summer. A June 23, 2014 letter of support has been signed by 87 experts (http://science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/Letter%20of%20Support%20for%20HR%204012%20-%2087%20Experts.pdf) and additional scientists and academics are indicating their support. Please let me know if you are willing to sign this letter of support for H.R. 4012.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.
Physicist and Epidemiologist
UCLA School of Public Health and
Scientific Integrity Institute
jenstrom@ucla.edu

http://science.house.gov/press-release/committee-approves-bill-prohibit-epa-using-secret-science

Committee Approves Bill to Prohibit EPA from Using Secret Science

June 24, 2014

Washington, D.C. – The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology today approved the *Secret Science Reform Act of 2014* (H.R. 4012) to require that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) base its regulations on data that is public.

Chairman Lamar Smith (R-Texas): "The EPA's regulatory process is both hidden and flawed. It hides the data and then handpicks scientists to review it. The American people foot the bill for the EPA's billion dollar regulations and they have the right to see the underlying data. If the EPA has nothing to hide, and if their data really justifies their regulations, why not make the information public? Data sharing is becoming increasingly common across scientific disciplines. The legislation requires that EPA science be available for validation and replication. Americans impacted by EPA regulations have a right to see the data and determine for themselves if the agency's actions are based on sound science or a partisan agenda. This bill ensures transparency and accountability. The American people deserve the facts. And so does good policy."

The *Secret Science Reform Act* was introduced by Environment Subcommittee Chairman David Schweikert (R-Ariz.) and has received letters of support from over 80 scientists and experts, 30 trade associations, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the former head of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, the former head of EPA's Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, and the California Construction Trucking Association.

Subcommittee Chairman Schweikert: “Public policy by public data. Today, with the reporting of H.R. 4012, the Committee took a big step forward in ensuring transparency for the American people.”
The *Secret Science Reform Act* does not require any disclosure of confidential information. It would only prohibit EPA’s use of secret science. A 2013 poll from the Institute of Energy Research found that 90 percent of Americans agree that studies and data used to make federal government decisions should be made public.
Provisions in the bill are consistent with the White House’s scientific integrity policy, the President’s Executive Order 13563, data access provisions of major scientific journals, the Bipartisan Policy Center and the recommendations of the Obama administration’s top science advisors.
For more information on today’s markup, including amendments and roll call votes, visit the Science, Space, and Technology Committee website.

June 24, 2014 Wall Street Journal Op-Ed by Lamar Smith "What is the EPA Hiding from the Public": http://online.wsj.com/articles/lamar-smith-what-is-the-epa-hiding-from-the-public-1403563536

Letters Supporting H.R. 4012: http://science.house.gov/letters-support-secret-science-reform-act-2014-hr-4012
87 Experts Letter of Support 30 Trade Associations Letter of Support U.S. Chamber of Commerce Letter of Support Dr. Graham Letter of Support Dr. McClellan Letter of Support CCTA Letter of Support
<USC Email for Support For Secret Science 070214.xlsx>

Duncan C. Thomas, Ph.D.
Professor, Biostatistics Division
Verna Richter Chair in Cancer Research
Dept of Preventive Medicine
University of Southern California
2001 N. Soto Street, C-202F, MC 9234
Los Angeles, CA
Zip: 90089-9234 (Postal)
90033 (FedEx)
email dthomas@usc.edu
phone (323) 442-1218
fax (323) 442-2349
mobile (818) 406-8096

WSJ OpEd EPA's Game of Secret Science Smith 073013.pdf

WSJ OpEd What is EPA Hiding from Public Smith 062414.pdf