May 19, 2017

Dear Chair Celeste,

I greatly appreciate your May 12 email response to my May 10 email message, as shown below. I want to inform you that Drs. Pope, Krewski, and Gapstur have just written formal comments about my Dose-Response article. Their comments contain NONE of the analyses on PM2.5 deaths that I have repeatedly requested since March 10. Instead, their comments contain numerous false statements indicating that they have not read my article. For instance, they state "Enstrom asserts that he estimates smaller PM2.5-mortality associations because he uses the 'best' PM2.5 data. He provides no evidence in support of this assertion . . . ." However, my evidence is clearly presented in Table 2 and explained in the Results text on page 4. Also, they state “It is not clear how or why his 'IPN' PM2.5 data differ from the 'HEI' PM2.5 data—especially given that these data come from the same monitoring network.” However, the differences in PM2.5 data are clearly and fully shown in Appendix Table A1 and explained in the Conclusion text on page 6. Thus, as of today, my Dose-Response findings of NO relationship between PM2.5 and total mortality in the ACS CPS II cohort stand as valid.

My NULL findings challenge the validity of the findings in the 2000 and 2009 HEI Reports and HEI should acknowledge this challenge, as I requested on May 10. Also, HEI should arrange a Forum where all of the key PM2.5 investigators can publicly debate the relationship between PM2.5 and premature deaths in the CPS II cohort. Members of the HEI Board, Staff, Committees, and Funders should participate in this Forum.

For your information, concerned experts like Steve Milloy and myself are continuing to inform EPA, Congress, industry representatives, impacted businessmen, and the general public of the STRONG evidence that PM2.5 does not cause premature deaths in the United States. We are convincing these groups that the EPA PM2.5 NAAQS and regulations need to be reformed. Also, we are convincing them that the 'secret science' research of Drs. Pope, Krewski, and Gapstur is wrong and that HEI should not continue to support it. My final suggestion is that you talk directly with HEI Board Member Linda Rosenstock, who knows a tremendous amount about me.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.
Dear Dr. Enstrom:

Thank you for your message. HEI Senior Staff brought your recent paper to the attention of the Board of Directors and we discussed it in some detail at our recent Board meeting. I am also pleased to know that Dan has been in touch with you by email and on the phone, and I know that he, along with the others in HEI leadership and in consultation with our Scientific Committees, is preparing further comments for you.

We at the HEI Board of Directors take our role of safeguarding the quality and integrity of the Institute’s science very seriously and welcome the opportunity for our Research and Review Committees to hear of other research that has come forward on the same topics on which HEI has conducted and reviewed studies. Having said that, we are confident that our time-tested procedures for rigor and independence have resulted in a large body of high quality and credible contributions to the science of air pollution and health.

We look forward to hearing more from Dan Greenbaum about your ongoing communication.

Sincerely

Richard Celeste, Chair

HEI Board of Directors
On Wed, May 10, 2017 at 6:05 PM James E. Enstrom <jenstrom@ucla.edu> wrote:

May 10, 2017

Board of Directors
Research Committee
Health Effects Institute (HEI)

Dear HEI Board and Research Committee Members,

I am writing to update you on my March 10, 2017 HEI email message. I now have strong uncontested evidence that the 2000 HEI Reanalysis Report and the 2009 HEI Research Report 140 deliberately misrepresented and exaggerated the relationship between fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$) and total mortality in the ACS Cancer Prevention Study (CPS II) Cohort. My evidence of NO relationship is presented in my March 23, 2017 ICCC-12 talk and PPT “PM$_{2.5}$ Does Not Cause Premature Deaths” and in my March 28, 2017 Dose-Response article “Fine Particulate Matter and Total Mortality in Cancer Prevention Study Cohort Reanalysis.” In addition, HEI President Daniel S. Greenbaum has now informed me that the lead CPS II investigators, BYU Professor C. Arden Pope III, U Ottawa Professor Daniel Krewski, and ACS Epidemiologist Susan P. Gapstur, have produced NO evidence that challenges the validity of the NULL findings in my Dose-Response article.

Thus, I request that you and/or HEI Staff post an appropriate notice on the HEI Website that my uncontested NULL CPS II findings contradict the CPS II findings in the 2000 and 2009 HEI Reports cited above. Also, I request your personal assessment or acknowledgment of my evidence. For your information, I am submitting all of my evidence to US EPA Regulatory Reform as per Executive Order 13777. Also, I am making a strong case to the primary HEI funders and appropriate Congressional Committees that the CPS II investigators, including HEI Principal Scientist Aaron J. Cohen, have deliberately exaggerated the relationship between PM$_{2.5}$ and total mortality in order to promote a scientifically unjustified EPA PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS.

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

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.
UCLA and Scientific Integrity Institute
jenstrom@ucla.edu