Dear Dr Enstrom,

I regret that it will not be possible to satisfy your request.

On Dec 6, 2008, at 4:32 PM, James E. Enstrom wrote:

Dear Dr. Dominici,

As a follow-up to your October 1 email message, I am writing to request that you run your R and SAS statistical programs to produce new MCAPS results, equivalent to those in Tables 1-4 of your August 12, 2008 EHP paper, for California residents (468 zip codes), other US residents (4,100 zip codes), and all US residents (4,568 zip codes). I am willing to pay you for the expenses associated with these computer runs. These proposed results are directly relevant to the October 24, 2008 CARB Final Report on PM2.5 and premature deaths in California (http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/health/pm-mort/pm-mort_final.pdf). Although your EHP paper is cited in Table 1 of this report, it is omitted from Tables 2a and 2b, which were the tables used to estimate the current relationship between PM2.5 and premature deaths in California.

Because the MCAPS cohort can provide important results directly relevant to the current relationship between PM2.5 and premature deaths in California, I hope you will seriously consider my request. If you are unable to conduct the analyses proposed above, can you suggest another way that they can be conducted?

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Best regards,

Jim Enstrom
http://www.cancer.ucla.edu
jenstrom@ucla.edu
(310) 825-2048
I greatly appreciate your response to my request regarding the results in the August 12, 2008 EHP paper. Although you do not have California-specific death rates, if possible, I would like to know the California portion of the "Western U.S." numbers in Table 1:

- Zip codes = 640, Counties = 62, Monitoring sites = 119, Persons = 3.1 million, Person-years = 14.4 million.

Based on my examination of Figure 1, most of the zip code locations in the "Western U.S." [California, Oregon, and Washington] appear to be in California. Any California-specific numbers that you have would be quite useful to me.

Of the 640 zip codes, 468 are in California.

Also, can you provide me with any additional information about your sensitivity analysis in Los Angeles County? For instance, has this analysis been posted as a JHU Biostat Working Paper?

Unfortunately no - sorry

This is an important and timely request because of the ongoing evaluation of the relationship between PM2.5 and mortality in California by the California Air Resources Board staff: [http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/health/pm-mort/pm-mortdraft.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/health/pm-mort/pm-mortdraft.pdf)

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Best regards,

Jim Enstrom
Dear Dr Enstrom,

Dr Samet has forwarded your inquiry to me. Unfortunately we don't have results specifically for the California counties as you are requesting. As part of the EHP paper we have conducted a very extensive Sensitive analysis specifically for the zip codes in Los Angeles county. We plan to publish that analysis in the near future.

Best regards
Francesca

Francesca Dominici PhD
Professor
Department of Biostatistics
Bloomberg School of Public Health
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, MD 21205
Phone: 410-6145107
www.biostat.jhsph.edu/~fdominic
Dear Dr. Samet,

I am writing regarding your August 12, 2008 *Environmental Health Perspectives* paper "Mortality in the Medicare Population and Chronic Exposure to Fine Particulate Air Pollution in Urban Centers (2000-2005)" ([http://www.ehponline.org/members/2008/11449/11449.pdf](http://www.ehponline.org/members/2008/11449/11449.pdf)), which is the published version of your 2007 Working Paper 133 ([http://www.bepress.com/jhubiostat/paper133/](http://www.bepress.com/jhubiostat/paper133/)). Page 18 states "A provocative finding is that the MCAPS data show no evidence of a positive association between zip-level PM$_{2.5}$ and mortality rates for the 640 urban zip counties in the West. This lack of association is largely because the Los Angeles basin counties have higher PM$_{2.5}$ levels than other West Coast urban centers but not higher adjusted mortality rates." I would very much like to know the relationship between PM$_{2.5}$ and mortality during 2000-2005 for MCAPS subjects residing in California. Your California-specific results are highly relevant to estimating premature deaths associated with PM$_{2.5}$ in California, as explained in my July 11, 2008 "Comments Regarding May 22, 2008 CARB Draft Staff Report" ([http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/PMDeathsEnstrom071108.pdf](http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/PMDeathsEnstrom071108.pdf)).

On September 10 I asked Dr. Scott Zeger for California-specific results from Working Paper 133, but have not yet received a response from him.

Thank you very much for your consideration regarding this request and for any information that you can give me on your California-specific results.

Best regards,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.
Jonsson Comprehensive Cancer Center
University of California, Los Angeles
[www.cancer.ucla.edu](http://www.cancer.ucla.edu)
jenstrom@ucla.edu
(310) 825-2048
September 10, 2008

Professor Scott Zeger
Chair of Biostatistics
Johns Hopkins University
szeger@jhsph.edu

Dear Dr. Zeger:

I am writing regarding your 2007 Working Paper 133, "MORTALITY IN THE MEDICARE POPULATION AND CHRONIC EXPOSURE TO FINE PARTICULATE AIR POLLUTION" (http://www.bepress.com/jhubiostat/paper133/). On page 12 you state "No positive association was found between county-level PM$_{2.5}$ concentration and mortality rates for the 32 urban counties in the western U.S. In the MCAPS cohort, the lack of association for the West is largely because the Los Angeles area counties have higher PM$_{2.5}$ levels than other western counties, but not higher adjusted mortality rates." I would very much like to know the relationship between PM$_{2.5}$ and mortality during 2000-2002 for MCAPS subjects residing in California counties. My December 15, 2005 Inhalation Toxicology paper (reference 24) found no relationship between fine particulate air pollution and mortality during 1983-2002 in eleven California counties and I would like to compare your results for California with mine. Thank you very much for your consideration and for any information that you can give me on your California results.

Best regards,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.
Jonsson Comprehensive Cancer Center
University of California, Los Angeles
www.cancer.ucla.edu
jensstrom@ucla.edu
(310) 825-2048