Dear Dr. Enstrom,

We received your proposal to develop a collaboration with us on a study of PM2.5 in relation to total mortality using CPS-II data.

We are considering your request and will reach back out to you shortly.

Susan M. Gapstur, PhD, MPH
VP, Epidemiology Research Program
American Cancer Society

From: James E. Enstrom [mailto:jenstrom@ucla.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2013 3:54 PM
To: Susan Gapstur
Cc: Peter Campbell; Mia Gaudet; Eric Jacobs; Marjorie McCullough; Alpa Patel; Victoria Stevens; Lauren Teras
Subject: Repeat Proposal for PM2.5 & Mortality Analysis Using CPS II

August 21, 2013

Dear Dr. Gapstur,

Because of the importance of my August 15, 2013 email message below, I am sending it again in order to make sure that you have received it. I request that you and/or other members of the ACS Epidemiology Team acknowledge receipt of my proposal and indicate that it is being given serious consideration. I understand that "A decision on whether or not a full proposal should be submitted can often be made within a week . . . ." I request a timely response given the August 19, 2013 deadline for EPA compliance with the House Science Committee subpoena described below.

Thank you very much for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.
August 15, 2013

Susan M. Gapstur, Ph.D., M.P.H.
Vice President, Epidemiology Research Program
American Cancer Society
National Home Office
250 Williams Street NW
Atlanta, Georgia, 30303
susan.gapstur@cancer.org

Dear Dr. Gapstur,

I am writing to propose a collaborative analysis focusing on the relationship of fine particulate air pollution (PM2.5) and mortality in the ACS CPS II cohort. This analysis would 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).

Background and Significance

For information on the immediate national significance of this proposal and on my training and experience, please read the August 9, 2013 Science article “House Subpoena Revives Battle Over Air Pollution Studies” (http://www.sciencemag.org/content/341/6146/604.full), the August 10, 2013 GlobalWarming.org blog “Dispute Continues Over House Science Committee Subpoena to EPA for Secret Science” (http://www.globalwarming.org/2013/08/10/dispute-continues-over-house-science-committee-subpoena-to-epa-for-secret-science/) and the August 12, 2013 ScienceInsider article “Will House Science Panel Need an Ethical Review?” (http://news.sciencemag.org/climate/2013/08/will-house-science-panel-need-ethical-review). More details are provided in the cited hyperlinks, particularly one to my August 8, 2013 letter.

My history with the ACS dates back to 1973 and I have had extensive dealings with most of the ACS epidemiologists who previously held your position. In 1991 I was given identifying information and questionnaire data on the 118,094 California subjects in CSP I. I have almost completed 50-year mortality follow-up on these subjects, while maintaining absolute subject confidentiality. The follow-up procedures used are described in my 1999 Epidemiology paper “Smoking cessation and mortality trends among 118,000 Californians, 1960-1997” (http://journals.lww.com/epidem/Abstract/1999/09000/Smoking_Cessation_and_Mortality_Trends_among_7.aspx).
Proposal


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

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.
UCLA School of Public Health and
Scientific Integrity Institute
914 Westwood Boulevard #577
Los Angeles, CA 90024
jenstrom@ucla.edu
(310) 472-4274