

Date: 07:16 AM 9/3/2008

To: "Eric Garshick" <eric.garshick@med.va.gov>

Subject: Request For Your 1998 Letter Regarding CARB SRP

Cc: "Eric Garshick" <eric.garshick@channing.harvard.edu>

Dear Dr. Garshick,

I hope that you will respond to my August 22, 2008 email message below. In particular, I would very much like to receive a copy of your 1998 letter discussed by Dr. Hanspeter Witschi at the March 11, 1998 CARB SRP meeting (see below). I am making this request as part of my petition to CARB. The request is important because CARB diesel emissions regulations are having a major impact on the California economy.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Best regards,

Jim Enstrom

University of California
Box 951772
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1772

(310) 825-2048

(310) 476-9110 FAX

<http://www.arb.ca.gov/srp/mt031198.pdf>

0001

01 BEFORE THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL

02 ON TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS

03 AIR RESOURCES BOARD

04 DR. JOHN FROINES, CHAIRMAN

07

08 IN THE MATTER OF:

09 THE AIR RESOURCES SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL

10 PUBLIC MEETING

15

15 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

16 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

17 WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 1998

0240

01 DR. WITSCHI: I HAVE A QUESTION AND IT'S TO ERIC
02 AND MAYBE I HAVE MISSED IT, YOU KNOW.
03 THERE IS YOUR LETTER WHEN YOU CAME DOWN IN
04 WRITING THAT YOU OBJECT TO USING YOUR STUDIES FOR A
05 QUANTITATIVE RISK ASSESSMENT, AND I'M NOT QUITE CLEAR
06 TODAY WHERE WE STAND ON THAT ONE.
07 COULD YOU CLARIFY THIS FOR ME?

At 11:11 AM 8/22/2008, James E. Enstrom wrote:

August 22, 2008

Eric Garshick, M.D.
Harvard Medical School
VA Boston Healthcare System
eric.garshick@channing.harvard.edu
eric.garshick@med.va.gov

Dear Dr. Garshick:

I am writing because your epidemiologic research was prominently used in the Scientific Review Panel (SRP) deliberations that lead to the 1998 declaration by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) that diesel particulate matter is a toxic air contaminant (TAC). This TAC declaration has subsequently led to the May 22, 2008 CARB estimate that diesel particulate matter is responsible for 3,900 premature deaths in California annually. However, there is extensive evidence, not used by CARB, indicating that fine particulate matter does not currently cause premature deaths in California. This evidence is described in my attached July 11, 2008 comments regarding the May 22, 2009 CARB Draft Staff Report **“Methodology for Estimating Premature Deaths Associated with Long-term Exposures to Fine Airborne Particulate Matter in California”**. Because of this new evidence and other related reasons, a group of California professors, including myself, has petitioned CARB to reassess its 1998 TAC declaration regarding diesel particulate matter, as described in the attached June 17, 2008 letter.

Because of the reservations you expressed in your March 11, 1998 SRP comments, some of which are shown below, would you be willing to submit to CARB your latest occupational epidemiologic evidence relevant to the 1998 TAC declaration regarding diesel particulate matter? Particularly helpful would be California-specific evidence on railroad workers and truck drivers exposed to diesel exhaust.

Thank you very much for your consideration regarding this important issue.

Best regards,

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

<http://www.arb.ca.gov/srp/mt031198.pdf>

0001
01 BEFORE THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL
02 ON TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS
03 AIR RESOURCES BOARD
04 DR. JOHN FROINES, CHAIRMAN
07
08 IN THE MATTER OF:
09 THE AIR RESOURCES SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL
10 PUBLIC MEETING
15
15 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
16 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
17 WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 1998

0240
08 DR. GARSHICK: WELL, I THINK THE ISSUE WAS THAT
09 TRYING TO HAVE ONE SLOPE DESCRIBE ALL THE DATA AT THIS
10 POINT IS -- HAS MANY UNCERTAINTIES, AND THAT REALLY IS THE
11 MAJOR OBJECTION.
12 AND I THINK THAT, YOU KNOW, TRYING TO
13 EXTRAPOLATE BACK PAST EXPOSURES PLUS WITH THE STUDY THAT
14 NEEDS SOME ADDITIONAL FOLLOW UP TO DEFINE THAT SLOPE, AND
15 THAT WAS REALLY -- REALLY MY POINT.
16 AND I MEAN, IT SHOULDN'T BE UNDO EMPHASIS --
17 THERE SHOULDN'T BE UNDUE EMPHASIS PUT ON THE SLOPE,
18 PARTICULARLY GIVEN THE DISCUSSIONS WE'RE HAVING RIGHT
19 NOW.
20 AND I -- I THINK THAT IT DEPENDS ON WHAT'S
21 DRIVING THE PROCESS. I MEAN, IF -- IF THE LAW SAYS THE
22 CALIFORNIA MUST COME UP WITH A -- WITH A SLOPE TO DRIVE
23 REGULATION, THEN THE POTENTIAL PROBLEM, POINTING AN
24 EMPHASIS ON THAT SLOPE, GIVEN ALL THE UNCERTAINTY -- ON
25 THE OTHER HAND, THE BOARD HAS TO IDENTIFY A TOXIC AIR

0241

01 CONTAMINANT BASED ON QUALITATIVE DISCUSSION, THEN WE HAVE
02 DONE THAT.

0245

20 DR. GARSHICK: YOU KNOW, IN TERMS OF THE
21 QUANTITATIVE ASPECTS OF THE ANALYSIS, IN TERMS OF THE
22 QUALITATIVE ASPECTS, A LOT OF -- A LOT OF WEIGHT TENDS TO
23 BE GIVEN TO DECISIONS MADE BY -- BY BODIES SUCH AS THIS,
24 PARTICULARLY SPECIFYING RANGES SUCH AS UPPER LEVELS OF
25 RANGE MAY BE UNDULY EMPHASIZED AS COMPARED TO LOW LEVELS
0246

01 OF RANGES. AND THAT'S WHAT I'M TALKING ABOUT, THE
02 UNCERTAINTY.

03 NOW, IT SHOULDN'T -- IT SHOULDN'T PARALYZE
04 THE REGULATORY PROCESS, BUT AND THE REASON WHY I'M
05 EMPHASIZING THE UNCERTAINTIES IS THAT MAY INDEED HAPPEN,
06 AND UNTIL WE KNOW MORE ABOUT THE ACTUAL POTENCY OF DIESEL
07 PER SE, WE'LL BE FORCED TO LIVE WITH THE -- HAVE THE
08 UNCERTAINTIES, AND I THINK THAT THE STAFF MADE A COMMENT
09 THAT THEIR OPINION THAT THE LOWER LEVEL OF THE RANGE WAS
10 MORE -- MORE APPROPRIATE. PERHAPS LOWER THAN THAT.

11 SO I THINK THAT'S THAT -- I'LL JUST ADD THAT
12 CAVEAT

Attachments:

C:\AirPollution\Petition Challenging CARB Diesel TAC Declaration061708.pdf;

C:\AirPollution\CARB Enstrom Comments Re PM2.5 Mortality Report 071108.pdf;