

April 10, 2017

Professor of Economics C. Arden Pope III
Brigham Young University, Utah

cap3@byu.edu

Professor of Statistics Daniel Krewski
University of Ottawa, Canada

dkrewski@uottawa.ca

Dear Professors Pope and Krewski,

I am writing you because I have strong evidence that the 1995 Pope *AJRCCM* article, the 2000 Krewski HEI Reanalysis Report, and the 2009 Krewski 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 is described 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,” particularly Tables 2 and 3 and References 26 and 27.

My [March 10, 2017 email message](#) requested that [HEI staff](#) evaluate my evidence. My April 3, 2017 email message notified the [HEI Board of Directors](#), [HEI Research Committee](#), and the [HEI Review Committee](#) of my request. HEI has not evaluated my evidence and apparently has not asked for your assistance. Thus, I make the following request directly to you as lead authors:

“In order to test the validity of my evidence, I request that you conduct a sensitivity analysis that produces tables similar to the California tables presented with your [September 7, 2010 letter to CARB](#). Specifically, please produce tables which describe the PM_{2.5} and mortality relationship in the CSP II cohort for the Ohio Valley states (Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia) and for the remainder of the Continental United States.” This can be done with minor modifications of the SAS Program that was used to produce the 2010 California tables.

Please complete this analysis as soon as possible and email me the results in the 2010 format so that they can be compared with the results in my Tables 2 and 3. Until you produce unequivocal results to the contrary, I will make the case that my NULL CPS II PM_{2.5}-mortality findings are correct and support other findings that “[The EPA Lied—Nobody Died](#).” All this new evidence reinforces the need for the [HONEST Act](#) to be passed by the U.S. Senate and signed into law.

Thank you very much for your cooperation regarding this extremely important request, which is a direct challenge to the scientific and public health validity of the EPA PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

Sincerely yours,

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