



CalConTrk.org

California Construction Trucking Association

334 N. Euclid Avenue • Upland CA, 91786-6031

Office 909-982-9898 • Fax 909-985-2348

publishing@CalConTrk.org

August 15, 2014

Chancellor Gene D. Block
University of California, Los Angeles
2147 Murphy Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1405
chancellor@conet.ucla.edu

Re: Reject Michael Jerrett, Ph.D., as UCLA Environmental Health Sciences Chair

Dear Chancellor Block,

We know that UCLA is searching for a new Environmental Health Sciences (EHS) Chair (<http://ph.ucla.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/EHS%20Chair%20Search%20oct2513.pdf>) and we understand that one of the top candidates for this position is UC Berkeley Prof. Michael Jerrett (<http://ph.ucla.edu/events/ehs-seminar-michael-jerrett-phd-ubiquitous-and-participatory-sensing-assessing-individual>). As knowledgeable California businessmen who financially support the University of California as long-term taxpayers, we strongly urge you to reject Prof. Jerrett for this influential position for two major reasons.

The first reason we are against Jerrett's hiring, is the almost laughable volume of research largess Jerrett has engaged in, mostly synonymous with scientific misconduct by systematically misrepresenting and exaggerating the relationship between fine particulate matter and total mortality and even heart disease in California. During 2010 and 2011 we wrote several letters to UC President Mark G. Yudof regarding Jerrett, which give detailed criticism of his PM2.5 epidemiologic research. Our correspondence and UC responses are contained in a 50-page attachment (<http://calcontrk.org/Jerrett051711.pdf>).

The latest misconduct by Jerrett is his September 1, 2013 *AJRCCM* paper "Spatial Analysis of Air Pollution and Mortality in California" (<http://www.atsjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1164/rccm.201303-0609OC>). His paper focuses on questionable measures of significant PM2.5 and mortality relationship based on one obviously tortured ad hoc model, but it completely ignores the overwhelmingly null evidence in his October 28, 2011 CARB Final Report "Spatiotemporal Analysis of Air Pollution and Mortality in California Based on the American Cancer Society Cohort" (<http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/apr/past/06-332.pdf>).

Furthermore, his paper does not cite the insignificant California PM2.5 mortality evidence from at least ten other studies, summarized in a 2012 American Statistical Association Joint Statistical Meeting paper "Particulate Matter is Not Killing Californians" (<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/ASAS092812.pdf>). The serious misconduct in the *AJRCCM* paper is described in detail by statistician Dr. William M. Briggs in his blogs of August 6, 2013 (<http://wmbriggs.com/blog/?p=8720>) and September 11, 2013 (<http://wmbriggs.com/blog/?p=8990>). *blog attached*

The continued demonization of diesel exhaust by researchers such as Jerrett for personal and professional advancement flies in the face of clearly objective scientific analysis such as the United Nations Economic

Commission for Europe that released this summer a paper titled, "*Diesel Engines Exhausts: Myths and Realities.*" The authors' findings and an expressive conclusion #121 on page 41 of report concluded:

"Eighty three per cent of particulate matters emissions in European Union countries (EEA, 2012a) and 97 per cent in the United States of America (EPA 2013) and Canada, is generated by other economic sectors, mainly the commercial, institutional and household sector. **Therefore, the claim that emissions from diesel engine exhausts from road transport are the main**

Evidence of Falsification in Jerrett 2013 paper

UCLA Policy 993: Falsification = "omitting data or results, such that the Research is not accurately represented in the Research Record." See Table

cause of lung cancer in humans needs to be seriously challenged.” (Note the bolding in the report).”

The U.N. conclusion is not really all that surprising considering a mortality study on those most closely exposed to diesel exhaust with decades of exposure – truck drivers. This study didn’t find elevated mortality levels for truck drivers compared with the general population. The study was performed by the National Institutes of Occupational Safety and Health and is titled: *Mortality Among Members of a Truck Driver Trade Association.*” The only surprise about this study is how the findings are ignored by most researchers in lieu of outdated and problematic mortality studies of coal miners and union truck drivers because they fit nice and tidy within the box of their preconceived conclusions – which isn’t science.

The academic dishonesty that is all too common in today’s research universities, where adherence to “faith and doctrine” and a desire to give those funding studies what they want to hear (or what they’ve paid for) when researching health effects and mortality related to diesel exhaust exposure was further confirmed by Dr. Boffetta, Director of the Institute for Translational Epidemiology. His 2012 study, “A review of cancer risk in the trucking industry, with emphasis on exposure to diesel exhaust” found that researchers must recognize the limitations in using older studies based on totally different formulated fuels, he also recognizes the changes in diesel engine technology that makes reliance on outdated studies skew conclusions. Boffetta found that many current studies (used to regulate the trucking industry) have inherent biases and that occupational exposure and evidence of increased risk of lung cancer are “limited” and “inconclusive.” Meanwhile, Jerrett, et al continues to generate fabulously one-sided studies that delight environmental regulators because without these slanted studies, they could not continue to blindly regulate.

As an indication of the national concern about his research, the U.S. House Science Committee has challenged EPA regarding the validity and transparency of the PM2.5 epidemiologic findings of Jerrett and his collaborators, primarily because these findings are based on ‘secret science’ data from the American Cancer Society (ACS) Cancer Prevention Study (CPS II). A June 12, 2013 letter from Committee Chair Lamar Smith to EPA discusses four papers co-authored by Jerrett that are based on ACS CPS II data and that have been used by EPA to justify costly regulations (<http://science.house.gov/press-release/committee-threatens-subpoena-epa-secret-science>). Because EPA did not comply with repeated data requests, the Committee issued an August 1, 2013 subpoena demanding that EPA produce the ‘secret science’ data that is possessed primarily by ACS (<http://science.house.gov/press-release/smith-subpoenas-epa-s-secret-science>). Jerrett is first author or co-author on three of the seven papers specifically cited in the subpoena. Since EPA and ACS have defied the August 1, 2013 subpoena, the House Science Committee approved the ‘*Secret Science Reform Act of 2014*’ (H.R. 4012) on June 24, 2014. This bill forbids EPA from using unverifiable studies that are based on ‘secret science’ data, like those of Jerrett (<http://science.house.gov/press-release/committee-approves-bill-prohibit-epa-using-secret-science>). Our June 17, 2014 letter of support ([CCTA Letter of Support](#)) has been specifically cited in the Committee press release. H.R. 4012 is supposed to come before the full House of Representatives in September and it was introduced in the U.S. Senate in July.

Second, there is overwhelming evidence that Jerrett is not an objective environmental scientist, activist yes, but scientist – no! Much of his research has blatantly exaggerated the health effects of air pollution in California and the United States. He has not given a balanced assessment of air pollution that is in context with other health risk factors and socioeconomic impacts. In particular, during the past decade, Jerrett has worked closely with CARB, CARB Chair and UCLA Law Professor, Mary D. Nichols, and UCLA EHS Prof. John Froines in providing the scientific justification for draconian CARB diesel vehicle regulations that have unjustly harmed businesses like ours. Several of Jerrett’s PM2.5 mortality papers since 2000, including those subject to the August 1, 2013 subpoena, were specifically cited in the October 24, 2008 CARB “Tran” Report (<http://killcarb.org/tranpage.html>) and the August 31, 2010 CARB “EPA” Report (<http://www.bakersfieldcalifornian.com/columnists/lois-heary/x618251275/Air-board-must-be-held-accountable>). These two reports have been used to justify the CARB diesel regulations with the now discredited CARB claim that PM2.5 contributes to up to 18,000 “premature deaths” per year in California. The CARB regulations have forced California businesses like ours, which depend heavily upon diesel powered vehicles, to pay billions of dollars in scientifically unjustified costs for diesel truck replacement and diesel particulate

filters. In addition, many of these businesses have closed or moved out of California because they are unable to comply with the CARB regulations.

Extreme activism conduct by Professors Nichols and Froines connected with the CARB diesel regulations is described in several detailed letters that Delta Construction Company has submitted to UCLA since March 11, 2009, articles written in the California Transportation News magazine and even published by inquisitive reporters such as Lois Henry of the Bakersfield Californian newspaper. An October 9, 2013 Delta's letter to the Council on Education for Public Health opposing the reaccreditation of the UCLA School of Public Health includes these prior letters as part of a 32-page attachment (<http://calcontrk.org/Delta100913.pdf>).

We are puzzled as to why Mr. Jerrett, a Canadian environmental activist academic, has been endowed this position. Are there no American's qualified for such a prestigious and obviously lucrative position?

Mr. Jerrett, much like his predecessor John Froines clearly does not understand, respect or minimally empathize with the plight of California business people like us, many of which are part of the struggling middle class and represented by a growing minority community. Indeed, he fits the profile of the "new" and very disturbing politicization activism class of "for sale" academics described in the April 2, 2012 National Association of Scholars Report "*A Crisis of Competence: The Corrupting Effect of Political Activism in the University of California*". (http://www.nas.org/images/documents/A_Crisis_of_Competence.pdf).

We strongly recommend that you reject Prof. Jerrett and select as EHS Chair an honest, ethical, and objective scientist who conducts environmental health research that is in the best interest of all Californians, including those most affected by specious research adored by activists. We will finish with this quote from the NAS report, "When that marketplace is functioning effectively, ideas progress to the extent they can be supported by evidence and logic; they cannot prevail because of their political value, because a political faction is able to enforce their dominance through sheer weight of numbers, or because ideas threatening to an orthodoxy are artificially excluded. Yet that is what has now happened in certain important areas of (UC) campus life. How has this happened?"

Clearly, "A great system of higher education has been corrupted." You need to stop this now and seriously look at ways to fix it; rejecting Mr. Jerrett is a good start.

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

Sincerely yours,



Lee Brown
Executive Director, CCTA



Norman R. ("Skip") Brown
Owner, Delta Construction Company

cc: UCLA Provost Scott Waugh
US House Science Committee Chair Lamar Smith
US House Science Committee Vice Chair Dana Rohrabacher

Summary Table. Epidemiologic cohort studies of PM2.5 and total mortality in California, 2000-2016
Relative risk of death from all causes (RR and 95% CI) associated with increase of 10 µg/m³ in PM2.5
<http://scientificintegrityinstitute.org/NoPMDeaths112215.pdf>

Krewski 2000 & 2010 CA CPS II Cohort N=40,408 RR = 0.872 (0.805-0.944) 1982-1989
 (N=[18,000 M + 22,408 F]; 4 MSAs; 1979-1983 PM2.5; 44 covariates)

McDonnell 2000 CA AHSMOG Cohort N~3,800 RR ~ 1.00 (0.95 – 1.05) 1977-1992
 (N~[1,347 M + 2,422 F]; SC&SD&SF AB; M RR=1.09(0.98-1.21) & F RR~0.98(0.92-1.03))

Jerrett 2005 CPS II Cohort in LA Basin N=22,905 RR = 1.11 (0.99 - 1.25) 1982-2000
 (N=22,905 M & F; 267 zip code areas; 1999-2000 PM2.5; 44 cov + max confounders)

Enstrom 2005 CA CPS I Cohort N=35,783 RR = 1.039 (1.010-1.069) 1973-1982
 (N=[15,573 M + 20,210 F]; 11 counties; 1979-1983 PM2.5) RR = 0.997 (0.978-1.016) 1983-2002

Enstrom 2006 CA CPS I Cohort N=35,783 RR = 1.061 (1.017-1.106) 1973-1982
 (11 counties; 1979-1983 & 1999-2001 PM2.5) RR = 0.995 (0.968-1.024) 1983-2002

Zeger 2008 MCAPS Cohort "West" N=3,100,000 RR = 0.989 (0.970-1.008) 2000-2005
 (N=[1.5 M M + 1.6 M F]; Medicare enrollees in CA+OR+WA (CA=73%); 2000-2005 PM2.5)

Jerrett 2010 CA CPS II Cohort N=77,767 RR ~ 0.994 (0.965-1.025) 1982-2000
 (N=[34,367 M + 43,400 F]; 54 counties; 2000 PM2.5; KRG ZIP; 20 ind cov+7 eco var; Slide 12)

Krewski 2010 (2009) CA CPS II Cohort
 (4 MSAs; 1979-1983 PM2.5; 44 cov) N=40,408 RR = 0.960 (0.920-1.002) 1982-2000
 (7 MSAs; 1999-2000 PM2.5; 44 cov) N=50,930 RR = 0.968 (0.916-1.022) 1982-2000

Behrberately Not Cited in Jerrett 2013
 Jerrett 2011 CA CPS II Cohort N=73,609 RR = 0.994 (0.965-1.024) 1982-2000
 (N=[32,509 M + 41,100 F]; 54 counties; 2000 PM2.5; KRG ZIP Model; 20 ind cov+7 eco var; Table 28)

Jerrett 2011 CA CPS II Cohort N=73,609 RR = 1.002 (0.992-1.012) 1982-2000
 (N=[32,509 M + 41,100 F]; 54 counties; 2000 PM2.5; Nine Model Ave; 20 ic+7 ev; Fig 22 & Tab 27-32)

Lipsett 2011 CA Teachers Cohort N=73,489 RR = 1.01 (0.95 – 1.09) 2000-2005
 (N=[73,489 F]; 2000-2005 PM2.5)

Ostro 2011 CA Teachers Cohort N=43,220 RR = 1.06 (0.96 – 1.16) 2002-2007
 (N=[43,220 F]; 2002-2007 PM2.5)

Single Published Finding
 Jerrett 2013 CA CPS II Cohort N=73,711 RR = 1.060 (1.003–1.120) 1982-2000
 (N=[~32,550 M + ~41,161 F]; 54 counties; 2000 PM2.5; LUR Conurb Model; 42 ind cov+7 eco var+5 metro; Table 6)

Jerrett 2013 CA CPS II Cohort N=73,711 RR = 1.028 (0.957-1.104) 1982-2000
 (same parameters and model as above, except including co-pollutants NO2 and Ozone; Table 5)

Ostro 2015 CA Teachers Cohort N=101,884 RR = 1.01 (0.98 -1.05) 2001-2007
 (N=[101,881 F]; 2002-2007 PM2.5) (all natural causes of death)

Thurston 2016 CA NIH-AARP Cohort N=160,209 RR = 1.02 (0.99 -1.04) 2000-2009
 (N=[~95,965 M + ~64,245 F]; full baseline model: PM2.5 by zip code; Table 3) (all natural causes of death)

Enstrom 2016 unpub CA NIH-AARP Cohort N=160,368 RR = 1.001 (0.949-1.055) 2000-2009
 (N=[~96,059 M + ~64,309 F]; full baseline model: 2000 PM2.5 by county)

WILLIAM M. BRIGGS

Statistician to the Stars

The Epidemiologist Fallacy Strikes Again. EPA, CARB, And Air Pollution

AUGUST 6, 2013 / BRIGGS / 4 COMMENTS

Here is an email I received from Jim Enstrom of the Scientific Integrity Institute (modified to embed the links; incidentally, CARB is the California Air Resources Board, a source of direction and envy for the EPA. CARB has never met a regulation it didn't like—or couldn't find "scientific" justification for):

IMPORTANT REQUEST: Recently posted is the June 27, 2013 AJRCCM Online Article in Press on "Spatial Analysis of Air Pollution and Mortality in California" by Jerrett, et al. [Journal link]. This paper deliberately misrepresents the complete findings in the 2011 Jerrett Report, which are discussed in your October 30, 2011 Blog "A Case of Failed Peer Review: Dust and Death". The results in the paper are particularly misrepresented for all cause mortality and the paper makes NO reference to the Jerrett Report itself. You MUST write another Blog about the dishonesty of the forthcoming Jerrett paper, which is the only document that will be cited by EPA and CARB in the future. Please call me if you want to discuss specific details.

Thanks very much for your help.

Jerrett and his fellow authors published an immense work (under CARB contract) which suffered fatally from the epidemiologist fallacy. This is when an epidemiologist says, "X causes Y" but who never—not once—measures X. He instead measures what he believes, but rarely tries proving, is a proxy to X.

And in those singular instances he does quantify the relationship of the proxy, he never carries the uncertainty of the this relationship through to his understanding of X causing Y.

Result? Rampant over-certainty, unnecessary action, strangling useless regulation. Maybe even panic in the streets. O statistics what have thy wrought!



*We're regulating you for your own
good (not ours)*

Here's a cute example, the title of which is explanation enough: Higher concentrations of convenience stores in the vicinity of middle schools could increase the risk of teenage students abusing alcohol, according to a National Taiwan University (NTU) study.

Jerrett *et alia* said that small particles in the atmosphere—no! ozone—no! nitrogen dioxide—caused early deaths. X caused Y. Problem is, they never measured, not even once, the actual exposure of any individual to dust, O₃, or NO₂. X went missing.

In essence, they looked back into public records and found addresses of people who may or may not still live in California and discovered how far these people lived from a highway. The (statistical) distance from the highway was said to equal the amount of exposure to pollutants. That's the proxy. Deaths and other maladies they got from (error prone) hospital records and the like.

Most of the study was a bust, in that the proxies were not correlated with the many maladies (including death) the authors tracked. But through a bravura performance, they eventually found one model which when squeezed sufficiently produced a p-value less than the magic number.

Ladies and gentleman, all it takes for scientific success and glory is to be born with a wee p-value. I mean, born with the ability to find them.

There are three relevant posts about the Jerrett report:

1. Criticism of Jerrett et al. CARB PM2.5 And Mortality Report. This is long and technical, but all the hard core criticisms are here. The (pro bono) paper I wrote with these criticisms (attached) was submitted to CARB for formal review.
2. A Case Of Failed Peer Review: Dust And Death. The paper I wrote was actually reviewed at a formal CARB meeting! I was pleased. Especially when they concluded (roughly), "Since the errors made by Jerrett are made by the many researchers CARB relies upon, we'll accept Jerrett's findings."
3. CARB Misinterprets Statistics, Calls For Elimination Of Dust. CARB went ahead and told the public that it knew what it was doing.

Well, one only has so much patience. I glanced through Jerrett's new paper and see it is much like the old. My heart at that point gave out. I'll leave it for readers to apply the criticisms I made of the original to this pale imitation.

Follow @mattstat

Share this:

 Twitter
  Google
  Facebook
  LinkedIn
  Email
  Print
  More

Related

A Case Of Failed Peer Review: Dust And Death
The distance between what civilians think peer review is and what it actually is suffers from the same failing as that evinced by Han Solo---rare pop culture reference!---when he boasted to Obi Wan Kenobi that the Millennium Falcon could do
With 20 comments

Updates
Beavering Away Will be engaged busily this week; posts may become sporadic, confused, nonsensical. More then usually, I mean. Now is the chance to send in a Guest Post (200 ~ 800 words) to finally show the world the Truth of In "Fun"

Criticism of Jerrett et al. CARB PM2.5 And Mortality Report
A pdf of this criticism may be downloaded here. The Jerrett report can be found here. Background on this subject can be found here. Overall Author Michael Jerrett and nine co-investigators and four student or post-doctoral investigators prepared
With 22 comments

Statistics

August 15, 2016

Jo Kay Chan Ghosh, Ph.D.
Health Effects Officer
South Coast Air Quality Management District
jghosh@aqmd.gov

Dear Dr. Ghosh,

I am writing to express serious concern that my July 26, 2016 public comments below regarding the health effects/impacts of particulate matter in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) are not being addressed. In particular, the August 16, 2016 PPT by Dr. Elaine Shen [Update on the Preliminary Draft Socioeconomic Report](#) claims that there will be 2,111 premature deaths due to PM2.5 in 2023. This is the same number of deaths shown in the attached July 28, 2016 PPT slide by Dr. Anthony Oliver [Preliminary Public Health Benefits of the Draft 2016 AQMP](#). This scientifically invalid claim does not provide valid public health justification for a 2016 AQMP that will impose an estimated \$38.2 billion in compliance costs on the SCAB economy.

Since 2006 I have repeatedly presented to CARB and SCAQMD strong epidemiologic evidence that there is no relationship between PM2.5 and total mortality in California. The latest version of this evidence is the attached table with 16 null results and 1 essentially null result from six different California cohorts (<http://scientificintegrityinstitute.org/NoPMDeaths081516.pdf>). Seven of the null results come from studies that were partially funded by SCAQMD. In addition, a very strong case has recently been made by nine accomplished experts, including myself, that "Particulate Matter Does Not Cause Premature Deaths" (https://www.nas.org/articles/nas_letter). Furthermore, I have now submitted for publication a manuscript with null findings that invalidate the positive nationwide relationship between PM2.5 and total mortality published in the seminal Pope 1995 paper, which is based on the American Cancer Society Cancer Prevention Study II (CPS II) cohort. My null CPS II cohort findings raise serious doubts about validity of the positive CPS II cohort findings in Jerrett 2005, Jerrett 2009, and Jerrett 2013 which have been used as the basis for the PM2.5 premature death claims in the PPTs of Drs. Oliver and Shen.

New (2016) & Prior (2013) → Evidence of Fabrication

All epidemiologic evidence relevant to the SCAB must be properly presented and summarized in the revised Draft 2016 AQMP Appendix I Health Effects (<http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/clean-air-plans/air-quality-management-plans/2016-air-quality-management-plan/DRAFT2016AQMP/appi.pdf?sfvrsn=2>). Indeed, Appendix I must be finalized in strict compliance with all provisions of California Health and Safety Code (CHSC) Section 40471 (b): "On or before December 31, 2001, and every three years thereafter, as part of the preparation of the air quality management plan revisions, the south coast district board, in conjunction with a public health organization or agency, shall prepare a report on the health impacts of particulate matter air pollution in the South Coast Air Basin. The south coast district board shall submit its report to the advisory council appointed pursuant to Section 40428 for review and comment. The advisory council shall undertake peer review concerning the report prior to its finalization and public release. The south coast district board shall hold public hearings concerning the report and the peer review, and shall append to the report any additional material or information that results from the peer review and public hearings." (<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=hsc&group=40001-41000&file=40460-40471>).

As I have previously requested, the 2016 AQMP must present current data on the average human exposure levels for PM2.5, ozone, and NOx in the SCAB. My evidence dating back decades indicates that the actual human exposure levels are far below the EPA National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and well below the levels for which there are proven adverse health effects. Furthermore, the tiny health effects of air pollution must be put into perspective with all the factors that influence human health, such as, employment, and with the fact that the SCAB has 2014 age-adjusted death rates for all causes, all cancer, and all respiratory diseases that are among the lowest in the entire US. These low death rates are summarized the attached table.

The ultimate scientific and regulatory fate of the 2016 depends upon the scientists who have conducted air pollution epidemiology research and upon the SCAQMD scientists who summarize these research findings in Appendix I Health Effects. We will soon find out if the SCAQMD scientists have the honesty and integrity to state that air pollution *does not cause* premature deaths in the SCAB, that the average daily human exposures to PM2.5, ozone, and NOx in the SCAB are well below the levels that *cause* adverse health effects, and that tougher air pollution regulations in the already healthy SCAB are not justified on a public health or socioeconomic basis.

In closing, please read my attached July 19, 2016 statement to the BizFed Southern California Business Coalition "AQMD Must Reassess Its Air Quality Regulations" and the attached page summarizing my scientific credentials and academic career.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.
UCLA and Scientific Integrity Institute
jenstrom@ucla.edu
(310) 472-4274

cc: Elaine Shen <eshen@aqmd.gov>
Shah Dabirian <sdabirian@aqmd.gov>
Anthony Oliver <aoliver@aqmd.gov>
Philip M. Fine <pfine@aqmd.gov>
Wayne Nastri <wnastri@aqmd.gov>
Henry A. Roman <har@indecon.com>
George D. Thurston <George.Thurston@nyumc.org>
Kevin R. Cromar <kevin.cromar@nyu.edu>
AQMP Comment <aqmp@aqmd.gov>

From: Pollack, Ann <APollack@research.ucla.edu>
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2016 2:08 PM
To: Enstrom, James E. <jenstrom@ucla.edu>
Cc: Modlin, Claudia <cmodlin@research.ucla.edu>
Subject: Meeting Follow up

Dear Dr. Enstrom:

Thank you for meeting with Claudia Modlin, Assistant Director, Office of Research Policy and Compliance, Michael Greer, President of the American Freedom Alliance, and me on Monday, September 12, 2016. During our meeting, you asked that I speak with Interim Vice Chancellor Ann Karagozian about what you termed the “scientific and research integrity of Michael Jerrett” as described in your letter of February 17, 2015, to James S. Economou. I have briefed Vice Chancellor Karagozian on our meeting and have also provided her with copies of the documents that you delivered on the afternoon of September 12th.

The documents that you delivered included an annotated copy of the August 15, 2014, letter to Chancellor Gene Block from Lee Brown and Norman Brown, and a copy of a referenced August 6, 2013, blog posting. Also included was a copy of an August 14, 2016, letter that you sent to Jo Kay Chan Ghosh at the South Coast Air Quality Management District. As you know, the prior 2013, 2014, and 2015, correspondence regarding Michael Jerrett have been previously reviewed, and a determination was made pursuant to UCLA Policy 993 that a specific and credible allegation of research misconduct had not been made. The annotations provided this week have now also been reviewed under the same standard.

Research integrity is of the utmost importance to UCLA, and we appreciate you bringing these matters to our attention. At this time, however, UCLA does not require further information. Additionally, while I appreciate your desire to meet with Vice Chancellor Karagozian, our office already provided a meeting for you on these matters on September 12, 2016, and the Vice Chancellor’s schedule does not allow for a further meeting. Thank you for your concern and your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

Ann Pollack

Ann Pollack
Assistant Vice Chancellor – Research
UCLA
11100 Kinross Avenue, Suite 340
Los Angeles, California 90095-1406
Tel: 310-794-0387
Fax: 310-943-1981
e-mail: apollack@research.ucla.edu