

EDWARD J. MARKEY
MASSACHUSETTS

COMMITTEES:

ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

FOREIGN RELATIONS

RANKING MEMBER:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIA, THE PACIFIC,
AND INTERNATIONAL CYBERSECURITY POLICY

COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

RANKING MEMBER:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON

SPACE, SCIENCE, AND COMPETITIVENESS

SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

CHAIRMAN:

U.S. SENATE CLIMATE CHANGE TASK FORCE

United States Senate

SUITE SD-255
DIRKSEN BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-2107
202-224-2742

975 JFK FEDERAL BUILDING
15 NEW SUDBURY STREET
BOSTON, MA 02203
617-565-8519

222 MILLIKEN BOULEVARD, SUITE 312
FALL RIVER, MA 02721
508-677-0523

1550 MAIN STREET, 4TH FLOOR
SPRINGFIELD, MA 01103
413-785-4610

January 18, 2018

The Honorable E. Scott Pruitt
Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Dear Administrator Pruitt:

I write to express my strong concern over decisions that you have made as Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Despite your role as the head of an agency with a mission to “protect human health and the environment” and to ensure that “national efforts to reduce environmental risk are based on the best available scientific information,”¹ many of your actions appear to directly contradict this mission and these longstanding goals.

I ask that you respond to the following questions prior to your appearance before the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee on January 30, 2018, in order to ensure that the American people receive the answers they need about your management of the EPA.

I therefore request answers to the following questions by the close of business on Wednesday, January 24, 2018:

Climate Change: Some of the most troubling policy decisions during your tenure as EPA Administrator have been to eliminate regulations set by the previous administration, including the Clean Power Plan, that were designed to protect the safety of Americans by lowering emissions and mitigating the impact of future climate change.

EPA staff appear to have been dissuaded from communicating to the public and to other scientists about climate risks. In October 2017, an EPA scientist, research fellow, and consultant withdrew from planned speeches at a workshop about the health of the Narragansett Bay and Watershed. Though you responded to the October 31 letter sent by New England members of

¹ Environmental Protection Agency, “Our Mission and What We Do” as visited on January 17, 2018.
<https://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/our-mission-and-what-we-do>

Congress expressing our concern, your reply was vague.² In this response letter, you indicated that “[p]rocedures have been put in place to prevent such an occurrence in the future.”

1. What are the exact procedures put in place to ensure that EPA scientists continue to be able to speak at public events about climate science?
2. How were these procedures communicated to EPA staff?
3. How have you evaluated whether these new procedures are successful and staff are not discouraged from participating in similar scientific forums? If no evaluation has been made, why not?

In addition to the protection of EPA’s climate scientists, I am concerned that the draft EPA Strategic Plan for FY 2018 through 2022, released on October 5, 2017, does not contain a single mention of climate change, despite the major threats that it poses to public health and the economy—threats that will only continue to increase during the next five years.³

4. Why was climate change not included in the EPA’s draft strategic plan for 2018-2022?
5. Were EPA political appointees involved in writing the draft strategic plan? If so, what role did political appointees play in creating this document, and did any political appointee remove any reference to climate change?

The EPA’s staff of dedicated researchers and scientists have worked hard to present the most accurate climate change data and information to the American public. This information is critical to illustrate what climate change is, why it matters, and what the EPA is doing to confront its effects. It is also a central component of the EPA’s mission statement, which declares that the EPA should work to ensure that “all parts of society – communities, individuals, businesses, and state, local and tribal governments – have access to accurate information sufficient to effectively participate in managing human health and environmental risks.”⁴

Unfortunately, since your confirmation as Administrator, outside groups and news organizations have documented a complete overhaul of the EPA’s website that resulted in relevant climate change data and information being hidden from the general public or removed entirely. The Environmental Data and Governance Initiative issued a report on January 10, 2018 that documented the removal of more than 200 climate-related pages from the EPA website.⁵ On April 28, 2017, the EPA removed the content of its main informational webpage⁶ on climate change, which had existed in some form since at least 1997, and replaced it with a page that states, “We are currently updating our website to reflect EPA’s priorities under the leadership of

² “Response Letter from the Environmental Protection Agency on the Narragansett Bay Estuary Program,” December 4, 2017. <https://www.whitehouse.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/2017-12-04%20EPA%20Response%20to%20NBEPP%20Letter.pdf>

³ Federal Register, Vol. 82, No. 192. “Environmental Protection Agency: Draft FY 2018-2022 Environmental Protection Agency Strategic Plan.” October 5, 2017. <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2017-10-05/pdf/2017-21245.pdf>

⁴ Environmental Protection Agency, “Our Mission and What We Do” as visited on January 17, 2018. <https://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/our-mission-and-what-we-do>

⁵ Environmental Governance and Data Initiative. “Changing the Digital Climate: How Climate Change Web Content is Being Censored under the Trump Administration.” January 2018. <https://envirodatagov.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Part-3-Changing-the-Digital-Climate.pdf>

⁶ Environmental Protection Agency. “Climate Change” Main Webpage, Historical Material and Snapshot of January 19, 2017. https://19january2017snapshot.epa.gov/climatechange_.html

President Trump and Administrator Pruitt.”⁷ The American public is entitled to have easily accessible and factual information regarding climate change—something the EPA is uniquely positioned to provide.

6. Can you please be specific and list how the changes to the climate change webpage will “reflect EPA’s priorities under President Trump and Administrator Pruitt,” what they will entail, and the date when the climate change webpage will be reposted on EPA’s website? Please describe in detail those priorities and how removal of climate change science fits under that set of priorities.
7. Were any EPA political appointees involved in discussions and/or development of recommendations to remove EPA webpages on climate change? Who was responsible for authorizing the removal of EPA webpages on climate change?
8. Were any EPA career scientists or authors of the reports on climate change involved in discussions regarding the decision to remove EPA webpages on climate change or the decision itself? If not, why not?
9. How does the EPA and its communications team handle discussion and mention of climate change in the EPA’s social media and other public-facing communications? Have EPA staff or other personnel been instructed to not use the term “climate change” in social media posts? If so, was this decision made by EPA political staff? When was this decision finalized and announced to staff?

On May 22, 2017, you created a Superfund Task Force, which was made up of 107 EPA employees⁸ and headed by Albert Kelly,⁹ a senior advisor and former bank executive with no experience in pollution cleanup, who was recently banned from participating in banking activity by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for unspecified violations.¹⁰ The Task Force’s recommendations¹¹ include no mention of considerations that should be made to Superfund sites in areas prone to flooding or sea-level rise. According to an Associated Press analysis, 327 Superfund sites are vulnerable to flooding or climate-change-related sea-level rise, and 2 million people live within a mile of these sites.¹² The damage done during the most recent hurricane season emphasizes the need for the EPA to seriously consider how to address both the threat of flooding and how flooding will get worse as sea levels continue to rise.

⁷ Environmental Protection Agency. “This page is being updated.” As visited on January 17, 2018. <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/signpost/cc.html>

⁸ Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility. “Pruitt Superfund Plan Leaves No Fingerprints.” Posted on December 20, 2017. <https://www.peer.org/news/news-releases/pruitt-superfund-plans-leave-no-paper-trail.html>

⁹ Environmental Protection Agency. “EPA Announces Superfund Task Force Recommendations: Recommendations to Streamline and Improve the Superfund Program.” As visited on January 17, 2018. <https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-announces-superfund-task-force-recommendations>

¹⁰ Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. “Order of Prohibition from Further Participation” delivered to Albert Kelly. July 27, 2017. https://www.eenews.net/assets/2017/08/28/document_gw_10.pdf

¹¹ Environmental Protection Agency, “Superfund Task Force Recommendations.” July 25, 2017. https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-07/documents/superfund_task_force_report.pdf

¹² Dearen, Jason, Michael Biesecker and Angeliki Kastanis. “AP finds climate change risk for 327 toxic Superfund sites.” Associated Press, December 22, 2017. <http://www.chicagotribune.com/lifestyles/pets/sns-bc-bc-us--flood-prone-toxic-sites-20171222-story.html>

Although the 2014 Climate Change Adaptation Implementation Plan¹³ instructed cleanup managers of toxic sites to prepare for extreme rain, higher floods, and more intense hurricanes, and recommended that the EPA work to protect people from an increased risk of toxic chemical releases, this report was removed from the EPA website following President Trump's election.¹⁴ It is therefore unclear what guidance is being provided to the public and stakeholders at Superfund sites regarding the threats posed by climate change and how these threats may change prioritization, assessments, cleanup, and other actions at these sites.

On December 4, 2017, a group of ten Senators requested an investigation from the Government Accountability Office (GAO) into the risks posed by natural disasters to Superfund sites and how the federal government can mitigate those risks.¹⁵ However, the EPA should be working to address this concern immediately. At least two Superfund sites were severely flooded during Hurricane Harvey, neither of which had finalized cleanup agreements in place, and one of which resulted in the release of high levels of hazardous dioxins.¹⁶

10. What is your plan to prioritize and respond to the 327 Superfund sites that are threatened by rising seas from a warming climate? If you do not currently have a plan, please provide a timeline by when one can be expected.
11. How is the EPA's Superfund program working to reduce risks from flooding and managing an increase in future risks from sea-level rise?
12. What lessons were learned from the flooding at two Superfund sites in Texas during Hurricane Harvey and the release of dioxins from the San Jacinto Waste Pits Superfund site?
13. What guidance is the EPA providing to responsible parties and other stakeholders about the risk of climate change and how this should impact assessment or cleanup activities at a Superfund site?
14. How do flooding risks and other climate-related impacts factor into the EPA's prioritization and decision processes for Superfund sites?

Fuel Efficiency Standards: On March 15, 2017, President Trump announced that he would order the EPA to reopen a review of the fuel economy and vehicle emissions standards, which set targets for the industry equivalent to delivering a fleet-wide average of at least 54.5 mpg by 2025. With little rationale and despite there being more than 288,000 workers involved in making components or materials used to improve vehicle fuel economy,¹⁷ the EPA on August

¹³ Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, "Climate Change Adaptation Implementation Plan." June 2014. As found on January 17, 2018 at <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/4059995-EPA-Superfund-Climate-Adaptation-Report.html>

¹⁴ Hersher, Rebecca. "An Absent EPA Climate Report, and a Tale of Two Flooded Superfund Sites." National Public Radio, September 29, 2017. <https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2017/09/29/553696314/an-absent-epa-climate-report-and-a-tale-of-two-flooded-superfund-sites>

¹⁵ Letter to the Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office, December 4, 2017. https://www.harris.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/GAO_Superfund_CC_Letter_Final.pdf

¹⁶ Environmental Protection Agency, "EPA Statement – San Jacinto River Waste Pits Superfund Site Data." September 28, 2017. As found on January 17, 2018 at <https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-statement-san-jacinto-river-waste-pits-superfund-site-data>

¹⁷ Natural Resources Defense Council and BlueGreen Alliance, "Supplying Ingenuity II: U.S. Suppliers of Key Clean, Fuel-Efficiency Vehicle Technologies." May 2017. As found at <https://www.nrdc.org/sites/default/files/supplying-ingenuity-clean-vehicle-technologies-report.pdf>

10, 2017 opened a comment period for the reconsideration of the vehicle greenhouse gas emissions for 2022-2025 model years.¹⁸ On December 6, 2017, twenty-seven Senators called on you not to weaken the light-duty vehicle emissions standards for model years (MY) 2021 and 2022-2025, which were established in an historic 2012 agreement between federal and state officials and industry representatives.¹⁹

The vehicle emissions standards drive innovation. I continue to monitor the review process, and will reject any move to undermine technically sound standards based on the best available science.

15. Will any jobs that have been created in the automotive sector since these standards went into effect be included in any cost-benefit analysis done as part of any proposed changes to the emissions standards?
16. How will you ensure that financial impacts of a decline in air quality, including any additional public health costs, are accounted for in future fuel efficiency rulemaking?
17. Please provide a list of meetings that you or other political appointees to the EPA have taken with any companies, nongovernmental organizations, or other entities in the past year, including the name of the group and the date of the meeting, as well as any memoranda, agendas, letters, meeting notes, or other documentation related to these meetings.
18. Has the EPA done the necessary modeling with updated inputs to be ready to issue a joint Notice of Proposed Rulemaking with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) on March 30?
19. Has the EPA been sharing its most up-to-date vehicle test results with NHTSA, and will NHTSA be able to use these data in its own modeling work underlying the proposed rule slated for March 30?
20. Do you plan to rescind the trailer standard that was finalized in the heavy-duty fuel efficiency and greenhouse gas emissions rule?
21. You have stated previously that the California waiver will be re-evaluated in the mid-term evaluation. As I do not know of any existing regulatory or statutory need to take another look at the waiver that has been granted through 2025, can you explain your rationale for including a re-evaluation of this waiver in the mid-term review process?
22. While the mid-term evaluation was intended to consider MY 2022-2025, your agency has indicated it is also considering the MY 2021 standard. As I do not know of any existing technical, legal, regulatory or statutory reason to re-examine MY 2021, can you explain your rationale for including consideration of the MY 2021 standard in the established mid-term review process?

Budget: The American people are entitled to transparent and prudent government. Some of your actions have raised questions about your fiscal judgment.

¹⁸ Environmental Protection Agency. "EPA, DOT Open Comment Period on Reconsideration of GHG Standards for Light Trucks." August 8, 2017. <https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-dot-open-comment-period-reconsideration-ghg-standards-cars-and-light-trucks>

¹⁹Letter to Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, December 6, 2017, https://www.markey.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/12_06_17%20Senate%20Letter%20to%20Admin%20Pruitt%20on%20Fuel%20Economy%20Emissions%20Standards.pdf

While it is important to ensure the physical security of the EPA Administrator, and while past EPA Administrators have also incurred costs for security details and office security sweeps, costs for security have reportedly skyrocketed during your brief tenure. Documents obtained by *Energy & Environment News* under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) indicate that you spent nearly twice as much on security as your two predecessors did over the first three months as Administrator.²⁰ In three months, your security detail cost American taxpayers more than \$617,000 in compensation and \$215,000 in travel costs. Your security costs over this time period represent a nearly 80 percent increase over the previous Administrator, and come at the same time as you request a more than 30 percent decrease for the EPA budget.²¹ Reports indicate that salaries for your full security team will cost upwards of \$2 million per year, without accounting for training, equipment, or travel.²²

23. Can you provide a justification and cost estimate for the 24-hour increased security presence to date, including costs for plane tickets (including cancellation and rescheduling fees), accommodations, and other travel arrangements?
24. Can you provide a justification and cost estimate for every other security upgrade, including the reported installation of a soundproof booth²³ and biometric locks?
25. Can you confirm or deny media reports that you are accompanied by armed security even within EPA headquarters,²⁴ and provide a justification and cost estimate for the compensation associated with this conduct if true?
26. Do you plan on continuing the 24-hour security presence throughout your entire tenure as Administrator?

You recently took a trip to Morocco with several of your staff members to speak with Moroccan officials about interest in importing natural gas as well as other topics.²⁵ This trip reportedly cost the American taxpayers \$40,000.²⁶ American gas exports have nothing to do with EPA's mission and are an issue typically covered by the Department of Energy (DOE).

27. What was your justification within the jurisdiction of the EPA for taking this trip to Morocco?
28. Did you use the title of EPA Administrator when scheduling, attending, or heading meetings in Morocco? If not, why not?

²⁰ Bogardus, Kevin, "Big spike in security spending for Pruitt." *Greenwire*, July 5, 2017. <https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060056958>

²¹ Environmental Protection Agency, "FY 2018 EPA Budget in Brief." May 2017. As visited on January 17, 2018 at <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-05/documents/fy-2018-budget-in-brief.pdf>

²² Marsh, Rene and Gregory Wallace. "First on CNN: Security costs skyrocket at 'lightning rod' EPA" *CNN*, October 23, 2017. <http://www.cnn.com/2017/10/23/politics/epa-pruitt-security-costs/index.html>

²³ Friedman, Lisa. "E.P.A. to Spend Nearly \$25,000 on a Soundproof Booth for Pruitt." *New York Times*, September 26, 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/26/climate/pruitt-epa.html>

²⁴ Davenport, Coral and Eric Lipton. "Scott Pruitt is Carrying Out His E.P.A. Agenda in Secret, Critics Say." *New York Times*, August 11, 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/11/us/politics/scott-pruitt-epa.html>

²⁵ Bilperin, Juliet. "Scott Pruitt and a crew of EPA aides just spent four days in Morocco promoting natural gas." *Washington Post*, December 13, 2017. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/12/13/scott-pruitt-and-a-crew-of-epa-aides-just-spent-four-days-in-morocco-promoting-natural-gas/?utm_term=.a6a1be48ebda

²⁶ Biesecker, Michael. "Pruitt's Morocco trip cost nearly \$40,000 --- employee." *Associated Press*, December 14, 2017. <https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/12/14/stories/1060069015>

29. Did you discuss this trip and itinerary with DOE officials? If not, why not? If so, please provide any emails, notes, letters or other correspondence with the DOE regarding this trip.
30. Please provide the daily itinerary for this trip, including whom you met with, meeting attendees (including EPA and any other American government employees, including contract employees), length of meetings, and topics discussed. In this response, please provide any documentation related to these meetings, including meeting minutes, memos, notes, and any other documentation of these official meetings
31. Were public funds used to pay for any portion of your trip to Morocco? Please describe exactly what amount of public funds were used and for what purpose, including the costs or cost estimates for security incurred during this trip, as well as a breakdown in accommodation and travel costs for you and any other EPA employees on the trip.
32. Please provide a detailed list of air travel and transportation used on this trip, for you and for other EPA attendees, including whether that air travel was first class, business class, coach, private planes, or military planes.
33. Which EPA personnel accompanied you on this trip? What was the role of each of these individuals? What was the cost per person for each individual who accompanied you on this trip?

Toxic Chemicals: The EPA is a pivotal player in our national fight against toxic substances and has historically worked to protect the public from the health risks posed by unsafe chemicals. Last year, on a bipartisan basis, Congress worked to enact reforms to the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) intended to, among other things, significantly strengthen new chemical reviews. These changes made as a part of the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act, have been significantly weakened by this administration.

For example, the EPA now appears to no longer release the results of its initial reviews of new chemicals or new uses of existing chemicals that identify risk concerns or data gaps.²⁷ Under previous administrations going back decades, the EPA would provide public notice of its initial recommendations that new chemicals be determined to be “not likely to present an unreasonable risk”; that they would or could present an “unreasonable risk of injury”; that they lacked sufficient information to conduct a reasoned evaluation; or that further review was needed. An EPA presentation dated December 6, 2017 noted that the agency was developing “revised terminology.”²⁸ Now, rather than publish these interim statuses, the EPA is only informing the public that a “Focus Meeting Occurred,”²⁹ and is not communicating the recommendations of its professional staff made at that meeting. The EPA appears to have stopped providing this information to the public, despite the agency’s continued interim and final decision-making on dozens of new chemicals each month. This information was invaluable to the public in ensuring

²⁷ Hiar, Corbin. “At Trump’s EPA, one-public chemical safety reviews go dark.” E&E News, January 20, 2018. <http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2018/01/trump-s-epa-once-public-chemical-safety-reviews-go-dark>

²⁸ Environmental Protection Agency, “Other Advance Questions” Presentation by Tanya Hodge Mottle, Acting Deputy Director of Programs, U.S. EPA Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics. December 6, 2017. As found on January 17, 2018 at https://www.eenews.net/assets/2018/01/10/document_gw_04.pdf

²⁹ Environmental Protection Agency, “Review New Chemicals under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA): Premanufacture Notices (PMNs) and Significant New Use Notices (SMUNs) Table.” As found on January 17, 2018 at <https://www.epa.gov/reviewing-new-chemicals-under-toxic-substances-control-act-tsca/premanufacture-notices-pmnts-and>

the accountability of EPA judgments as to whether new chemicals will be safe when they enter the market. While there may be legitimate reasons for the amelioration of initial concerns about a new chemical by the time the EPA makes a final decision on it, transparency and good governance warrant the EPA explaining to the public the steps it took to remove the concern—not to hide from the public any evidence of the EPA's initial concern.

34. Can you provide examples of the "confusion"³⁰ that the EPA alleges was produced by providing the public with the interim statuses? Please provide any documentation or communications between EPA staff and the public that evidence this confusion.
35. Please provide an explanation as to how the new terminology was developed, including any meetings held (and related documentation) on the topic and how the new terminology will better protect public health?
36. Can you commit to updating the public with more information on potentially hazardous chemicals or presumed safe chemicals, beyond simply stating that a focus meeting has occurred? Please include in your response the type of information the EPA could provide to improve transparency into this process and a date by when this change will take place.

Under your leadership, the EPA has indefinitely delayed finalizing its proposed bans on high-risk uses of methylene chloride, N-methylpyrrolidone, and trichloroethylene.^{31,32} The 2016 Lautenberg Act specifically authorized the EPA to pursue needed restrictions on these chemicals. The law allowed for prioritized action on high-risk uses of these chemicals—which the EPA has declared to present unreasonable risk. Dozens of deaths have been linked to methylene chloride-based paint strippers, and agency experts have noted connections between trichloroethylene and developmental damage. Trichloroethylene was one of the chemicals found in the water around Camp Lejeune, a Marine base in North Carolina. Potentially 900,000 service members were exposed to this dangerous chemical, which causes cancer and is linked to fetal cardiac defects.³³

37. Can you provide a detailed justification for the indefinite delay of the proposed bans for high-risk uses of methylene chloride, N-methylpyrrolidone, and trichloroethylene?
38. Was Michael Dourson involved in any capacity on the evaluation of trichloroethylene while he was working as an EPA advisor? If so, please detail and provide any written documents of his work, including any memos, meeting notes, or other correspondence.

Also, under the previous administration, the EPA had proposed to ban the use of the chlorpyrifos, a neurotoxic pesticide used on a variety of fruits and vegetables.³⁴ Residential and

³⁰ Environmental Protection Agency, "Other Advance Questions" Presentation by Tanya Hodge Mottle, Acting Deputy Director of Programs, U.S. EPA Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, December 6, 2017. As found on January 17, 2018 at https://www.eenews.net/assets/2018/01/10/document_gw_04.pdf

³¹ Kaplan, Sheila. "E.P.A. Delays Bans on Uses of Hazardous Chemicals." New York Times, December 19, 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/19/health/epa-toxic-chemicals.html>

³² Environmental Protection Agency, "New Chemicals Decision-Making Framework: Working Approach to Making Determinations under Section 5 of TSCA." November 2017. As found on January 17, 2018 at https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-11/documents/new_chemicals_decision_framework_7_november_2017.pdf

³³ Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. "Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Health effects linked with trichloroethylene (TCE), tetrachloroethylene (PCE), benzene, and vinyl chloride exposure." April 11, 2017. As found on January 17, 2018 at https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/sites/lejeune/tce_pce.html

³⁴ New York Times, "EPA's Decision Not to Ban Chlorpyrifos." October 21, 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/10/21/us/document-EPA-Chlorpyrifos-FOIA-E-mails-to-NYT.html>

indoor use of chlorpyrifos was banned in 2000.³⁵ However, you opted to reject the EPA's earlier findings and deny the petition to ban the use of chlorpyrifos,³⁶ despite the EPA analyses that found widespread risk from pesticide residues, drinking water contamination, and drift. Chlorpyrifos has been linked to neurological damage, with children particularly at risk for learning disabilities.

39. Can you provide a detailed explanation of why the EPA chose to refute earlier analyses performed by Science Advisory Panels, including those done in 2016,³⁷ 2012,³⁸ and 2008³⁹, which provided independent scientific review and reaffirmed the health risks connected with chlorpyrifos exposure? Please include any and all new studies, or analyses, performed since the November 2016 Human Health Risk Assessment that provide the basis for this decision.
40. Can you provide a detailed timeline for the "ongoing registration review"⁴⁰ that the agency is performing to continue its evaluation of the risks of chlorpyrifos, despite the body of evidence previously collected by EPA researchers?
41. Can you provide the times and dates of every meeting and any relevant communication that you or your senior administration officials had regarding chlorpyrifos or toxic chemical standards, including with employees of or lobbyists working on behalf of Dow Chemical, the American Chemistry Council, the American Farm Bureau, or CropLife America?

The EPA is critically important to keeping the American public safe from harm and has worked since its inception to protect public health and the environment. I have serious concerns about the ability of agency staff to fulfill this mission under your leadership, and look forward to your prompt and detailed reply to each of the above questions and requests.

Sincerely,



Edward J. Markey

³⁵ Environmental Protection Agency, "Dursban Announcement" Archived Speech by Carol M. Browner, June 8, 2000. As found on January 17, 2018 at <http://archive.is/ANPup#selection-803.0-819.477>

³⁶ Environmental Protection Agency, "News Release: EPA Administrator Pruitt Denies Petition to Ban Widely Used Pesticide." March 29, 2017. As found on January 17, 2018 at <http://archive.is/XAUYw>

³⁷ Environmental Protection Agency, "Memorandum on Meeting Minutes of the April 19-21 2016 FIFRA SAP Meeting Held to Consider and Review Scientific Issues Associated with "Chlorpyrifos: Analysis of Biomonitoring Data." July 20, 2016. As found at https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-07/documents/chlorpyrifos_sap_april_2016_final_minutes.pdf

³⁸ Environmental Protection Agency, "Memorandum on Meeting Minutes of the FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel Meeting held April 10-12, 2012 on "Chlorpyrifos Health Effects." As found on January 17, 2018 at <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-06/documents/041012minutes.pdf>

³⁹ Environmental Protection Agency, "Memorandum: Transmittal of Meeting Minutes of the FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel Meeting held September 16-18, 2008 on the Agency's Evaluation of the Toxicity Profile of Chlorpyrifos." December 17, 2008. As found on Regulations.gov on January 17, 2018 at <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0274-0064>

⁴⁰ Environmental Protection Agency, "Revised Human Health Risks Assessment on Chlorpyrifos." As found on January 17, 2018 at <https://www.epa.gov/ingredients-used-pesticide-products/revised-human-health-risk-assessment-chlorpyrifos>