

Message

---

**From:** Sarah Manlove [Ex. 6]  
**Sent:** 10/23/2017 12:14:24 PM  
**To:** Press [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group  
(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b293283291dc44e0b5d1c36be9281d8a-Press]  
**Subject:** Liz Bowman's Response to the NYT

Sent this morning to Ms. Bowman and Mr. Pruitt

Dear Ms. Bowman,

I am writing to express my displeasure and frank outrage at your response to NYT reporter Eric Lipton in the October 21st piece: 'Why has the EPA Shifted on Toxic Chemicals? An Industry Insider Helps Call the Shots'. Please hear me out- I am an American citizen living overseas who is very concerned about our hyper polarization. I am not anti-industrial rights, nor am I extreme left, nor am I an activist. I am just a U.S. citizen who reads the New York Times to find information. You can help me do that- but NOT by your response to the NYT.

In response to repeated requests for information Mr. Lipton reports that you responded in an e-mail the following:

"No matter how much information we give you, you would never write a fair piece," Liz Bowman, a spokeswoman for the E.P.A., said in an email. "The only thing inappropriate and biased is your continued fixation on writing elitist clickbait trying to attack qualified professionals committed to serving their country."

The NYT has a circulation of almost half a million people. Half a million. By refusing to share or respond to information your response denied to those people the chance to understand and hear the EPA's case about roll back of regulations. How is this helpful? Personally for me I find the continued 'no comment'/'no information' kinds of response you gave and the current administration often gives to the NYT insulting. Your response just entrenched me further in your opposing 'camp'. So again I ask- how is this helpful?

NYT Reader Circulation:

571,500 Daily 1,087,500 Sunday 2,200,000 Digital-only (as of May (Sunday) / November (daily) 2016 / (Digital-only) May 2017)

I can only assume from your response to Mr. Lipton that you in fact have no wish or intention to try and make a case for what your agency wants to do and why it's a good idea. I can only assume that you want to deny, ignore, and insult the readers of the NYT and it's reporters and so in fact are not seeking any bipartisan dialogue about what you do. So again I ask- how is your response helpful? Was it your intent to actually further divide our country rather than helping to unify us despite what the White House does? Do you truly believe that NYT readers are that dumb?

I don't need you to censor information for me. I need you to respond thoughtfully and professionally with information about why and how what the EPA is doing is a good idea so that I can make up my own mind.

Do you understand that the NYT has an area called 'from the left and the right'? Do you understand that in most NYT pieces the opposing view of a thesis statement is given in a non-opinion piece? One may have to search for it, but it is always there. If it is not there, or weakly given, I as a critical reader, will go search for it. You NOT doing your job in supplying information makes it harder. The average person does not have time to do this and you made it harder with this response- simply because of your (or your agency's leadership) petty biases about 'elite clickbait' (as opposed to Fox/Breitbart/Alex Jones and conservative sources which oh my goodness are just paragons of unbiased and balanced reporting). I can only assume you and your agency live in a kind of coolaid drinking blind willful ignorance about anyone not in your sphere, and not completely on board with YOUR perspectives on the world. You have completely and utterly disregarded one of the most important and influential newspapers in our country- and it's readers.

Your response hinders the free press. So I'll remind you democracy is built on the free press and transparency so people can make up their own minds. Democracy is not taken down suddenly- it is chipped away. Your response IS one of those instances of chipping away.

Please re-think because all you accomplished with your response was to make me MORE suspect of the EPA. It made me feel further divided from what your administration's intention might be, and caused me to be more polarized. So a final time- How is a response like you gave actually helpful to your cause?

Thank you for hearing me out. I have contacted my senator about your response and I will be telling everyone I can about it. It can not stand. Do your job for all Americans, not just the press and people who you think are favorable to your agenda.

Sarah

Citizen Overseas Concerned about a polarized America