

Message

From: Fred Lucas **Ex. 6**
Sent: 12/12/2017 2:43:59 PM
To: Press [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group
(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b293283291dc44e0b5d1c36be9281d8a-Press]
Subject: FoxNews.com inquiry on credibility of science in regulations

Hello. I am doing a freelance story for FoxNews.com about what some critics claim is “junk science” that has guided regulation.

Republicans in the House and Senate are backing something called the Better Evaluation of Science and Technology Act, or “BEST Act.”

[https://www.lankford.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Better%20Evaluation%20of%20Science%20and%20Technology%20\(BEST\)%20Act.pdf](https://www.lankford.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Better%20Evaluation%20of%20Science%20and%20Technology%20(BEST)%20Act.pdf)

Regarding the EPA, I wondered if you could provide a comment regarding the following examples that critics have cited to me for this story.

The House Science Committee subpoenaed the EPA in an effort to obtain data from Harvard’s 1993 “Six Cities” study on PM. However, the EPA said only Harvard can provide the information.

The EPA’s proposed ban on Chlorpyrifos in 2015, based largely on one study by the Columbia Center for Children’s Environmental Health. Since then, both the EPA’s Scientific Advisory Panel and the USDA raised questions about the Columbia study.

Some, such as the Natural Resource Council, raised questions about the IRIS findings that guided regulations on formaldehyde.

I would appreciate any information you can provide on any of these topics.

Thank you.

Fred Lucas

Ex. 6