

Message

From: Steven [Ex. 6]
on behalf of Steven Salzberg [salzberg@jhu.edu]
Sent: 5/6/2018 1:51:12 PM
To: Press [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group
(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b293283291dc44e0b5d1c36be9281d8a-Press]
CC: Steven Salzberg [salzberg@jhu.edu]
Subject: proposed new rule on scientific transparency

Dear EPA and EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt,

I'm a professor at Johns Hopkins University who writes a science blog on the *Forbes* website. I'm writing with a question. I've written a piece, to be posted tomorrow, that takes the EPA and Scott Pruitt to task for this new policy:

<https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-administrator-pruitt-proposes-rule-strengthen-science-used-epa-regulations>

In my article, I explain that your new policy is not about scientific transparency at all, but rather is a clever ruse to allow the EPA to ignore numerous studies of the health effects of pollution. I point out that many studies of human health are protected by human subjects rules, which under this new policy would mean they are not "transparent." This in turn means the EPA can ignore them, which will put human health at risk.

My questions are:

- 1) Is your new proposed policy going to allow you to ignore studies of human subjects when the underlying data is not available?
- 2) Don't you care that by ignoring such studies, you will harm human health and directly undermine the core mission of the EPA?

If you respond, then I would like to include your response (edited for length if necessary) in my column.

My blog represents my own opinions, not Forbes'.

Sincerely,
Steven Salzberg

--

Steven L. Salzberg, Ph.D.
Bloomberg Distinguished Professor of Biomedical Engineering, Computer Science, and Biostatistics
Director, Center for Computational Biology
McKusick-Nathans Institute of Genetic Medicine
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21205
Web: salzberg-lab.org [Ex. 6]
Forbes column: forbes.com/sites/stevensalzberg