

Message

From: Patrick Ness Ex. 6
Sent: 10/5/2017 4:33:25 AM
To: Press [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group
(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b293283291dc44e0b5d1c36be9281d8a-Press]
Subject: Michael Dourson Article Question

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing this to express my curiosity as to why someone at the EPA wrote an article entitled "widespread Praise for Dr. Michael Dourson" and why the EPA would allow this article to be posted on our government website. Although I could dive into opinions on the nomination of Dr. Dourson, that is not my concern. Instead, my focus here is to question the purpose of this article.

It seems like a waste of time for the EPA itself to want to release any sort of endorsement of a nominee for any position, especially when the person was nominated by the president and not necessarily from the EPA. Why not allow the process to take place before needing to make any sort of press release? In addition, the high accolades and referenced comments within the article seem somewhat nonsensical. How does someone who barely met Dourson at a Christian retreat have any sort of idea as to whether this person would perform well and protect the public as the Head of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention? Additionally, having Christian based faith is not a job qualification for such a position. Science helps determine risk assessment and what is best for the public- not religion, opinions, political party affiliation, monetary endorsements, or endorsements from camp directors or chemical companies.

I could continue with numerous other comments about how awkward I find this article on our government's website. Contacting the EPA is not something I typically think about doing, so that should be evidence enough of how strange I find this. As an Architectural Designer who practices with a great sensitivity to current environmental issues, I have been extremely concerned about the changes to the EPA since the election- including the nomination of Scott Pruitt to head the department. The number of people with extremely questionable backgrounds (when it comes to environmental protection) that have been given top positions in such an important organization is immensely alarming. Seeing a somewhat unnecessary article with a strangely positive tone for a not-yet elected nominee on our government website evokes a similarly disturbing feeling. If it's safe to assume that the department takes a rigorous approach to keeping American citizens safe, then I might ask the department to consider evaluating website content with a similar approach.

Thank you for taking the time to review my concerns,
Patrick Ness