

Message

From: Daguillard, Robert [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BBE9682B940C4F2C90732E4D37355DD4-DAGUILLARD,]
Sent: 12/26/2017 5:05:55 PM
To: Ex. 6
CC: Press [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b293283291dc44e0b5d1c36be9281d8a-Press]
Subject: RE: Subject: Writing at suggestion of Dr. R. Baldauf: A few questions re apparently withdrawn' International Programme on Chemical Safety 1996 report, Environmental Health Criteria 171: Diesel Fuel and Exhaust Emissions.

Dan, a quick follow-up: After reviewing your questions, we'll be referring you to WHO for answers.

Regards, R.

Robert Daguillard
Office of Media Relations
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC
+1 (202) 564-6618 (O)

Ex. 6

From: Daguillard, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, December 26, 2017 11:09 AM
To: Ex. 6
Subject: Subject: Writing at suggestion of Dr. R. Baldauf: A few questions re apparently withdrawn' International Programme on Chemical Safety 1996 report, Environmental Health Criteria 171: Diesel Fuel and Exhaust Emissions.

Good morning Dan,

Dr. Gantt and my colleagues from our Seattle office forwarded me your inquiry. Have you, in fact, published your story; and regardless, do you still need the information you requested in the preceding e-mail? If so, what is your hard deadline?

Happy to discuss.

Very best, R.

-----Original Message-----

From: ddanforbes Ex. 6
To: gantt.brent <gantt.brent@epa.gov>
Sent: Fri, 22 Dec 2017 8:42
Subject: Writing at suggestion of Dr. R. Baldauf: A few questions re apparently withdrawn' International Programme on Chemical Safety 1996 report, Environmental Health Criteria 171: Diesel Fuel and Exhaust Emissions.

Good Morning, Dr. Gantt:

Regarding the since 'withdrawn' International Programme on Chemical Safety 1996 report, Environmental Health Criteria 171: *Diesel Fuel and Exhaust Emissions*. ([See here.](#)) Just a couple of questions numbered in bold-face below. And thanks!

Daniel Forbes, a reporter in Portland, Oregon here. Just to introduce myself, my 20-article series in *The Portland Mercury* on toxics from art-glass factories influenced state policy here in Oregon. ([See here.](#))

Currently I'm writing on the prospective re-opening of a Portland Public School campus. Part One of my environmental risk assessment of Harriet Tubman Middle School has been published ([see here](#)), with Part Two in the offing. And I was interviewed on our local NPR public radio station, OPB, on the matter ([here](#)). I've certainly relied on several papers from your colleague, Dr. Richard Baldauf.

As you know, diesel particulate matter (DPM) is a big part of the issue for a school located literally 20-feet from the edge of I- 5, the West Coast's major, Canada-to-Mexico highway. Directly under the school is one of the worst bottlenecks in Oregon, up to 17,800 trucks a day belching and lurching directly below the campus.

Part One of my article discusses that; Part Two will consider the stabs at mitigation of the outdoor air on campus, the students at some real risk -- a risk that science can not yet quantify.

Oregon does not regulate dirty diesel trucks the way California does. I read the minutes of the Oregon DEQ advisory group, the Air Toxics Science Advisory Committee (ATSAC) which pondered from 2015 to 2017 setting a new DPM Unit Risk Estimate benchmark. The committee initially declared the extant Oregon DEQ Ambient Benchmark Concentration of 0.1 ug/m³ -- adopted in 2005 from a 1996 WHO study that has since been withdrawn -- as outmoded and no longer valid.

In their discussions, they pointed to California's stringent URE of 0.003 ug/m³, which was also adopted by Washington State. Talked over the months about how that conservative standard might be a step too far, but that certainly cutting the extant Oregon standard of 0.1 by a factor of ten, maybe -- to 0.01 ug/m³ -- was a good goal moving forward.

Ultimately, they hemmed and hawed and kept it at 0.1. -- which is 33-times higher than the California/Washington benchmarks.

The point as to why I write you today: The Oregon science advisers initially shied away from any reliance on the WHO's **Criteria 171**. But then they ultimately rested their DPM safe-air goal benchmark upon it, voting to do so in March 2017. So in Oregon DEQ's eyes, the 21-year-old, apparently withdrawn Criteria 171 still carried weight.

See the DEQ's table on its Ambient Benchmark Concentrations, which uses a cancer-based DPM level of 0.1 ug/m³ based on "the best professional judgement" of DEQ's science advisors. ([See here, Page 4.](#)) "The selected value is close to that *suggested* by the World Health Organization." [Emphasis added.]

So my few questions, please:

1. Was Criteria 171 withdrawn by the WHO?

2. If so, why? What was considered the weakness in its epidemiology and/or toxicology?
3. If possible, please point me to the WHO statement withdrawing Criteria 171. A link with a page number would be great if you had it (said the greedy reporter).
4. What was the actual Unit Risk Estimate promulgated by Criteria 171? Was it 0.1 ug/m3? Was it some level very close to 0.1 ug/m3?

I'm sorry to say -- forgive me -- but I'm afraid I need your reply today, Friday, as we plan to publish over the weekend.

Many thanks,

Daniel Forbes
Cascadia Times

Ex. 6

Robert Daguillard
Office of Media Relations
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC
+1 (202) 564-6618 (O)

Ex. 6