

Message

From: Bennett, Tate [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1FA92542F7CA4D01973B18B2F11B9141-BENNETT, EL]
Sent: 8/23/2017 10:13:51 PM
To: Annie Dwyer [Annie.Dwyer@cei.org]
CC: Bowman, Liz [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=c3d4d94d3e4b4b1f80904056703ebc80-Bowman, Eli]; Taylor Barkley [Taylor.Barkley@cei.org]
Subject: Re: New CEI Chlorpyrifos report and other resources

Thanks!! We should all get together soon.

On Aug 23, 2017, at 6:06 PM, Annie Dwyer <Annie.Dwyer@cei.org> wrote:

Hi Tate and Liz,

I wanted to make sure you received a copy of CEI's recent report by our chemical and consumer risk expert [Angela Logomasini](#). The report came out a couple weeks ago, but given recent news, she recently wrote an oped and blog post on the issue that I thought you'd be interested in. The two pieces are linked below. I've also included links to the report and the press release so you have them. Feel free to pass these along to others who might be interested.

Tate – I can't remember if I introduced you earlier, but I'm copying Taylor Barkley who handles government affairs for CEI.

Hope all is well over there. Take care –
Annie

Huffington Post: Bugged by Junk Science (8/21/2017)

Excerpt: In March 2017, EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt rightly rejected the petition, allowing the EPA to continue its more thorough safety review. His decision was judicious, but news headlines and environmental activists have dubbed it an assault on science. Few media stories focused on what's at stake and why Pruitt's decision was, in fact, wise.

CEI.org: NYT Pesticide Exposé Only Exposes Foolish Reporting (8/23/2017)

Excerpt: It may be true that some EPA staff were at odds with the Trump political appointees on this decision, but those employees did not have a good scientific justification for their position, nor were they elected to make such policy decisions. Agency staff based their proposal to ban the chemical on a single study, despite decades of research that supported registration of the chemical as safe. The agency's own Science Advisory Panel—which is composed of scientists who review agency pesticide risk assessments—told EPA staff in March 2016 that the study contained many flaws, and reliance on it for regulation was “premature and possibly inappropriate.” But the Obama EPA released a risk assessment last November based on that study, attempting to justify the ban with junk science.

Accordingly, Administrator Pruitt was right to go against what some staff may have wanted, and as a representative of an elected official, he has that right. Ultimately, these are policy decision that only elected officials and their appointees have the right to make.

Surely, it's crucial to be certain that products are safe to use, and in this case, the long-standing science supported chlorpyrifos safety when used according to legal guidelines. In addition, EPA should also consider the impacts of the regulations to ensure they don't do more harm than good. In this case, that

requires consideration of how a pesticide ban would impact agricultural productivity and food prices and availability. Who would know more about that than farmers? As Lipton's article details, farmers need chlorpyrifos because there are few alternative products left to fight crop-destroying insects.

August Report: [EPA Denial of Chlorpyrifos Ban Sets Pro-Science Precedent](#)

Activist Petition to Ban Safe and Valuable Pesticide Would Undermine Food Affordability

Press Release: [CEI Fellow Praises Trump EPA Refusal to Ban Chlorpyrifos](#)

August 10, 2017

As members of Congress develop proposals to ban the pesticide chlorpyrifos, CEI's Angela Logomasini, praises EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt for his refusal to ban it earlier this year.

"Pruitt's decision is a repudiation of junk science used to push unwarranted and counterproductive regulations," says Logomasini, a Senior Fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, in "[EPA Denial of Chlorpyrifos Ban Sets Pro-Science Precedent](#)", a new policy brief on the topic released today. "Denying a ban on chlorpyrifos not only sets an important pro-science approach to regulation that the agency should continue to follow, it recognizes the essential value that this pesticide has in helping produce affordable food supply."

Last March, Pruitt denied an activist petition to ban the chemical, which farmers have safely used for decades. Dr. Logomasini's report details how activists attempted to force EPA to abandon long-standing scientific principles demonstrating its safety to push an unwarranted ban based on a single, poorly designed study.

Recently, Senator Ben Cardin (D-MD) and six other Democratic Senators have proposed the "Protect Children, Farmers and Farmworkers from Nerve Agent Pesticides Act of 2017," which would ban the chemical without any scientific justification. This legislation is not only unnecessary, it would adversely impact consumers.

Because of excessive regulations on pesticides, few crop protection products are available to farmers to fight a wide array of crop destroying insects—both native pests as well as an increasing number of accidentally imported ones.

"The Trump administration decision to deny the petition is a welcome, pro-science shift in policy—and a victory for public health, consumers' budgets, and struggling farmers," says Logomasini.

[Read more about "EPA Denial of Chlorpyrifos Ban Sets Pro-Science Precedent" here.](#)

Annie Dwyer

Vice President of Communications

Competitive Enterprise Institute

Ex. 6 | @ceidotorg
annie.dwyer@cei.org