

Message

---

**From:** Beck, Nancy [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=168ECB5184AC44DE95A913297F353745-BECK, NANCY]  
**Sent:** 5/3/2017 9:13:28 PM  
**To:** townsend mark [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]  
**Subject:** RE: Failures in OSCPP

Mark,

Thanks for your note—I did receive this second one. Its just my first week and I'm settling in so give me a few weeks to get my bearings and then it would make more sense for us to chat.

Thanks,  
Nancy

---

Nancy B. Beck, Ph.D., DABT  
Deputy Assistant Administrator, OCSPP  
P: 202-564-1273  
M: [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]  
[beck.nancy@epa.gov](mailto:beck.nancy@epa.gov)

**From:** townsend mark [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 3, 2017 1:54 PM  
**To:** Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Failures in OSCPP

I just determined that my previous message to you may have never been delivered as EPA may not yet have sent up your account and my message may have gone into limbo. Please allow me to introduce myself and if possible to meet with you to discuss my Federal observations of the failings of EPA management. Based i believe in part on non-trained policy staff (lawyers, economists, policy experts etc.) consistently ignoring or finessing science to meet their perceived goals and objectives. Often programs are actually successful in their early years but do not know how to take credit for success and move on to new higher return projects. They continue to seek resources to feed the search for one more significant digit. When it is found no one knew what to do with it --- bury it, and ask for more money was the theme song I often heard. The concept of ROI was ignored even by Jim Jones and economist and my mention of such put me in a bad position over time.

I would be honored to meet with you at anytime to discuss an ex-public servants views of what went wrong and remained wrong at EPA for far too long.

If you have received and reviewed the below (likely lost message) and deemed such a meeting unnecessary I honestly think you are missing out on a rare set of insights.

Sincerely  
Mark W Townsend  
MS MBA and Cancer Researcher  
[Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)] cell

----- Forwarded message -----

From: townsend mark [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]

Date: Fri, Apr 21, 2017 at 10:21 AM

Subject: Failures in OSCPP

To: [beck.nancy@epa.gov](mailto:beck.nancy@epa.gov)

When Charlie Auer quickly departed OPPTS and Wendy Cleland Hamnett and Jim Jones moved up I realized Pesticides and Toxics were going to be poorly managed. As a rather outspoken manager scientist at decision meetings asking questions like "what is the return on the investment" or "why are we wasting money reviewing again the same chemicals" I knew my days were likely numbered and I was correct.

However, with my MBA in finance and public policy and years of industry experience testing carcinogens I was a highly effective mid-level manager in your TSCA program. And i have more than 40 years as a fed and am a tad bored being retired. And I am known by Steve Russel and others at ACC as i represented the Challenge Program and the OECD SIAM review process and often worked with ACC and API and chemical industry representatives. I always viewed myself as a practical decision maker with my decisions based on facts and not a fear of chemicals. I always loved the TV industry "PSA" --- "Without chemicals, life itself is impossible!"

Why am i writing to you? Oddly, enough i would like to return to EPA for several years to help you and others clean house within OCSPP.

- A. Why does EPA have some many programs reviewing the same chemicals?
- B. Why does EPA insist on reviewing the same chemicals over and over again?
- C. Why did Congress insist on using the 83 black listed already reviewed chemicals as a priority?
- D. Asbestos and Carbon Tetrachloride do not need more review or testing --- Why did they get prioritized?
- E. I know where the skeletons reside and would like to help YOU dig them up, defuse them, and prioritize REAL work.
- F. Why does OPPT TSCA have a larger budget since the work products should be simplified not expanded. The program needs to be MANAGED not continue down established risk assessment process tracks.
- G. Why would anything put SAFETY in an organizational title when there really are no "safe chemicals" only relatively safe use.

OCSPP name is so inappropriate. Green chemistry does in fact work for me --- relative risk also makes sense.

I could easily go on with this list, especially in reference to TRI, HAPPS, Chem View, PMNs, Existing chemicals, Test rules, OECD/ECHA REACH, and the consolidation or removal of redundant chemical review units at EPA.

I have attached a short and focused resume and would love to come to head quarters to discuss a role for me in helping you aggressively clean up redundant and wasteful EPA programs. My vision is to return for one to two years on your staff and to help you direct ongoing work to be targeted and more effective and to kill redundancies in work and web page spam (OH! Chem View is web page SPAM).

I retired as a GS 15/10 Biologist. I can help you resolve problems

Mark W Townsend  
MS Veterinary Microbiology/Virology  
MBA Public policy and finance  
Cancer Research NIH/NCI Contractor  
TSCA Manager

