Message

From: Flowers, Lynn [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1A4411C874D041B9A8BADFC32B91BD70-FLOWERS, LYNN]
Sent: 6/17/2016 3:57:26 PM
To: Vandenberg, John [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=dcae2b98a04540fb8d099f9d4dead690-Vandenberg, John]; Ross, Mary [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=98359cd1f66f46ec91d327e99a3c6909-Ross, Mary]; D'Amico, Louis [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=78a91f83c4414910be286efe02004dbc-D'Amico, Louis J.]; Jones, Samantha [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=eac77fe3b20c4667b8c534c90c15a830-Jones, Samantha]; Bussard, David [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=cf26b876393e44f38bdd06db02dbbfe5-Bussard, David]; Gatchett.Annette@epa.gov; Berner, Ted [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=f1949c9653024d3cb4aa4c2bd69c4fde-Berner, Ted]; Cogliano, Vincent [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=51f2736376ac4d32bad2fe7cfef2886b-Cogliano, Vincent]; Perovich, Gina [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=6e3c19d7f4db41bfa2477aa27ad83945-Perovich, Gina]
Subject: FW: glyphosate letter re: NIH and IARC and news clip on "staff split on risk"
Attachments: glyphosate_aderholt_house_NIH_IARC_Jun72016.pdf

Just sharing...provocative title.

Daily News

House Panel Investigating Possible EPA Staff Split On Glyphosate Risk

June 14, 2016

The House panel investigating EPA's oversight of glyphosate is seeking to determine whether agency scientists are split over whether the nation's most commonly-used herbicide is likely to cause human cancers, potentially complicating the agency's ongoing cancer analysis of the substance, according to a source with the panel.

There may be two "groups within EPA that have different feelings on the impacts of glyphosate," a committee aide tells *Inside EPA*, explaining a motivation behind the panel's recent inquiry into EPA's ongoing cancer analysis of the herbicide. "Our concern is ensuring that they are going to make that decision based on sound science, and that there isn't any political motivation involved."

House science panel Chairman Lamar Smith (R-TX), in May and June letters to EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy, has questioned EPA's handling of the glyphosate review, and requested documents and staff interviews to support the panel's oversight.

The congressional inquiry began after EPA April 29 posted its "Cancer Assessment Document: Evaluation of the Carcinogenic Potential of Glyphosate" finding the substance is unlikely to cause cancer and then subsequently withdrew that document along with a dozen others May 2.

The report by EPA's pesticides office's Cancer Assessment Review Committee (CARC) faults the World Health Organization International Agency for Research on Cancer's (IARC) March 2015 report that concluded glyphosate probably causes cancer.
The IARC finding broadened advocates' calls for greater restrictions on glyphosate, which had largely focused on ecological concerns, to focus more on risks to human health. Glyphosate is commonly used on genetically-modified crops, but advocates are urging EPA to ban the substance due to concerns about its health impacts.
EPA's withdrawn report faults the IARC review, in which some EPA scientists participated, saying IARC overlooked negative findings, which could have influenced the group's conclusions.
In a May 4 letter, Smith faulted EPA's release and subsequent withdrawal of its glyphosate cancer review, and requested all documents and communications informing that analysis, dating back to Jan. 1, 2015. Smith said the move raised questions about EPA's motivation to provide a fair review of glyphosate and suggested broader problems with agency chemical risk reviews.

Smith's Concerns

In a June 7 letter, Smith reiterated his concerns and requested transcribed interviews with four EPA pesticides and research office officials, including some that participated in the IARC review.
A House science committee aide tells *Inside EPA* that the panel has a lot of questions about why EPA published and then withdrew its CARC review, which was marked "final," and found glyphosate is unlikely to cause cancer. An agency spokeswoman told *Inside EPA* in May that the documents were "preliminary" and were "taken down because EPA's assessment is not final."
The purpose of the House inquiry, the committee source says, is to ensure that EPA's analysis of glyphosate is based on scientific findings, rather than political motivations. The source also says that the panel could address its concerns through legislation, though lawmakers have not yet begun to consider that prospect.
"I think there is probably a legislative option, but we haven't explored that yet until we get more information from the agency," the source says.
Additionally, EPA has told the House panel that staff is currently searching for documents in response to the May request, though the agency has not been clear on what documents staff will provide or when.
The House oversight committee is interested to learn "whether there is some sort of struggle or some argument between what may be competing groups about how they feel about the potential impacts of glyphosate," the source says.
Smith's inquiry into EPA's review of glyphosate is at least the second time this year the House panel has questioned agency processes for reviewing chemicals' risks.
This spring, Smith raised questioned EPA's management of and motivation to improve its controversial Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) chemical review program. In May, Smith requested numerous documents on the IRIS program, and then, in a June 2 follow-up letter, threatened to subpoena the documents after EPA had missed his deadline for providing the records. -- *Dave Reynolds* (dreynolds@iwpnews.com)

Lynn Flowers, PhD, DABT
Office of Science Policy
US EPA
Washington, DC
202-564-6293