Message

From: Diem, Art [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=968850B28AF04C6A828006016A28CF22-ADIEM]
Sent: 10/16/2015 1:14:09 PM
To: Palma, Ted [Palma.Ted@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Follow up on chloroprene modeling and additional questions

Hi Ted,
Thanks for sharing this with me.
Art
- -
Art Diem, Environmental Engineer
USEPA Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards,
Sector Policies and Programs Division, Refining and Chemicals Group
Diem.Art@epa.gov
919-541-1185

From: Palma, Ted
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2015 7:18 AM
To: Diem, Art; Lassiter, Penny; Pagan, Ines; Smith, Darcie
Cc: Keating, Martha; Rimer, Kelly
Subject: FW: Follow up on chloroprene modeling and additional questions
Importance: High

FYI, response from last week's call with DuPont

Ted Palma
USEPA
OAQPS/HEID/ATAG
MD C539-02
RTP, NC 27711

919-541-5470 (work)
palma.ted@epa.gov

From: PATRICK.A.WALSH@dupont.com [mailto:PATRICK.A.WALSH@dupont.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2015 6:28 PM
To: Kelly.Petersen@LA.gov; Doris.B.Grego@dupont.com; James.B.Allen@dupont.com; Carlos.F.Saldana@dupont.com; Palma, Ted; Morris, Mark; Casso, Ruben; Rimer, Kelly; Strum, Madeleine
Subject: RE: Follow up on chloroprene modeling and additional questions
Importance: High

All,

I have reviewed all the appropriate information and my position hasn't changed. I'm worried that EPA is going down the wrong path. Let me explain my thinking to you:

My problem is that the data as presented by EPA with regard to NATA are presented as "cancer risk":

Facility ID	FIPS	Tribal Code	Parameter	Pollutant	Risk Value (cancer risk reported in a million)	Facility Emissions (tpy)	Facility Name	State	County Name	Comment
8026611	22095	Cancer risk	Chloroprene	1816.044	130.0775	E I DuPont de Nemours & Co - Pontchartrain Site		LA	St. John the Baptist	

(Taken from email from Madeleine Strum to Kelly Petersen, 6/24/15)

That would read to most people that chloroprene is a known, proven human carcinogen. But it hasn't been proven, or even generally accepted, and EPA's own toxicology data states such.

The IRIS database for chloroprene reads similarly to the IARC monograph:

"Under the Guidelines for Carcinogen Risk Assessment (U.S. EPA, 2005), there is evidence that chloroprene is 'likely to be carcinogenic to humans'"

Even the IRIS group will not explicitly state that chloroprene is a KNOWN human carcinogen. The entire series of documents discusses chloroprene's carcinogenicity in mice and rats **only**. While they can be used as models for human physiology, mice and rats are NOT human, and there are numerous examples of materials that are spectacularly toxic to non-human animals but have little or no effect on humans (chocolate springs to mind). Therefore, it is, in my opinion, an irresponsibly large leap to present the chloroprene release data as definitely carcinogenic to humans by presenting it as "increased cancer risk".

In addition, the epidemiological data does not comport with the model at all. The following table describes actual cancer rates for St. John Parish for the most recent 4-year period for which data is available:

Rank	County	Annual Incidence Rate(†) over rate period - cases per 100,000	Lower 95% Confidence Interval	Upper 95% Confidence Interval	Average Annual Count over rate period	Rate Period	Recent Trend	Recent 5-Year Trend (‡) in Incidence Rates	Lower 95% Confidence Interval	Upper 95% Confidence Interval
53	St. John the Baptist Parish(7,9)	460.8	432.3	490.7	209	2008-2012	stable	-2.2	-9.4	5.6

(Data from http://statecancerprofiles.cancer.gov/incidencerates/index.php?stateFIPS=22&cancer=001&race=00&sex=0&age=001&type=incd&sortVariableName=rate&sortOrder=default#results)

Given the following:

1. 50+ year history making chloroprene in St. John Parish
2. 20-30 year latency period for most cancers

According to the risk factors EPA attributes to our chloroprene emissions, St. John Parish should have the highest cancer rate in the state. This should be especially true given that our history of emitting chloroprene is much longer than the typical latency for cancer. But in actuality, St. John is in the **lowest quartile** of measured cancer rates in the state (#53 out of 66 parishes) and the rate of cancer is decreasing according to the 5-year trend. Thus, the model has a serious flaw as it doesn't come close to reflecting real, published cancer rate data.

The above, taken together, indicate that EPA is planning to publish misleading data in an inflammatory way. Therefore, it would be irresponsible to publish it. I strongly urge EPA to reconsider its present course.

Patrick A. Walsh, CIH
E.I. DuPont De Nemours and Company
Safety, Health, Environmental, and PSM Manager
DuPont Performance Polymers Pontchartrain Works
LaPlace, LA 70068

(985) 536-5731 Work
(251) 321-5989 Mobile
Patrick.A.Walsh@dupont.com

Let's Solve. DuPont

-----Original Appointment-----
From: Kelly Petersen [mailto:Kelly.Petersen@LA.GOV]
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 10:09 AM
To: Kelly Petersen; GREGO, DORIS B; ALLEN, JAMES B; SALDANA, CARLOS F; Palma, Ted; Morris, Mark; Casso, Ruben; 'Rimer, Kelly'; Strum, Madeleine; WALSH, PATRICK A.
Subject: Follow up on chloroprene modeling and additional questions
When: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 11:00 AM-12:00 PM (UTC-06:00) Central Time (US & Canada).
Where: `DEQ/Room 919 - OMF Conference

Please join a conference call at 11am central time on Tuesday, October 6th. The call in information is below.

Meeting Number: 4341356

To join the conference call:
(1) Dial 888-363-4735, or 215-446-3657 for international calls.
(2) Enter the Meeting Number, then #

Thanks, Kelly Petersen

This communication is for use by the intended recipient and contains information that may be Privileged, confidential or copyrighted under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby formally notified that any use, copying or distribution of this e-mail,

in whole or in part, is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender by return e-mail and delete this e-mail from your system. Unless explicitly and conspicuously designated as "E-Contract Intended", this e-mail does not constitute a contract offer, a contract amendment, or an acceptance of a contract offer. This e-mail does not constitute a consent to the use of sender's contact information for direct marketing purposes or for transfers of data to third parties.

Francais Deutsch Italiano Espanol Portugues Japanese Chinese Korean

http://www.DuPont.com/corp/email_disclaimer.html