Message

From: Wall, Dan [wall.dan@epa.gov]
Sent: 12/6/2019 3:17:47 PM
To: Partridge, Charles [Partridge.Charles@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Questions on Hailer-McDermott Meconium Study and Board of Health Meeting

Comp time is approved.

From: Partridge, Charles <Partridge.Charles@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2019 6:18 PM
To: Greene, Nikia <Greene.Nikia@epa.gov>; Mylott, Richard <Mylott.Richard@epa.gov>; Barnicoat, Dana <Barnicoat.Dana@epa.gov>; Wall, Dan <wall.dan@epa.gov>; OBrien, Wendy <OBrien.Wendy@epa.gov>
Cc: Lynn Woodbury <woodburyl@cdmsmith.com>
Subject: Fwd: Questions on Hailer-McDermott Meconium Study and Board of Health Meeting

I will start working on these and try to share a draft early in the morning. Wendy or dan are you around tomorrow. It's my off day, but I will put in some comp time if Dan is ok with that.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Matt Vincent <matt@rampart-solutions.com>
> **Date:** December 5, 2019 at 6:08:50 PM MST
> **To:** "Partridge, Charles" <Partridge.Charles@epa.gov>, "Mutter, Andrew" <mutter.andrew@epa.gov>
> **Subject: Questions on Hailer-McDermott Meconium Study and Board of Health Meeting**
>
> Hi Charlie,
> Thanks for the conversation today. As we discussed, I am writing a story for the Butte Weekly, which will be published next Wednesday. My deadline for submittal is close of business tomorrow, so I would very much appreciate your responses sooner than later.
> Please let me know via email or call if you have any clarifying questions or need anything else. Again, I really appreciate it!
> Matt
>
> 1. I felt that Dr. Hailer kind of put you on the spot in the meeting when she mentioned she'd already showed you her meconium data back in March 2019 and asked you to clarify what your change in response was to the same data now that it's in her report and now that it's published. Can you give me an official statement as your answer to that question, and would you care to clarify for the record the details of that March 2019 meeting?
>
> 2. More relevant, now that the data is published with references, and has appeared on the front page of the daily newspaper, causing quite a stir, what is your detailed plan for next steps and a timeframe to complete it? E.G. In your estimation, how long will it take for EPA to conclude from Hailer/McDermott's raw data and additional samples whether we have an issue that needs further attention?

3. Relative to what you said at the Board of Health meeting about running remaining samples "blind" at an EPA, CDC or independent laboratory, which Katie confirmed there were remaining meconium samples; and her offer to go through in excrutiating detail her methods, raw data, etc. -- Have you confirmed that she will send you her (and McDermott's) leftover splits and have you received or officially requested the study's raw data?

4. Hailer made a very confident statement that she/McDermott had looked through all of their methods, data, etc. and ultimately concluded "No: we didn't make any mistakes." You made a number of statements that clearly indicated a need for EPA to "confirm", "looking at the study further" "delving into the data much deeper" and even went so far as saying "if the Butte data holds up" "if these (data) turnout."

What are the main things you are looking at in the data and what do you make of Hailer's comment that there were no mistakes made?

5. Hailer and McDermott say in their study's published conclusion that their approach "provided straightforward evidence of elevated exposure to metals in a mining exposed community. The approach was inexpensive, thorough and required no advanced statistical analysis." Further they used the term "potential public health emergency." What is your reaction and assessment to these conclusions.

6. Please explain your experience in toxicology and with EPA and in that experience, what is your assessment/comparison of this particular "pilot" "proof of concept" study and how it is being amplified versus any other examples you've worked with or are aware of?

7. You mentioned a study from Canada as the "gold standard" of meconium studies, which used >2,000 samples and as relevant study you are looking to for appropriate comparisons. Can you please send that to me and perhaps give me a reason why you hold it in higher regard to the other studies referenced in Hailer's study and in her presentation/comparisons?

8. Do you know anything about the NIH grant proposal Hailer/McDermott submitted and why it was unsuccessful?

9. Please feel free to add anything else, any other statements that you would like me to include in the story. Again, don't hesitate to call or email me if you have additional questions. Thanks again!