Message

From: Partridge, Charles [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=27DA56DA9A12472787EF56077099CF36-PARTRIDGE, CHARLES]
Sent: 2/6/2020 2:24:36 PM
To: Lynn Woodbury [woodburyl@cdmsmith.com]
CC: Wall, Dan [wall.dan@epa.gov]; Greene, Nikia [Greene.Nikia@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: Interview

Yeah, you may be right. Let's talk on Monday. Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP) Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Cp

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 6, 2020, at 7:17 AM, Woodbury, Lynn <woodburyl@cdmsmith.com> wrote:

Charlie,

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

The MT Std article seemed pretty balanced...

How did the meeting go last night?

Lynn

Get Outlook for Android

From: Partridge, Charles <Partridge.Charles@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, February 5, 2020 6:06:54 PM
To: Wall, Dan <wall.dan@epa.gov>
Cc: Woodbury, Lynn <woodburyl@cdmsmith.com>
Subject: Fwd: Interview

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Matt Vincent <matt@rampart-solutions.com>
Date: February 5, 2020 at 5:58:03 PM MST
To: "Greene, Nikia" <Greene.Nikia@epa.gov>, "Partridge, Charles"

<Partridge.Charles@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Interview

FYI

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Matt Vincent <matt@rampart-solutions.com>
> **Date:** February 5, 2020 at 2:58:30 PM MST
> **To:** "MCDERMOTT, SUZANNE" <SMCDERMO@mailbox.sc.edu>
> **Subject: Re: Interview**
>
> Thanks again, Suzanne. You certainly raise a lot of important questions, that EPA would likely be able to answer. I do know from my own involvement in Superfund over the years that the metals you indicate should be being looked at were included and screened out early in the process. That said, I guess I am not aware of any research that documents copper, zinc and manganese as neurotoxins, at least not as it relates to the levels found here in Butte's environmental setting. I would assume that EPA took this information into consideration before deciding on its contaminants of concern and the action levels, but they would need to confirm that. So you know, lead was actually mined quite extensively albeit historically in Butte, as was silver, gold, copper, zinc and manganese. Copper and molybdenum (and silver as a byproduct) are the current metals being mined.
> As it relates to my questions on the "public health emergency" terminology used, I would ask you again for a response, if you might consider that.
> Thanks yet again,
> Matt
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
>> On Feb 5, 2020, at 2:26 PM, MCDERMOTT, SUZANNE <SMCDERMO@mailbox.sc.edu> wrote:
>>
>> Hi Matt,
>> We are not obstructing the EPA, instead we are moving forward as committed scientists. Reviewing other peoples work and conducting a systematic review takes time, and Dr. Lead is doing this in a careful way. Conducting research takes time, and then preparing a publishable manuscript and having it peer reviewed takes months. This is how

science has always worked. My position has always been that for over 30 years the monitoring of human health impacts in Butte has been minimal. Then I decided to do some analyses that culminated in three papers, and they want us to engage in a back and forth that really isn't productive. Why hasn't the EPA been doing monitoring of human levels of copper, manganese, zinc (all neurotoxins) for the past decades? Why are they monitoring lead when this isn't one of the mined metals? Why haven't they been monitoring mobility and mortality associated with metal exposure? Why have they been monitoring arsenic in urine, instead of in hair and nails, as it is well established that the half-life of arsenic is very short and the blood and urine do not accurately reflect expose? Why is the EPA so intent on discrediting our work instead of doing their own studies and having them peer reviewed?
Regards
Suzanne

From: Matt Vincent <matt@rampart-solutions.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 5, 2020 3:43 PM
To: MCDERMOTT, SUZANNE <SMCDERMO@mailbox.sc.edu>
Subject: Re: Interview

Thanks for your quick response, Suzanne! Believe it or not, one of the main questions I had, you appear to have answered indirectly via the content of your email.

That question was based on Dr. Partridge's multiple references during his presentation that he has attempted to get clarification, information and data from you and Dr. Lead on a number of topics relative to the paper, to no avail. My question was going to be "why haven't you/Dr. Lead provided the requested info or engaged in any critical discussions with EPA to this point, which I believe has now been three months since the publication was released?"

Partridge also made it clear that this lack of response and apparent cooperation on your/Dr. Lead's part was in stark contrast to how he characterized his interactions with Dr. Hailer, describes as being "very prompt, very professional and cooperative."

If you would like to provide a more direct response to my question (in quotes), that may be helpful for me and/or preferable for you.

Speaking as not only a reporter who was at the meeting, but also as a chemist (B.S. Chemistry), I will tell you that the EPA's interpretation of the data and its comparison to other referenced meconium studies and its conclusions reached certainly seemed to be in high confidence. Further, EPA noted that its review and conclusions had been derived from both internal and external sources. In short, the presentation of findings seemed to make a lot of sense to the board members and attendees with whom I've spoken.

I guess I have no alternative other than to wait for the results of the meconium review paper you reference at the end of your email. It does raise another question or two though, if you'd be willing to answer: Do you have any idea of when this paper might be published? It sounds as if there is a draft paper that has been submitted for peer review and publication, but not provided to the agencies — is this the case? And if so, why?
Lastly, the term "public health emergency" came up multiple times in EPA's presentation today. The daily newspaper referenced this term in its early coverage of the study. As a result, there was and remains a significant sector of the Butte community that is very concerned and reaching for answers to many serious questions (e.g. Is my baby safe/healthy? What can we do to protect our family if we live here and are starting/raising a family?) As both a reporter and a citizen with an opinion, I must say, it is frustrating now hearing that it will be weeks, months, maybe longer (?) before this community can get the answers to these and other questions it is desperately seeking. What can you say to explain or justify this response to something that was initially deemed a "potential public health emergency?"
Thanks again for the response,
Matt

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 5, 2020, at 12:27 PM,
MCDERMOTT, SUZANNE

<SMCDERMO@mailbox.sc.edu>
wrote:

Hi Matt,
Thanks for covering this important story. At this point I think it is best to have the science speak for itself. I have attached the three published papers I have been part of – one deals with meconium. My colleague Jamie Lead is deep into an analyses of all the studies that have been published to date about meconium levels. He is taking great pains to describe the differences in techniques used and to make fair comparisons of the results. He will not release his finding until after they go through peer review- which is what all scientists do to assure the credibility of his work. We cannot engage in back and forth with the EPA or others based on opinion, we have to be careful and this requires months of scrutiny. Please be patient and we will send you the results of the meconium review paper when it is accepted for publication.
Thanks
Suzanne

—

Suzanne McDermott, Ph.D.
Professor

803-777-7225
smcdermo@mailbox.sc.edu

Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics
Arnold School of Public Health
University of South Carolina
Discovery Building, 915 Greene Street
Columbia , SC 29208

<image001.png>

From: Matt Vincent <matt@rampart-solutions.com>
Date: Wednesday, February 5, 2020 at 2:12 PM
To: "MCDERMOTT, SUZANNE"

<SMCDERMO@mailbox.sc.edu>
Subject: Interview

Good afternoon, Dr. McDermott,
I am a freelance journalist for The Butte Weekly printed newspaper, as well as the author of an editorial blog. This morning I covered the Butte-Silver Bow Board of Health meeting, which included a presentation by EPA's Dr. Charles Partridge that focused on his/his agency's review of the meconium study of which you were the lead author.
Based on his presentation, I would very much like to have a conversation with you to get your take and response on a number of issues that were raised.
My deadline is this Friday at 5 p.m., so the sooner you might be able to talk with me, the better.
Thanks!
Matt Vincent
<meconium manuscript.pdf>
<brain cancer MT.pdf>
<Davis_et_al-2018-Environmental_Geochemistry_and_Health copy.pdf>