

To: Smith, Charles[Smith.Charles@epa.gov]; Kent, Ray[Kent.Ray@epa.gov]; Miller, David[Miller.DavidJ@epa.gov]
Cc: Jordan, William[Jordan.William@epa.gov]; Vogel, Dana[Vogel.Dana@epa.gov]; Metzger, Michael[Metzger.Michael@epa.gov]
From: Rowland, Jess
Sent: Tue 3/24/2015 4:27:26 PM
Subject: RE: by 1:00 today - FW: Round Up questions - Q from USDA

(b)(5) deliberative process

JR

Sent from my Windows Phone

From: Smith, Charles
Sent: 3/24/2015 8:45 AM
To: Kent, Ray; Miller, David; Rowland, Jess
Cc: Jordan, William; Vogel, Dana; Metzger, Michael
Subject: RE: by 1:00 today - FW: Round Up questions - Q from USDA

(b)(5) deliberative process

(b)(5) deliberative process

Sent from my Windows Phone

From: Kent, Ray
Sent: 3/24/2015 10:20 AM
To: Miller, David; Rowland, Jess; Smith, Charles
Cc: Jordan, William; Vogel, Dana; Metzger, Michael
Subject: RE: by 1:00 today - FW: Round Up questions - Q from USDA

From the email chain I have no idea what study USDA and others are referring to.

Ray

From: Miller, David
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2015 10:00 AM
To: Rowland, Jess; Smith, Charles; Kent, Ray

Cc: Jordan, William; Vogel, Dana; Metzger, Michael

Subject: RE: by 1:00 today - FW: Round Up questions - Q from USDA

The email chain below, to me, seems to be pretty much entirely devoid of much to go off of so the question I think will need to be made clearer. The references below are to things like “a study like this”, “maybe three years ago or four years”, “the methodology was similar”, “this one seems to be very similar”, and “I would be curious to know if the EPA scientist have reviewed the methodology for this study.”

(b)(5) deliberative process

But if there is an obvious and very quick answer (e.g., “We are aware of it and it is entirely irrelevant”), then that would be good to know and convey.

David.

From: Strauss, Linda

Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2015 9:31 AM

To: Rowland, Jess; Miller, David

Cc: Sisco, Debby; Overstreet, Anne; Keltz, Colleen; Dinkins, Darlene; Collantes, Margarita; Jordan, William

Subject: by 1:00 today - FW: Round Up questions - Q from USDA

Jess and David,

Can you answer this question from USDA? Can you let me know by noon or 1:00? Thanks.

Linda

From: Lee, Monica
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2015 8:54 AM
To: Strauss, Linda
Subject: Fw: Round Up questions

Are you familiar with this methodology? USDA seems to think we've reviewed the process before.

Monica Lee
202-564-0645 (o)
202-713-6902 (c)

From: Purchia, Liz <Purchia.Liz@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2015 8:45 AM
To: Lee, Monica
Subject: FW: Round Up questions

Can you check whether we have reviewed the methodology for this study?

Liz Purchia

Press Secretary

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Direct: 202-564-6691

Cell: 202-841-2230

From: Herrick, Matthew - OC [<mailto:Matthew.Herrick@oc.usda.gov>]
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2015 7:13 PM
To: Purchia, Liz
Subject: Re: Round Up questions

Okay. Thanks. A study like this came out maybe three years ago or four years ago and the methodology was similar: the scientists injected rodents with glyphosate with an IV and monitored them. At the time, that study was widely criticized by US and international researchers. This one seems to be very similar. With the one from a few years ago, it took several days to several weeks for researchers around the world to be familiar with the actual methodology used. I would be curious to know if the EPA scientist have reviewed the methodology for this study. Let me know. Thanks.

Matt Herrick, USDA

202-679-3882 (m)

On Mar 23, 2015, at 7:06 PM, Purchia, Liz <Purchia.Liz@epa.gov> wrote:

Sure. I'll call tomorrow. We've had inquiries from WSJ, Reuters, NPR, NPR DC, NPR St. Louis, Politico, DTN farmer, Vice news, Tri- Sates Public Radio on Glyphosate today.

This is the statement we've been using.

We are currently reassessing glyphosate as part of our scheduled registration review (the periodic reevaluation required by FIFRA every 15 years) and coordinating its re-evaluation with Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency. If at any time EPA discovers that the use of a registered pesticide may result in unreasonable adverse effects on people or the environment, we will take action to remove it from the marketplace or limit its use. EPA's 2012 human health risk assessment of glyphosate (2012) concluded that when used according to the EPA-approved label directions, the pesticide meets the statutory safety standards. During registration review, we will update the existing human health and ecological risk assessments based on the best available scientific data. We will

determine whether any risk mitigation is needed to ensure that glyphosate can continue to be used without unreasonable risks to people or the environment, including species like the monarch butterfly. We expect to release for public comment the preliminary ecological and human health risk assessments for glyphosate later in 2015.

For the latest glyphosate tolerances please go to following link for the CFR:

<http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/retrieveECFR?gp=1&SID=48d555b26f36ad26ea1d8e99db1dc8fd&ty=HTML&h=L&r=SECTION&>

Liz Purchia

U.S. EPA

202-564-6691

202-841-2230

On Mar 23, 2015, at 6:46 PM, Herrick, Matthew - OC <Matthew.Herrick@oc.usda.gov> wrote:

Can you touch base tonight or tomorrow about this? No rush. My mobile if you need is (b)(5) delib
(b)(6) personal Have a good night.

From: Purchia, Liz [<mailto:Purchia.Liz@epa.gov>]
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2015 9:35 AM
To: Herrick, Matthew - OC
Subject: Re: Round Up questions

Not yet but we're expecting to. We're going to work on a response.

Liz Purchia

U.S. EPA

202-564-6691

202-841-2230

On Mar 23, 2015, at 9:31 AM, Herrick, Matthew - OC <Matthew.Herrick@oc.usda.gov> wrote:

Hi, Liz. Are you all getting questions about the WHO statements on Round Up? We have not, but I wanted to check to see how you're answering if asked. Thanks. I hope you're well.

-Matt

202-690-0060