From: Chassy, Bruce

To: Martina (E-mail); Wayne Parrott; Stanley Abramson; ninafedoroff; Eric Sachs; Jim Gaffney; Philip D. Harvey;

Adrianne Massey

Subject: Conference Call

Date: Monday, August 29, 2011 3:50:06 PM

Attachments: Sunstein WSJ 08 23 11.pdf

ATT00001..htm

BIO letter EPA Scope Expansion.pdf

ATT00002..htm

NAS Members Letter to EPA - FINAL (7-5-11)-1.pdf

ATT00003..htm

Genetically Engineered Food for All - NYTimes.com.pdf

ATT00004..htm

EPA Federoff response.pdf

ATT00005..htm

Colleagues:

Would there be any objection to moving the conference call back (delaying) one hour? That would be 5PM EDT.

I have attached the following background material for our call on Friday:

- 1. NAS members letter to EPA
- 2. The EPA response letter
- 3. BIO letter to EPA
- 4. NIna Federoff Letter in NYT
- 5. Federoff et al. in FASEB Journal (to follow, PDF not available yet)
- 6. WSJ article by Cass Sunstein about "Eliminating Washington Red Tape"

See also:

http://www.feedstuffs.com/ME2/dirmod.asp? sid=49804C6972614A63A1A10DF54CD95D65&nm=Search+our+Archives&type=Publishin g&mod=Publications%3A%3AArticle&mid=AA01E1C62E954234AA0052ECD5818EF4&ti er=4&id=DBDDF7EC97FD43F58861553B088CE6B2

An agenda will follow later in the week. That said, the overarching agenda issue is what should industry, academe, BIO and interested members of civil society do next to encourage EPA to reduce rather than expand regulation of biotech crops? What are each sectors interests in the pending rule-changes are how do they differ/overlap? How can we help one another articulate a clear and consistent message and to whom and how should we be delivering that message? Which are the key messages to stress?

Regards