

From: Chassy, Bruce
To: Martina (E-mail); Wayne Parrott; Stanley Abramson; ninafedoroff.Fedoroff; Eric Sachs; Jim Gaffney; Philip D. Harvey; Adrienne Massey
Subject: Friday Conf Call Time Moved to 5PM EDT
Date: Thursday, September 01, 2011 10:28:52 AM
Attachments: [EPA Deaf Ear Federoff et al 2011.pdf](#)
[ATT00001.htm](#)

Colleagues:

The conference call tomorrow, Friday Sept. 2 will begin at 5:00PM EDT (4:00PM CDT, 2 PM PDT).

The dial-in and pass codes are:

Call-in: [REDACTED]

Passcode [REDACTED]

Participants:

Stanley Abramson
Bruce Chassy
Nina Federoff
Jim Gaffney
Phillip Harvey
Adrienne Massey (may not be able to attend)
Martina McGloughlin
Wayne Parrott
Eric Sachs

Tentative Agenda

1. Introductions. Everyone will be asked to give a brief introduction that describes their interest in the proposed EPA rule changes.
2. Review of what EPA is proposing to do, the process to be followed, and the timeline. Stan Abramson
3. Discussion of the academic response to the EPA draft document. Chassy and Federoff.

Letter to EPA signed by NAS members

NYT Editorial

FASEB Journal editorial (Federoff, Haselkorn and Chassy. EPA Turns a Deaf Ear to Science. <http://www.fasebj.org/content/25/9/2855.full.pdf+html>, PDF attached)

EPA response letter

Questions for discussion

Should the NAS letter be more widely publicized? If so, how?

Should the names of the NAS co-signatories be released?

Should the EPA response be published?

Should a committee of NAS members request a meeting with Administrator Jackson? Other EPA staff? Other organizations?

What other next steps might the science and academic communities take to advance this issue?

How to organize?

4. Discussion of the BIO and Industry Response

The BIO letter to NAS (Stan Abramson and Adrienne Massey)

Next steps?

5. Who will represent civil society and how are their interests the same or different? (NGOs, Foundations, NG- research institutes). Phil Harvey and others

6. Identification of key issues and messages

Not-science based; regulation should be commensurate with real risk

Is inconsistent with the administrations claim that they are simplifying and reducing regulatory hurdles

Raises a barrier to new developments to all but large multi-national corporations -- locks out academic scientists

Gives an advantage to scientists and developers in other countries (for example Brazil)

Inhibits the introduction of technologies that will add to the productivity and sustainability of agriculture

Contributes to higher cost of foods and feeds and stifles attempts to reduce hunger

Reduces US competitiveness

EPA wants this issue to go away, how do we promise them that we will continue to keep the heat on and make it even more public?

Others?

7. Brainstorming about other possible next steps

Congress and lobbying? To who and by whom?

Organizing a larger group of researchers? To do what?

8. Coordinating and communicating. Should we continue to meet regularly? How else might we stay in touch and support one another's efforts?