From: Mace Barron/GB/USEPA/US
Sent: 12/7/2012 5:04:02 PM

To: William Benson/GB/USEPA/US@EPA
CC:
Subject: Re: Dispersant causes more harm than good in oil spill cleanups -- study

Ex 12061
Worldwide
Court Reporters, Inc

Will do. I liked Bob's idea!
Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services

From: William Benson
To: Mace Barron
Cc:
Date: 12/07/2012 04:35 PM EST
Subject: RE: Dispersant causes more harm than good in oil spill cleanups -- study

Please keep me in touch with where this goes. I think it is a good idea, and I think the question will be - - what constitutes "an EPA perspective." I guess figuring that out is why Bob is paid the big bucks.

I think a response would be easy to pull off and I wonder if "an EPA perspective" requires SPC, RAF, ??? involvement.

Good luck and please keep me posted.

From: Mace Barron/GB/USEPA/US
To: Robert Kavlock/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "David Dix" <dix.david@epa.gov>, Elizabeth Blackburn/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "Rick Greene" <Greene.Rick@epamail.epa.gov>, "Megan Maguire" <maguire.megan@epa.gov>, "David Piantanida" <piantanida.david@epa.gov>, "Hal Zenick" <zenick.hal@epa.gov>, Michael Hemmer@EPA, Albert Venosa/CI/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 12/07/2012 11:45 AM
Subject: Re: Dispersant causes more harm than good in oil spill cleanups -- study

I think an EPA perspective on dispersant research could be a good thing, as opposed to individual crticisms. A journal like ES&Ts policy section would be a great venue.
Do you think it would get approved up the food chain?

Bob, could you explore with OEM and the Administrator's office? I am willing to lead this with a team of folks, but would want to know we would not run into any policy concerns.
sincerely,
Mace

From: Robert Kavlock/DC/USEPA/US
To: Mace Barron/GB/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "David Dix" <dix.david@epa.gov>, Elizabeth Blackburn/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "Rick Greene" <Greene.Rick@epamail.epa.gov>, "Megan Maguire" <maguire.megan@epa.gov>, "David Piantanida" <piantanida.david@epa.gov>, "Hal Zenick" <zenick.hal@epa.gov>, Michael Hemmer/GB/USEPA/US@EPA, Albert Venosa/CI/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 12/07/2012 10:48 AM
Subject: Re: Dispersant causes more harm than good in oil spill cleanups -- study

Mace

Thanks for the quick response. In light of your comments about the potential tip of the iceberg, what do you think about a letter to the editor of some noteworthy journal (ES&T, SETAC, ToxSci) articulating some of the generic points that are important to consider when conducting dispersant research? At least we would have a marker down.

Bob

From: Mace Barron/GB/USEPA/US
To: Robert Kavlock/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "David Dix" <dix.david@epa.gov>, Elizabeth Blackburn/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "Rick Greene" <Greene.Rick@epamail.epa.gov>, "Robert Kavlock" <Kavlock.Robert@epamail.epa.gov>, "Megan Maguire" <maguire.megan@epa.gov>, "David Piantanida" <piantanida.david@epa.gov>, "Hal Zenick" <zenick.hal@epa.gov>, Michael Hemmer@EPA, Albert Venosa/CI/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 12/07/2012 10:59 AM
Subject: Re: Dispersant causes more harm than good in oil spill cleanups -- study

Bob, attached are comments on the Rico-Martinez rotifer paper; please let us know if you need anything else on this.

Given the hundreds of studies conducted on the DWH spill, dispersants and oil, we anticipate there will be a substantial number of studies relating to dispersants that will be of potential concern to EPA (ie, this may be tip of iceberg).

Unfortunately, in papers like the this on rotifers and the Ortmann one previously reviewed for ORD headquarters, the authors (and the press) are speculating way beyond the rather narrow limits of the research. Additionally, I think journals are eager to publish articles on the spill, and possibly the peer review is not as rigorous as it could be (e.g., this is a paper that should have had major revisions).
A proactive strategy maybe needed to address how ORD can best serve an advisory role.

Note that to our knowledge, the only research currently being peformed on oil within ORD is not ecotoxicology focused (e.g., theme 3 SHC focused on oil product fate and efficacy, rather than tox), so we will only have professional judgement to rebutt any concerns.

sincerely,
Mace
[attachment "ORD Review of Rico Martinez et al 2012.docx" deleted by Robert Kavlock/DC/USEPA/US]

From: Robert Kavlock/DC/USEPA/US
To: Elizabeth Blackburn/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "Rick Greene" <Greene.Rick@epamail.epa.gov>, "Branch Chief Mace Barron" <Barron.Mace@epamail.epa.gov>, "Robert Kavlock" <Kavlock.Robert@epamail.epa.gov>, "Hal Zenick" <zenick.hal@epa.gov>, "David Dix" <dix.david@epa.gov>, "Megan Maguire" <maguire.megan@epa.gov>, "David Piantanida" <piantanida.david@epa.gov>
Date: 12/03/2012 09:17 PM
Subject: Re: Dispersant causes more harm than good in oil spill cleanups -- study

Rick/Mace

Can you do a critique of the paper? Until we can evaluate it, we should stick to our talking points. As well, There is a PNAS paper coming out tomorrow that Lek shared this morning.

-----Elizabeth Blackburn/DC/USEPA/US@EPA wrote: -----

==========
To: "Rick Greene" <Greene.Rick@epamail.epa.gov>, "Branch Chief Mace Barron" <Barron.Mace@epamail.epa.gov>, "Robert Kavlock" <Kavlock.Robert@epamail.epa.gov>, "Hal Zenick" <zenick.hal@epa.gov>, "David Dix" <dix.david@epa.gov>
From: Elizabeth Blackburn/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 12/03/2012 08:16PM

CONFIDENTIAL

Cc: "Megan Maguire" <maguire.megan@epa.gov>, "David Piantanida" <piantanida.david@epa.gov>
Subject: Dispersant causes more harm than good in oil spill cleanups -- study
==========
Hi all

Apparently there were about 30 stories today about this study. In the event we get a question about it, any suggested response about how it might relate to the work we did? Or should we say that we're reviewing the study and then just reiterate what we found back in 2010?

Thanks

Liz

News Headline: Dispersant causes more harm than good in oil spill cleanups -- study |

News Date: 12/03/2012
Outlet Full Name: Greenwire
Contact Name:
News Text: After more than 2 million gallons of Corexit 9527A, an oil dispersant, was poured into the Gulf of Mexico to clean up BP PLC's toxic oil spill in 2010, a new study has found those very dispersants could be doing even more harm to microscopic organisms that live in the water.

The dispersant was used to break apart the oil and stop it from being swept to shore.

In one of the first examinations of how oil dispersant affected plankton, the study published in the journal Environmental Pollution found the combination of oil and the dispersant becomes 52 times more potent that oil alone.

"There is a synergistic interaction between crude oil and the dispersant that makes it more toxic," said Terry Snell, co-author of the report and a Georgia Institute of Technology biologist. The Corexit "makes it more toxic to the planktonic food chain."

The dispersant makes the oil droplets even smaller, which makes it "bio-available" to tiny organisms, said Florida State University researcher Ian MacDonald. "The effect is a specifically toxic synergy -- the sum is worse than the parts."

An August 2010 study by U.S. EPA determined the dispersant-oil combination isn't worse for shrimp, fish and other sealife than oil alone already is. Yet several studies have found the mixture is more detrimental to the embryos of some fish species (Douglas Main, NBC News, Nov. 30). -- HP
Liz Blackburn
USEPA, Office of Research and Development
202-564-2192
Cell 202-436-2453

CONFIDENTIAL