

DECKER, HALLMAN, BARBER & BRIGGS

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

260 PEACHTREE STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1700
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303
(404) 522-1500 MAIN
(404) 577-9149 FACSIMILE

F. EDWIN HALLMAN, JR.
(404) 588-2525 Direct
e-mail: challman@dhbblaw.com

June 19, 2008

BY FEDERAL EXPRESS

The Honorable U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer
Chair, Committee on Environment and Public Works
410 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Re: Ten troubling questions about the
Government's lead-abatement experiments in
Baltimore's poor, inner-city neighborhoods

Dear Chairwoman Boxer:

A close investigation of government-funded lead-abatement experiments conducted by Johns Hopkins University and the Kennedy Krieger Institute (KKI) in poor, inner-city neighborhoods of Baltimore,¹ which continue to receive widespread coverage in the national news media, raise numerous questions that should be of interest to the Committee on Environment and Public Works. In this letter, I summarize ten of the more important questions that are particularly relevant to this Committee.

The experiments, which were published in 2005 in a journal called *Science of the Total Environment*, were directed by Dr. Mark Farfel at Johns Hopkins University and Dr. Rufus Chaney at the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) research facility in Beltsville, Maryland. To test whether composted sewage sludge can reduce health risks posed by lead-contaminated soils, Farfel and Chaney tilled soils in inner-city neighborhoods and amended the soil with composted sewage sludge sold by the City of Baltimore under the trade names Eckology and Orgro. The experiments were designed to allow small children

¹ Farfel, M.R., Orlova, A.O., Chaney, R.L., Lees, P.S., Rohde, C., and Ashley, P., *Biosolids compost amendment for reducing soil lead hazards: A pilot study in urban yards*, *Science of the Total Environment*, 340 (1-3):81-95 (2005). The experiments were funded by the United States Environmental Protections Agency, the USDA, and the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development.

to ingest lead-contaminated soil mixed with the composted sewage sludge. They were based in part on a controversial theory held by Chaney and some other government scientists that Class A sewage sludge (biosolids) will protect children, who ingest lead, from being poisoned.

In 2001, a Maryland Court of Appeals ruled in a lawsuit against Farfel and Johns Hopkins University filed by families in previous lead abatement experiments in poor, inner-city neighborhoods. The Court likened those experiments, in which two children developed symptoms of lead poisoning, to Nazi war crimes and the government's Tuskegee experiments². Johns Hopkins University refuses to disclose the exact locations where its latest experiments were performed; therefore, other scientists are not being allowed to independently investigate whether residents may have been harmed or are currently at risk.

QUESTION (1): Given the Government's strong interest in promoting land application of sewage sludge as being safe and beneficial, did any federal agencies that funded the experiments in Baltimore (i.e., EPA, USDA or HUD) lean on the Associated Press - either directly or indirectly through Johns Hopkins University - to rebut its original "Impact" story about risks that their experiments in Baltimore may have posed to inner-city residents?

On April 13, 2008 *Associated Press* (AP) ran an "Impact" story concerning the KKI's lead-abatement experiments in Baltimore³. In response, the KKI organized a major public relations campaign that included disseminating false and misleading information about risks associated with the composted sewage sludge used in the experiments. Then, apparently under pressure from Johns Hopkins University, AP senior managing editor Mike Silverman and reporter Malcolm Ritter ran a rebuttal story last week

² *Erika Crimes v. Kennedy Krieger Institute, Inc.*, Circuit Court for Baltimore City, Case Nos. 24-C-99-000925, 24-C-95066067/CL193461. Order dated Oct. 11, 2001.

<http://www.courts.state.md.us/opinions/coa/2001/128a00.pdf>

³ Heilprin, J. and Vineys, K., *Sludge tested in poor neighborhoods Associated Press*, Baltimore, Md., April 13, 2008. <http://abcnews.go.com/Health/wireStory?id=4646032>

in which Mr. Silverman stated that AP's original story was unbalanced and created a distorted impression about the level of risk in the Baltimore experiment.⁴

In AP's rebuttal, Mr. Silverman and Mr. Ritter completely ignored blatantly false information that is being widely disseminated by Johns Hopkins University and the KKI as part of their PR campaign to downplay any risks associated with Baltimore's composted sewage sludge and the experiments in Baltimore. This PR effort clearly appears to be designed to thwart any investigations or scrutiny of the experiments by public interest groups, the press, your committee and others.

In AP's rebuttal, Mr. Silverman and Mr. Ritter also ignored key peer-reviewed studies on lead exposure risks in inner-city neighborhoods published by researchers at the University of Cincinnati shortly after the original AP story ran.^{5,6} These researchers discovered significant brain atrophy in inner-city children exposed to lead. Specifically, decreases in grey matter occurred in the regions of the brain controlling "executive functions, mood regulation, and decision-making." This damage was observed at blood lead levels as low as 5 micrograms per deciliter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$), which is well within the range of blood lead levels expected in the Baltimore experiments based on soil lead concentrations.

Mr. Silverman and Mr. Ritter are not equipped to weigh the risks associated with the experiments in Baltimore. It appears that they simply capitulated to pressure from Johns Hopkins University to recant the story, which was factually accurate and had presented both sides of the argument. AP's rebuttal raises the first among many troubling questions that Congress should address concerning the Government-sponsored lead abatement experiments in inner-city areas of Baltimore.

⁴ Ritter, M., *Johns Hopkins raps AP story on lead experiment*, Associated Press, June 13, 2008.

⁵ Wright, J. P., Dietrich, K.N., Ris, M.D., Hornung, R. W., Wessel, S.D., et al., *Association of Prenatal and Childhood Blood Lead Concentrations with Criminal Arrests in Early Adulthood*, *PLoS Med.* 5: e101 (2008).

⁶ Cecil, K. M., Brubaker, C.J., Adler, C.M., Dietrich, K.N., Altaye, M., et al., *Decreased Brain Volume in Adults with Childhood Lead Exposure*, *PLoS Med.* 5: e112 (2008).

QUESTIONS (2 - 4):

- **Why did Farfel and his USDA co-author, Dr. Rufus Chaney, describe the manufacturer's (US Filter's) test results of Baltimore's composted sewage sludge only "in general" terminology?**
- **Why did Farfel and Chaney not report levels of mercury, a regulated heavy metal, in the compost samples that HUD required KKI to test for regulated heavy metals as an "added precaution"?**
- **Why did Farfel and Chaney also not report levels of molybdenum, for which EPA limits cumulative loading limits, in KKI's samples of Baltimore's composted sewage sludge?**

When Members of Congress from Maryland asked about potentially dangerous chemicals and pathogens that may be present in the Baltimore's composted sewage sludge, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) claimed:⁷

(a) "Metal levels were found to be well below applicable standards and guidelines."

(b) "As an added precaution beyond the manufacturer's monitoring of these levels during the making of the compost, HUD required the researchers to collect a sample of the compost to be used at each of the treated yards to analyze for lead and other metals for which there are standards." (Emphasis added).

⁷ HUD response to Senator Barbara Mikulski, Senator Benjamin Cardin and Representative Elijah Cummings, May 6, 2008.

The facts:

In Farfel's research article, the authors only described concentrations of nine regulated metals in the compost "in general."⁸ Even more telling, Farfel and his coworkers reported the levels for only seven of the nine metals in Baltimore's composted sewage sludge for which there are standards. For unexplained reasons, they did not report levels of mercury or molybdenum.

The importance of reporting molybdenum is highlighted in the *McElmurray* and *Boyce* dairy farm cases in Georgia where spreading lime on soil treated with sewage sludge released high concentrations of molybdenum. As soon as the molybdenum mobilized at the higher pH, it contaminated forage crops and milk supplies. Contaminants from sewage sludge found in milk pulled from shelves in grocery stores included high levels of thallium, an extremely toxic heavy metal that is at the top of the USDA's list of bioterrorism agents of concern in America's food supplies.

Hundreds of head of cattle died as the result of ingesting molybdenum and other hazardous wastes released by the City of Augusta's sewage sludge⁹. As was the case with the McElmurray and Boyce lands treated with sewage sludge, Farfel and coworkers added lime to the soil treated with Baltimore's composted sewage sludge.

QUESTION (5): Why did Farfel and Chaney not measure the residents' exposure levels to lead-contaminated dusts?

The main pathway for elevating blood lead levels in children living in areas where soils are contaminated with lead is through soil dusts tracked in and deposited on floors. In a study assessing the lead abatement benefits of landscape coverings, researchers in the Department of Pediatrics at Northwestern University in Chicago measured levels of lead-contaminated soil that accumulated in main entryways and on doorway mats provided

⁸ Farfel, M.R., Orlova, A.O., Chaney, R.L., Lees, P.S., Rohde, C., and Ashley, P., *Biosolids compost amendment for reducing soil lead hazards: A pilot study in urban yards*, *Science of the Total Environment*, 340:81-95 (2005).

⁹ *R.A. McElmurray III v. United States Department of Agriculture*, United States District Court, Southern District of Georgia, Case No. CV105-159. Order issued Feb. 25, 2008.

to the study participants.¹⁰ They found that grass coverage of bare soil areas cut the amount of track-in of lead-contaminated dusts in half. The authors concluded: "Lowering the track-in of lead may be the most important influence for the youngest children, whose main pathway for blood lead elevation is lead-contaminated floor dust adhering to a hand, which is then placed in the mouth."

Farfel and Chaney collected dust samples in their experiments in Baltimore but, unlike researchers at Northwestern University, they did not report the total amounts of lead-contaminated dusts that accumulated in main entryways or on doorway mats provided to the study participants. Instead, they relied upon bioavailability measurements to argue that much of the lead was rendered less available for being absorbed by humans, animals, and plants.

The facts:

The data that Farfel and Chaney published in *Science of the Total Environment* (2005) indicate that soil lead levels in some cases actually increased in their test areas in Baltimore as a result of tilling the soil and adding composted sewage sludge. But, were these increases, which may have elevated the residents' risks of lead poisoning, offset by a decrease in lead bioavailability caused by phosphates in the composted sewage sludge that Farfel and Chaney mixed with the soil?

In a similar study using phosphoric acid,¹¹ Chaney admitted that relative bioavailability measurements have little value so far as understanding whether their lead abatement experiments actually reduce risks of lead poisoning in children. When discussing their results, Chaney and his co-authors wrote:

¹⁰ Binns, H.J., Gray, K.A., Chen, T., Finster, M.E., Peneff, N., Schaefer, P., Ovsey, V., Fernandes, J., Brown, M., and Dunlap, B., *Evaluation of landscape coverings to reduce soil lead hazards in urban residential yards: The Safer Yards Project*, *Environ Res.* **96**:127-38 (2004).

¹¹ Ryan, J.A., Berti, W.R., Brown, S.L., Casteel, S.W., Chaney, R.L., and Doolan, M., et al., *Reducing children's risk from soil lead. Summary of a field experiment*, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **38**:18A-24A (2004). http://www.esd.ornl.gov/research/earth_sciences/images/2004ryan_esd_38_10A-24A.pdf

“[W]e will only be able to quantify and predict these observed changes in lead bioavailability when the mechanisms that affect lead solubility and absorption by the receptors are understood ... Moreover, without an understanding of the reasons for variations, a change in measured lead bioavailability is of limited value.”

It is difficult to imagine that measuring levels of contaminated dusts never occurred to Farfel, Chaney, or any of the other researchers involved in the experiments in Baltimore, or to any of the experts who reviewed their project proposal. What is clear is that their arguments that composted sewage sludge reduced the bioavailability of lead are scientifically questionable, at best. In an experiment supposedly designed to reduce risks of lead poisoning in children, Farfel’s and Chaney’s decision not to measure levels of lead-contaminated dusts that accumulated in main doorways – the main pathway for blood lead elevation in small children – raises troubling questions as to whether the decision was part of a conscious effort to avoid reporting elevated levels of lead exposure caused by the experiments.

QUESTION (6): Were federal officials behind Dean Michael Klag spreading false claims that Dr. Lewis’s research showed that Class A sewage sludge is safe?

In an interview last month with *Democracy Now!*,¹² Michael Klag, Dean of the Bloomberg School of Public Health at Johns Hopkins University, stated that former EPA scientist Dr. David Lewis found that “almost no bacteria survive in Class A sludge” and that “there’s a simple cure for the sludge problem: don’t use Type B; use Type A.”

¹² *Johns Hopkins University responds to allegations toxic sludge tested as lead poisoning fix in poor black neighborhoods, Democracy Now!*, May 23, 2008.
www.democracynow.org/2008/5/23/johns_hopkins_university_reponds_to_allegations

The facts:

Dr. Lewis and his colleagues, which included a pediatrician treating children exposed to sewage sludge, published exactly the opposite conclusions. Professor Gattie and Dr. Lewis, for example, state:¹³

“Lewis and coworkers, however, found that some Class A sludges generate the same complaints and concluded that going to Class A products will not resolve the pathogens issue (Lewis and Gattie 2002). The reason for this is that infections appear to be primarily opportunistic, following irritation of the skin, mucous membranes, and respiratory tract by chemical components.”

Dr. Klag, ironically, made these erroneous statements to bolster his claims that the original AP Impact story about Johns Hopkins’ lead abatement experiments contained “inaccuracies and misrepresentations.” AP apparently accepted these assertions from Dr. Klag without verification.

QUESTIONS (7-9):

- **What role did EPA and other federal agencies play in Professor Thomas Burke, who had little or no experience in biosolids research, being named chair of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) panel that investigated land application of sewage sludge?**
- **Did Professor Burke’s appointment to the panel have anything to do with the fact that the NAS report – if it linked Class A sewage sludge to illness or death – could result in new lawsuits against Farfel and Johns**

¹³ Gattie, D.K., Lewis, D. L., *A high-level disinfection standard for land-applied sewage sludge (biosolids)*, *Environ. Health Perspect.*, 112: 126-31 (2004).

Hopkins University over risks posed by their lead abatement experiments?

Did EPA or USDA officials use Burke to manipulate the NAS, which was created to advise Congress on matters of science?

On May 15, 2008, *Nature* reported that the 2002 NAS panel concerning land application of sewage sludge, which was headed by Thomas Burke at Johns Hopkins University, included scientific data fabricated in an EPA-funded study at the University of Georgia to dismiss allegations that hazardous wastes in sewage sludge killed hundreds of head of cattle on two Georgia dairy farms.¹⁴

Nature lauded the panel for citing a paper by former EPA scientist David Lewis that linked exposure to Class A and Class B sewage sludges (biosolids) to gastrointestinal, respiratory, and skin-related illnesses. However, *Nature* questioned the NAS report's conclusion that there was no documented scientific evidence that sewage sludge produced in accordance with EPA regulations has ever harmed public health or the environment, noting that Dr. Lewis' findings were independently confirmed last year by a multi-university study in Ohio.

On May 28, 2008, however, *Nature* published the following correction:

“The 2002 biosolids study from the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) did not reference research into health impacts by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) whistleblower David Lewis, as reported in our News story 'Raking through sludge exposes a stink' (*Nature* **453**, 262–263; 2008). The citation was included in a prepublication draft that is still posted on the EPA's internet site, but the NAS panel voted to remove the reference before final publication. An NAS spokesman said

¹⁴ Editorial, *Stuck in the Mud* (p. 258); News article by J. Tollefson, *Raking through sludge exposes a stink*, *Nature* Vol. **453** (p. 262-3) (May 15, 2008).

the panel decided the information was not relevant as the panel was not charged with evaluating health impacts." (Emphasis added).

The facts:

Although *Nature* quoted an NAS spokesperson (Bill Skane), the original source of the claim that the NAS panel voted to remove Dr. Lewis's research was, undoubtedly, panel chair Thomas Burke. Only Professor Burke would be in a position to authoritatively state why Dr. Lewis's work linking Class A and Class B sewage sludges to illnesses and deaths was removed in the final version of the NAS report.

In response to *Nature*'s correction, NAS panel member Ellen Harrison, former Director of the Cornell Waste Management Institute, who authored the section of the report containing references to Dr. Lewis's research, submitted the following correction of her own to *Nature*:¹⁵

I am compelled to correct an error that was contained in *Nature News* (*Nature* **453**, 577; 2008). [T]he "correction" stated that the NAS panel "voted to remove" [Lewis's reference] because it was not relevant to the committee's charge. In fact the panel was not even made aware of the change to the report between the "final prepublication draft" that we all approved that contained this reference and the published version. The NAS made this change to the report without permission from the panel. This is a violation of the NAS procedures requiring full committee consensus on reports. I would not have approved the removal of this reference since it was clearly relevant to the work of the committee. I do not know who approved the removal of this citation, but it was not authorized by the committee. Given the controversial nature of the sewage sludge (aka "biosolids") issue and of Lewis's work in particular, the

¹⁵ E-mail from E. Harrison to correspondence@nature.com, June 17, 2008.

unilateral action of NAS to remove the reference was highly inappropriate.

According to a conversation NAS employee Susan Martel had with Ellen Harrison in 2002, Professor Burke personally removed the reference to Dr. Lewis's published findings.¹⁶ Professor Burke took this action after receiving an e-mail from Wisconsin Biosolids Coordinator, Greg Kester, who urged Professor Burke not to elevate Dr. Lewis's work or criticize EPA, because certain Members of Congress would take political advantage.¹⁶

QUESTION (10): How high up in the Bush Administration did efforts go to use dishonest science to protect the pipeline EPA and USDA created for hazardous chemical and biological wastes to flow unmonitored from industries and municipalities across America to the nation's farmlands – and to what lengths will the Government go to cover up any resulting illnesses, deaths, injustices to the poor and less educated, and spoiling of our agricultural lands and natural resources?

Nature editors commented on EPA's handling of the sewage sludge issue in last month's editorial concerning the McElmurray case and Dr. Lewis's research:

"In what can only be called an institutional failure spanning more than three decades – and presidential administrations of both parties – there has been no systematic monitoring programme to test what is in the sludge. Nor has there been much analyses of the potential health effects among local residents – even though anecdotal evidence suggests ample cause for concern."

¹⁶ Snyder, C., *The Dirty Work of Promoting "Recycling" of America's Sewage Sludge*, *IJOEH* 2: 415-27 (2005). www.ijoeh.com/pfds/IJOEH_1104_Snyder.pdf

EPA's retaliations against Dr. Lewis, and plans to publish fake data to cover up the cattle deaths in Augusta, began in 1998. The United States Department of Labor found that Henry Longest, Acting Head of EPA's Office of Research & Development (ORD), and other top ORD officials had retaliated over Dr. Lewis's *Nature* commentary concerning the way EPA program offices use, and sometimes neglect or abuse, science.¹⁷ The Labor Department issued additional rulings against EPA later when Dr. Lewis was denied a promotion, and again when Longest attempted to remove Dr. Lewis's laboratory director for approving his second *Nature* article, which specifically addressed problems with sewage sludge.

As deputy assistant administrator of OW in the 1970s, Longest oversaw the development of EPA's sewage sludge regulations before coming to ORD. After multiple retaliations against Dr. Lewis and his laboratory director, Longest offered Dr. Lewis an opportunity to transfer to the University of Georgia for up to four years if Dr. Lewis would agree to resign from EPA afterwards. Dr. Lewis signed the agreement in 1998, after University of Georgia administrators promised to pursue for him a tenured, full professorship.

Several weeks after signing the agreement, however, EPA national biosolids spokesperson John Walker, who Longest had supervised at OW, contacted land application specialist Julia Gaskin at the University of Georgia and assembled a team of researchers to investigate allegations in the *McElmurray* and *Boyce* dairy farm cases that Augusta's sewage sludge was contaminating lands with high levels of hazardous wastes and poisoning dairy cattle.

Under the direction of John Walker's supervisor, Charles Gross and Robert Brobst, who headed EPA's Biosolids Incident Response Team, the University of Georgia published environmental monitoring data that appeared to debunk the *McElmurray* and *Boyce* lawsuits. The data, however, were fabricated by the City of Augusta from 1987 to

¹⁷ Letter from George R. Holt, Wage and Hour Division, U.S. Department of Labor, to Henry L. Longest, II, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Management, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Jan. 16, 1997.

1997, during periods of time when the cattle were dying, to make it appear that the sewage sludge contained low levels of heavy metals and other contaminants.

Gaskin and her co-authors added to the deception by concealing the results of tests on soil and forage samples from the McElmurray and Boyce dairy farm lands, which one of her co-authors, Professor William Miller, analyzed from the late-1980s to the mid-1990s. Dr. Miller's data showed that the McElmurray and Boyce lands were contaminated with very high levels of nitrates and heavy metals from Augusta's sewage sludge. Gaskin and Miller further compounded their deception by collecting new soil and forage data from beef cattle farms in 1999 and using the data, together with Augusta's fabricated data from 1987 to 1997, to conclude in a research article published in 2003 that Augusta's sewage sludge was safe and non-toxic to cattle.¹⁸

Robert Bastian at OW provided the NAS panel with Gaskin's draft manuscript to dismiss the dairy cattle deaths on the McElmurray and Boyce farms. United States District Court Judge Anthony A. Alaimo in the Southern District of Georgia, however, issued an Order on February 25, 2008 in which Judge Alaimo found that the data Brobst, Gaskin and Miller used were "unreliable," "incomplete" and in some cases "fudged," "fabricated," and "invented." Judge Alaimo ordered the USDA in February of this year to compensate the dairy farmers for their contaminated lands and he devoted four pages of his Order to deriding EPA's and the University of Georgia's handling of Dr. Lewis and his research. Judge Alaimo concluded "senior EPA officials took extraordinary steps to quash scientific dissent, and any questioning of the EPA's biosolids program."

Despite Congress holding two hearings in 2000 into multiple retaliations against Dr. Lewis and his laboratory director, EPA terminated Dr. Lewis in 2003. To no avail, Senator James Inhofe of your Committee requested that EPA Administrator Christie Todd Whitman intercede in Dr. Lewis's termination, partly because EPA had included Dr. Lewis on a short list of experts to be contacted in case of a bioterrorist attack on the United States. The University of Georgia declined to support hiring Dr. Lewis because it would "hurt EPA funding." Dr. Lewis, who funded all of his research team's work on sewage

¹⁸ Gaskin, J.W., Brobst, R.B., Miller, W.P., Tollner, E., *Long-term Biosolids Application Effects on Metal Concentrations in Soil and Bermudagrass Forage*, *J. Environ. Qual.* 32:146-152 (2003).

sludge out of his own pocket, has remained unemployed since his termination by EPA.

Dr. Rufus Chaney, the USDA agronomist who co-authored Farfel's research article on the lead-abatement experiments in Baltimore, helped Walker design Gaskin's study in 1998.¹⁹ Then, to help defend Gaskin's research article containing the fake data used by the NAS, Chaney contacted Gaskin and provided her with research articles that he co-authored with others in Maryland, including with Assistant Dean, Jay Scott Angle, at the University of Maryland.²⁰ Chaney also posted a letter on the United States Compost Council supporting EPA's actions against Dr. Lewis.²¹

Dr. Lewis testified before Congress in 2004 that officials in the Office of the President of the University of Georgia had quashed a press release on his research highlighting the plight of African-American communities targeted for sewage sludge dumping along the Gulf Coast.²² Dr. Lewis also testified that Gale Buchanan, Dean of the University of Georgia's College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, prevented faculty members familiar with Miller's testing of the McElmurray and Boyce farms from testifying in court on behalf of the dairy farmers.

Buchanan retired shortly afterwards, and President Bush named him Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics at the United States Department of Agriculture. University of Georgia President, Michael Adams, brought in Jay Scott Angle from the University of Maryland to replace Buchanan. In his press release, President Adams praised Angle for establishing projects in inner-city areas of Baltimore and publishing research that allayed concerns over the use of sewage sludge as an agricultural fertilizer.²³

The narrative above provides a brief history of the collaborative efforts EPA and USDA officials carried out with faculty at the University of Georgia and Johns Hopkins

¹⁹ *U.S. ex. rel. Lewis, McElmurray and Boyce v. Walker*. United States District Court, Middle District of Georgia, Civil Action File No. 3:06-CV-16.

²⁰ E-mail from Rufus Chaney to Julia Gaskin, April 22, 2005.

²¹ USCC Listserve, October 5, 2004. www.compostingcouncil.org

²² U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Minerals, *The Impact of Science on Public Policy*, Feb. 4, 2004.

²³ *University of Maryland administrator named dean of UGA College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences*, June 3, 2005. www.uga.edu/news/artman/publish/050603angle.shtml

University. A more detailed account is presented in the proceedings of Dr. Lewis's current United States Department of Labor cases²⁴ and the False Claims Act lawsuit that Dr. Lewis and the dairy farmers filed against EPA and University of Georgia officials.²⁵

The immediate objective of the collaboration between federal officials and the Universities in Maryland and Georgia was to include Gaskin's fake scientific data in the NAS report and delete Dr. Lewis's credible research linking Class A and Class B biosolids to adverse effects on human health and the environment. The larger purpose of this collaboration was to protect the Government's policies on land application of sewage sludge and cover up any adverse effects on public health and the environment, including any harm suffered by inner-city residents in Baltimore, as well as other economically and educationally disadvantaged communities targeted for disposal of sewage sludge throughout the United States.

I hope this information will be useful as you and your staff members prepare the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works for hearings into these matters later this Summer.

Sincerely,



F. Edwin Hallman, Jr.

For DECKER, HALLMAN, BARBER & BRIGGS

FEHjr:tbm

c: David L. Lewis, Ph.D.
Mr. R. A. McElmurray, III
Mr. G. William Boyce

²⁴ Lewis v. United States Environmental Protection Agency. U.S. Department of Labor, Administrative Review Board, ARB Case No. 04-117; Administrative Law Judges, Case Nos. 2003-CAA-6, 2003-CAA-5.

²⁵ U.S. ex. rel. Lewis, McElmurray and Boyce v. Walker. United States District Court, Middle District of Georgia, Civil Action File No. 3:06-CV-16.