

EXHIBIT 10

Hudson Center documents with beginning Bates numbers
SYN04500030, SYN04692612, SYN04692588, SYN04557757,
SYN04498031, SYN04719584, SYN04754181, SYN04756236,
SYN04756413, SYN04753802, SYN04755971, SYN04756465,
SYN04754102, SYN00917231, SYN00825358, SYN04586796,
SYN04530620, SYN04557757, SYN04558661, SYN00841163,
and SYN04755977

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

**Ciba Crop Protection
Ciba-Geigy Corporation
Post Office Box 18300
Greensboro, NC 27419**

**Regulatory Affairs Department
Greensboro Facsimile Transmission
Fax Number (910) 292-6374
Voice Contact: (910) 632-2726**

Sent To: Alex Avery ^{FAX} 703-337-8593 Date: 12/17/94

Company: Center for Global Food Issues

Number of Pages (including cover): 16

Sent From: Janis McFarland

Company: Ciba

Phone Number: 1-800-334-9481 ext 2354

Additional Information: *Alex, it was a pleasure speaking with you yesterday. Again, my sincere apologies for the delay due to our emergencies here in Greensboro. As of today, life is back to normal & Ciba will be happy to assist in any way to help with your projects. Attached are a few editorial comments that you & I spoke about yesterday - as well as a few pages on the background of our special review of atrazine, Simazine and Dupont's cyanazine. I will be sending more to your dad by mail. 3 scientists have called in with rave reviews of the chapters 6 & 7 - with no technical corrections. I am checking on a few facts and will get back to you. Thank you for the opportunity to review the atrazine pages.*

Best-Regards MACJ

BE THE BEST



000785331

1005F3SD/je
[I]:REPORTS/WORD]

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER IN ATRAZINE LITIGATION

SYN04500030

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

Email Message

From: Duvall Sherry USGR
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2001 5:10 PM
To: 'avery, dennis'
Cc: Carroll Beth USGR
Subject: Your draft

Attachments: AveryDraft.doc

Dennis:

Again, thanks for helping us tell the atrazine story. I'm attaching your draft with only a few changes which I'd be glad to discuss with you. Please let me know on Monday if these are acceptable.

I'm also attaching a link to an interesting EPA report done in '92 which you may be familiar with. We thought it might be a nice tie-in to your article, considering that atrazine helps prevent erosion (through no-till farming and conservation tillage) and the report cites sediment and silt as the number one polluter of our rivers and streams (see the "Rivers and Streams section not too far down).

Let me know what you think.

<http://www.epa.gov/owowwtr1/305b/sum1.html>

Sherry Duvall
Syngenta Communications
336.632.6107

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

Achieva, Inc. Issues Resolution

To: Sherry Duvall
From: Allan R. Johnson *A.R.J.*
RE: Dennis Avery Oped

Achieva, Inc was contracted in December 2001 to help edit and place an oped by Dennis Avery, Hudson Institute, to generate farmer comment to EPA concerning the Atrazine reassessment.

Editing

Achieva, Inc. offered suggestions and partial rewrites on the draft oped that were provided to Syngenta.

Placement

Achieva, Inc. developed the following list of publications based on discussions with Syngenta personnel:

- Minnesota Agri News – Weekly newspaper serving Minnesota and Northern Iowa Circulation – 23,500
- Tri State Neighbor – Biweekly newspaper serving South Dakota and Northeast Iowa Circulation – 31,500
- Iowa Farmer Today – Weekly newspaper serving the state of Iowa and surrounding states Circulation – 71,228
- Ohio's Country Journal – Farm newspaper serving the state of Ohio publishing 18 issues per year Circulation – 15,000
- Lancaster Farming – Weekly newspaper serving Pennsylvania as well as New Jersey, Delaware and Maryland. Circulation – 48,600
- Illinois AgriNews – Weekly newspaper serving the state of Illinois and surrounding states Circulation – 38,900
- Indiana AgriNews – Weekly newspaper serving the state of Indiana and counties in Western Ohio Circulation – 18,300
- High Plains Journal – Weekly newspaper serving Kansas, Oklahoma and portions of Nebraska, Colorado and Texas Circulation – 56,000



NewsAlert

a special report for Crop Protection employees

November 1, 2002

Independent Scientists Join Defense of Atrazine in Light of New Study Receiving Media Attention

This week, atrazine has hit the headlines once again. This time, the Syngenta Crop Protection herbicide is the focus of widespread media attention resulting from yet another study (published in *Nature* journal yesterday) by University of California at Berkeley scientist Tyrone Hayes. The study alleges that low concentrations of atrazine cause gonadal abnormalities (hermaphroditism) in certain types of frogs in North America. We told you about an earlier similar study by Hayes in April (see NewsAlert announcements "Atrazine Study Gains Significant Media Coverage," April 16, and "Syngenta Takes Strong Stance on Atrazine Amid Recent Allegations and Media Coverage," June 7).

While Syngenta takes all studies involving our products seriously, comprehensive research both by Syngenta as well as by independent scientists does not substantiate the claims made by either Hayes study. And this time, Syngenta isn't the only party speaking out.

With the publication of the most recent Hayes study, an independent panel of scientists (the Atrazine Endocrine Ecological Risk Assessment Panel) has issued its own statement questioning the results of the study. Specifically, the eight scientists on the panel released a response stating: "There are many shortcomings in [the Hayes] study design that make interpretation of the data difficult and raise serious concerns about their conclusions." In the statement, the scientists on the panel report some of their concerns and also outline why the Hayes "field studies suffer from major inadequacies."

Also, Alex Avery, Director of Research and Education at the reputable Center for Global Food Issues, commented on the Hayes study in an article called "Jumping to Conclusions Could Hurt Farmers and the Environment" posted on the center's website. In it, he says, "Prematurely accepting the authors' conclusions as fact could have profound effects on farms where atrazine is used to save topsoil, protect water quality and conserve precious natural resources. Indeed, the vast majority of published scientific research contradicts the findings of this one report." He also points out that "hermaphroditism in frogs is a well-known phenomenon which has been observed for decades in all parts of the world. There are many reports of frog hermaphroditism occurring prior to the use of atrazine and in areas where atrazine has never been used. ... Hayes's latest study is reminiscent of peer-reviewed studies that tried to link pesticides to frog limb abnormalities but were debunked after further studies found natural parasitic flatworms to be the cause. Until this work has been corroborated by other labs, it must be considered preliminary and inconclusive."

Janis McFarland, Head of Regulatory Affairs, wants employees to know that the significant attention given by the media to this study does not mean the claims made by this study can be substantiated, and in fact, previous efforts to replicate this type of work have failed to substantiate the results. "We know this kind of press has an impact on the public as well as on our own employees," says Janis. "We want you to know that Syngenta takes all research involving our products seriously, and we thoroughly review the results of any study involving our products. We completely support sound science and safety research, and we want to know about and address any concerns related our products. For many years," she adds, "we've had a comprehensive research program focused on atrazine and that research continues to support the product's safety."

Janis says that atrazine remains under "Special Review" by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). "The EPA released a favorable revised assessment earlier this year, and we expect a favorable conclusion in 2003," she says. "Throughout the Special Review process, which is in its eighth year, we've steadfastly defended the safety of atrazine based on sound science, and despite the recent media attention, the data supports the safety of this product. We're confident that sound science will prevail and atrazine will continue to be available to American growers."

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

From: Carroll Beth USGR
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2009 3:22 PM
To: Ford Shery USGR; Goldsmith Steven USGR
Cc: Nadel Alan USGR
Subject: FW: FINAL OPED's **Attorney/Client Privileged**
Attachments: SAPdcMD.doc

Here's the 3rd party question.....I can probably ask Alex Avery but do we have any method for handling funding the 3rd party?

From: Mike Burita [mailto:mikeb@quinnthomas.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2009 11:00 AM
To: Carroll Beth USGR
Subject: FW: FINAL OPED's **Attorney/Client Privileged**

Hi Beth – Hope you are well. It was nice seeing you in person again last week.

I've attached an oped that we are aiming to place on behalf of a third party in a DC based publication in advance of the SAP, most likely the Washington Times. The goal is to reach out to our likely DC allies (anti-regulatory, pro-ag, free market, conservative bloggers, etc.)

Elizabeth Whelan or the other gentleman at ACSH strike me as the best person to byline this piece. I know you're extremely busy, but I was hoping that you might be able to help me with a quick intro to them so I can follow up to see if they're interested in signing.

Thanks!

Mike Burita
202.420.9361

----- Forwarded Message

From: Eileen Doherty <edoherty@whwg.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Oct 2009 11:53:27 -0400
To: Doug Badger <doug@quinnthomas.com>, Mike Burita <mikeb@quinnthomas.com>, "dave.flakne@syngenta.com" <dave.flakne@syngenta.com>
Subject: FINAL OPED's **Attorney/Client Privileged**

Doug, Mike and Dave,

Attached are the three oped's regarding the November 3 SAP. The first two are the regional op ed's for Minnesota and Iowa. It'd up to you guys to determinw which on goes to which signer/news outlet.

The third is for a Washington DC paper. Doug and Mike, do we have a signer for this one/ Possible placement is the Washington Times?

Eileen

----- End of Forwarded Message

1

FILED UNDER SEAL
Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

From: Adam D'Luzansky [ADluzansky@whwg.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2009 4:24 PM
To: Goldsmith Steven USGR
Cc: Eileen Doherty
Subject: RE: Syngenta Daily Snapshot 11.13.09
Attachments: image001.jpg

Steve,

We do have ideas at the ready on how we can amplify the supportive content on the web. Our priority is for that amplification to take place as far from Syngenta's name as possible. To date, the corn growers have been engaging in an active Twitter retweet campaign, of their own accord, and that has been very good thus far. Once we launch the website in the next week or so, we will have a platform that we control, but is not Syngenta branded, which will then allow us to take our amplification efforts to the next level.

Let me know if you want further details and we can put a quick call together in the next day or two.

Best,

Adam

From: steven.goldsmith@syngenta.com [mailto:steven.goldsmith@syngenta.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2009 5:10 PM
To: Adam D'Luzansky
Subject: FW: Syngenta Daily Snapshot 11.13.09

Adam - hope you're well. Have you thought about how to amplify this sort of supportive content on the web yet as Randy and co. have suggested? I'd like to make sure we address that as part of the digital media strategy.

Thanks.
Steve

From: Ford Sherry USGR
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2009 10:27 AM
To: Bachmann Jane USRE; Carroll Beth USGR; Goldsmith Steven USGR; Minehart Paul USWS; Razo Carly USGR; Schulz Michele USGR; Shaw Jennifer USGR; Shaw Judy CAGU
Cc: Adam D'Luzansky
Subject: FW: Syngenta Daily Snapshot 11.13.09

From: Randy Krotz [mailto:randy.krotz@v-fluence.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 15, 2009 10:59 PM
To: Ford Sherry USGR; Stanbrook Lionel CHBS
Cc: Susan Luke
Subject: Syngenta Daily Snapshot 11.13.09

Daily Snapshot

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

Summary of items reported⁽¹⁾:

Syngenta PRODUCT BRAND—Atrazine: (1 reference-aggregated; 1 relevant and influential items reported)

- [Hudson Institute fellow criticizes EPA's decision to launch another review into atrazine](#)

Issues, Related—Regulatory Issues: (1⁽²⁾ reference-aggregated; 3 relevant and influential items reported)

- [Sustainable farming NGO distributes call-to-action regarding food safety, anti-large ag bill](#)
- [Advocacy political organization contends proposed cap-and-trade legislation will benefit farmers, environment](#)
- [DOJ, USDA set workshop schedule to address competition concerns in agricultural industry](#)

Issues, Related—Environmental Effects: (1 reference-aggregated; 1 relevant and influential item reported)

- [Reuters content gains international visibility claiming farms and the potential link to GHG emissions is at issue in U.N. Copenhagen climate talks](#)

Issues, Related—Pesticides: (2 reference-aggregated)

1. **Subject:** Hudson Institute fellow criticizes EPA's decision to launch another review into atrazine

Content Source: Government

Content Type: News/Announcement

Distribution Type: Web 1.0 - News

Primary Media Type: Static

URL:

http://www.hudson.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=publication_details&id=6589&pubType=HI **Opens**

Online Influence⁽³⁾: High

**Appears in Visible
Online Environment⁽⁴⁾:**
No

Slant⁽⁵⁾: Favorable

Traction:

Center for Global Food Issues

<http://www.cgfi.org/category/commentary/>

MichNews

<http://www.michnews.com/>

Summary: Dennis Avery, senior fellow for the Hudson Institute in Washington, DC., criticizes the Environmental Protection Agency's decision to conduct another multi-year regulatory review of the safety of atrazine even though it just finished a comprehensive study three months ago that determined atrazine "is not likely to cause cancer in humans" and does not affect the reproductive development of frogs and other amphibians.

In light of EPA's announcement, Avery contends politics is "overriding" science and that atrazine continues to be a safe, effective tool farmers have relied on for over fifty years. Without it, the commentary asserts food prices and soil erosion will likely increase as less sustainable farming and more environmental degradation occurs.

Analysis: This is the kind of third-party content that helps inject balance into the overwhelmingly negative online environment regarding atrazine.

Recommendations: v-Fluence is available to discuss amplification options.

Relevant content excerpt⁽⁶⁾:

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

Extreme Activists take the reins at EPA

✿ by Dennis T. Avery, Alex Avery (11/13/09)

The Environmental Protection Agency, in a George Orwellian move, has just announced that it has suddenly decided to put the herbicide atrazine through yet another regulatory wringer, despite having just completed a comprehensive, multi-year regulatory review of the safety of atrazine begun in 1994. Only three months ago the EPA announced that after reviewing hundreds of scientific studies, atrazine "is not likely to cause cancer in humans" and does not affect the reproductive development of frogs and other amphibians. Atrazine has been used safely for more than 50 years in the U.S. and has been upheld as safe by the World Health Organization and the governments of Canada, France, the UK and others.

The timing suggests that politics is the overriding concern. Atrazine was already slated for a 2010 human health review, but no such headline impact has ever been found. The new team didn't dare bet on finding a human health flaw now. Instead, they decided to re-do the just-completed review process, betting that they can produce enough new smoke to deregister atrazine on some lesser charge. Since the review process still requires a series of expert review panels, EPA needed to start immediately or risk losing their Obama chance.

Atrazine is one of the most widely used herbicides, helping farmers control weeds while protecting topsoil from erosion via no-plow and other conservation cropping methods. Without herbicides, farmers must use plows and other bare-earth weed control methods that lead to far greater soil erosion and far more fossil fuel use. Atrazine is a critical tool in the no-plow revolution: it helps combat resistance to other weed killers, maintain high soil organic carbon levels in our fields (supposedly something the EPA promotes) and protects rivers and streams from sediment pollution (another environmental good). Economic studies show atrazine provides more than \$2 billion in direct economic benefits to our nation, even beyond the benefits in soil sustainability and stream pollution prevention.

So why should you care if farmers lose atrazine? Because it will mean higher food costs, more soil erosion, less sustainable farming, and more environmental degradation. It'll mean putting more of our farming eggs in fewer baskets. As we've learned with the unwelcome but inevitable return of bed bugs to our major cities, needlessly eliminating pesticides from society's toolbox leaves us more vulnerable to the scourges of nature.

With world population still growing and overall food demand set to double over the next 40 years, we need all the farming tools we have (and more) just to keep our heads above the rising tide of farm product demand. We're all in this struggle together and the farmer's loss hits our environment and pocketbooks.

The atrazine witch hunt is being driven primarily by the Natural Resources Defense Council, a powerful eco-activist group that simply won't take no for an answer. Review after review by the EPA, starting in the 1980s, has found that atrazine poses no health risk to humans or other risk to wildlife. Yet the NRDC knows that actual evidence is simply unnecessary; all they need is enough concocted public fear to cow the EPA into reacting to the politics.

They've done it before. Nearly twenty years ago, the NRDC perpetrated one of the biggest scams ever on the American public, claiming that a product called alar, used in growing apples, was the "most potent cancer-causing agent in our food supply." NRDC ranted that alar was a "cancer-causing agent used on food that the EPA knows is going to cause cancer for thousands of children." Alar, it turns out, was far less a cancer risk than tap water or peanut butter, as the EPA's own Scientific Advisory Panel finally ruled.

Why did NRDC perpetrate the fraud? According to boasts from the NRDC's public relations firm, it was all an elaborate (and highly successful) fundraising scheme. When their lies were exposed—sadly too late to save mass parental anguish over supposedly poisonous apple juice or to save apple farmers tens of millions in market losses—the NRDC equivocated. "We never said there was an immediate danger," they said as they laid blame on journalists who "muddled" their report and

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

the public who "overreacted."

The NRDC is now trying to do to atrazine what they did to alar. Make no mistake, the NRDC (and current political operators within the EPA) will continue to go back to the scientific wishing well until they "frighten" the EPA into banning atrazine. This time around, the herbicides makers and corn farmers aren't backing down. Will we stand up with them for sound science, or allow the further politicization of our regulatory agencies?

Background: DENNIS T. AVERY is an environmental economist and senior fellow for the Hudson Institute in Washington, DC. Alex Avery is director of research and education at the Hudson Institute's Center for Global Food Issues

2. Subject: Sustainable farming NGO distributes call-to-action regarding food safety, anti-large ag bill

Content Source: NGO - Advocacy

Content Type: Call to Action

Distribution Type: Web 1.0 - Email

Primary Media Type: Static

URL: The National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition: <http://sustainableagriculture.net/take-action/>

Online Influence: High	Appears in Visible Online Environment: No	Slant: Negative
-------------------------------	--	------------------------

Traction:

Mark Crispin Miller: <http://markcrispinmiller.com/2009/11/help-protect-our-food-and-family-farms/>

Living La Vida Locavore: <http://www.lavidalocavore.org/diary/2737/action-food-safety-is-needed-but-not-at-the-expense-of-sustainable-ag>

Summary: Advocacy organization The National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition distributed a call-to-action alert asking its supporters to contact members of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (HELP) Committee and urge them to pass S.510, the Senate version of major food safety legislation already passed by the House.

Though the bill mostly focuses Food and Drug Administration regulations on food, it does include several modifications to the nation's large-scale food processing system and corporations as well as includes additional funding for organic and sustainable agriculture.

Analysis: Several pro-organic farming stakeholders have expressed support for this bill. The bill is up for committee vote Wednesday November 18th and negative content is likely to continue at least until then.

Recommendations: No action recommended at this time.

Relevant content excerpt^[7]:

ACTION ALERT!

November 12, 2009

FOOD SAFETY PROPOSALS MUST PROTECT FAMILY FARMS, SUSTAINABLE & ORGANIC AGRICULTURE

CALL MEMBERS OF THE "HELP" COMMITTEE BEFORE NOVEMBER 18!

The Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (HELP) Committee will mark up S. 510, the Senate version of major food safety legislation already approved by the House of Representatives, next

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

Wednesday, November 18

The bill focuses on foods regulated by the Food and Drug Administration, not meat and poultry which is regulated by USDA.

The bill includes several key reforms that would put real teeth into federal regulation of large-scale food processing corporations to better protect consumers. However, the bill as written would also do serious harm to family farm value added processing, local and regional food systems, conservation and wildlife protection, and organic farming.

The good news is the HELP committee could fix those problems with the adoption of some common sense provisions to retain a crack down on corporate bad actors without erecting dangerous new barriers to the growing healthy food movement based on small and mid-sized family farms, sustainable and organic production methods, and more local and regional food sourcing.

The National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition and the National Organic Coalition, have fashioned just such a set of common sense provisions that must be added to S 510.

We urge you to contact your Senator on the HELP Committee (list below) and urge them to support the NSAC/NOC amendments!

It's easy to call. If your Senator is on the HELP Committee (see the list below), please call or fax their office and ask to speak with the aide in charge of food safety issues. You can also call the Capitol Switchboard and ask to be directly connected to your Senator's office: 202-224-3121.

The message is simple: "I am a constituent of Senator _____ and I am calling to ask him/her to support the proposals for amendments to S 510 offered by the National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition and the National Organic Coalition."

Specifically, ask them to support the following key principles:

- * The bill should provide small and mid-sized family farms that market value-added farm products with training and technical assistance in developing food safety plans for their farms.
- * The bill should direct FDA to narrow the kinds of farm activities subject to FDA control and to base those regulations on sound risk analysis. (Current FDA rules assume, without any scientific evidence or risk analysis, that all farms which undertake any one of a long list of processing, labeling or packaging activities should be regulated.)
- * The bill should direct FDA to ease compliance for organic farmers by integrating the FDA standards with the organic certification rules. FDA compliance should not jeopardize a farmer's ability to be organically certified under USDA's National Organic Program.
- * The bill should insist that FDA food safety standards and guidance will not contradict federal conservation, environmental, and wildlife standards and practices; and not force the farmer to choose which federal agency to obey and which to reject.
- * Farmers who sell directly to consumers should not be required to keep records and be part of a federal "traceback" system. All other farms should not be required to maintain records electronically or records beyond the first point of sale beyond the farmgate.

For more information on the Senate Food Safety bill, please see NSAC's Talking Points here and its Policy Brief: Food Safety on the Farm.

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

3. Subject: Advocacy political organization contends proposed cap-and-trade legislation will benefit farmers, environment

Content Source: NGO - Advocacy
Content Type: Commentary/Opinion
Distribution Type: Web 1.0 - News
Primary Media Type: Static

URL: Center for American Progress: http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/11/offsets_farmers.html

Online Influence: High	Appears in Visible Online Environment: No	Slant: Neutral
-------------------------------	--	-----------------------

Traction:

Earth Blips: <http://earthblips.dailyradar.com/story/carbon-offsets-would-be-a-boon-to-farmers/>
USAGnet: <http://www.usagnet.com/story-national.php?id=2370&yr=2009>

Summary: Advocacy political organization Center for American Progress posted a lengthy commentary contending despite opposition by agriculture industry stakeholders, such as Iowa Senator Chuck Grassley, the proposed cap-and-trade legislation will likely benefit the nation's agricultural industry.

The article features quotes by government officials and organizations, such as Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack and the Environmental Protection Agency, and cites academic studies, including the recent University of Tennessee study released this week, which contend the proposed legislation will not only curb carbon pollution but also provide farmers the ability to profit from conservation measures that capture or store carbon and cut emissions of other harmful gases such as methane from livestock waste and nitrous oxide used in fertilizer. These measures, the commentary notes, will translate into increased profits for farmers.

The commentary concludes, "Progressive voices in American agriculture understand that farmers and rural America have a great deal to lose from climate change and much to gain from a robust policy to cut carbon pollution."

Recommendations: No action recommended at this time.

Relevant content excerpt:

Carbon Offsets Would Be a Boon to Farmers

When it comes to legislation cutting carbon pollution, two Iowans steeped in agriculture policy take very different views of the likely impact on rural America.

"The agriculture industry and rural communities will be some of the hardest-hit areas," says Senator Chuck Grassley (R-IA).

"For American agriculture, the income benefits will outweigh costs, particularly over the long term," says Tom Vilsack, Iowa's former governor and now secretary of agriculture in the Obama administration. "For rural Americans, it will help create new economic opportunities and green-energy jobs."

Secretary Vilsack has it right. While no one can precisely predict what the economic impacts will be of either the American Clean Energy and Security Act, H.R. 2454, which passed the House in June, or the Clean Energy Jobs and American Power Act, S. 1733, now under consideration in the Senate, most thoughtful analysis contradicts the doomsday scenarios seen by some farm state lawmakers and representatives of big agriculture.

For American farmers and the rural areas where they live, clean-energy and carbon-pollution-cutting legislation will mean significant economic benefits. A clean energy economy built on wind, solar, and biofuels including gas derived from anaerobic digestion of manure will bring vitaly needed economic development to the rural areas that are home to most of those resources. And taking action now will help prevent the often catastrophic impacts of doing nothing, including droughts, heavy downpours, and floods,

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

all of which will reduce crop yields and cut farm income.

One of the key upsides to legislation curbing carbon pollution is it will give farmers the ability to profit from conservation measures that capture or store carbon and cut emissions of other harmful gases such as methane from livestock waste and nitrous oxide used in fertilizer. Those practices include no-till and reduced-till farming, using less fertilizer, planting trees or cover crops, and capturing methane from livestock operations. Farmers, who are not subject to the pollution caps in the legislation, will be able to sell those offsets to industrial polluters whose emissions are capped and can't meet their targets on their own or find they can do it more cheaply by buying offsets from farmers.

Both the Department of Agriculture and the Environmental Protection Agency see a huge market opportunity for farmers in offsets that will boost their incomes and help strengthen rural economies. EPA's estimate of the House bill is a \$20 billion offset market by midcentury.

As Vilsack wrote in a recent commentary in the *Wichita Eagle*: "Over the long term, the benefits will far outweigh costs, growing to almost \$15 billion to \$20 billion in 2040-50. At that rate, agricultural offsets could be worth more than 5 percent of today's total agricultural sales."

Vilsack also explored the impact of carbon pollution reduction legislation in testimony before the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee on October 27, 2009:

"While farmers, ranchers, and forest landowners have a lot at stake if we fail to act, they also have much to gain if we address climate change quickly and wisely," he said. "Rural America has an unprecedented potential for economic development and job growth through new energy technologies...A robust carbon offsets market will provide farmers, ranchers, and forest landowners with the potential for new sources of income."

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's analyses of both the House and Senate bills, said Vilsack, show "that economic opportunities for farmers and ranchers can outpace—perhaps significantly—the costs from climate legislation."

American agriculture is well positioned to take advantage of these opportunities, according to a report from the Center for Rural Affairs: "[A]griculture can play an important role in mitigating these damaging emissions, both by reducing its own emissions and by sequestering carbon. Given U.S. agriculture's current climate, the quality and volume of its soils, the competence of its farmers, the maturity of its science and technology, and the sophistication of its policy institutions, there is no national agricultural complex better suited to carbon sequestration than U.S. agriculture."

Though farmers will face some higher costs for fuel, fertilizer, and electricity under carbon-pollution-reduction legislation, analysts say the potential extra income from selling offsets will easily outpace those costs.

"Depending on the carbon pricing scheme, farmers could increase their net profits by up to 24 percent," notes the Agricultural Carbon Market Working Group, with additional income coming "from a number of sources including revenue from the production of low-carbon biofuels and an increase in commodity prices caused by changes in management practices."

A University of Tennessee study released on November 11 also predicts that farm revenue will grow by \$13 billion a year with a well-designed trading system in carbon offsets.

Iowa State University economist Bruce Babcock analyzed the impacts on Iowa corn and soybean farmers from climate legislation and predicts higher production costs of about \$4.52 per acre (1 percent to 2 percent), but additional income of about \$8 an acre by shifting to no-till farming.

Further, a study prepared for the Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions at Duke University concluded "that the agricultural sector would be placed in a favorable position" by policies that cut carbon pollution and establish a market for offsets.

"While agricultural producers will feel the input price ramifications of restrictions on fossil fuel-intensive input suppliers (energy, fuels and fertilizers in particular), they can benefit in several ways. First, a

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

portion of production cost increases can be passed on to consumers in the form of higher prices. Second, new revenue opportunities may exist for bioenergy feedstocks. Third, by being outside the [carbon pollution] cap, agriculture and forestry are a considerable potential source of offsets for sale."

Progressive voices in American agriculture understand that farmers and rural America have a great deal to lose from climate change and much to gain from a robust policy to cut carbon pollution.

As National Farmers Union President Roger Johnson told the House Agriculture Committee in June: "Failure to reduce [carbon pollution] emissions poses significant economic impacts on agriculture and populations whose welfare is of special interest to the agricultural community. Models of climate change scenarios demonstrate increased frequency of heat stress, droughts, and flooding events that will reduce crop yield and livestock productivity."

Carbon offset projects, he added, "could be valuable revenue streams for producers who will experience increased agricultural input costs."

4. Subject: DOJ, USDA set workshop schedule to address competition concerns in agricultural industry

Content Source: Government
Content Type: News/Announcement
Distribution Type: Web 1.0 - News
Primary Media Type: Static

URL: PR Newswire: <http://www.prnswire.com/news-releases/justice-department-and-usda-set-dates-for-workshops-to-explore-competition-and-regulatory-issues-in-the-agriculture-industry-69988247.html>

Online Influence: High	Appears in Visible Online Environment: No	Slant: Negative
-------------------------------	--	------------------------

Summary: The Department of Justice and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) announced the dates and locations of joint public workshops that will explore competition and regulatory issues in the agriculture industry.

The all-day workshops, which will begin in March 2010, will be held in Alabama, Colorado, Iowa, Washington, D.C. and Wisconsin, and aim to promote dialogue among interested parties and foster learning with respect to the appropriate legal and economic analyses of these issues, as well as to listen to and learn from parties with experience in the agriculture sector.

Each workshop may feature keynote speakers, general expert panels, and break-out panels that will address more narrowly-focused issues. At each workshop, the public will have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments.

Analysis: These workshops, which were first announced by Attorney General Eric Holder and Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack on Aug. 5, 2009 to address concerns over lack of competition in the agricultural industry. They are the first joint Department of Justice/USDA workshops ever to be held to discuss competition and regulatory issues in the agriculture industry. a full list of workshops and cities are available here: www.usdoj.gov/atr/events.htm

Recommendations: v-Fluents is available to discuss amplification of statements responding to the launch of these workshops.

Relevant content excerpt:

Justice Department And USDA Set Dates for Workshops to Explore Competition and Regulatory Issues in the Agriculture Industry

Workshops to be Held in Alabama, Colorado, Iowa, Washington, D.C. and Wisconsin

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

WASHINGTON, Friday, Nov. 13, 2009 - The Department of Justice and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) announced today the dates and locations of joint public workshops that will explore competition and regulatory issues in the agriculture industry. The workshops, which were first announced by Attorney General Eric Holder and Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack on Aug. 5, 2009, are the first joint Department of Justice/USDA workshops ever to be held to discuss competition and regulatory issues in the agriculture industry. The all-day workshops, which will begin in March 2010, will be held in Alabama, Colorado, Iowa, Washington, D.C. and Wisconsin.

The goals of the workshops are to promote dialogue among interested parties and foster learning with respect to the appropriate legal and economic analyses of these issues, as well as to listen to and learn from parties with experience in the agriculture sector.

Each workshop may feature keynote speakers, general expert panels, and break-out panels that will address more narrowly-focused issues. At each workshop, the public will have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments.

The attendance and participation of the public is encouraged throughout the series of workshops. With the goals of generating further dialogue and understanding the issues, the workshops will involve farmers, ranchers, processors, consumer groups, agribusinesses, government officials, and academics. This collection of stakeholders will create a forum for discussion and will ensure various industry perspectives.

The Department of Justice and USDA are also asking for comments in advance of the workshops. Interested parties should submit written comments in both paper and electronic form to the Department of Justice no later than Dec. 31, 2009. All comments received will be publicly posted. Two paper copies should be addressed to the Legal Policy Section, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, 450 5th Street, NW, Suite 11700, Washington, D.C. 20001. The electronic version of each comment should be submitted to agriculturalworkshops@usdoj.gov.

Additional updates and information, including agendas and speakers, will be posted on the Antitrust Division's events website at www.usdoj.gov/atr/events.htm.

5. Subject: Reuters content gains international visibility claiming farms and the potential link to GHG emissions is at issue in U.N. Copenhagen climate talks

Content Source: Other/Unaffiliated
Content Type: Commentary/Opinion
Distribution Type: Web 2.0: Authored Blog
Primary Media Type: Static
URL:

Africa Reuters
<http://af.reuters.com/article/topNews/idAFJOE5ACDB320091113>

Online Influence: High	Appears in Visible Online Environment: n/a	Slant: Negative
------------------------	--	-----------------

India Reuters
<http://in.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idINIndia-43922320091113>

Online Influence: High	Appears in Visible Online Environment: n/a	Slant: Negative
------------------------	--	-----------------

UK Reuters

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

<http://uk.reuters.com/article/IdUKTRE5AC1N820091113>

Online Influence: High

Appears in Visible Online
Environment: n/a

Slant: Negative

Additional Traction:

<http://tweetmeme.com/story/273018212/farms-on-the-radar-at-copenhagen-climate-talks-green-business-reuters>

Summary: International wire service Reuters posted content (largely on non-US sites) leveraging the upcoming UN climate change conference in December in Copenhagen. The content is presented as a "news" story and includes messaging critical of large-scale farming practices:

The public must debate what kind of farming they wanted, for example to choose between housed, low-carbon cows, and roaming, less carbon-limited beasts, said Allan Buckwell, policy director at Britain's Country Land and Business Association.

Analysis: The pickup of this content was largely limited to Reuters sites in India, UK and South Africa. Similar issues-focused content will likely be generated in the run-up to, and throughout, the Copenhagen talks.

Recommendations: v-Fluence is available to discuss tactics to influence the negative online message environment.

Relevant content excerpts:

LONDON (Reuters) – U.N. negotiators will next month put farming onto the radar of climate regulations for the first time, but governments face aggressive lobbies and gaps in the science proving the extent of agricultural emissions.

Farming is both a likely victim of climate changes including more droughts and floods, and a cause, through the release of greenhouse gases from fertilizer and cattle. The sector also has a wide impact through soil management.

Much public focus is on saving the world's forests to slow climate change, but soils hoard three times more carbon than all the world's plants, underlining how farm management can significantly counter or add to manmade carbon emissions.

Farmers can lock up carbon by tilling the soil less and by improving the fertility of the land, for example adding organic matter including dung and crop waste.

A U.N. climate meeting in Copenhagen in December may launch a research programme to test low-carbon incentives, possibly targeting the 2 billion poor living on small farms, for roll-out from 2013 under a new global climate treaty.

In fertilized countries, new rules will limit or at least monitor farm carbon from as early as 2012 in the United States and Europe, and from 2015 in Australia and New Zealand.

"They're lucky to have got away with it this far, it should be included in a U.S. climate bill and in Copenhagen," said Robert Goodland, formerly of the World Bank and co-author of a report which last month caused a stir by estimating that farm livestock account for 51 percent of all global greenhouse gases.

The estimate included carbon emissions from burning trees to clear land for cattle, and cows' respiration as well as their methane-rich burps, and took account of new research suggesting methane is a stronger greenhouse gas than previously thought.

More conventional estimates put agriculture at about 14 percent of global greenhouse gases, rising to a third including deforestation.

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

TOOLS

Uncertain accounting is a critical obstacle in harnessing the potential of the agricultural sector and especially soils, which in theory could cut annual global greenhouse gas emissions by as much as 10 percent from present levels by 2030.

One example of the scientific fog is no-till, where farmers plough the soil less and so retain more carbon. But in soggy land that can increase emissions of nitrous oxide – a far more potent greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide, scientists say.

"We know farm management has a very significant influence on how much carbon is in the soil," said Cesar Izaurralde, a soil scientist at the U.S. Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. "I think in the next two to three years the research community will have the tools ready."

A new U.N. paper proposed last Friday at climate talks in Barcelona a "programme of work" to add farm research to the climate deal to be agreed in Copenhagen, which could pave the way for support for low-carbon incentives in developing nations.

The World Bank's BioCarbon Fund gives a glimpse of how that may unfold, trialling two projects in Kenya to lock carbon into the soil, and so generate offsets for sale to rich polluters in the developed world.

"The projects we're working on are real projects," said Johannes Woelcke, the World Bank's team leader for the Kenya trials which will cut carbon dioxide emissions by an estimated 130,000 tonnes annually, involving 90,000 small-scale farmers.

"We're demonstrating that this is working. Of course there needs to be further work on accounting methods."

Like other experts, Woelcke hopes the final text from Copenhagen will refer to agriculture – unlike the existing Kyoto Protocol – and support more trials and research.

WARY

In the developed world, governments have to decide for themselves how to limit farm emissions. Lobbies are wary of steps to embrace the sector in climate change policies.

New Zealand and Australia have plans to limit farm emissions under cap and trade schemes. The European Union and U.S. plan focus on rewards through carbon offsets or direct payments.

"We're not happy with an emissions trading scheme full stop, we remain emphatically opposed," said Don Nicolson, president of Federated Farmers of New Zealand. The American Farm Bureau (AFB) opposes draft U.S. climate bills which would cap carbon emissions from industry, but not from agriculture.

"We oppose the bills in congress," said Rick Krause, senior director of congressional relations for the AFB, saying the bills would raise fuel and fertilizer costs.

The public must debate what kind of farming they wanted, for example to choose between housed, low-carbon cows, and roaming, less carbon-limited beasts, said Allan Buckwell, policy director at Britain's Country Land and Business Association.

Randy P. Krotz, Senior Vice President

v-Fluence Interactive

-- It starts online!

www.v-Fluence.com

Toll Free: 877-835-8362 ext. 2035

Direct: 314-860-8002

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

Mobile 314-378-9675
AOL IM: VFRKrotz
LinkedIn: <http://www.linkedin.com/in/randvkrotz>
Fax 877-568-4848

This message and any attachments contain information which is confidential and may be privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. It is intended to be read only by the individual or entity to whom it is addressed or by their designee. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not use, copy, or disclose to anyone any information contained in this message and any attachments or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this message in error, please delete or destroy this message and any attachment and immediately notify the sender at the e-mail address above and/or v-Fluence Interactive Public Relations, Inc. by telephone at (877) 835-8362. Click here for information on v-Fluence [unsolicited commercial e-mail policy](#).

Corporate Headquarters: 4579 Laclede Ave #275, St. Louis, Missouri 63108 ♦ Administrative Offices: 7770 Regents Road, #113-576, San Diego, CA 92122.

=====

.....

.....

.....

This message may contain confidential information. If you are not the designated recipient, please notify the sender immediately, and delete the original and any copies. Any use of the message by you is prohibited.

.....

⁽¹⁾ Outreach reporting, including tactics/campaigns and associated measurements, are included in this summary as they relate to brand, product and/or general/related spaces.

⁽²⁾ Aggregated Items Included traction from

⁽³⁾ v-Fluence's Online Influence Index is based on various validated third-party data sources, such as Alexa, Google (PageRank) and Technorati (Authority), as well as the number of links pointing in (LPI), effective use of visibility-generating tactics like hyperlinking and tagging and more. If you'd like to receive associated data along with your daily snapshots, please let us know.

⁽⁴⁾ The visible environment is made up of the most visible and influential online destinations that show up in Google, MSN and Yahoo! when people search for brands, products and related issues specific to a particular market or scope, as identified through v-Fluence's in-depth benchmark research and language analysis.

⁽⁵⁾ Favorable, negative, neutral or balanced toward Syngenta Corporation specifically and/or pesticides in general.

⁽⁶⁾ Please contact us if you'd like to receive copies of original content on a daily, weekly or monthly basis.

⁽⁷⁾ Please contact us if you'd like to receive copies of original content on a daily, weekly or monthly basis.

From: Adam D'Luzansky [ADluzansky@whwg.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2010 3:56 PM
To: Adelman Jessica USWS
Cc: Josh Gilder; Eileen Doherty; Goldsmith Steven USGR; Ford Sherry USGR; Doug Badger; Mike Burita; jmorris@ddcadvocacy.com; Nadel Alan USGR
Subject: Greatest Hits ***Privileged and Confidential. Prepared at the request of counsel***
Attachments: Fact_Sheet.pdf; FAQ.pdf; StCloudTimes_120509.pdf; WashingtonTimes_110309.pdf; WinonaDailyNews_020310.pdf; HighPlainsMidwestAGJournal_012810.pdf; LisaJacksonAgricultureLetter_011510.pdf; NationalTeleconference_012110.pdf; OhioTeleconference_020210.pdf; MinnesotaTeleconference_020310.pdf

February 4, 2010

Memorandum for Jessica Adelman, Syngenta
From: White House Writers Group
Re: Atrazine Communications Team Greatest Hits

Here, as promised, are a few of the greatest hits from your atrazine communications team. It focuses on briefing materials we have drafted, earned media – both editorial and outreach – and the website.

Briefing Materials

We have attached the Fact Sheet and the FAQ's which we all developed for the media in preparation for the November and February SAPs.

Media Outreach/Editorial - Attached are three Oped's that we either drafted or placed and an article from the High Plains Midwest Journal.

- St. Cloud Times - 12/5/09 – Lori Feltis
- The Washington Times - 11/3/09 – Alex Avery
- Winona Daily News – 2/3/10 – Tim Pastoor
- High Plains/Midwest AG Journal – 1/28/2010 – Jennifer Latzke

Media Outreach/News – In response to the PANNA/LSP Report we drafted a letter for the NCGA to EPA and set up three media teleconference briefings for farm groups and press:

- Drafted and sent a letter for The Triazine Network to EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson (attached) dated January 15. The letter was signed by 52 constituency groups and was written in response to a January 5 letter sent to the Administrator by a handful of environmental activist groups claiming that the agriculture community was overwhelmingly opposed to atrazine.
- Held three separate media teleconferences with farm groups to brief members of the media on the activity taking place in Washington at the EPA to declassify atrazine and their opposition to it. Worked with SGRM staff to identify supporters and recruit them as "hosts" of the press briefings. The results of those teleconferences are listed below.
- National Media Teleconference – 1/21/10 – Hosted by the Triazine Network, the release (attached) had wire pick-up on over 200 outlets. The Triazine Network is the same group that sent the letter to EPA Administrator Jackson on 1/15/10. Coverage: 1/21: KMOX Radio (St. Louis, MO); 1/21: Wisconsin Ag Connection; 1/26: Truth About Trade & Technology; 1/16: Sioux City Journal; 1/16: Abilene Recorder Chronicle 1/15;

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

<http://CattleNetwork.com>; 1/22: High Plains Journal; 1/21: Southern States News; 1/22 Feedstuffs; 1/27 Miami County Republic; 1/27: Louisburg Herald; 1/21 Midwest AgNet; 1/25 AgriMarketing.

- Ohio Media Teleconference – 2/2/10 – Hosted by the Ohio Corn Growers Association, Ohio Farm Bureau Federation and American Agri-Women, a release (attached) was sent to over 650 media outlets. Speakers: Dwayne Siekman, Executive Director, Ohio Corn Growers Association; Adam Sharp, Senior Director of Legislative Policy, Ohio Farm Bureau Federation; Marcie Williams, Past President, American Agri-Women (provided quote for news release). Media on the teleconference: Amy Fahnestock, CropLife Magazine; Beth Wagner, WTUZ Radio; Chris Kick, Farm & Dairy Newspaper; Jacqui Fatka, Feedstuff; Julie Carr Smyth, Associated Press; Kevin Walker, Farm World; Matt Reese, Ohio's Country Journal; Seth Teter, Ohio Farm Bureau; Wendy Sweetser, Tristate Neighbor. Coverage: still monitoring for pickup, an OCGA spokesman did an interview on 610 AM Radio in Columbus which gets very broad pickup. (MP3 attached)
- Minnesota Media Teleconference – 2/3/10 – Hosted by Minnesota Corn Growers Association and the Minnesota Agricultural Water Resources Coalition, a release (attached) was sent to over 400 media outlets. Speakers: Tim Dritz, Vice President, Minnesota Corn Growers Association; Warren Formo, Director of Clean Water Programs, Minnesota Agricultural Water Resources Coalition. Media on the teleconference: Bob Kelleher, MN Public Radio; Chad Smith, KLGR Radio; Janet Kubat, Agri News; Randy Kennedy, MN Christian Broadcasters; Telly Mamayek, WCCO Radio; Tim Gerlach, MN Corn Growers; Tom Rothman, MN Farm Network. Coverage: 2/2: Minnesota Public Radio. Here is the link: <http://minnesota.publicradio.org/display/web/2010/02/02/atrazine-hearings/>

Website

Here is the link: <http://demo.democracydata.com/affa/default.aspx> Revised text will be up on the website by COB Monday. FYI, below is an explanation of how the proposed website will work. As we've discussed the name and structure of the membership will likely change.

The website will serve as the primary online presence for the campaign. It will provide a central warehouse of information for advocates and host a number of advocacy tools to help promote campaign messaging. The campaign website includes the following elements:

- A multipage format, allowing for more and better information, and tools for advocates.
- A registration option on each page:
 - Website visitors will be encouraged to join the campaign and engage in support of atrazine.
 - All of our collateral pieces will have the website address and advocates will be encouraged to sign up to receive more news and information.
- A dynamic News and Resources page will house targeted campaign materials and media clippings:
 - Pushing out appropriate national and local media hits.
 - Serving as a tool for state based and national bloggers and other social-media influentials to virally spread our messaging.
 - Utilizing multi-media platform elements such as video and audio clips.
 - Increasing the opportunity for viral buzz by utilizing social sharing tools such as RSS, Twitter and Facebook sharing capability urging users, bloggers and others to spread our materials through their own social networks.
- An engaging display of the campaign's messaging that encourages advocates to take immediate action by signing the petition, contacting their congressional representatives, or spreading our campaign message through their own social web.

FILED UNDER SEAL
Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

From: Josh Gilder [joshuagilder@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 2010 10:19 AM
To: Goldsmith Steven USGR
Cc: Ford Sherry USGR; Adelman Jessica USWS; Eileen Doherty; Mark Davis; Mike Burita; Doug Badger; Clark Judge
Subject: action ideas

Steve/Sherry: I assume you're very busy right now, but I thought I'd send out some ideas about possible next steps, from immediate to a few days down the road:

Immediate

- 1) continue pushing Avery out to media – Hayes credibility, EPA politicization, etc. Mike is working on getting Avery on KQED radio (NRP San Francisco) opposite Tyrone right now.
- 2) Draft LTE responses to bigger papers (Avery, Solomon any others) – Wash Post, USA Today, etc.
- 3) Get our statement up on atrazinefacts.com. We need somewhere to point people.

Over the next few days

- 4) Given the broad exposure this received, we might be able to get an op-ed placed by Alex - maybe something to the effect of the dangers of removing a valuable tool from agriculture based on shaky science, etc.
- 5) Steve is picking dates for Tim to come to DC and schedule deskside briefings for next week. Critical to do this now, no need to be cautious in who we meet with since atrazine is on everyone's radar now.
- 6) We need to identify some allies within the media that can push back on Hayes – maybe Ron Bailey at Reason, maybe Tierney
- 7) we need to start fighting our own war and talk about the economic costs and political consequences to rural ag states if atrazine is removed – Blue Dog letter to EPA, Stenholm op-ed, Ohio AP, regional media, national political media
- 8) Should we plan something bigger surrounding the Lisa Jackson event at the press club on 3/8? An ag demonstration, prepare something to circulate?

Josh Gilder
Senior Director
The White House Writers Group
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW
Suite 110G
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 783-4600

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

From: Josh Gilder [joshuagilder@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 04, 2010 10:34 AM
To: Goldsmith Steven USGR
Subject: Re: Avery Letter to the Editor

SOrry, Steve, I mistyped. We're thinking of this for all the papers that covered the Hayes story, not for Men's Health Josh Gilder Senior Director The White House Writers Group
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW
Suite 110G
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 783-4600

On Mar 4, 2010, at 11:22 AM, steven.goldsmith@syngenta.com wrote:

> I don't know if Alex is the right person for this, though he might be.
> I think for Mens' Health mag, we want to approach it more thoughtfully
> and deal with the no harm to health and benefits to humanity rather
> than Hayes specifically (did they even cover that angle?). "How do we
> feed the world if not with safely used crop protection products?"

>

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Josh Gilder [mailto:joshuagilder@gmail.com]
> Sent: Thursday, March 04, 2010 10:49 AM
> To: Goldsmith Steven USGR
> Cc: Ford Sherry USGR; Adelman Jessica USWS; Eileen Doherty; adam
> d'luzansky
> Subject: Avery Letter to the Editor

>

> Steve: working of the Men's Health LtE, we've put this together for
> Alex and Mike would like pumping it out to those papers that carried
> the TH story. We didn't discuss this, but Alex is rearing to go, so we
> thought we'd seize the opportunity.)

>

> I've posted it on Google docs. Here it is below:

>

>

>

> -----
> ---- This message may contain confidential information. If you are not
> the designated recipient, please notify the sender immediately, and
> delete the original and any copies. Any use of the message by you is
> prohibited.

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

From: Josh Gilder [joshuagilder@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 04, 2010 2:52 PM
To: Goldsmith Steven USGR
Cc: Adelman Jessica USWS; Mike Burita; Eileen Doherty; adam d'luzansky
Subject: For Alex to Greenwire

Steve: here's what Mike proposes we have Alex send to Sara. Could you pass it by Beth and get edits/ok?
Thanks, josh

Sara - I've been following some of your recent stories on atrazine and news out of the Scientific Advisory Panel process.

I just learned and thought you might take interest in the fact that EPA has postponed the April Scientific Advisory Panel for three weeks. See link here:

URL

No reason is mentioned for the postponement, but my personal observation is that the SAP members have been feeling the pressure of this rushed and unprecedented reevaluation and asked the administration for more time to prepare. In my 10+ years of watching these SAP processes, this has been unprecedented and is clearly being dictated more by politics than science.

I take this delay as good news and hopefully a sign that EPA has decided to take a deep breath and let the SAP do what it is good at and methodically review this process and not rush to judgment based on media headlines or timetables for NRDC and other anti-pesticide groups.

Happy to talk more with you about this if you see a story here.

Alex Avery
Director of Research and Education
Hudson Institute Center for Global Food Issues (www.cgfi.org)

Josh Gilder
Senior Director
The White House Writers Group
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW
Suite 110G
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 783-4600

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine **EXPOSED** Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

From: Carroll Beth USGR
Sent: Monday, November 09, 2009 11:28 AM
To: Adam D'Luzansky; Eileen Doherty; Ford Sherry USGR; Goldsmith Steven USGR; Nadel Alan USGR; McFarland Janis USGR; jthompson@jaynethompson.com; crobling@jaynethompson.com; doug@quinnthomas.com; mikeb@quinnthomas.com; jmorris@ddcadvocacy.com; agabron@ddcadvocacy.com; jwinn@ddcadvocacy.com; Joshua Gilder; Mark Davis; Clark S. Judge; syoung@jaynethompson.com
Attachments: EnviroViews Activists Take the Reins at EPA.doc

FYI – see attached

From: Dennis Avery, Hudson Institute [mailto:cgfi@hughes.net]
Sent: Sunday, November 08, 2009 7:28 PM
To: Dennis Avery Hudson Institute
Subject:

This week's article is attached.

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

Email Message

From: Pastoor Tim USGR
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2003 4:33:19 PM
To: Ford Sherry USGR; McFarland Janis USGR; Carroll Beth USGR; Hosmer Alan USGR;
CC: Elder Andrea USGR;
Subject: RE: Alex Avery responds to Baltimore Sun atrazine editorial

Alex's response is punchy and to the point. Too many more additions would lose the reader, I'm afraid. The EPA statement is far too wishy-washy to help with a punchy response, so I'd avoid it. What might grab readers, on the other hand, is to state the fact that after X number of environmental tests across Y species, atrazine has NOT adversely affected wildlife populations. EPA's review and their statement on this is quite clear. Only the amphibian statement lacks backbone.

Regards,

Tim Pastoor
336-632-2226
tim.pastoor@syngenta.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Ford Sherry USGR
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2003 3:31 PM
To: McFarland Janis USGR; Carroll Beth USGR; Pastoor Tim USGR; Hosmer Alan USGR
Cc: Elder Andrea USGR
Subject: FW: Alex Avery responds to Baltimore Sun atrazine editorial
Importance: High

Please review the editorial response below, just submitted to me by V-Fluence. While I believe it's an excellent idea to respond to the editorial, there are a few key points I would like to add: 1) the recent favorable "no effect" ruling on salmon; 2) the fact that in 45 years of use, there are no incidents showing that atrazine has caused harm to fish, birds or other wildlife; and 3) the SAP's agreement with EPA that "there is not sufficient evidence to indicate that atrazine consistently produces effects across the range of amphibian species examined."

What do you think?

Sherry

-----Original Message-----

From: Cheryl Byrne [mailto:cheryl.byrne@V-FLUENCE.com]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2003 3:06 PM
To: Ford Sherry USGR
Subject: Alex Avery responds to Baltimore Sun atrazine editorial

Sherry--Alex Avery has written a letter in response to Sunday's BaltoSun editorial. He has been contacted by the paper, so it's possible this may be

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER IN ATRAZINE LITIGATION SYN00917231

printed. The editorial it is reprinted in is reprinted in the book "Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch seen it."

>Date: Mon, 25 Aug 2003 11:57:46 -0400
 >To: letters@baltsun.com
 >From: Alex Avery <aavery@rica.net>
 >Subject: Frog atrazine editorial
 >
 >Your Sunday Aug. 24 editorial, Risky business, supporting the
 >activist-driven lawsuit against the agricultural herbicide atrazine was ill
 >considered. The supposed threat of death or deformity to frogs from
 atrazine
 >has been suggested (not proven) by only one researcher. Two independent
 >university research groups have been unable to replicate these results.
 >Replication is the foundation of science.
 >
 >While Maryland is home to at least 20 frog and toad species and its farmers
 >apply roughly half a million pounds of atrazine each year, not one of these
 >species is endangered and there is scant evidence of any problems. Your
 >editorial failed to mention two proven natural causes of recent frog
 >population declines and deformities: the chytrid fungus and a parasitic
 worm.
 >
 >Atrazine is an important herbicide that helps drastically reduce soil and
 >nutrient runoff from Maryland farms into the Chesapeake Bay. These activist
 >groups would like nothing more than to ban farm inputs without real
 evidence
 >of harm, the so-called "precautionary principle." But even organic farm
 >pesticides -- such as copper, sulfur, and carcinogenic pyrethrum -- would
 be
 >banned under such a system.
 >
 >Sincerely,
 >Alex Avery, Director of Research
 >Hudson Institute, Center for Global Food Issues
 >PO Box 202
 >Churchville, VA 24421
 >office: (540) 337-6354
 >cell: (540) 255-6378
 >home: (540) 885-5667
 >aavery@rica.net

Risky business

Originally published August 24, 2003

FROGS HAVE **Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch** spring there seem to be fewer of them, while increasingly those that do appear are severely deformed; no legs, extra legs, a double set of reproductive equipment.

Part of nature's early warning system, frogs are sounding the alarm that they and many other creatures - possibly including humans - are being poisoned in ecosystems all over the world. Studies suggest at least part of the damage is caused by fertilizers and pesticides used on golf courses, farm fields and well-manicured suburban lawns. A leading culprit is believed to be the widely used weed killer atrazine.

But the Bush administration has dragged its feet for so long on calls to ban the chemical that the federal courts should sharply restrict atrazine use until action is taken.

At risk is not only the environment but human health as well. It is far safer to err on the side of caution than to gamble that the evidence against atrazine so far is wrong.

The Environmental Protection Agency is reviewing that evidence and other available data to determine whether the United States should join four other nations - Denmark, Germany, Norway and Sweden - where atrazine has been banned.

But the Natural Resources Defense Council, an environmental advocacy group, suspects the agency is playing slow-down ball because of political pressure on the White House from the pesticide industry. That tactic is consistent with the Bush strategy for deflecting demands to act on global warming: The president declares himself in pursuit of "sound science" and defers decisions indefinitely.

In fact, an EPA spokesman told The Sun's Dennis O'Brien that despite studies fingering atrazine as an environmental hazard, the agency had been unable to find a consensus on the exact damage it causes.

Now, the NRDC has gone to the U.S. District Court in Baltimore seeking help in goosing the agency along. In a lawsuit filed under the Endangered Species Act, the group is asking the court to order restrictions on the use of atrazine until the EPA finally decides whether to ban it.

Such restrictions are clearly called for. Twenty-one endangered species, including four types of sea turtle in the Chesapeake Bay, are believed to be harmed by atrazine. Further, limiting atrazine use would pose no insurmountable hardship; alternative herbicides are available that could do the job more safely. Farmers also have the option of changing their planting methods so they would no longer require weed killer at all.

If the court acts quickly enough, the restrictions could be in place before next year's planting season begins.

Frogs aren't mentioned in the lawsuit because they are not considered an endangered species in Maryland. But that may only be a matter of time.

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

Cheryl Byrne
Senior Vice-President
v-Fluence Interactive Public Relations
<http://www.v-fluence.com>
877-835-8362 x2002

This message and any attachments contain information which is confidential and may be privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. It is intended to be read only by the individual or entity to whom it is addressed or by their designee. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not use, copy, or disclose to anyone any information contained in this message and any attachments or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this message in error, please delete or destroy this message and any attachment and immediately notify the sender at the e-mail address above and/or v-Fluence Interactive Public Relations, Inc. by telephone at (877) 835-8362.

Thank you very much.

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

Email Message

From: Carroll Beth USGR
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2003 5:15:26 PM
To: Ford Sherry USGR; Mcfarland Janis USGR; Pastoor Tim USGR; Hosmer Alan USGR;
CC: Elder Andrea USGR;
Subject: RE: Alex Avery responds to Baltimore Sun atrazine editorial

Sherry,

I think you could add point number 2 pretty easily and that it would be a good addition. You might be able to incorporate point number 1 but my understanding of that "no may effect" finding is that it is really based on not nearly as much usage in PNW as in the midwest, so it actually might get tripped up if it called into question how much atrazine is used in the Bay watershed. I think point number 3 will not be understood by the average reader.

-NBC

-----Original Message-----

From: Ford Sherry USGR
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2003 3:31 PM
To: Mcfarland Janis USGR; Carroll Beth USGR; Pastoor Tim USGR; Hosmer Alan USGR
Cc: Elder Andrea USGR
Subject: FW: Alex Avery responds to Baltimore Sun atrazine editorial
Importance: High

Please review the editorial response below, just submitted to me by V-Fluence. While I believe it's an excellent idea to respond to the editorial, there are a few key points I would like to add: 1) the recent favorable "no effect" ruling on salmon; 2) the fact that in 45 years of use, there are no incidents showing that atrazine has caused harm to fish, birds or other wildlife; and 3) the SAP's agreement with EPA that "there is not sufficient evidence to indicate that atrazine consistently produces effects across the range of amphibian species examined."

What do you think?

Sherry

-----Original Message-----

From: Cheryl Byrne [mailto:cheryl.byrne@V-FLUENCE.com]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2003 3:06 PM
To: Ford Sherry USGR
Subject: Alex Avery responds to Baltimore Sun atrazine editorial

Sherry--Alex Avery has written a letter in response to Sunday's BaltoSun editorial. He has been contacted by the paper, so it's possible this may be printed. The editorial it is responding to follows, in case you haven't seen it.

>Date: Mon, 25 Aug 2003 11:57:46 -0400
>To: letters@baltsun.com
>From: Alex Avery <aavery@rica.net>
>Subject: Frog atrazine editorial

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER IN ATRAZINE LITIGATION

SYN00825358

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

- >
- >Your Sunday Aug. 24 editorial, Risky business, supporting the
- >activist-driven lawsuit against the agricultural herbicide atrazine was ill

- >considered. The supposed threat of death or deformity to frogs from atrazine
- >has been suggested (not proven) by only one researcher. Two independent
- >university research groups have been unable to replicate these results.
- >Replication is the foundation of science.
- >
- >While Maryland is home to at least 20 frog and toad species and its farmers

- >apply roughly half a million pounds of atrazine each year, not one of these

- >species is endangered and there is scant evidence of any problems. Your
- >editorial failed to mention two proven natural causes of recent frog
- >population declines and deformities: the chytrid fungus and a parasitic worm.
- >
- >Atrazine is an important herbicide that helps drastically reduce soil and
- >nutrient runoff from Maryland farms into the Chesapeake Bay. These activist

- >groups would like nothing more than to ban farm inputs without real evidence
- >of harm, the so-called "precautionary principle." But even organic farm
- >pesticides -- such as copper, sulfur, and carcinogenic pyrethrum -- would be
- >banned under such a system.
- >
- >Sincerely,
- >Alex Avery, Director of Research
- >Hudson Institute, Center for Global Food Issues
- >PO Box 202
- >Churchville, VA 24421
- >office: (540) 337-6354
- >cell: (540) 255-6378
- >home: (540) 885-5667
- >aavery@rica.net

Risky business

Originally published August 24, 2003

FROGS HAVE been trying to tell us something for quite a while now. Each spring there seem to be fewer of them, while increasingly those that do appear are severely deformed; no legs, extra legs, a double set of reproductive equipment.

Part of nature's early warning system, frogs are sounding the alarm that they and many other creatures - possibly including humans - are being poisoned in ecosystems all over the world. Studies suggest at least part of

the damage is caused by fertilizers and herbicides used on corn, soybean, farm fields and well-manicured suburban lawns. A leading culprit is believed to be the widely used weed killer atrazine.

But the Bush administration has dragged its feet for so long on calls to ban the chemical that the federal courts should sharply restrict atrazine use until action is taken.

At risk is not only the environment but human health as well. It is far safer to err on the side of caution than to gamble that the evidence against atrazine so far is wrong.

The Environmental Protection Agency is reviewing that evidence and other available data to determine whether the United States should join four other nations - Denmark, Germany, Norway and Sweden - where atrazine has been banned.

But the Natural Resources Defense Council, an environmental advocacy group, suspects the agency is playing slow-down ball because of political pressure on the White House from the pesticide industry. That tactic is consistent with the Bush strategy for deflecting demands to act on global warming: The president declares himself in pursuit of "sound science" and defers decisions indefinitely.

In fact, an EPA spokesman told The Sun's Dennis O'Brien that despite studies fingering atrazine as an environmental hazard, the agency had been unable to find a consensus on the exact damage it causes.

Now, the NRDC has gone to the U.S. District Court in Baltimore seeking help in goosing the agency along. In a lawsuit filed under the Endangered Species Act, the group is asking the court to order restrictions on the use of atrazine until the EPA finally decides whether to ban it.

Such restrictions are clearly called for. Twenty-one endangered species, including four types of sea turtle in the Chesapeake Bay, are believed to be harmed by atrazine. Further, limiting atrazine use would pose no insurmountable hardship; alternative herbicides are available that could do the job more safely. Farmers also have the option of changing their planting methods so they would no longer require weed killer at all.

If the court acts quickly enough, the restrictions could be in place before next year's planting season begins.

Frogs aren't mentioned in the lawsuit because they are not considered an endangered species in Maryland. But that may only be a matter of time.

Cheryl Byrne
Senior Vice-President
v-Fluence Interactive Public Relations
<http://www.v-fluence.com>
877-835-8362 x2002

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch
This message and any attachments contain information which is confidential and may be privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. It is intended to be read only by the individual or entity to whom it is addressed or by their designee. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not use, copy, or disclose to anyone any information contained in this message and any attachments or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this message in error, please delete or destroy this message and any attachment and immediately notify the sender at the e-mail address above and/or v-Fluence Interactive Public Relations, Inc. by telephone at (877) 835-8362.

Thank you very much.

FILED UNDER SEAL
Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

From: Goldsmith Steven USGR
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 2010 9:09 AM
To: Ford Sherry USGR; Pastoor Tim USGR
Cc: Nadel Alan USGR
Subject: RE: radio interview request - NPR in San Francisco

Mike is going to check with Alex Avery on his availability. We might suggest that there have been others involved in the EPA SAPs previously who have detailed knowledge of the history of this product who could talk to the issue well and suggest Alex.

From: Ford Sherry USGR
Sent: Monday, March 01, 2010 8:56 PM
To: Pastoor Tim USGR; Goldsmith Steven USGR
Cc: Nadel Alan USGR
Subject: FW: radio interview request - NPR in San Francisco

Tim—Do you want to do this at 12:30? Here's the link to the program:
<http://www.kqed.org/radio/programs/forum/>

And bio for host Michael Krasny: <http://www.kqed.org/radio/about/staff/michael-krasny.jsp>

We can talk about it tomorrow.

Sherry

From: danzoll@gmail.com [mailto:danzoll@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** dan zoll
Sent: Monday, March 01, 2010 8:27 PM
To: Ford Sherry USGR
Subject: Fwd: radio interview request - NPR in San Francisco

Hi Sherry

We are having Tyrone Hayes on the Forum program (kqed.org/forum) tomorrow, march 2, from 9-930 AM PACIFIC to discuss his atrazine study. I am writing to invite a Syngenta representative to join us.

thanks for considering this request

PS i understand that KQED Radio News talked to Tim Pastoor today. Forum is a different program...

best
Dan Zoll
Senior Editor
KQED Forum

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

Email Message

From: Alex Avery
Sent: Thursday, January 20, 2005 11:21:40 AM
To: Carroll Beth USGR;
Subject: RE: Frogs and Pesticides article and White Paper

Also, do you have a need for an op-ed quickly given Hayes's weekend Minnesota tour-de-fawning-eco-accolites? I bet I could get something into the Minneapolis Star-Trib next week. Former Minnesota Senator Boschwitz is a patron of the Center and has string-pulling power. Let me know. But I think an op-ed on the MPCA fiasco and the smoke and mirrors campaign of Hayes (his inability to answer a simple question about why the impacts on frogs are so hard to find in the real world) would be great.

Alex Avery
Director of Research
Center for Global Food Issues, Hudson Institute PO Box 202, Churchville, VA 24421
(540) 337-6354, or -6387
aavery@cgfi.org

-----Original Message-----

From: beth.carroll@syngenta.com [mailto:beth.carroll@syngenta.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 20, 2005 10:57 AM
To: aavery@rica.net
Cc: sarah.hull@syngenta.com; sherry.ford@syngenta.com; janis.mcfarland@syngenta.com; alan.nadel@syngenta.com
Subject: RE: Frogs and Pesticides article and White Paper

Alex,
I have spoken with Sherry Ford (Syngenta communications) and she (and I) would like for you to continue to publish on this issue especially since he is threatening with some papers that may come out. The last "paper" (the one I gave you) as you may realize is not really a paper but a "forum" that likely received little to no review from AIBS. So we can't tell from the e-mails if these are really papers or if they will just be editorials but having you do a response may be appropriate. Otherwise we might discuss turning this e-mail dialog you have been having into a publication. Think about what else you might want to do and I will discuss further with Sherry today.

Thanks
Beth

-----Original Message-----

From: Alex Avery [mailto:aavery@rica.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 20, 2005 10:38 AM
To: Carroll Beth USGR; Hull Sarah USGR
Subject: FW: Frogs and Pesticides article and White Paper

I AM making him nervous. He can't take even a little knowledgeable heat. I've danced him into a fact stalemate! Read and enjoy. Note that he simply CAN'T answer the most straight forward, simple question about atrazine and frogs -- where's the bodies?

Alex Avery

FILED UNDER SEAL

Director of Research
Center for Global
(540) 337-6354, or -6387
aavery@cgfi.org

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

-----Original Message-----

From: tyrone@socrates.Berkeley.EDU [mailto:tyrone@socrates.Berkeley.EDU]
Sent: Thursday, January 20, 2005 10:20 AM
To: Alex Avery
Subject: RE: Frogs and Pesticides article and White Paper

where are the impacts on the frogs...perhaps you are aware of a growing concern over amphibian declines...???? is atrazine the ONLY cause no, but i believe a contributing factor. you continue giving your daughter the medicine. for your sake, i hope she becomes 1.2% better. i will err on the side of caution. you do your thang and i will do mine. i will publish in the top peer reviewed journals from one of the top two univesrsities in the country with rigor. you continue to do what you do. watch me work.
my name is tyrone

On Thu, 20 Jan 2005, Alex Avery wrote:

> If atrazine is so harmful -- a potential risk you say it would be
> irresponsible to take -- then why are there still cricket and northern
> leopard frogs in Illinois after 40 years of intensive atrazine use?
> It's a simple question. You won't answer this question because it
> totally
undercuts
> your theory/argument.
>
> Once again, why are there frogs of all kinds in the several states
> that
I've
> mentioned where atrazine has been used extensively for 40 years? You
> say that the effects of atrazine are clear cut and have been seen in
> multiple organisms, including fish and mammals. So, why are the
> real-world impacts
so
> hard to find?
>
> We'll just have to do our thangs and disagree, but I don't think
> you've
come
> even remotely close to making a convincing case. Every time I
> challenged
you
> on where the impacts on the frogs in the real world were, you launch
> into
a
> "we shouldn't take the risk" song and dance. What risk? We're not
> talking CANCER here, Dr. Hayes. We're talking about gonadal dysgenesis
> and hermaphroditism that occur in the wild even in non-exposed frogs.
> And in

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION - SUBJECT TO
PROTECTIVE ORDER IN ATRAZINE LITIGATION

SYN04530621

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

the

- > case of delayed gonadal development, it doesn't even prevent their
- > sexual maturation. Are the hermaphrodite frogs able to reproduce?
- >
- > I know the "C" word sends others running, but I know better. There is
- > ZERO evidence that atrazine has ANY human health effects at real-world
- > exposure levels.
- >
- > Also, atrazine has more agronomic importance than you give it credit,
- > as
- it
- > is a valuable herbicide for resistance management as well as being a
- > low cost and proven herbicide. Atrazine doesn't have a 1.2% "chance"
- > of improving yields -- it has a 100% chance of doing that. The issue
- > is by
- how
- > much over the alternatives. Compared to no herbicide and no plowing or
- other
- > tillage weed control, atrazine will improve yields by 40-50%.
- >
- > You are no doubt correct that without atrazine, corn farmers would
- > utilize alternatives and the yield losses would likely be minimal. But
- > there would be costs and alternative risks to such an approach -- from
- > chemicals that also may have subtle developmental impacts on frogs or
- > worms or whatever that have yet to be tested or revealed. You can't
- > replace atrazine
- entirely
- > with glyphosate, perhaps the lowest risk herbicide, so now you're
- > talking about using a potentially higher risk herbicide than atrazine.
- >
- > Moreover, herbicides allow for more sustainable farming, as they make
- > possible no-till and conservation tillage farming that cut soil
- > erosion by
- > 70-95 percent. The Soil and Water Conservation Society have said it is
- > the most sustainable farming system ever devised by man. This not only
- increases
- > our sustainability, but also reduces impacts from siltation on fish
- > and other aquatic organisms. As Trimble demonstrated in his study in
- > Science (285:1244-1246. 1999), this has drastically reduced soil loss
- > from
- farming.
- >
- > Doin' our thangs with respect.
- >
- > Cheers,
- > Alex Avery
- > Director of Research
- > Center for Global Food Issues, Hudson Institute PO Box 202,
- > Churchville, VA 24421
- > (540) 337-6354, or -6387
- > aavery@cgfi.org
- >

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION - SUBJECT TO
PROTECTIVE ORDER IN ATRAZINE LITIGATION

SYN04530622

FILED UNDER SEAL

>
> -----Original Message-----
> **Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch**
> From: tyrone@socrates.Berkeley.EDU
> [mailto:tyrone@socrates.Berkeley.EDU]
> Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2005 10:32 PM
> To: aavery@rica.net
> Subject: RE: Frogs and Pesticides article and White Paper
>
> "chemical toxicology is perhaps the most straight forward and
> uncomplex of any ecological phenomenon"...therein lies the problem as
> i address in a paper coming out in april. chemical toxicology makes
> unrealistic simplistic assumptions about biology (life) that cannot
> explain these important effects...cancer...endocrine
> disruption...endocrine disruption that leads to cancer etc. i throw
> the same question back at you.... "How many tests and experiments and
> how many lines of inquiry should be followed (before we decide to pull
> a compound out of use)? For how many years (should) a compound (be
> used while we figure out the exact mechanism of action). How much
> "uncertainty" qualifies as enough to block (pulling it off the market?)" and you see, you keep jumping on the
> frogs.
> again i point out that THE SAME mechanism and related effects have
> been observed in independent studies in multiple fish and amphibians,
> reptiles, birds, and mammals....let me put it this way...if my
> daughter were on a medication and 15 doctors said, oh, there are some
> adverse effects...it may cause breast cancer, but we don't know how.
> and the medication has only a 1.2% chance of improving your daughter's
> health and the manufacturer said, "oh we don't believe it" and
> produced studies as shabby as the one's for atrazine and then
> basically bent (even lied) about the results...you know...i would take
> my daughter off the medication. you would make a different decision obviously.
>
> there are many people (and species) out there, who can't make that
> decision...don't have that choice. i like to think that i am speaking
> for them.
>
> you do your thang, and i will do mine.
> tyrone
>
>
> On Wed, 19 Jan 2005 aavery@rica.net wrote:
>
>> Ok, you say that it should be Syngenta's burden to prove their
>> compound
> is
>> safe. But to what extent of proof? We both know it is logically
> impossible
>> to prove absolute safety. So, to what extent should the "proof of
> safety"
>> extend? How many tests and experiments and how many lines of inquiry
>> should be followed? For how many years before a compound is approved
>> for use? How much "uncertainty" qualifies as enough to block use
>> once approved? These really are the difficult policy questions.

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION - SUBJECT TO
PROTECTIVE ORDER IN ATRAZINE LITIGATION

SYN04530623

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

> >

> > Atrazine has been widely used for over 40 years and there is
> > desperately scant evidence that it has caused or is having any ecological impacts.

In

> > those places where atrazine use has been banned, as in Europe, it
> > was

for

> > water contamination at levels above which some consumers feel
comfortable,

> > not for any demonstrated environmental impacts.

> >

> > You have found an interesting effect in your lab, although one that
would

> > be difficult to characterize as "dire" for the frogs. I've never

> > stated

or

> > written that your research was invalid or shoddy or in any way
deficient.

> > However, I do question the relevance.

> >

> > The field data are fairly contradictory to your theory/claims that

> > atrazine likely has significant impacts on amphibian populations.

> > The research on cricket frogs in Illinois by Reeder et al. show that

> > the frequency of hermaphroditism is essentially the same today (3%)

> > as it

was

> > between 1930-1950 and prior to the manufacture and use of atrazine.

Given

> > the past 40 years of heavy atrazine use in this intensive corn

> > growing region (where I have lived, hiked, canoed, and mucked

> > around), I ask the logical question -- what evidence is there that

> > atrazine is or has had a significant impact on amphibians?

> >

> > What evidence is there that the 82% of sites you surveyed in ND, SD,

> > and NE that were "barren" of frogs was caused by atrazine? Are you

> > saying

now

> > that atrazine has impacts beyond hermaphroditism and gonadal

> > dysgenesis and is outright toxic and killed off all of the frogs?

> > And if atrazine

was

> > responsible for the "82%" statistic, why is that not occurring in

Illinois,

> > Indiana, Ohio, or other places where atrazine is used extensively?

> >

> > Frankly, the "I don't have to prove it's unsafe, they have to prove

> > it's safe" line is a sort of an intellectual surrender. I understand

> > that ecology is highly complex. However, chemical toxicology is

> > perhaps the most straight forward and uncomplex of any ecological

> > phenomenon. There are certainly subtleties and nuances at low level

> > exposures, but if atrazine were as harmful to amphibians as you say

> > and given it's widespread use, then why aren't the impacts on

FILED UNDER SEAL

>> amphibian populations
more **Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch**

>> obvious and correlate more neatly with atrazine use than any of your
>> published field research indicates?
>>
>> I'll keep reading and following the research as I have extensively
>> for
the
>> past 10 years. Thanks for your time and the dialogue.
>>
>> Respectfully,
>> Alex Avery
>>
>>
>>> i think you are reading what you want to.
>>>
>>> you must ask yourself, "what is my motivation? what is driving me?"
>>>
>>> unlike yourself, i have been in both camps, on both sides of the
>>> issue...and (with all do respect) i am not someone "writing" about
>>> the issue from my computer terminal...i am in it.
>>>
>>> it should be syngenta's burden to prove their compound safe, not
>>> mine
to
>>> prove it unsafe. indeed, it is the uncertainties that should drive
>>> the policy. as a scientist, a father, and a citizen, we owe future
>>> generations this much.
>>>
>>> you do your thang, and i will do mine.
>>>
>>> tyrone
>>>
>>> On Wed, 19 Jan 2005, Alex Avery wrote:
>>>
>>>> You're a lot less forthcoming with the public on the
>>>> uncertainties involved in this issue than you are in this last email.
>>>>
>>>> With respect,
>>>>
>>>> Alex Avery
>>>> Director of Research
>>>> Center for Global Food Issues, Hudson Institute PO Box 202,
>>>> Churchville, VA 24421
>>>> (540) 337-6354, or -6387
>>>> aavery@cgfi.org
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> -----Original Message-----
>>>> From: tyrone@socrates.Berkeley.EDU
>>>> [mailto:tyrone@socrates.Berkeley.EDU] Sent: Wednesday, January
>>>> 19,

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION - SUBJECT TO
PROTECTIVE ORDER IN ATRAZINE LITIGATION

SYN04530625

FILED UNDER SEAL

>>> 2005 4:15 ^{DM}
Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

>>> To: Alex Avery

>>> Subject: RE: Frogs and Pesticides article and White Paper

>>>

>>> look, i have no doubt that MANY factors contribute to amphibian
>>> declines. i also think that the impacts and interactions of these

many

>>> factors are complex. i do not think that they can be distilled to
>>> the simple observations through time and space that you propose.

>>>

>>> whether or not i agree with you is not the issue here. i respect
>>> your opinion and the very valuable role that you and others play
>>> in

keeping

>>> the science sound. i also recognize that we will never be able to
>>> generate the kind of simple, clear cut relationship that you seem
>>> to expect, however. again, biology...life, just ain't that
>>> simple. i,

for

>>> one, will not gamble that the science is wrong for the small
>>> benefit that atrazine promises. as a scientist, a father, and a
>>> citizen, i think we owe future generations a little more than that.

>>>

>>> you keep doing your thang, i'll keep doing mine.

>>>

>>> with respect,

>>> tyrone

>>

>>

>>

>>

>

>

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

Email Message

From: Duvall Sherry USGR
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2001 5:10 PM
To: 'avery, dennis'
Cc: Carroll Beth USGR
Subject: Your draft

Attachments: AveryDraft.doc

Dennis:

Again, thanks for helping us tell the atrazine story. I'm attaching your draft with only a few changes which I'd be glad to discuss with you. Please let me know on Monday if these are acceptable.

I'm also attaching a link to an interesting EPA report done in '92 which you may be familiar with. We thought it might be a nice tie-in to your article, considering that atrazine helps prevent erosion (through no-till farming and conservation tillage) and the report cites sediment and silt as the number one polluter of our rivers and streams (see the "Rivers and Streams section not too far down).

Let me know what you think.

<http://www.epa.gov/owowwtr1/305b/sum1.html>

Sherry Duvall
Syngenta Communications
336.632.6107

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

Email Message

From: Duvall Sherry USGR
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2002 5:11 PM
To: 'avery, dennis'
Subject: your op-ed piece on s-metolachlor

Attachments: AveryOpEd.doc

Dennis---Greetings from NC! I wanted to let you know that we are currently trying to place the attached piece ("EPA double crosses its own pesticide reduction campaign") you wrote on s-metolachlor in a major media outlet. We understand a decision by EPA may be made in the next several weeks on whether or not to grant registration of old metolachlor to Cedar Chemical.

On another note, the piece you wrote on atrazine ("Will the EPA ban soil conservation?") has received good play in ag trade media, including Iowa Farmer Today, Illinois AgriNews, Indiana AgriNews, Ohio's Country Journal and Lancaster Farming.

We appreciate your good work and will keep you informed on the s-metolachlor piece.

Sherry Duvall
Communications Manager
Syngenta Crop Protection
410 Swing Road
Greensboro, NC 27409
336.632.6107 phone
336.632.2290 fax
sherry.duvall@syngenta.com

FILED UNDER SEAL

Atrazine EXPOSED Unsealed by the Court & Exposed by SourceWatch

Email Message

From: Carroll Beth USGR

Sent: Thursday, April 10, 2003 2:56 PM

To: Ford Sherry USGR; Hosmer Alan USGR; Hertl Peter USGR; Pastoor Tim USGR

Cc: Mcfarland Janis USGR; Carter Kay USGR; Dickson Gary USGR; Muldoon Joe USWS

Subject: Communication Needs for SAP

Folks,

Here are the communication needs identified yesterday. We will need to have another meeting to fine tune plans for handling the press.

Thanks, Beth

P.S. Sherry are you going to create a media packet like you did for the Technical Briefing?

Communications Needs for SAP

1. Characterization of the existing frog data (how to frame it)
2. Spokespersons:

Syngenta: Tim Pastoor (Syngenta will refer more detailed questions to the panel)

Panel: Ron Kendall, Others??

Triazine Network: Jere White, Stephanie Whalen

3. Documents

- Fact Sheets
- Summary of Panel reports
- History of frog data
- Reregistration timeline

4. Call Select Media:

- Richard Harris
- John McQuay
- Neil Shah
- David Safford
- Steve Milloy
- Alex Avery
- Nancy Koons (?) from the NY Times

From: Mike Burita [mikeb@quinnthomas.com]
Sent: Monday, March 01, 2010 2:51 PM
To: Goldsmith Steven USGR; Eileen Doherty; Josh Gilder
Cc: Doug Badger
Subject: are you guys OK with this headline for Avery release?

Importance: High

It's hard hitting, but accurate I think.

New Atrazine Study Promoted by Discredited Researcher

"Scientifically Flawed," "Insufficient Data," "Results Problematic if not impossible"

Describe Past Reviews of Atrazine Research Dr. Tyrone Hayes