

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR:Owens.Denise@epamail.epa.gov ( Owens.Denise@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-JUN-2002 10:17:57.00

SUBJECT:: EPA News CLips - Weekend Edition

TO:Popkin.Roy@epamail.epa.gov ( Popkin.Roy@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Chick.Kelly@epamail.epa.gov ( Chick.Kelly@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Queen.Janice@epamail.epa.gov ( Queen.Janice@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Berger.Diane@epamail.epa.gov ( Berger.Diane@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Trovato.Ramona@epamail.epa.gov ( Trovato.Ramona@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:samuel\_a.\_thernstro@ceq.eop.gov ( samuel\_a.\_thernstro@ceq.eop.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Basile.Tom@epamail.epa.gov ( Basile.Tom@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Cunningham.Robert@epamail.epa.gov ( Cunningham.Robert@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Cooper.Mildred@epamail.epa.gov ( Cooper.Mildred@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Jaeger.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov ( Jaeger.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Glazier.Kelly@epamail.epa.gov ( Glazier.Kelly@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Deleon.Dona@epamail.epa.gov ( Deleon.Dona@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Evans.Cary@epamail.epa.gov ( Evans.Cary@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Cunningham.John@epamail.epa.gov ( Cunningham.John@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Ross.William@epamail.epa.gov ( Ross.William@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Torma.Tim@epamail.epa.gov ( Torma.Tim@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Walker.Jan@epamail.epa.gov ( Walker.Jan@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Damm.Thomas@epamail.epa.gov ( Damm.Thomas@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Roos.Michelle@epamail.epa.gov ( Roos.Michelle@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Skinner.Thomas@epamail.epa.gov ( Skinner.Thomas@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Lemley.Rich@epamail.epa.gov ( Lemley.Rich@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Kalla.Patty@epamail.epa.gov ( Kalla.Patty@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Kahn.Miles@epamail.epa.gov ( Kahn.Miles@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Rayner.Marcus@epamail.epa.gov ( Rayner.Marcus@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Makris.Jim@epamail.epa.gov ( Makris.Jim@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Duteau.Helen@epamail.epa.gov ( Duteau.Helen@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Carter.Donnell@epamail.epa.gov ( Carter.Donnell@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Conklin.Craig@epamail.epa.gov ( Conklin.Craig@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Baker.Michael@epamail.epa.gov ( Baker.Michael@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Mackinnon.Kathleen@epamail.epa.gov ( Mackinnon.Kathleen@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Keho.Ginger@epamail.epa.gov ( Keho.Ginger@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Burnett.Andrew@epamail.epa.gov ( Burnett.Andrew@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Blackburn.Elizabeth@epamail.epa.gov ( Blackburn.Elizabeth@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:John L. Howard Jr. ( CN=John L. Howard Jr./OU=CEQ/O=EOP@EOP [ CEQ ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Mulvaney.Susan@epamail.epa.gov ( Mulvaney.Susan@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Otis.Rick@epamail.epa.gov ( Otis.Rick@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Hunt.Loretta@epamail.epa.gov ( Hunt.Loretta@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Nelson.Kim@epamail.epa.gov ( Nelson.Kim@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Knutti.Emil@epamail.epa.gov ( Knutti.Emil@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Anderson.Diane@epamail.epa.gov ( Anderson.Diane@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Horton.Ashley@epamail.epa.gov ( Horton.Ashley@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Lopez.David@epamail.epa.gov ( Lopez.David@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Tulis.Dana@epamail.epa.gov ( Tulis.Dana@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Means.Bruce@epamail.epa.gov ( Means.Bruce@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Wiggins.James@epamail.epa.gov ( Wiggins.James@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:White.Rebecca@epamail.epa.gov ( White.Rebecca@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Bowles.Jack@epamail.epa.gov ( Bowles.Jack@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Mcneil.Tucker@epamail.epa.gov ( Mcneil.Tucker@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Grant.Pamela@epamail.epa.gov ( Grant.Pamela@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Luttner.Pamela@epamail.epa.gov ( Luttner.Pamela@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:luttner.mark@epamail.epa.gov ( luttner.mark@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Holmstead.Jeff@epamail.epa.gov ( Holmstead.Jeff@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Baker.Jan@epamail.epa.gov ( Baker.Jan@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Thompson.Doris@epamail.epa.gov ( Thompson.Doris@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Esanu.Diane@epamail.epa.gov ( Esanu.Diane@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO:Hope.Brian@epamail.epa.gov ( Hope.Brian@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC:sahadeo.phyllis@epamail.epa.gov ( sahadeo.phyllis@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC:Cantor.Maura@epamail.epa.gov ( Cantor.Maura@epamail.epa.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )



<br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; environmental regulation. The latest example is the proposal  
 to cut  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; back significantly air pollution control requirements  
 for older power  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; plants and factories.  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Once again, the president and his top policy-makers kowtow  
 to the  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; utility industry. Easing restrictions o  
 n the junk that  
 coal- and oil-fired power  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; plants and factories can belch into the atmosphere will  
 lead to dirty  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; air and more misery for all who share the planet.  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Sen. James Jeffords, a Vermont Independent who heads the  
 Senate's  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; environment committee, called the announcement "the biggest  
 rollback  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; of the Clean Air Act in history."  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Dirtier air means more people will suffer from lung problems  
 and  
 <br>  
 &nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; asthma attacks. Environmentalists predict as many as 9,000  
 deaths  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; could result from dirtier air.  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Last month, the Environmental Protection Agency and other  
 federal  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; agencies offered brief hope that this administration finally  
 was  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; getting it right on the issue of global warming. The agencies  
 warned  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; of severe consequences from global warming. Their report  
 admitted  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; that it was a real threa  
 t caused largely by human actions.  
 The  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; admission was a first for this administration.  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; But after the report caught national attention, the president  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; dismissed its findings by saying it was "put out by bureaucrat  
 s."  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Later, Bush stirred people up after saying he had read  
 the report  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; when he really hadn't. EPA chief Christie Whitman further  
 downplayed  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; the report by saying she hadn't reviewed it until she  
 read about it  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; in a newspaper.  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; With the EPA's latest on polluting power plants, it is  
 quite  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; clear that there is little hope for this administration  
 on key  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; environmental issues - even when the backtracking affects  
 the air  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; everyone breathes.  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; The new regulations should be blocked. They will have to  
 go  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; through a rule-making process that could take two years  
 or longer.  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;

p; The process should include public comment. The administration ought  
to get an earful on this latest attempt to please the polluters. If  
Bush persists with this idea after hearing what undoubtedly will be  
public outcry against it, Congress should defeat it.

\*\*\*\*\*

<br>  
<p>Kansas City Star June 16, 2002, Sunday  
Copyright 2002 The Kansas City Star Co.  
All Rights Reserved

<p>  
Kansas City Star  
June 16, 2002, Sunday METROPOLITAN EDITION  
SECTION: SUNDAY BUSINESS; Pg. G9 ;WEB REVIEW  
LENGTH: 431 words  
HEADLINE: Web review;  
This week  
's topic: Pesticides in food  
BODY:  
MoneyWise ratings  
5 stars Put this site at the top of your bookmarks.  
4 stars Well worth the bandwidth.  
3 stars Useful, but not fun. (Or fun, but not 'useful.)  
2 stars More fun than watching your screen saver.  
1 star Skip it. Organize your CDs.  
5 stars  
www.epa.gov/pesticides/food  
This  
is the Environmental Protection Agency's Office of  
Pesticide  
Program site.You will find many good links that should  
answer your  
questions about pesticides.  
Among other important topics, links focus on how the government  
regulates pesticides; the types of pesticides on food;

what the  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  pesticide residue limits are on food; why children might  
 be  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  especially sensitive to pesticides; and what organically  
 grown means.  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  4 stars  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  [www.ams.usda.gov/nop](http://www.ams.usda.gov/nop)  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;  This is the Agriculture Department's National Organic Program  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  site.You can find out which farm associations, producers  
 and related  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  operations are certified for organic production under  
 the link  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  "Accredited Entities to Certify Organic Producers." The  
 "Consumer  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  Information" link under the Information and Resources  
 heading is a  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  &nbsp;   good one to check for information about what is considered  
 organic  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  food and the pesticides and substances that are prohibited  
 in organic  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  food.  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  4 stars  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  [www.infoplease.com/spot/pesticide1.html](http://www.infoplease.com/spot/pesticide1.html)  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;  This is an online site of Learningnetwork.com, an online  
 consumer  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  network of learning and information resources that includes  
 the  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  resource [infoplease.com](http://infoplease.com).  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;  There is good,  
 helpful information on pesticides found  
 in foods  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  your family probably eats every day. The site provides  
 some powerful  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  statistics on foods that contained pesticide residue even  
 after  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  washing - apples, peaches and strawberries, for example.  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;  If you are thinking about going organic, this site lists  
 the 10  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  most important foods to buy.  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  4 stars  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  [www.ewg.org/pub/home/reports/baby\\_food/bab  
 y\\_home.html](http://www.ewg.org/pub/home/reports/baby_food/baby_home.html)  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;  This is an online site of Environmental Working Group,  
 a  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  nonprofit environmental research organization in Washington,  
 D.C.  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;  This site primarily focuses on pesticides in baby food.  
 There is  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  worthwhile reading for parents concerned about how pesticides  
 can  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  influence their child's development. Featured is a solid,  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  four-chapter study on the infant risks from pesticides;  
 sampling plan  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  &nbsp;   and testing methods used on baby foods; pesticides found  
 in baby  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;  food; and conclusions and recommendations.





<br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; were going to game the system."  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Over the last few weeks, internal memos, notes and other energy industry materials have kept popping into  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; public view, suggesting in sometimes vivid detail just how the "smart guys," as Lay called them, worked to  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; manipulate the California energy market in 2000 and 2001.  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; The paper flow, which began in early May with the release of a set of so-called "smoking gun" memos from  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Enron, has prompted regulators, politicians and other industry figures to begin reexamining the root causes of  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; the crisis and even to consider anew that most fundamental of questions: Was there, in fact, a shortage at  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; all?  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Federal regulators, who long maintained that the mess was one of the state's own making--and who, in turn,  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; were maligned by California leaders as cops asleep on the beat--seem to have executed an about-face.  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Patrick H. Wood III, the former Texas regulator who late last year was appointed chairman of the Federal  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Energy Regulatory Commission by President Bush, said that initially he considered the Ca  
 lifornia debacle the  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; result of a flawed deregulation plan. Now he's not so sure.  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; "I didn't walk in here thinking we needed to do a names, numbers, times and dates and 'Who's your alibi?'  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; investigation of the California market, and now I do," Wood said in an interview. "That kind of analysis is  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; something that we really do need to do ... to get the definitive understanding of what happened in the  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; California market."

<p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; While Wood and others say the evidence on manipulation is not yet conclusive, California officials who  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; contended all along that the crisis was artificial are no longer being dismissed as conspiracy theorists. There is  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; more at work now than sorting out the spin and revising history.  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Although the crisis faded away a year ago, the Enron memos and subsequent disclosures have given a push to  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; state efforts to retrieve some of the fortune spent to keep the lights on.  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; \*  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Seeking to Revise Long-Term Contracts  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; California officials have demanded nearly \$9 billion in refunds from power companies on the grounds that  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; wholesale electricity rates violated a federal requirement of "just and reasonable" prices. They have also  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; sought a restructuring of long-term contracts negotiated with generators--often at steep prices--to keep  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; el  
 ectricity flowing.  
 <p>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; At a minimum, the disclosures have poked a hole or two in the vapor of mythology that enveloped the crisis  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; almost from the start. Bottlenecks on the north-south transmission lines, air quality rules, drought in the  
 <br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Pacific Northwest, overworked plants, the demands of the