

Why Susan Dudley is Dangerous for Public Health



Susan Dudley, nominee for administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, has consistently opposed protections of the public health, safety, and environment. Here is a look at Dudley in her own words.

Limiting Arsenic in Drinking Water

Why It Matters

*Exposure to arsenic is directly linked to bladder, lung and skin cancer. Following a 1999 National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report examining arsenic's dangerous health effects, the EPA was urged to issue a rule limiting the allowable Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) of arsenic in drinking water.*¹

What She Said

“[The proposed standards are] an **unwelcome distraction from the task of protecting the water supply.**”²

“While [EPA] should share information about arsenic levels and hazards, it should not impose its judgment, based on national average costs and benefits, on individual communities as to how best to invest in their own public health.”³

Reducing Smog-Related Health Risks from Ground-Level Ozone

Why It Matters

*Ground-level ozone is a serious public health concern responsible for premature mortality, chronic asthma, and chronic and acute bronchitis.*⁴

Industry groups opposed the rule by circulating mythical claims that ground-level ozone has the same effect as stratospheric ozone in screening out UV rays. This claim was instantly discredited.

What She Said

“**Due to ozone's screening effect on harmful ultraviolet-B radiation,** the proposed reduction in ozone levels would increase malignant and nonmelanoma skin cancers and cataracts, as well as other UV-B-related health-risks. This doesn't mean that more ozone is always better. It does mean that if the EPA really cares about public health it should take these trade-offs into account.”⁵

Safeguarding Against Potential Risks of Genetically Modified Foods

Why It Matters

Great controversy exists over the safety of Genetically Modified (GM) Foods and their potential to pose long-term health risks to humans and animals, such as the potential to introduce dangerous new allergens into the food supply.⁶ Additionally, GM crops pose potential risks to the environment and biodiversity.⁷

What She Said

“**Unscientific fears, fanned by activists and short-sighted government policies,** have led to a regulatory framework that signals out genetically modified crops for greater scrutiny and even prohibition... Policymakers regulating agricultural biotechnology face pressure from well-organized activists to constrain the new technology. Large biotech companies do not speak out aggressively against unscientific policies, either because they don't dare offend the regulators on whom their livelihood depends, or because regulations give them a competitive advantage.”⁸

¹ The Arsenic and Clarifications to Compliance and New Source Contaminants Monitoring Final Rule (66 FR 6976) January 2001

² Dudley, Susan. How not To Improve Public Health. Mercatus Center: January 11, 2001 *available at* http://mercatus.org/publications/pubID.2630/pub_detail.asp

³ Dudley, Susan. Public Interest Comment on the EPA's National Drinking Water Standards for Arsenic. Mercatus Center: Oct. 31, 2001 p. 8

⁴ Overview of Rulemakings for the Purpose of Reducing Interstate Ozone Transport, Environmental Protection Agency / Air and Radiation (AR), 40 CFR 51, Fall 2003, *available at* http://www.rtknet.org/new/reg/reg.php?reptype=R&rin=2060-AJ20&data_set=200310&database=reg&detail=3&datatype=T

⁵ Dudley, Susan, Wendy Gramm. The Human Costs of EPA Standards. Wall Street Journal: July 1997

⁶ Pioneer Hi-Bred International (Dupont). 2004. Press Room: Biotechnology - Biotech Soybeans and Brazil Nut Protein.

⁷ Brown, Paul, David Gow. Damning Verdict on GM Crop. The Guardian: March 2005

⁸ Dudley, Susan. Issues in Science and Technology: Forum : Genetically modified Crops: 2006 *available at* <http://www.issues.org/21.3/forum.html>