

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The inaugural issue of *Environmental Practice* is absolutely fabulous! Well worth the wait. I feel indeed privileged to have been a contributor. Not only am I elated to see my own article, but the entire journal appears to be excellent—the contents, the layout, etc. As an NAEP member, I know I will find every issue technically informative and enjoyable to read, even when I am not a contributor.

J. Peyton Doub
Tetra Tech NUS
Gaithersburg, MD

I just received my first issue of *Environmental Practice*! I was really excited! I liked the section about the new CEPs with pictures—these people have really done a lot to get their certification and this recognition of their accomplishment is terrific. I also like the decision to allow non-members to subscribe to *Environmental Practice*—I hope this may bring extra dollars and members in. Overall, it looks terrific and I'm looking forward to the articles in the March 2000 issue.

Rena M. Pomaville, PhD
Insight Environmental Services
Brighton, MI

With regard to "A New Situation: Where Will This Road Lead Us?" on page 79 of the June 1999 issue, one of the things I would tell my best client (and Dr. Cuba) is that anthracene and pyrene are not carcinogens. According to the US EPA's IRIS database, both anthracene's and pyrene's carcinogenicity are "Classification—D, not classifiable as to human carcinogenicity . . . Based on no human data and inadequate data from animal bioassays." As a gentle suggestion, as *Environmental Practice* takes flight, hypothetical "case studies" (and the journal itself) would be more plausible, credible, and useful without incorrect information, although I realize that editorials are not peer-reviewed. Good luck with the journal, and watch out for those carcinogens! (Opinions stated herein are mine alone, have nothing to do with my employer, and have not been peer-reviewed.)

Shanna Collie, PhD
Roy F. Weston, Inc.
Houston, Texas

Author's Response: While it is true that I did not consult the EPA list, I did consult various scientific and peer-reviewed texts on the subject (e.g., *The Condensed Chemical Dictionary*, Tenth Edition, G. G. Hawley). So I ask, would you rather rely on a peer-reviewed scientific text or a legislatively reviewed list? If the science says the item is

dangerous at some level but the government says it is non-carcinogenic, what is the appropriate professional and ethical response to situations in which the chemical may arise? In the professional sense, our job is to *interpret our science through the context of the law*. If we had a client who wished to know what the regulations were we should advise them of the class of chemical involved and how to deal with the situation. But if we are asked the scientific question about the nature of the substance, we should rely on science and not bureaucracy; for that is science already once filtered through policy and politics.

Thomas R. Cuba, PhD, CEP
Delta Seven Inc.
St. Petersburg, FL

Just a short note to mention that I enjoyed the editorial in the December 1999 issue. With the carnage/recession in the environmental industry of the past 7 years, and state and federal rule enforcement at its lowest point in at least as many years, it is interesting to see anyone say anything to remind readers that the bulk liquid commodity industry still has its risks. Good job.

Clement Mesavage
President, Think Tank Resources, Inc.
Fairfax, VA

Join the Dialog

The central purpose of *Environmental Practice* is to provide a forum for the discussion and analysis of significant environmental issues. An important part of this discussion is the *Letters to the Editor* section, introduced in this issue. The editors welcome your comments and insights on articles appearing in this or other issues of the journal.