

IMERYYS240414

Metadata

BegAttach	IMERYYS 240414	ORIGINAL
Confidentiality	Yes	ORIGINAL
DATA_Prod_Vol	IMERYYS010;	ORIGINAL
DocumentType	HardCopy	ORIGINAL
EndAttach	IMERYYS 240414	ORIGINAL
PgCount	1	ORIGINAL
ProdVol	IMERYYS010;	ORIGINAL
Text Path	\\IMERYYS010\TEXT\0003\IMERYYS 240414.txt	ORIGINAL
Trial_Ex_Number	Pltf_IMERYYS_00062095	ORIGINAL

TURNER Eric (CIT)

De: Zazenski, Rich (LNA) [Rich.Zazenski@america.luzenac.com]
Envoyé: 20 November 2000 22:06
À: Bernstein, Robert (LNA); Meli, Rich (LNA)
Cc: Turner, Eric (LNA)
Objet: RE: Current draft of Eurotalac Exec Summary to NTP

I've been on the phone today with the chief counsel for Jim Tozzi at CRE (Bill Kelly). He is going to help us with the "objections" letter we need to send to NTP. It does not have to be very detailed - in fact Kelly suggested something as simple as bulletpoints. The following list of Luzenac Objections is what I have just sent to Bill:

Addressed in EuroTALC sub.

1. Failure of NTP to consider the findings and conclusions from the 1994 FDA talc workshop - for both the ovarian cancer issue as well as the NTP animal study.

Yes: for animal study

2. Failure of the NTP to consider the detailed review of talc contained in the Dec. 1998, Journal of Comments on Toxicology - Special Issue on Talc.

No but will

3. Failure of NTP to consider the findings of the June 2000, Mortality Study of French Talc Workers.

Yes

4. Failure of NTP to clearly differentiate the type of talc (asbestiform v. non-asbestiform) in a number of the epidemiology studies upon which they based their carcinogenic conclusion.

Yes

5. Failure of NTP to address the lack of dose-response relationship with the hygienic use of cosmetic talc and ovarian cancer

No

6. Failure of NTP to address the lack of carcinogenicity associated with talc pleurodesis.

No but could

7. Failure of NTP to meet their own guidelines for defining a "reasonably anticipated human carcinogen". The NTP animal study must be dismissed from consideration because of a serious flaw in the execution of the study (a period of uncontrolled dust generation).

Yes: related to 1.

8. Failure of NTP to give adequate scientific weight and consideration to the Battelle hamster study (Wehner et al, 1977).

No

9. Failure of NTP to present "convincing relevant information" as to the biological plausibility for talc to be a "reasonably anticipated human carcinogen" in light of NTP's own admission that cosmetic talc is neither

Not specifically but part of others

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Bernstein, Robert (LNA)
> Sent: Monday, November 20, 2000 1:53 PM
> To: Meli, Rich (LNA)
> Cc: Zazenski, Rich (LNA)
> Subject: FW: Current draft of Eurotalac Exec Summary to NTP

>
> Rich--I don't disagree with (still haven't read the damn thing). Keep in mind that for us to have a standing in a legal action, we have to object to everything in the draft report in the administrative section. We can do that by voicing our concerns in writing, agreeing with the objections of another party, or simply insuring that all points are objected to by someone. Probably (I'm no lawyer), those choices in that order offer us the soundest legal standing for not having our case thrown out.

>
>
> RSB