

Message

---

**From:** HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000] [/o=Monsanto/ou=NA-1000-01/cn=Recipients/cn=230737]  
**on behalf of** HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]  
**Sent:** 4/28/2015 2:52:30 PM  
**To:** JENKINS, DANIEL J [AG/1920] [/o=Monsanto/ou=NA-1000-01/cn=Recipients/cn=813004]  
**CC:** LISTELLO, JENNIFER J [AG/1000] [/o=Monsanto/ou=NA-1000-01/cn=Recipients/cn=533682]  
**Subject:** RE: Glyphosate IARC Question

Dan,

Wow! - that's very encouraging. Thanks for the news update.

Regarding the sarcomas Jess mentions in Cheminova's mouse study, I'm assuming he is talking about the Haemangiosarcomas in high dose males (1000 mg/kg/day, the limit dose) and low numbers (1-3) of histiocytic sarcomas 'spattered' across all dose groups. These were discussed in the 2004 WHO/FAO JMPR documents which states: "Owing to the lack of a dose-response relationship, the lack of statistical significance and the fact that the incidences recorded in this study fell within the historical ranges for control, these changes are not considered to be caused by administration of glyphosate."

Bill

**From:** JENKINS, DANIEL J [AG/1920]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 28, 2015 9:33 AM  
**To:** HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]  
**Cc:** LISTELLO, JENNIFER J [AG/1000]  
**Subject:** RE: Glyphosate IARC Question

Hey- cc'ing Jen

So...Jess called me out of the blue this morning:

Plaintiff Exhibit

0404

MONGLY00987755

"We have enough to sustain our conclusions. Don't need gene tox or epi. The only thing is the cheminova study with the sarcoma in mice- we have that study now and its conclusions are irrelevant (bc at limit dose...?). I am the chair of the CARC and my folks are running this process for glyphosate in reg review. I have called a CARC meeting in June..."

Also, Jess called to ask for a contact name at ATSDR. I passed on Jesslyn's email. He told me no coordination is going on and he wanted to establish some saying "If I can kill this I should get a medal". However, don't get your hopes up, I doubt EPA and Jess can kill this; but it's good to know they are going to actually make the effort now to coordinate due to our pressing and their shared concern that ATSDR is consistent in its conclusions w EPA.

Dan Jenkins  
U.S. Agency Lead

Regulatory Affairs  
Monsanto Company  
1300 I St., NW  
Suite 450 East  
Washington, DC 20005

○ [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**From:** HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 27, 2015 1:20 PM  
**To:** JENKINS, DANIEL J [AG/1920]  
**Subject:** RE: Glyphosate IARC Question

That would be great, Dan.

**From:** JENKINS, DANIEL J [AG/1920]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 27, 2015 11:51 AM  
**To:** HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]  
**Subject:** Re: Glyphosate IARC Question

I think you and I could get on the phone w Jess Rowland and discuss this pretty openly. He'll give us straight talk.

Dan Jenkins

US Agency Lead

Monsanto Company

202.383.2851 office

571.732.6575 cell

On Apr 27, 2015, at 8:02 AM, HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000] [REDACTED]@monsanto.com> wrote:

Dan,

As you know, we are considering the value/advisability of doing more work to help us deal with the IARC fallout (see attached), and we are trying to get feedback from various stakeholders to help us decide on pulling any triggers.

The first two suggestions (New Meta-analysis & AHS Collaboration) would involve beefing-up the Epidemiology area with two new/updated analyses culminating in 2 new publications.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> possible endeavor would be an expert panel meeting and subsequent publication. This would be very expensive to do well with sufficient big names. An alternative approach would be one or two smaller expert panels two address one or two areas of most need/value (Epidemiology, Animal Bioassay data, and/or genotox/MOA).

Finally, we are considering doing some additional experiment to directly address all the positive in vitro formulation genotox studies out there – we have had only a very early/superficial talk with Gary Williams so there are no details yet.

NOW THE QUESTION - What are your thoughts on approaching EPA and having a conversation, probably a generic one, about what area they see as most problematic (e.g., human epidemiology vs. animal bioassays vs. genotox) or just ask if there is anything that would help them defend the situation?

Bill

<Post-IARC Meeting Science Proposals.pptx>