

ed with a company." David Padwa, chairman of Agrigenetics wondered whether the proposal would have a "chilling effect" on university-industry agreements.

Ditzel and Reimers lacked good answers. "There's a whole host of questions," Ditzel said. He and Reimers reiterated the need to know whether the idea

was worth pursuing. They have set an arbitrary date of June to drop work on the proposal if no further interest is expressed by universities or industry.

Despite Cape's apparent skepticism, he urged the two men to continue. "It's an extremely profound proposal." Hugh d'Andrade, senior vice president at Schering-Plough added some encourage-

ment. Industry, he said, is currently faced with two choices in the licensing of patents—negotiate individually with universities or we use the technique anyway, which constitutes infringement. Neither is attractive or acceptable. The pool proposal "has its problems, but it's better than the two alternatives."

—MARJORIE SUN

Hit List at EPA?

A "hit list" of targeted scientists advising the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), an artifact from the first days of the Reagan incumbency, became the focus of an investigation in Congress on 4 March. That day, the House Science and Technology Committee approved sending subpoenas to two former EPA officials—Kitty Adams, former special assistant to Anne (Gorsuch) Burford, EPA's administrator, and to Warren Wood, former aide to James Sanderson and Rita Lavelle, both former EPA officials. The subpoenas seek documents, magnetic tapes, and computer diskettes which are thought to contain detailed checklists used in screening scientists and consultants for their political views.

The investigation, one of several the House has begun on the politicization of EPA, centers on a cryptic document that appeared on 1 March in five congressional offices. It is a list of 90 scientists on boards at EPA, giving cynical comments on their competence and ideological outlook. It appears to be a survey of industry opinions.

The hit list was released first by Senator Gary Hart (D-Colo.) but was quickly snapped up by Representative James Scheuer (D-N.Y.). He chairs the House science subcommittee on natural resources, agricultural research and environment and is leading one of the inquiries into EPA's toxic waste program. He persuaded the full committee to issue the subpoenas and also to endorse a letter to Burford requesting interviews with five current EPA staffers, including John Hernandez, the deputy administrator, and John Daniel, the chief of staff.

In releasing the hit list on 1 March, Senator Hart explained that it had come from an anonymous tipster, who called to say that this was just one of several such documents made available to Reagan appointees at EPA in 1981. The caller said this political package was collated by Louis Cordia, who worked at the conservative Heritage Foundation, served as a specialist on EPA matters during the transition between the Carter and Reagan Administrations, and now is deputy director of EPA's Office of Federal Activities. Although Hart's staff seemed to know little about the source of this information, Scheuer's press aide, Marcus Kunian, says it came from a "responsible professional at EPA" who is known to Scheuer and has proved accurate in the past.

The document, which is undated and unsigned, lists 90 scientists by name, and opposite their names gives comments such as the following: "clean air extremist," "smooth but extreme environmentalist," "reported to be liberal and environmentalist," "get him out, horrible," "very good, keep," "get him out fast, extreme anti-nuclear type," and so on. None of the EPA officials contacted by

Science seemed to doubt its authenticity. However, an EPA spokesman did say that it must have been produced by someone outside the agency.

Cordia was quoted in the *Washington Post* as saying the list may have come from one of 15 boxes of documents he was planning to remove from his office on 11 February. Today, he says that he never saw the list before 1 week ago. A *Post* reporter contradicts him, saying Cordia conceded that many personnel checklists like this were prepared during the transition period early in 1981. The 15 boxes, Cordia says, contain excess research materials for which he has no space at EPA. The agency's inspector general has taken them into custody for safekeeping.

Cordia maintains that the hit list, whatever its origins, never played a part in EPA appointments to advisory boards. Although some members of EPA panels believe the agency has been remiss in seeking scientific opinion, nearly all who spoke with *Science* backed Cordia on this point: there has been no ideological purge of the advisory boards. The total number of advisors on standing committees has decreased from around 70 to 37 since 1980, and the number of committees has gone down from five to three. But most said that EPA had retained a fair balance of opinion.

"I haven't seen anything to make me believe they have manipulated the scientists," says Karim Ahmed of the Natural Resources Defense Council, an outsider who frequently testifies against EPA actions. Edward Ferrand, New York City's chief air quality official and a member of EPA's science board for 8 years, said the same. "I'm a Democrat and I could be described as an environmental liberal," Ferrand says. "I know they got rid of a lot of people, but I haven't noticed any drastic change" in the kind of appointments made.

Terry Yosie, EPA's executive director of the science advisory board, describes the hit list as "unfair and reprehensible." He says he "totally disavows" the document: "Whoever prepared it was not dealing from a full deck." Yosie says he did not consult with Cordia in making nominations to the board, and "to the best of my knowledge," hit lists like this one were not used to screen candidates.

EPA has been criticized for shrinking the size of the advisory board and for failing to appoint any women or minority members. Yosie reports that he is now planning to expand the board's size from the present 37 members to "between 50 and 60." Why? Looking over the agenda for 1983, Yosie saw that "we have an expanded work load." EPA apparently is considering advertising the new vacancies in order to create a large pool of candidates.

—ELIOT MARSHALL