SUMMARY OF 16 ISSUES

Investigation of No-Bid NIDCR/FDA contract with consultants LSRO Inc., and BETAH Associates, Inc. Case No. 2004-99:

Contract:

**Issue 1**: Did NIDCR officials Lawrence Tabak, Norman Braveman, and Marion Blevins attempt to circumvent the competitive bidding laws?

**Issue 2**: Did Tabak, Braveman, and Blevins generally engage in activities designed to cover up their violations by creating a façade of legality?

**Issue 3**: Did Tabak, Braveman, and FDA’s Runner put together an “outcome biased” study?

**Issue 4**: Did Director Tabak provide false or deceptive testimony to Congress about the LSRO/BETAH deal?

**Issue 5**: Did NIDCR take over what was really an FDA project?

**Issue 6**: Did Braveman – along with Runner, “subcontractor” LSRO, and “contractor” BETAH – shut interested citizens and consumer groups out of the process, despite assurances to the contrary?

**Issue 7**: Did BETAH willingly accept its role as the strawperson contractor, in light of its lack of expertise to do scientific studies, or was it pressured into going along with the scheme out of fear of losing other NIH business?

**Issue 8**: Did the participants misrepresent the contract as a “conference” instead of a “study”?

**Issue 9**: Did LSRO secretly negotiate a contract, even though it was neither an existing contractor, nor a sole source supplier, nor the winner of a competitive bid?

**Issue 10**: Did LSRO conduct an “independent” scientific inquiry?

**Issue 11**: Were the violations at the low level or did they involve higher-ups?

**Issue 12**: Were the violations inadvertent or intentional?

**Issue 13**: Is NIDCR engaged in a pattern of paying dentists to conduct sham studies on amalgam that rarely, if ever, get completed or published? How many millions of dollars have been wasted in the process?

**Issue 14**: Is NIDCR contracting with dentists and failing to provide proper disclosure of risks in its mercury experiments in other studies, e.g., on Portuguese orphans and low-income American children?

**Issue 15**: Is having NIDCR contract with dentists to do “independent” studies of amalgam an inherent conflict of interest, as critics such as Senator Lautenberg maintain? Or does it create, at a minimum, the appearance of a conflict of interest?

**Issue 16**: Is having dentists – instead of toxicologists – in charge of NIH studies to determine the toxicological effects of mercury on the neurological system and body organs an imprudent misuse of taxpayer-funded research?