

OBJECTIVES OF NBC CONTACT

1. To alert the NBC news staff to the fact the lead industry is not going to accept biased and distorted reporting without a fight.
2. To acquaint other news media of this fact.
3. To obtain a more balanced network report of approximately equal time, but not simply a rebuttal.

OBJECTIONS TO NBC CHRONOLOG

1. What do we have on the animal situation? Are there any on record that don't show paint involvement? What are these cats referred to, how high was the lead, which is called "very high"? Can Dr. Zook refute this section? (Page 1)
2. Is strebel correct? Is 500 ppm right? (Page 2)
3. Utley comment on autos poisoning zoo animals is almost demonstrably wrong. (Page 2)
4. Is there any real evidence that babies being born today have high lead levels . . . ??? (Does this happen if Mom has it?) (Page 2)
5. Utley's comment "heavily contaminated with lead" is wrong. (Page 2)
6. Is there any way to check Newfield's comments? Is it true that a re-poisoning is a "guarantee of permanent brain damage?" (Page 3)
7. Chamberlain statement is most confusing and hard to know whether wrong or right because who says let's wait about lead-paint-eating children? (Page 5)
8. The ceramic soup bowls did not leach lead from the glaze but from an added inside decal which was not coated with anything. (Page 7)
9. Something should have been said about the U.S.P.A., LIA, and the FDA program. And while the comment about legislation is technically correct -- nothing (as I understand it) specifically about ceramics, the present legislation does give FDA authority to set up regulations, control lead content, and re-call pottery in violation -- which is the force of law whether specifically on this or not . . . so this is very misleading and really wrong. Fact is there is law covering this situation. (Page 9 and 10)
10. Diesel trucks were photographed at close range as lead in gas was discussed. Diesel fuel does not contain lead.
11. Presumably this 7% per year comes from a calculation of the Seven-City Study -- but it is not a correct interpretation, is it? (Page 11)
12. Pasadena housewife study was quoted out of context. (Page 11)
13. This Kennedy statement is wrong. (Page 11)
14. Have we seen anything of reports of lead in rainwater being "very close" to danger level for drinking water? What about that Geological survey report on stream water to show lead content not high there? (Page 11)

15. NAS document refutes Chow but not mentioned. (Page 11)
16. Chow says half lead you breathe is absorbed -- is this in range? Think NAS sticks with about 35-37. (Page 12)
17. 10,000 natural level? What is actually lowest air measurement? And what is ambient in LA? Could it be 10,000 times? (Page 13)
18. Newfield and Kennedy obviously talking about childhood lead poisoning but this was put in lead in gas segment. (Page 12)
19. What is Frost going to say about this? (Page 13)
20. On the whole Ruckelshaus thing, the NAS document doesn't back up Ruckelshaus . . . And the NAS review was not even mentioned, though it is a definitive scientific report on the subject. (Page 13-14)
21. Utley is stating "abolish" lead gasoline in stronger terms than Ruckelshaus . . . who says phasing out, was hedging, but was being pushed into a stronger position by Utley, who re-states Ruckelshaus' position stronger than does the EPA head. (Page 15)
22. Utley's windup says, in effect, that the problem of lead is new. It is not. That there's not much scientific knowledge about it. There is -- more than any similar substance. That study of lead in food has not been done. It has. That lead is a "clear and present danger" to the entire population. It is not. (Page 16)