

July 11, 1974

MEMORANDUM TO: E.S. Nuspliger
The Society of the Plastics Industry, Inc.

SUBJECT: BNA Coverage of OSHA Hearings

A brief tabulation of the coverage of the OSHA hearings in the BNA Occupational Safety and Health Reporter strongly suggests that SPI acted quite wisely in its decision to cooperate fully with the press vis-a-vis the distribution of the Arthur D. Little data, the "position" press release, and complete copies of the SPI testimony.

Of 111 1/4 column inches of coverage in the June 27 and July 4 issues of the Reporter, SPI accounted for a full 62 inches, or more than 55 percent of the total. Dr. Selikoff, on the other hand, earned only 6 3/4 inches, OSHA 7 3/4, and NIOSH 8.

The June 27 issue, which covered only the first day of hearings, carried 6 3/4 inches of SPI testimony, based solely on the "position" press release. SPI, as you know, did not testify on the first day and had it not been for the "early" distribution of the press release, would not have been included at all. Instead, SPI earned the lead in the subsequent article. The July 4 lead was also based on SPI testimony.

As a comparison, DOW, whose testimony and cross-examination lasted approximately six hours, received only 4 1/4 inches of coverage, largely because DOW did not make copies of its presentations available to the press.

Not included in the above calculations is an 11 inch story in the June 27 issue on the A.D. Little findings. This story was based on the SPI press release of June 20.

We believe the above comparisons demonstrate the advantages that accrued to SPI as a result of its decision to place its story in the hands of the press at the earliest possible moment.



Matthew M. Swetonic

CC: R.L. Harding, J. Lawrence, J. Kiss, Jim Moore, T. McGrath
D. White, J. Blizin, W. Durbin, C. Thompson, J. Callaghan

BFG24357

23217070