

CONFIDENTIAL TO

U. S. GYPSUM

Blumberg No. 6113

PLAINTIFF'S  
EXHIBIT

US6-218

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                               | <u>PAGE</u> |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------|
| <b>PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS</b>                |             |
| Introduction .....                            | 1           |
| Situation Analysis .....                      | 2           |
| Objectives .....                              | 6           |
| Strategies .....                              | 7           |
| <b>COMMUNICATIONS POLICIES AND PROCEDURES</b> |             |
| Introduction .....                            | 22          |
| Information Sharing .....                     | 23          |
| Media Contact .....                           | 25          |
| News Dissemination .....                      | 27          |

## **APPENDICES**

PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

## INTRODUCTION

U.S. Gypsum has asked Hill and Knowlton to prepare an action program outlining communications ideas that might be useful in supporting its current legal efforts with regard to asbestos in school ceilings. It has also asked that we prepare a memorandum outlining steps that should be taken in the event of media contact on the issue. The first part of this memorandum addresses the first area, the second, the latter.

This memorandum builds upon our January 11 memo. Approved recommendations and projected timetables are contained in the Appendices.

At the outset, we should point out that communications is not a talisman for "making an issue go away." The asbestos controversy is here to stay, and as we pointed out in our original memorandum to U.S. Gypsum, it may be that the company cannot "win" in any conventional sense. However, we believe that communications activities, carefully deployed in areas that are communications-sensitive, can support its immediate objectives as well as effectively minimize negative attention from key audiences.

The following situation analysis provides the rationale for recommended objectives and activities.

SITUATION ANALYSIS

As a starting point in examining this complex assignment, we looked at the eventual, cumulative impact asbestos litigation could have on the company. Potential scenarios are:

- o That the company could become involved in so many recovery suits that resources must be diverted to "putting out the brush fires" at the expense of focused, planned, positive communications.
- o That a first ruling against the company, or any other company involved in this type of litigation, could, by its legal precedent, trigger a domino effect, adversely affecting the outcome of other suits. (The opposite is a possibility, of course. In that case, a clear legal precedent would obviously serve to vindicate the company, obviating the need to carry out planned communications contingency activities.)
- o That one or more adverse jury decisions could alarm the financial community as well as the company's shareholders.
- o That as asbestos litigation continues, especially if jury decisions go against the company or other corporate defendants, publicity about the suits can bubble up into the national media. This could

result in attendant negative consequences for the company as a purveyor of what is popularly thought to be extremely hazardous material.

Examination of the above scenarios suggests that the pivotal point in the company's overall defense against recovery suits is a clearcut, favorable verdict in the first case -- whether the defendant in the case is U.S. Gypsum or another. Targeting the case which the company's lawyers (and perhaps the lawyers of another company) believe has the best chance of winning should be the primary task of U.S. Gypsum's legal staff. It is our judgment that this is a key public relations strategy.

Planning, however, should take into account several other considerations.

First, asbestos, like nuclear energy and other pariahs of the 1980s, is an emotionally charged issue. Opponents who might ordinarily be considered knowledgeable, and here we include the EPA, make no differentiation between the various types of asbestos and the hazards associated with each. As a result, all asbestos materials are popularly considered to be extremely dangerous.

Second, the issue of asbestos has not remained on any local level. It is a national issue, in every sense of the word. The federal government has made it a concern. The networks have covered it. Huge corporations have been tarnished by it, even assuming they have escaped major

financial damage. The issue of asbestos, therefore, has stayed in the public's eye -- without any convincing product or hazard differentiation.

Third, corporations whose names have been linked with asbestos, and here we are thinking primarily of Johns-Manville, are widely seen as abrogating legitimate corporate responsibilities. Moreover, in some cases, this perception goes further -- some corporations linked with asbestos are viewed as having guilty knowledge about the dangers of asbestos.

In general, public opinion on the issue can be summarized as follows: People know about asbestos, and they believe it is extremely dangerous. And, they know they can't trust corporations to deal with the issue in good-faith. In areas where asbestos in schools have created local controversies, public sentiment on asbestos can be assumed to be that much more vehement. In our judgment, the broader public climate will have a direct relationship to what verdicts juries bring in on asbestos litigation.

An additional important point is that U.S. Gypsum is not in this alone. Legal and communications positions taken by other companies involved in this controversy can directly, and perhaps adversely, impact the company.

Finally, the question of preemptive briefings of selected national media, particularly media who might be supposed sympathetic to business, has been discussed.

There are obvious risks in this course, most notably that of raising the issue prematurely. Nevertheless, we believe there are certain "trigger points" that indicate the on-set of national media attention. (They are described below.) An important strategy is to recognize those points, and move quickly to put the company's story before the media in a timely fashion once those trigger points have occurred.

The following examines these considerations in terms of objectives, and strategies.

### OBJECTIVES

As we see it, U.S. Gypsum's communications efforts should fall into two distinct phases. The first phase should encompass the time between now and the first verdict. The second phase should encompass time beyond that, as appropriate at that juncture. (If an unfavorable verdict is rendered in the first case or in the first series of cases, the likelihood is that communications activities should shift immediately to the financial arena.) Phasing a program in this manner suggests that communications objectives should necessarily be shorter-term rather than otherwise. Based upon the reasoning in our situation analysis, we see three immediate communications objectives:

- o To concentrate public relations resources, as appropriate, in support of winning a favorable, clear-cut verdict in the first test case.
- o To assist in creating a more balanced public opinion climate in both the initial test case market, and nationally so that jurors sitting on this case and subsequent ones will not suffer the onus of acting directly against popular public opinion.
- o To position U.S. Gypsum as a socially responsible corporate citizen acting not only in the best

interests of its shareholders, but also in the best interests of people exposed to its products.

The achievement of these communications objectives, indeed, the success of any of the activities outlined in this program, assumes close and on-going liaison with U.S. Gypsum communicators and planners and with its legal counsel, both in-house and on retainer.

STRATEGIES

- o Develop a coalition with other affected corporations, either as a separate effort, or under the aegis of an appropriate trade organization. ✓
- o Identify that case which has the best chance of winning a clear-cut victory for the company (and other affected companies) and build supporting public relations activities around it. ✓
- o In the event of a possible, initial adverse verdict, seek to go on the public record first. ]
- o Use the arguments presented in the winning case to build compelling reasons for school boards to desist from filing additional recovery and punitive suits.
- o Organize a third-party panel of independent experts to be available for testimony, commentary and technical support in appropriate markets and forums. ] *pay panel vs advice*
- o Begin to capture "share of mind" on the national level.
- o Lay the groundwork for immediate response to trigger points which suggest the on-set of national media attention.

STRATEGY: Form an industry coalition with members confronted by similar suits.

One of the most salient facts in any public opinion review of the asbestos issue is that industry has failed to communicate its position on any of the issue's various aspects. This vacuum frees activists to make allegations that remain publicly unchallenged.

Moreover, a segmented industry, with each member acting on its own behalf, runs several risks. First, overall strategies can conflict, with detrimental results to individual members. For example, W.R. Grace could decide that an aggressive public posture is in its benefit. This could be directly in conflict with other companies' strategies, including U.S. Gypsum's.

Second, and perhaps even more important, a single company confronting what has become a national issue does not have the manpower or the resources to effectively challenge or modify preconceptions. As we have noted, we believe the public opinion climate could have a direct relationship to verdicts in these cases. However, resource sharing and concerted action can shore up credibility and maximize impact.

Third, we believe that the first unfavorable verdict could have a domino effect, adversely influencing verdicts in other cases where the issues are similar. A clear-cut victory for the industry, widely publicized, could have the

opposite impact. Information sharing will be key to the success of this strategy.

We believe the critical first task is to develop a united industry front on the issues. If this is the only achievement obtained by an industry coalition, we believe it will have been well worth the effort.

However, the effort should go much further -- with other benefits for all members.

An active industry coalition serving as an information source and media response mechanism could also act to deflect attention away from affected companies. It, in effect, could take the heat from the press and activist industry critics. (This would be, of course, particularly beneficial in a highly publicized verdict against the company or the industry.) Moreover, combining resources and manpower should enable the industry to compete effectively for "share of mind" on the issue.

*Group - viable*  
*not any*  
*if it's possible to get them together*

If U.S. Gypsum agrees that our reasoning here is sound, and takes the initiative in forming such a coalition, to some extent further strategies and tactics, already discussed and under discussion here, would depend upon policy and position decisions made by the coalition.

*used a*  
*Apologize*

Hill and Knowlton has had considerable experience and success with organizing such coalitions and would be happy to assist U.S. Gypsum in organizing one.

STRATEGY: Identify that case which has the best chance of winning a clear-cut favorable jury verdict, and build supporting public relations around it.

*may be kept  
on call*

For maximum effectiveness, this strategy assumes industry-wide participation (although U.S. Gypsum could, if it chose pursue it unilaterally). It is also a legal as well as a public relations strategy.

From the stand-point of public relations, the most effective victory is one which defines the issues clearly: There are no proven health hazards associated with Audicote, or another similar product; and, the manufacturer of Audicote, and similar products, and not liable for recovery costs and/or punitive damages.

The company's attorneys, in concert with attorneys from other affected companies, will have to determine the case which in their view has the best chance of winning. The second element of the strategy is for attorneys to seek delaying actions in other pending cases, while seeking to move the "winnable" case forward.

Once the verdict has been delivered, and it is, as anticipated, favorable, Hill and Knowlton will immediately move a major press release over its national network. To build on the momentum, we will schedule interviews with major national business and general interest publications. In addition, interviews with science and environmental media

will be scheduled for company representatives and third-party experts supporting the verdict.

The benefit to the company, and to the industry, of a full-scale publicity program at that point is to help create a public opinion climate whereby other favorable verdicts will follow. In addition, wide-spread publicity regarding a favorable verdict can have the effect of forcing school boards to consider the costs of losing a case, thereby having the net effect of fewer suits against the company. *contingency*  
*loss*

Moreover, national news coverage of the favorable verdict can help build a "record" the company can use to its benefit in other contexts.

STRATEGY: In the event of a possible, initial adverse verdict, seek to go on the public record first.

This back-up strategy assumes the possibility of an adverse ruling coming before the favorable target case. If this, according to legal staff, is a strong possibility then we believe the company should give serious consideration to settling the case out-of-court and claiming a "victory."

The rationale is to ensure there is no prejudicial public record involving asbestos in schools litigation.

The second element in this strategy is to target publicity at selected markets, again with the same rationale.

STRATEGY: Use the arguments presented in the winning case to build compelling reasons for school boards to desist from filing recovery and punitive suits.

School boards, at present, have no compelling reason not to file a recovery suit against manufacturers. The cost/benefit argument holds no water, as school boards are not concerned with the costs to the manufacturers. The argument noting acceptable alternatives (re-painting the ceiling or otherwise sealing it) carries no weight in the face of cries for the elimination of all asbestos in the school. The scientific data could be construed as ambiguous. And, finally, there is the question of personal liability in the event the asbestos becomes a risk. (Arguments of comparative risks, e.g., risks of smoking versus asbestos, are ineffective in a society that demands risk-free guarantees, and if they are used, they should be immediately dropped from public statements.)

A clear-cut victory for the company, however, obviously changes all that. In that case, presumably, the school board will have to absorb removal costs, making the cost/benefit argument a credible, and compelling one.

Immediately following the first case, therefore, we recommend the company develop a presentation based on the issues decided in that case for company spokespeople invited to address school boards. In addition, the company should present the benefits of alternatives to removal. In addition,

we suggest the company consider offering to repaint the ceiling itself, as a socially responsible corporation.

STRATEGY: Organize a third-party panel of independent experts to be available for testimony, commentary and technical support in appropriate markets and forums.

Several important benefits can be derived from organizing this type of panel. First, as already noted, asbestos manufacturers, like industry proponents of nuclear energy a few years ago, have little, if any, credibility. Evidence adduced by recognized, independent experts, in tandem with the company's own, can significantly heighten credibility. (This kind of backing could also shore up the wavering school board member who may not be convinced removal is the most efficient or appropriate action.)

Second, the scientific evidence supporting the allegation of health hazards posed by these products is ambiguous -- and can be interpreted different ways. Nevertheless, how the science is read will have a major impact on verdicts. And, the preponderance of the evidence appears to be on side of the plaintiffs. (The government, presumably a disinterested party, has thrown all its weight behind total removal of asbestos in schools.)

One important use of this panel could be to request that it review the EPA protocol used in arriving at conclusions. This, then could be incorporated into both legal and public relations strategies.

Third, an independent panel, like the proposed coalition, could help deflect attention away from affected

companies. Technical questions, etc., could be referred to panel members, for example. And, answers would have that much more credibility coming from third-party sources.

Fourth, one notable result of the asbestos controversy is the public perception of corporations shunning their social responsibilities. A panel, funded by, but independent of, the industry could go a long way in ameliorating that perception.

As mentioned, the panel should be funded by all the industries cooperating in the coalition. And the coalition should make a public statement that while it is providing funding, conclusions and recommendations are entirely those

of the panel. (Two caveats occur here. First, participating companies should make their position clear at the outset, but necessarily, distinguish their position from any arrived at by the panel. Second, to be truly independent, the panel must be balanced -- members should be included who in the past may have had questions and concerns about the issue.)

Members of the panel should be available to school boards, on request. They should be available to undertake technical assignments, e.g., review of EPA protocol, etc. Finally, they should be available to the media and for other forums (speech platforms, etc.) as appropriate.

We should point out that while the conception of the panel stems from public relations considerations, it could, used appropriately, provide a decisive turning point in the

national debate over asbestos, thus performing an extraordinary public service.

STRATEGY: Begin to capture "share of mind" on the national level.

This strategy has already been discussed with the company, and involves placing interviews and by-lined articles by experts sympathetic to the company's point of view.

While we believe this strategy has considerable merit, we suggest actual placement efforts should be delayed until the company (or the coalition) decides upon a panel of experts.

Our reasoning is this: Hill and Knowlton could arrange for a series of interviews and for several prestigious article placements. However, in that case, the expert has already delivered his opinion of the controversy, and naming him to the panel loses impact. (He appears to come to the panel with preconceived ideas.)

Moreover, the news value of commentary by specially appointed panel experts commenting on their findings, particularly if critical of government-backed research, is much greater than opinion pieces which are not tied apparently to current news.

We are in the initial stages of identifying and meeting with experts. If, therefore, the company rejects the notion of a panel, we can move immediately to begin placement efforts.

STRATEGY: Lay the groundwork for immediate response to trigger points which suggest the on-set of national media attention.

Again, this strategy has already been discussed, and approval received for beginning materials development (contingent upon receipt of transcripts from the company). In addition, Hill and Knowlton has interviewed suggested spokespersons preparatory to media training. Finally, a media list is under development now. (Part one of the media list, selected health and environmental writers is contained in the appendices to this document. Part two, selected national business and financial writers will be forwarded to the company within a day or so, while Part three, local reporters following the company, will be provided by U.S. Gypsum communicators.) Finally, as we mentioned, recommended communications policies and procedures are contained in Part Two of this memorandum.

The point here is to discuss those "triggers" which could signal the on-set of intense media exposure.

We understand the company has been asked to provide a spokesman for Ch. 5, WMAQ, Chicago, an NBC affiliate, sometime next week. Because Ch.5 is a network affiliate, there is the possibility that the interview could be carried over other network stations. This, then, should be considered a trigger.

Although the McNeil/Lehrer show has not yet aired, it, too, should be considered a trigger, as it is highly regarded in the journalistic community, and has frequently been in the lead in breaking stories of national importance. (At the time of this writing no broadcast time has been set.)

— Local inquiries from stringers representing national media should be considered possible triggers.

Similarly, reports in major regional newspapers should be considered triggers, particularly if the newspaper owns a syndication.

Finally, inquiries from free-lancers, particularly well-regarded free-lancers, should be considered triggers.

Almost more important than consideration of what constitutes a trigger (the argument can be made credibly that any media inquiry is a trigger), is company response.

In our judgment, the company should use these inquiries (Ch. 5, McNeil/Lehrer, etc.) to present its position and begin to compete for "share of mind." Alternatively, the company could use appropriate inquiries to announce actions, the formation of an independent panel, etc., that position it in a positive light.

The next section suggests policies and procedures that accomplish this in an orderly, timely fashion.

COMMUNICATIONS POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

## INTRODUCTION

The key to the effectiveness of any communications program is for the personnel conducting it to retain on-going close communications. This is particularly important in this case as U.S. Gypsum is confronting issues of national as well as corporate significance.

The involvement of several U.S. Gypsum departments, Hill and Knowlton, and potentially, other players, suggests that, at least initially, some firm groundrules are established. Once the information-sharing process is fully established, groundrules can be modified or eliminated as circumstances dictate.

Here we present check-lists, or flow-sheets, as guides to three central tasks: information-sharing; media contact; and, news dissemination.

INFORMATION-SHARING

In this context, information-sharing by the legal department is crucial. Indeed, little can be accomplished without it. However, we recognize that personnel assigned to asbestos litigation are preoccupied, and are sensitive about adding substantially to their responsibilities. We suggest the following:

- o Automatic copies to the Senior Vice President of Corporate Relations and Planning of all internal memos and other relevant documents regarding the controversy. Similarly, we believe Hill and Knowlton should also be copied. (We are thoroughly aware of the confidentiality of the assignment. Only selected personnel have been advised of our participation and records and memos have been sequestered. However, we must strongly emphasize that our potential effectiveness is nullified without adequate information.)
- o Weekly meetings, in person or by conference call, should be established for up-dating and strategy review. The legal department should be given the responsibility for naming the time and place for the meetings, since their court schedules will be less flexible. Participants should include the Senior Vice President of Corporate Relations and Planning (or his designate) and Gordon Smith, Hill

and Knowlton, as well as the legal department representative, and retained counsel, if necessary. They, in turn, will have the responsibility of communicating decisions and developments with their staff.

- o Other meetings with the legal department, corporate relations and planning and Hill and Knowlton will be arranged as necessary for planning and strategizing. (Hill and Knowlton personnel are available to meet wherever is most convenient for U.S. Gypsum.)
- o Hill and Knowlton will provide the legal department, the Senior Vice President of Corporate Relations and Planning and his staff as designated with detailed conference reports, following up on meetings, and conference calls.
- o Hill and Knowlton will provide the Senior Vice President of Corporate Relations and Planning with detailed monthly activity reports outlining all activities carried out on behalf of U.S. Gypsum during the previous month. We will also provide the legal department with monthly reports.

MEDIA CONTACT:  
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The following policies and procedures should apply to all contacts by the media. In outlining them, we have assumed that corporate spokesmen have received media training. (In addition, we would suggest that as a precaution, Suzanne Torrey receive training. Although we recognize that because of her duties, she will not be designated an official spokesperson, nothing can prevent the surprise stand-up, stand-alone interview in the corridors of a court. We believe it would be wise to prepare her for this eventuality.)

- o All divisions and division spokespeople, corporate secretaries, etc., who might be likely to take a call from the media should be advised they are not to comment on asbestos litigation.
- o All calls, instead, should be referred to Paul Colitti, who should have responsibility for screening them.
- o Although Colitti does not, should not, respond to inquiries on the spot, he should ask what the reporter's deadline is, and seek to accomodate it.
- o If calls come through as messages from the media, Colitti should call back that day to determine the nature of the inquiry. Again, a response need not be immediate unless Colitti is repeating an approved corporate position or dealing with a

routine matter. What is important, however, is for Colitti to convey a sense of cooperation.

- o Having received a call, or having taken a message, Colitti should notify Hill and Knowlton, which can provide U.S. Gypsum available intelligence on that reporter, and when appropriate, available samples of his work. This should give us a good idea of the way individual reporters treat their stories, thereby helping us manage news dissemination.

o Colitti should then notify the Vice President of Corporate Relations and Planning of the contact.

If the contact is routine, that is, if policy regarding that inquiry has already been developed, then notification could take the form of a log - entry (include Hill and Knowlton intelligence) so U.S. Gypsum can keep track of calls. If the inquiry regards matters that have not already been discussed, or acted upon, Colitti should meet with the Vice President of Corporate Relations and Planning to decide policy. The meeting should include Hill and Knowlton and, if appropriate, a representative of the legal staff.

*What is strategy of response*

- o At that point, it should be decided whether a Hill and Knowlton representative should sit-in on the interview to monitor its course, and provide additional guidance if necessary.

NEWS DISSEMINATION:  
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

As the program gets underway, U.S. Gypsum will have occasion to disseminate news to the media. The following policies and procedures will ensure timely, orderly dissemination.

- o Once the decision has been made to release news or information, Hill and Knowlton should either write or review the release to ensure it has maximum potential for pick-up.
- o In addition, the determination should be made at that point, in consultation with Hill and Knowlton, whether it best serves the company's interests to release the news widely -- through our national network -- or to release it through one reporter. At that point, working with U.S. Gypsum, Hill and Knowlton will advise on appropriate timing for the release.
- o Once the release has been written and reviewed, it should be circulated through U.S. Gypsum's internal approval process. We recommend that the company move now to establish an expedient approval process, so that news is not held up. We also suggest that one person be given responsibility

for sheperding releases through the process, to help ensure there are no delays.

- o When the release has been approved, it should be sent, by messenger or by telecopy, to Hill and Knowlton. Hill and Knowlton will type the release and copy it on U.S. Gypsum stationery and hold it for release until it receives an official go-ahead from U.S. Gypsum.
- o As a precautionary measure, Hill and Knowlton will read the release word for word, comma by comma, to a U.S. Gypsum representative before releasing it. (We have found this a useful check against inadvertent errors and/or last minute corporate changes.)
- o Upon a phone call from U.S. Gypsum authorizing release, Hill and Knowlton will put it out through appropriate channels -- general and business wires, national and selected local media, including newspapers, magazines, broadcast media, the PR newswire, etc.
- o Immediately after release, Hill and Knowlton will begin monitoring for pick-up on our Dow Jones News Service, Reuters, and Associated Press wires, and report coverage to U.S. Gypsum at once.

APPENDIX A\*\*\*

APPROVED PROJECTS

Position Paper

Position Paper Summary

Questions and Answers

Media List Development

Spokesperson Identification

Spokesperson Training

TIMETABLE

10-12 days following receipt of company transcripts.

13-14 days following receipt of transcripts.

13-14 days following receipt of transcripts.

Part one enclosed;  
Part two by Monday, Jan. 23;  
Part three supplied by company.

Interviewing completed.

To be determined.

\*\*\* Until all of the position paper materials have been developed, it is important that a brief position statement be written. This will concisely give the four or five key points the company wants to make. These points should be the primary themes of the company's position.

APPENDIX B

SCIENCE AND ENVIRONMENT MEDIA

Ms. Isabel S. Abrams  
Freelance & Science Editor  
Science Challenge,  
Current Health 2  
2216 Schiller Avenue  
Wilmette, IL 60091  
312-251-8935

Mr. Jerry L. Ackerman  
Environment/Energy Writer  
The Boston Globe  
Boston, MA 02107  
617-929-3157

Mr. Kenneth Anderson  
Editorial Director  
Publishers Editorial Services, Inc.  
P. O. Box 247  
Katonah, NY 10536  
914-232-7816

Mr. Robert Bazell  
Science Correspondent  
NBC News  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, NY 10020  
212-664-4375

Dr. Irving S. Bengelsdorf  
Contrib. Science Columnist  
Los Angeles Herald Examiner  
Tech. Writer-Specialist  
Jet Propulsion Lab  
170 S. Orange Dr.  
Los Angeles, CA 90036  
213-577-9467

Mr. Jules Bergman  
Science Editor  
ABC News  
7 West 66th St.  
New York, NY 10023  
212-887-3988

Mr. Jerry E. Bishop  
The Wall Street Journal  
22 Cortlandt Street  
New York, NY 10007  
212-285-5106

Mr. Philip M. Boffey  
Science Policy Reporter  
The New York Times  
1000 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036  
202-862-0376

Mr. Joseph R. Botta  
Senior Editor  
Consumer Reports  
256 Washington Avenue  
Mount Vernon, NY 10550  
914-667-9400

Ms. Mary Jo Boyd  
Science Digest  
888 Seventh Avenue  
New York, NY 10106  
212-262-4160

Mr. David R. Branch  
Southeast Bureau Chief  
International Medical News Group  
1099 S. W. Ninth Terrace  
Boca Raton, FL 33432  
305-392-2612

Ms. Gail F. Bronson  
Money Magazine  
Time Inc.  
1271 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10020  
212-841-4805

Mr. Anthony Boyd  
Freelance Writer  
85-17 57 Road  
Elmhurst, Queen, NY 11373  
212-779-2259

Mr. Gene Bylinsky  
Associate Editor  
Fortune Magazine  
Time-Life Bldg.  
Rockefeller Center  
New York, NY 10020  
212-841-2805

Mr. Thomas Y. Canby  
Senior Writer  
National Geographic Magazine  
17 & M Streets, N.W.  
Washington, DC 22203  
202-857-7257

Mr. John Carey  
Science Reporter  
Newsweek  
444 Madison Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
212-350-2447

Mr. Joseph Carey  
Medical Writer  
USA TODAY  
Box 7852  
Washington, DC 20044  
202-276-3785

Ms. Carla Carlson  
Science Writer  
U.S.-Information Agency  
400 C Street, S.W.  
Room 456  
Washington, DC 20547  
202-724-9435

Ms. Kay Cassill  
Special Correspondent  
People Magazine  
22 Boylston Avenue  
Providence, RI 02906  
401-751-4949

Mr. Laurence B. Cherry  
Freelance  
5284 Post Road  
Bronx, NY 10471  
212-543-9272

Mr. Evert Clark  
Technology News Editor  
McGraw-Hill World News  
Washington Bureau  
400 National Press Bldg.  
Washington, DC 20045  
202-624-7390

Mr. Matt Clark  
Medicine Editor  
Newsweek  
444 Madison Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
212-350-2442

Mr. Victor Cohn  
Science & Medical Writer  
The Washington Post  
1150 15th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20071  
202-334-7337

Mr. B. D. Colen  
Science/Medical Columnist  
Newsday, Inc.  
Long Island, NY 11747  
516-454-29455

Mr. Joseph F. Collier  
Medical Writer  
Cleveland Press  
4182 Giles Road  
Moreland Hills, OH 44022  
216-247-6542

Mr. Robert W. Cooke  
Science Editor  
The Boston Globe  
Boston, MA 02107  
617-929-3064

Mr. Lewis Cope  
Staff Writer  
The Minneapolis Star & Tribune  
425 Portland Avenue  
Minneapolis, MN 55488  
612-372-4426

Mr. Robert M. Corbett  
Science Writer  
San Diego Evening Tribune  
P. O. Box 191  
San Diego, CA 92112  
714-299-3131

Mr. Robert C. Cowen  
Natural Science Editor  
The Christian Science Monitor  
One Norway Street  
Boston, MA 02115  
617-262-2300

Ms. Barbara Cullitan  
News Editor  
Science Magazine  
1515 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005  
202-467-4430

Mr. Julian DeVries  
Medical Editor  
The Arizona Republic  
P. O. Box 1950  
Phoenix, AZ 85001  
602-271-8212

Mr. Joseph Donohue  
Science Writer  
Atlantic City Press  
Devins Lane  
Pleasantville, NY 08232  
609-645-1234

Mr. Laszlo Dosa  
Science Editor  
Voice of America  
Washington, DC 20547  
202-755-4800

Mr. Donald C. Drake  
Medical Writer  
The Philadelphia Inquirer  
400 N. Broad St.  
Philadelphia, PA 19101  
215-854-2544

Mr. Edward Edelson  
Science Editor  
New York Daily News  
220 E. 42nd St.  
New York, NY 10017  
212-949-3750

Mr. Lee Edson  
Freelance  
36 Iron Gate Road  
Stamford, CN 06903  
203-322-8791

Mr. Arthur Fisher  
Science Editor  
Popular Science  
Times Mirror Magazines  
380 Madison Avenue  
New York, NY 10017  
212-687-3000

Mr. Dennis Flanagan  
Editor  
Scientific American  
415 Madison Avenue  
New York, NY 10017  
212-688-3900

Ms. Ira Flatow  
Science Reporter  
National Public Radio  
801 Second Avenue  
#701  
New York, NY 10017  
212-490-2444

Mr. Jon Franklin  
Science Writer  
The Evening Sun  
P. O. Box 1377  
Baltimore, MD 21278  
301-332-6457

Mr. Donald J. Frederick  
Writer/Editor  
News Service  
National Geographic Society  
Washington, DC 20036  
202-857-7760

Mr. Arthur S. Freese  
Freelance  
137 East 36 Street  
New York, NY 10016  
212-532-3010

Mr. Lawrence Galton  
Freelance  
1140 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10028  
212-722-6824

Mr. Robert Gannon  
Freelance  
127 E. Curtin Street  
Bellafonte, PA 16823  
814-355-4800

Mr. Max Lawrence Gates  
Science Writer  
The Ann Arbor News  
340 East Huron  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106  
313-994-6838

Ms. Ruth Mehrtens Galvin  
Sr. Correspondent  
Time Magazine  
277 Dartmouth Street  
Boston, MA 02116  
617-262-7551

Ms. Ellen Hale  
Gannett News Service  
P. O. Box 7858  
Washington, DC 20044  
703-276-5800

Mr. Alan Hall  
Research Editor  
Business Week  
1221 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10020  
212-997-2799

Ms. Jean Hall  
Medical Editor  
Gannett Westchester Newspapers  
One Gannett Drive  
White Plains, NY 10604  
914-694-5019

Mr. Paul G. Hayes  
Science Reporter  
Milwaukee Journal  
Box 661  
Milwaukee, WI 53201  
414-224-2072

Mr. Philip J. Hilts  
Sci/Tech Writer  
National Staff  
The Washington Post  
1150 15th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20071  
202-334-7437

Mr. Carle Hodge  
Science Writer  
Arizona Republic  
P. O. Box 1950  
Phoenix, AZ 85001  
602-271-8106

Ms. Joan Hollobon  
Medical Reporter  
The Globe & Mail  
444 Front Street, W.  
Toronto, Ont. Canada M5V 2S9  
416-585-5168

Mr. Paul S. Jacobs  
Medical Writer  
Los Angeles Times  
Times-Mirror Square  
Los Angeles, CA 90053  
213-972-7032

Mr. Daniel Kaercher  
Health & Education Editor  
Better Homes and Gardens  
1716 Locust Street  
Des Moines, IA 50336  
515-284-2819

Mr. Fraser Kent  
Freelance  
511 S.W. 23 Road  
Miami, FL 33129  
305-858-2228

Mr. Donald C. Kirkman  
Chief Science Writer  
Scripps-Howard News Service  
1110 Vermont Avenue, N.W.  
Room 610  
Washington, DC 20005  
202-833-9520

Mr. Richard A. Knox  
Medical & Science Writer  
The Boston Globe  
Boston, MA 02107  
617-929-3078

Ms. Mary Knudson  
Medical Writer  
The Baltimore Sun  
501 N. Calvert Street  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
301-332-6171

Mr. Ronald Kotulak  
Science Writer  
Chicago Tribune  
435 N. Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, IL 60611  
312-222-3539

Ms. Alice Lake  
Freelance  
Glendale Road  
Harrison, NY 10528  
914-698-1441

Ms. Lynne Lamberg  
Freelance  
2211 Ken Oak Road  
Baltimore, MD 21209  
301-466-17068

Mr. Earl Lane  
Science Writer  
Newsday  
Suite 1020  
1301 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004  
202-393-5630

Mr. John M. Langone  
Staff Writer  
Discover Magazine  
Time-Life Bldg.  
Rockefeller Center  
New York, NY 10020  
212-841-3519

Mr. Warren Leary  
Science Writer  
Associated Press  
2021 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
202-833-5300

Mr. Paul T. Libassi  
Editor  
The Sciences  
Two East 63 Street  
New York, NY 10021  
212-838-0230 x253

Mr. Bard Lindeman  
Editor  
50 Plus Magazine  
850 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
212-750-1612

Mr. Robert Locke  
Science Writer  
The Associated Press  
1111 South Hill Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90015  
213-746-1200

Ms. Suzanne Loebl  
Freelance  
788 Riverside Drive  
New York, NY 10032  
212-281-4065

Mr. Julian Loewe  
Science Editor  
Pasadena Star-News  
525 East Colorado Blvd.  
Pasadena, CA 91109  
213-578-6460

Ms. Hara Marano  
American Health Partners  
80 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10011

Ms. Gail McBride  
Editor  
JAMA Medical News  
535 North Dearborn  
Chicago, IL 60610  
312-751-6635

Ms. Jean McCann  
Medical News Inc.-National  
International News of Medicine  
2980 Berkshire Road  
Cleveland Heights, OH 44118  
216-932-8025

Ms. Pat S. McCormack  
UPI Health Editor &  
Freelance  
45 Marion Road  
Westport, CT 06880  
212-850-8600

Mr. Kenneth J. McCracken  
Medical Writer  
Rochester Post-Bulletin  
P. O. Box 6118  
Rochester, MN 55901  
507-285-7743

Mr. Kevin S. McKean  
Discover Magazine  
1271 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10020  
212-841-4975

Mr. Donald F. Phillips  
Field Editor  
Hospitals, JAMA  
840 Lake Shore Drive  
Chicago, IL 60611  
312-645-9733

Mr. Henry W. Pierce  
Pittsburgh Post-Gazette  
50 Blvd. of the Allies  
Pittsburgh, PA 15222  
412-263-1565

Mr. Paul M. Raeburn  
Science Writer  
The Associated Press  
50 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, NY 10020  
212-621-1659

Ms. Judith Randal  
Science Correspondent  
New York Daily News (Wash. Bureau)  
Room 407  
2101 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037  
202-467-6670

Mr. David H. Rhinelanders  
Medical/Science Writer  
Hartford Courant  
285 Broad Street  
Hartford, CT 06115  
203-241-6545

Ms. Carol Ann Rinzler  
Freelance  
160 East 48 Street  
New York, NY 10017  
212-355-3257

Ms. Joann E. Rodgers  
Science Writer  
Hearst Newspaper  
301 E. Lombard Street  
Baltimore, MD 21203  
301-528-8815

Mr. Neil D. Rosenberg  
Medical Reporter  
Milwaukee Journal  
P. O. Box 661  
Milwaukee, WI 53201  
414-224-2327

Mr. Al Rossiter, Jr.  
Science Editor  
United Press International  
315 National Press Bldg.  
Washington, DC 20045  
202-393-3430

Mr. Stephen A. Rothman  
Medical Writer  
The Post  
c/o 6600 Parker Avenue  
W. Palm Beach, FL 33405  
305-837-4429

Mr. William Rubin  
Editor  
International Medical News Group  
12230 Wilkins Avenue  
Rockville MD 20852  
301-770-6170

Ms. Cristine Russell  
National Staff  
The Washington Post  
1150 15th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20071  
202-334-7466

Mr. Richard Saltus  
Science Writer  
San Francisco Examiner  
110 5th Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
415-777-7872

Ms. Mildred Spencer Sanes  
246 Brantwood Road  
Eggertsville, NY 14226  
716-832-5683

Mr. Charles P. Schaeffer  
Senior Editor  
Changing Times Magazine  
1729 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
202-887-6498

Ms. Kathleen Schwar  
Staff Writer  
Tribune Chronicle  
240 Franklin Street, S.E.  
Warren, OH 44482  
216-841-1751

Ms. Sana Siwolop  
Reporter  
Discover Magazine  
Time-Life Bldg.  
Rockefeller Center  
New York, NY 10020  
212-841-4031

Mr. Gordon Slovit  
Medicine/Science  
Minneapolis Star & Tribune  
425 Portland  
Minneapolis, MN 55488  
612-372-4128

Mr. William Snyder  
Medical Writer  
Nashville Banner  
1100 Broadway  
Nashville, TN 37202  
615-255-5401

Ms. Anastasia Toufexis  
Writer  
Time Magazine  
Time-Life Building  
Rockefeller Center  
New York, NY 10020  
212-841-3754

Mr. Earl Ubell  
Health & Science Editor  
WCBS-TV  
524 West 57 Street  
New York, NY 10019  
212-975-5623

Mr. John Van  
Science Writer  
Chicago Tribune  
435 N. Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, IL 60611  
312-222-4280

Mr. Hill Williams  
Science Reporter  
Seattle Times  
Box 70  
Seattle, WA 98111  
206-464-2264

Ms. Ruth Winter  
Columnist-Register &  
Tribune Syndicate  
44 Holly Drive  
Short Hills, NJ 07078  
201-376-8385 or 0199

Ms. Phyllis Wollman  
Freelance  
401 East 74 Street  
New York, NY 10021  
212-RH4-5443

Mr. Michael Woods  
Science Editor  
The Toledo Blade  
1280 National Press Bldg.  
Washington, DC 20045  
202-393-4580

Mr. Patrick Young  
Chief Science/Medical Correspondent  
Newhouse News Service  
1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 1320  
Washington, DC 20006  
202-383-7847

Mr. Thomas Yulsman  
News Editor  
Science Digest Magazine  
888 Seventh Avenue  
New York, NY 10106  
212-262-6565

Ms. Barbara Yuncker  
Medical/Science Editor  
New York Post  
210 South Street  
New York, NY 10002  
212-349-5000

Mr. David Zinman  
Science Writer  
Newsdays  
Long Island, NY 11747  
516-454-2957

Mr. William V. Breyfogle  
Science/Medical Writer  
Telegraph Herald  
W. 8th & Bluff Sts.  
Dubuque, IA 52001  
319-588-5748

Mr. Michael Briley  
Freelance  
1138 Mariano Drive  
Ojai, CA 93023  
805-646-0962

Mr. Richard Dietman  
Minnesota Public Radio  
45 East 8th Street  
St. Paul, MN 55101  
612-221-1500

Mr. Warren Froelich  
Science Writer  
San Diego Union  
San Diego, CA 92112  
619-299-3131

Mr. John Noble Wilford  
Science News Reporter  
The New York Times  
299 West 43 Street  
New York, NY 10036  
212-556-7485

Ms. Abigail Trafford  
U.S. News & World Report  
2300 North Street  
Washington, DC 20037  
202-861-2000

1. FAVORABLE COURT CASE

WIDE PUBLICITY + SENSATIONAL STORIES

2. UNFAVORABLE COURT CASE

OUR POINT OF VIEW

3. REPRINTS OF FAVORABLE ARTICLES

4. PANEL OF EXPERTS - WHAT IS THEIR ASSIGNMENT  
HOW DO THEY WORK AS A PANEL  
WITH KINGS PANEL - NEUTRAL? DRUGS - PAY  
INDUSTRY OR USG.

5. IDENTIFY PEOPLE FAVORABLE

6. ~~POSITIVE~~ ASSOCIATION - STORES PERSON - DR.

7. ~~THE~~ What happens when we get see  
press story in local paper.

8. What happens if we get a query from press radio

TV

- 1. favorable
- 2. Association
- 3. panel

[ we need. we need to give him

1. front page

2. reprints

3. refer to recentists (EPA?)

4. cost of press or lawyer

Susan Tunney - literature search  
searcher