

August 12, 1960

Dr. L. E. Curtis, Medical Director
Standard Oil Company of California
225 Bush Street
San Francisco 20, California

Dear Doctor Curtis:

In the report of 8-11-60, which you will have received before this letter reaches you, you will note the results on the blood of Robert J. Selbough. This result is definitely out of line with the others and with the results obtained regularly in the blood of persons who have not been subjected to exposure to lead.

I remark on this, not because this man is in danger, for he is not, but rather because (1) he has sustained somewhat more than the usual exposure to inorganic lead within recent weeks or months, or (2) he was engaged sometime ago in an occupation involving a considerable exposure to lead, or (3) the sample which yielded these two results (which check within the analytical error) was slightly contaminated with lead from external sources (perhaps a tube not as clean as it should have been). This was a sample of moderately small volume, in which case the analytical error is magnified by the multiplication factor, and it could be, of course, that the analytical error encountered in both methods was at its maximum in this specific instance. This latter is unlikely, but I must recognize that it is not ^{im-}possible.

Now, the question is - what, if anything, do you do? I am not prepared to urge any course of action upon you, but I will suggest that the same procedure may be employed here, if you agree, that we spoke of over the telephone in the case of Mr. Glasgow. There is certainly no reason to rush into this, but eventually this result should be checked, and he should be interviewed to determine whether or not there is some reasonable or likely explanation of this finding.

Sincerely yours,

Robert A. Kehoe, M.D.