01285

Author

Carporate Author

Report/Article Title

Memorandum for Record: Telecon with Lt Col Laney, USAF/SG Task Force Report, signed James W.

Tremblay, September 11, 1978

Manuscript: Handwritten notes by Capt. Young regarding a call from Pat Bragg (\$GI), September 8,

1978, 1300 HR

Journal/Book Title

Year

0000

Month/Bay

Color

Number of Images

9

Bascripton Notes

Alvin L. Young filed this item under the category "DDT/Human Toxicology and Environmental Fate"; Tremblay's memo for record includes both typewritten copy and original handwritten notes, including 3 pages of data not included in memo. The memo is regarding the report, "The Toxicology, Environmental Fate, and Human Risk of Herbicide Orange and its Associated Dioxin" and its final clearance and publication. Young's notes also deal with clearance and publication of the report. See item 1165 for final version of report.

Memo for Record

Telecon with Lt Col Laney, USAF/SG Task Force Report

- 1. Reference telecon with L/C Laney (USAF/SGPA) on 11 Sep 78.concerning SG Task
 Force Report. He forwarded the review comments to us this morning. He commented
 that the executive summary has not been cleared and his letter will ask that we
 redraft the executive summary and re-submit it to SAF/OI for clearance. His
 letter of 11 Sep also says that the report should be published without the executive
 summary. Rewrite of the executive summary is secondary to publishing the report.
 He said they "didn't want it in the final report anyway".
- 2. The SGPA letter goes on to indicate that AF/SGI (Pat Bragg) has requested that final publication be expedited and to notify USAF/SGPA if final publication will be delayed past Oct 2, 1978. According to L/C Laney, SAFOI "came unglued" when they found out that SGPA had set 2 Oct as suspense. SAFOI wanted the final report published "yesterday".
- 3. On the question of the requirement for full staff review (AF/SAF/DOV) of the added material in the final report, L/C Laney indicated that additions that further support and substantiate our conclusions probably would not require full staff review. He suggested that we submit to Air Force SGPA the pages as written and as rewritten and he'll send them over to AF/SGI,SAF/OI, and DOD/PA for review and approval.
- 4. L/C Laney suggested that when we are ready to go to reproduction that we touch base with AF/SGI, SAF/MIQ, and SAF/OI to determine number of copies required for final report.

JAMES W. TREMBLAY

Mens for Record - Teleray & 4 hancy USAF/1 5G Task Force Report 1. Refuence telesse the 4c Laney non 11 Sept 18 concerning 54 Tank Force Report. He forwarded the review comments to us this AM. He sommented that the Executive Summery has not have cleared and his letter well ask that we redraft the Epecutive Summery and resubmit it to SAF/DI for clearance. His letter of 11 Sept also says that the report should be published without the Executive Summery. Recurite of the Ereculuse

summary is secondary to publishing the report. He said they"... dedu't want it is the final report anyway." 5GHA and 2. The SGPA letter goes on to indicate that AF/SGI (Vat Magg) has requested that final publications to notify USAFISGPA ... publication will be delayed past October 2, 1928. according to 1/c Laney, SAFOI "... came unglied ... " when they found out 59PA had set 20ct suspense. They (SAFOI) wants the final report

published "yesterday".

3. On the question of the requirement for full staff (AF/SAF/DOD) review of added material in the final report, Ic Laney indicated that additions that and substantiale further support, our constrained probably would not require full the review. He suggested that we submit to AF 1567, SALJOS and Det the leffens the pages as written and as rewritten and he'll send over to AF/SGI, SAF/OI and DOD/PA for approval.

4. On number of copies 4. 4c Lancy suggested that when we are ready to go to reproduction that we touch have with AF/SGI, SAF/MIQ and SAF/OI. to determine number of copies required for final report. My T.

Data in Table 7 Ch/ do not agree à data in Table 1 Ch 5 Table 7 Ch & Table 1 ChI 43,768,100 # 52,700,000 8,900,000# / difference.

1.2 ×10⁶ # T in Purple 51.5 ×10⁶ # T in Orange 44 ×10⁶ # T

38.3 ×106 # T in purple

44 X106 # T

330# TCOD

38.3 42.7 ×106 # Tim HO @ ## 7 3.8 1.3 ×106 # Tim HP

 $38.3 \times 10^{6} \# T = \frac{330}{203 \# TCDD} (5.3 ppm)$

2.215 XID gal Paser HO

300,000 gol 4P

$$44 \times 10^{6} \# T = 330 \# 7000 = 7.5 pm$$
 $38.3 \times 10^{6} \# T = 203 \# 7000 = 5.3 ppm$
 $42.1 \times 10^{6} \# T @ 5.3 ppm = 223 \# 7000$

CAN From PAT Bragg (SGI)

1. Executive Summary not approved as written.

Objection: Does not sufficiently summarge conclusions at the end of each chapter;

R. Bos y of Hamuscript approved with only minor recommanded revisions, for public release of RPAR commend that another II & II do not somewh with RPAR on 2,45.7. IM proper aware and some upset about this!

3. REPORT to be returned to USAFOEHL probably on 11 Sep.

4. Executive summary will need to be re-submitted for charance.
Rapid turn-around promised!

5. Informally (unofficially) (and personally)
I dokted Post to they to impluence 56
to que us of least be month
turn around on body of report.