

file
ETS/IAPAG
General
February 18, 1987

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bill Kloepfer
FROM: Roger Mozingo
Peter G. Sparber
Susan Stuntz
RE: TI-ETS Advisory Group Proposal

There are several scientific, public affairs and legislative steps which must be taken to ensure credible communications with our publics in a timely and cost-efficient manner on the ETS issue. In our view, the TI-ETS Advisory Group proposal does not meet The Institute's public affairs and legislative needs.

We support that conclusion with the following observations.

1. Need to communicate with key audiences.

Almost all of our challenges revolve around the perceptions of elected and appointed officials, journalists, business and labor officials, and tobacco industry leaders. None of these audiences are scientifically oriented. All have shown little interest in scientific elegance.

The proposal makes little reference to any form of public communication, and to the extent that the organization is governed by a separate board, we would have no ability to ensure that such public communication will occur.

The academic/scientific community represents a possible audience but, with the exception of a very few scientists who participate in or work with IAPAG, this audience is largely hostile, and with CTR history as our guide, least likely to be persuaded by industry-sponsored research. However, the availability of new research dollars might encourage some scientists to remain open on this issue.

**CONFIDENTIAL:
TOBACCO LITIGATION**

TIOK 0009616

2. Timeliness

If we are successful in our public affairs and legislative efforts, the ETS controversy will continue at its current level for another 12 - 18 months. That, at least, will signify that our publics regard the issue as debatable. Given the understandably slow pace of the TI-ETSAG Committee, we do not believe that anything accomplished by the proposed "Institute" will have a bearing on the debate in this time period.

3. Credibility

The "independent" appearance of an ETS Institute will have no positive effect on its credibility.

Although an ETS Institute would adhere to high scientific standards, it no doubt would be viewed externally as a clear extension of The Tobacco Institute and, therefore, wholly biased. We only wish that a separate office, journal and staff would accomplish "independence", and hence credibility.

The Tobacco Institute's experience with "independent" groups is not very good. The National Tobacco Education Council, Council for Tobacco Research, and Tobacco Growers Information Committee, are all examples of perceived dependencies on the industry, regardless of the reality.

4. Cost

We have no way of knowing if the projected costs are reasonable. However, from a legislative or public affairs point of view, this makes little sense as a five-year, \$21 million investment.

We come to this conclusion for all of the previously stated reasons. We might soften our objection if we had an assurance that some "good will" might be earned by support of this research.

However, "good will" would be earned only if the program is credible. To be credible, an ETS Institute would have to function far more openly than what is anticipated here.

From a public affairs and legislative standpoint, the TI-ETSAG Committee has functioned for two years and produced little of significance for use by lobbyists or public

**CONFIDENTIAL:
TOBACCO LITIGATION**

Bill Kloepfer
February 18, 1987
Page Three

affairs, and is just now recommending that a new organization exist to "expeditiously" support research. We find this frustrating. Frankly, the proposal is an expensive case of too little, too late.

What might serve us better than an ETS Institute? The following are some possibilities:

1. Funds to privately support indoor air quality studies conducted by groups which already agree with our position, e.g. labor, ventilation contractors. It would be difficult to spend as much as \$500,000 a year here, yet the results would be more credible to lawmakers, and more marketable.
2. "Challenge grants" to building owners to encourage public scrutiny of indoor air pollution. Few owners are likely to accept the offer but their reluctance to do so will draw attention to the broader issue. Annual cost - \$250,000 maximum.
3. "Glass house" analysis. We should encourage member companies to evaluate their own facilities and to create model indoor air environments. If we are vulnerable here, a hostile labor union could do to us what Irangate has done to the Administration's "get tough with terrorists" program.
4. Tools, such as the R. J. Reynolds briefcase, to help us dramatize the overall indoor air quality problem and minimize ETS. To be useful, these tools must be portable, must identify several "frightening" components of indoor air beyond nicotine, and ideally give measurements on the spot.

Methodological excellence is of little consequence if it does not meet these criteria.

5. A simplified, low cost air quality test to be marketed independently to public health officials, union OSHA representatives and others in a position to determine acceptable quality.
6. An inexpensive home test - almost like a "do it yourself" water test - to identify the presence of indoor air pollutants. It may not be feasible, but we envision a litmus strip with various chemical reagents which would turn colors to suggest different kinds and levels of pollution.
7. Intensified IAPAG interaction with the scientific community. Their personal interaction has kept some scientists neutral and the anti-smokers nervous.

TIOK 0009618

Bill Kloepfer
February 18, 1987
Page Four

In conclusion, by the time the new ETS Institute is founded and projects underway, the war could be over. There must be other ways to accomplish the goal but yet to remove the tobacco industry from being such an integral part of the leadership of an Institute. There is no value to scientific research if it is not credible.

/mm

**CONFIDENTIAL:
TOBACCO LITIGATION**

TIOK 0009619