

LEAR 26 1987

# THE TOBACCO INSTITUTE

1875 I STREET, NORTHWEST  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006  
202-457-4800 • 800-424-9876

WILLIAM KLOEPFER, JR.  
Senior Vice President-  
Public Relations  
202-457-4861

March 24, 1987

Donald K. Hoel, Esq.  
Shook, Hardy & Bacon  
1101 Walnut, 20th floor  
Kansas City, MO 64106

Dear Don:

At the February meeting of The Institute's ETS Advisory Group, the staff provided comments on the proposal to establish an institute to commission and oversee independent industry-funded scientific research. In summary, we expressed concern over a lack of public affairs orientation in the proposal.

Following that meeting, the proposal approved without substantial amendment by a majority of the Advisory Group went forward to the Committee of Counsel whose advice on it is pending. Meanwhile, the staff has continued to consider the matter, and I have been asked to summarize our views before it is presented for approval to the Executive Committee.

Regardless of certain structural differences between the proposed institute and the existing Council for Tobacco Research, we feel there is no assurance that the institute will, unlike the CTR, provide support for the industry in the public affairs area. There is no requirement for its officials, advisors, grantees or contractors to provide insight, views and research results to legislators or the press. It appears that, as in the case of the CTR procedures, research results would become available if and when published in journals, without any institute obligation to publicize them.

LG 2018027

Donald K. Hoel, Esq.  
March 24, 1987  
Page 2

It is also implicit that the institute would not be required to support projects or activities in areas more properly described as political or technical. Our suggestions below will amplify this point. Additionally, the proposal seems to weaken support for our policy to treat the ETS issue in the broader context of overall indoor air quality.

Now and at least in the short term, The Institute is beset by an actively hostile and largely misguided, if well-meant, campaign in the media and at all levels of government to rid workplace and other building interiors of ETS. This is occurring and will continue to occur along with our need to fight unprecedented levels of excise taxation and advertising and promotional restrictions. At the same time, the ceiling on our budget challenges us continuously to improve the efficiency of our resource uses. We are concerned that the proposed institute may divert resources in what may be considered to be a public affairs effort but without a public affairs impact.

As we have learned through experience, in the scenarios of development of smoking policies and regulations, government officials, the news media and business managers attach little understanding of scientific elegance, proceeding instead on perceptions, emotions and the "logic" of danger in ETS. The challenge to us is not simply to assert to others but to persuade them that the perceptions are wrong. To date, we have had limited success, but it has resulted only from two projects in which The Institute has been directly involved -- the PASS work in New York and the ACVA experience.

Meeting this challenge requires a credibility which the industry lacks. We feel it can be improved if the source of criticism of current perceptions and the finding of projects to change them is one and the same.

LG 2018028

Donald K. Hoel, Esq.  
March 24, 1987  
Page 3

So as not to leave our comments in a purely negative mode, we have developed several thoughts regarding the industry's real and immediate needs to which the proposed institute would in our opinion contribute little:

- o Funding IAQ studies by third parties, e.g., ventilation contractors and unions, with built-in requirements for appropriate publicity or testimony.

- o Assistance in the form of challenge grants to building operators to analyse overall IAQ.

- o "Glass house" analyses of IAQ in the premises of Institute members as good-faith signals to their own employees and a means to widen support in labor circles.

- o Development of additional PASS equipment for unobtrusive sampling of IAQ components other than ETS markers.

- o R&D to create simple IAQ measuring devices for home and commercial use -- a "litmus test" concept.

- o Coordination of additional IAPAG and contractor/grantee liaison in scientific and technical circles.

- o Development of a new approach to relevant research, not seeking answers to questions about ETS, as most of the published research and current industry-supported projects now do, but instead identifying problems laid to ETS and seeking their real causes. As an example, we might envision case studies of two groups of children with and without excessive respiratory problems or developmental retardation, and then study a wide range of hereditary, environmental, economic and social factors which may differentiate them.

LG 2018029

Donald K. Hoel, Esq.  
March 24, 1987  
Page 4

Through its memberships in the ETS Advisory Group our staff is fully aware of and sympathetic to the need for greater creativity and oversight in IAQ research and technical areas than can be provided by current Group members who are distracted from their primary obligations and duties. We hope that problem can be speedily resolved in the process of early focus within the industry on how to meet all of the present needs.

Cordially,



William Kloepfer, Jr.

WKjr:mss

cc: Samuel D. Chilcote, Jr.  
Bob Lewis  
Roger Mozingo  
Pete Sparber

LG 2018030