



Uploaded to VFC Website ~ October 2012 ~

This Document has been provided to you courtesy of Veterans-For-Change!

Feel free to pass to any veteran who might be able to use this information!

For thousands more files like this and hundreds of links to useful information, and hundreds of "Frequently Asked Questions, please go to:

[Veterans-For-Change](#)

*Veterans-For-Change is a 501(c)(3) Non-Profit Corporation
Tax ID #27-3820181*

If Veteran's don't help Veteran's, who will?

We appreciate all donations to continue to provide information and services to Veterans and their families.

https://www.paypal.com/cgi-bin/webscr?cmd=_s-xclick&hosted_button_id=WGT2M5UTB9A78

Note: VFC is not liable for source information in this document, it is merely provided as a courtesy to our members.

Item ID Number 01285

Author

Corporate 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 (SGI), September 8, 1978, 1300 HR

Journal/Book Title

Year 0000

Month/Day

Color

Number of Images 9

Description 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, SAF/OI "came unglued" when they found out that SGPA had set 2 Oct as suspense. SAF/OI 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/MIO, and SAF/OI to determine number of copies required for final report.

JAMES W. TREMBLAY

Memo for Record - Telecon ^{with} c/c Loney
USAF/SG Task Force Report

1. Reference telecon ^{with} c/c Loney ^(USAF/SG, PA) on
11 Sept 78 concerning SG Task Force Report.
He forwarded the review comments
to us this AM. He commented that
the Executive Summary has not been
cleared and his letter will ask
that we redraft the Executive Summary
and resubmit it to SAF/DI for
clearance. His letter of 11 Sept
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." ~~SGPA~~ and ~~SGOP~~

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} ~~that~~ if final publication will be delayed past October 2, 1978. According to c/c Laney, SAFOI "... came unglued..." when they found out SGPA had set 2 Oct suspense. They (SAFOI) want 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, Lt Lane indicated that additions that further support, ^{and substantive} our conclusions probably would not require full staff review. He suggested that we submit to AF/~~SGI~~^{/SGPA}, ~~SAF/OI~~ and ~~DOD/PD/CIA~~ the pages as written and as rewritten and he'll send over to AF/SGI, SAF/OI and DOD/PA for ^{review}/approval.

~~4. On numbers of copies~~

4. Yc 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.

~~4~~
Maj T.

Data in Table 7 Ch I
do not agree \bar{c} data in
Table 7 Ch 5

Table 7 Ch I

Table 1 Ch V

T

43,768,100 #

52,700,000

8,900,000 #
Difference!

$1.2 \times 10^6 \# T$ in Purple
 $51.5 \times 10^6 \# T$ in Orange
 $44 \times 10^6 \# T$

$38.3 \times 10^6 \# T$ in purple

$44 \times 10^6 \# T$

330# TCDD

38.3
 3.8

 42.1

$42.7 \times 10^6 \# T$ in HO @ ~~4~~ ~~111~~
 $1.3 \times 10^6 \# T$ in HP

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

$$127 \# TCDD \text{ in HP}$$

2.215

$$\begin{array}{r} 1.2 \\ 42.6 \\ \hline 43.8 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{r} 51.5 \\ - 8.86 \\ \hline 42.64 \end{array}$$

$2.215 \times 10^6 \text{ gal Pure HD}$

300,000 gal HP

$$44 \times 10^6 \# \quad T = 330 \# \text{ TCDD} = 7.5 \text{ ppm}$$

$$38.3 \times 10^6 \# \quad T = 203 \# \text{ TCDD} = 5.3 \text{ ppm}$$

$$42.1 \times 10^6 \# \quad T @ 5.3 \text{ ppm} = 223 \# \text{ TCDD}$$

$$330 - 223 = 107 \# \text{ TCDD}$$

$$107 \# \text{ TCDD in } 1.2 \times 10^6 \# \text{ T} = \underline{\underline{89.2 \text{ ppm TCDD}}}$$

$$\frac{104 \#}{1.2 \times 10^6}$$

8 SEP 78, 1300Hr
CAPT YOUNG

Call From Pat Bragg (SGI)

1. Executive Summary not approved as written.

Objections: Does not sufficiently summarize conclusions at the end of each chapter.

2. Body of Manuscript approved with only minor recommended revisions, for public release!

Comment that Chapter IV & VI do not concur with RPAR on 2,4,5-T. EPA people aware and some upset about this!

3. Report to be returned to USAF OEHHL probably on 11 Sep.

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

5. Informally (unofficially) (and personally) I asked Pat to try to influence SG to give us at least one month turn around on body of report.