

Internal Correspondence

To: L. C. Krogh - Executive - 223-6S-04  
From: L. F. Ludford - Public Relations - 225-5N-04  
Subject:  
Date: September 8, 1981

**3M**

Wednesday afternoon, September 2, 1981, I received a telephone call from Karl Stark, a staff reporter at the Bucks County, Pennsylvania Courier Times. You may recall that I talked by phone with Mr. Stark on August 19 after he called Bill Pearlson with questions about Light Water AFFF (FC-95). I reported that conversation in a memo to you dated August 20.

This second call was a follow up to the August 19 interview. Mr. Stark had more questions about Light Water, which I answered. At the end of the conversation, I asked him what direction his story was taking. He said he really didn't know, that it was "up in the air" and he would have to discuss it with his editor. I figured that was the case after the first interview, so things haven't changed much. He added that he wanted to talk to a number of other people, but was not out "to make a splashy hatchet job." I suggested that he include several fire fighters who have used Light Water.

Stark's first question was about the history and development of Light Water. I told him why it was developed for the Navy and how it was then used elsewhere in the military; that use expanded to civilian airport crash and rescue operations, the petroleum industry and finally throughout the nation, who use it for transportation accidents and similar emergencies.

I explained how effective Light Water is in enabling rescue crews to rescue people trapped in aircraft and other petroleum fires; that this wasn't as possible in previous years. I explained the "flash back" angle and how fast Light Water puts out petroleum based fires. He said he'd only seen Light Water used once (?) and acknowledged it worked fast. When Light Water is used, I said fire fighters normally are covered head to toe with heavy protective clothing.

Once again I repeated that 3M knows of no evidence that suggests fire fighters are exposed to a health danger because they use Light Water.

**Exhibit  
1260**

State of Minnesota v. 3M Co.,  
Court File No. 27-CV-10-28862

He asked where ICI is located and I told him Wilmington, Delaware. In response to a question, I said I thought ICI may have transferred about a dozen women workers. I said he should call ICI for confirmation.

He wanted to know how many women were transferred by 3M. I told him 13 in Alabama and one in Minnesota, but did not identify the plant locations. He asked if they belonged to a union. I said the one did but the others did not. He asked which union, and I told him the OCAW.

He wanted to know how widely used Light Water is. I told him that while there was competition, Light Water was a leader in the AFF field. He wanted me to say it was the leader, but I refused. He asked how much was sold per year and I told him 3M and most other companies don't give out that information. He understood. He said he heard Exxon was a big customer, but I replied I didn't know.

Stark asked me to mail him a copy of the American Industrial Hygiene Journal story and I said I would. He also wanted to know when any additional toxicology test results would be available. I said I thought perhaps in late September. I also emphasized that the only test information he has now is preliminary and that most toxicologists are very cautious about extrapolating preliminary test results on rodents to human beings.

I tried to keep the interview on a positive tone. Stark seemed satisfied and said he probably would call me back sometime later with additional questions. I will keep you informed.

  
LFL:rd

c: R. M. Adams  
R. J. Davis  
D. A. Fischer  
F. D. Griffith  
C. W. Hanson  
G. L. Hegg  
D. W. Klinger  
J. D. LaZerte  
J. F. Lohmiller  
J. C. McBride  
W. C. McCormick  
A. F. Jacobson  
D. R. Pauly  
W. H. Pearlson  
R. A. Prokop  
  
D. E. Roach  
T. J. Scheuerman  
W. F. Scown  
P. L. Sevareid  
S. D. Sorenson  
F. A. Ubel