

Bailey, Heather

From: Jim Murphy <murphyjim1948@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2022 11:43 AM
To: Martin, Arvina; Benford, Brian; Furman, Keith; Heck, Patrick; Vidaver, Regina; Evers, Tag; Anna Andrzejewski; Fruhling, William; Bailey, Heather; Stouder, Heather; Smith, Kate; LORC Resident Member - Marsha Rummel
Cc: Jim Murphy - Retired
Subject: Lead language in Chapter 41

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hello All,

While LORC is no longer working on Chapter 41 and the language you approved seems to be in the version going to Landmarks, etc, I bring to your attention to a story in the New York Times today, Wednesday March 30, on the dangers of lead dust. I do appreciate your inclusion of lead abatement language by feature replacement rather than just remediation going forward.

Anna, I particularly bring this to your attention so if there is any movement at Landmarks to reduce or eliminate the lead language in 41.25 STANDARDS FOR ALTERATIONS, (1) General, (e) Lead Paint that you and Landmarks continue to appreciate the dangers and not weaken that language. I send to you Alders for the same reason in case there is such a movement at the Common Council level.

As you know, we are happy to provide additional written and verbal testimony on the dangers of lead paint dust if changes are on the table.

If you have not seen the New York Times story on the dangers of lead dust in today's 3/20 paper, it is very interesting. I try and avoid conspiracies, but from my point of view, here is one. [here is the link](#). If you cannot open that link, I am happy to copy the text and email you.

Jim

Jim Murphy
1500 Rutledge St
Madison, WI 53703
608/358-6095
murphyjim1948@gmail.com