

FILE NAME: RT Vanderbilt (RTV)

DATE: 0000

DOC#: RTV264

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Inspection Report - J-M Talc-Chrysotile
Controversy

JOHNS-MANVILLE - TALC-CHRYSOTILE CONTROVERSY

Summary

Six (6) samples of various Vanderbilt talc products were analyzed for Chrysotile content by McCrone Associates and by E. M. Ventions, Inc. No chrysotile was detected by either laboratory. The six (6) samples were supplied by the Johns-Manville Company as portions of the samples they had found to contain up to 35% chrysotile fiber, as reported to Vanderbilt personnel and to officials of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration in Washington.

Analytical Data

In March of 1975 representatives of Johns-Manville Corporation, Denver, Colorado (R. S. Lamar) called requesting a meeting between themselves and R. T. Vanderbilt personnel regarding the labeling of tremolitic talc. The meeting was eventually arranged for April 16, 1975 at RTV Corporate Headquarters in Norwalk, Connecticut.

The meeting was attended by R. S. Lamar, R. P. Carter (representing J. M.), H. B. Vanderbilt, T. T. Noland, A. M. Harvey, G. S. Thompson, and P. B. Gibney, Jr.

Lamar and Carter explained that they had called this meeting to present their story that our talcs (NYTALG, etc.) contained chrysotile and other forms of asbestos. They offered technical data, copies of which were left with us, and offered to send us samples of the talc they studied. During the discussion Lamar stated that one of the Vanderbilt products contained 35% chrysotile. The data they presented included "fiber" counts performed on four (4) so-called Vanderbilt products indicating that chrysotile constituted up to one-third of the "fibers" counted. (see attached Johns-Manville document) Fibers were defined by the inadequate and obsolete criteria of 3:1 aspect ratio.

Their reasons for the visit were given as purely informative, as friends, in case we were unaware of the mineral content of our talc. They admitted they had gone to OSHA offices in Washington with the same story, complaining that they were losing business to Vanderbilt talcs which they considered to contain more asbestos than theirs. They have labelled their Western talcs with the OSHA Asbestos label, and they had hoped to convince us to do likewise. Mention was made of the law suits now existing against Johns-Manville resulting from non-labelled asbestos 20 years ago.

We ended the meeting with their promise to send us portions of the retained samples of Vanderbilt talcs they had analyzed and reported on.

The above statement concerning chrysotile came as a complete surprise to us since our past studies of the mineral content of all our talc ores and products had revealed no chrysotile. The minerals present in the talc products discussed had been determined to be as follows:

major non-asbestiform tremolite and anthophyllite
moderate serpentine (antigorite-lizardite)
moderate talc
trace quartz

Other grades of talc produced by Vanderbilt in a separate mine and mill facility in the Gouverneur, New York area contain the following minerals:

major fibrous talc
minor serpentine (antigorite-lizardite)
minor asbestiform anthophyllite
trace quartz

**PLAINTIFF'S
EXHIBIT**

RTV 6380

**DEPOSITION
EXHIBIT**

1/28/78 11/3/78

These grades are listed as fibrous talcs and are labelled with the OSHA Warning Label as required. No chrysotile had been detected in any Vanderbilt talc product or ores.

In view of the discrepancy between the data presented by Johns-Manville and those obtained by us an immediate investigation by RTV laboratory personnel of "off the shelf" sample room materials representing the same products examined by Johns-Manville was begun to determine the accuracy of the results presented by Lamar and Carter. These internal studies, which included special mineral separation and concentration techniques, failed to detect any chrysotile. Similar studies were conducted on a variety of ores from various areas of our mining operation with similar results; i.e. no chrysotile detected.

Samples of the talcs Johns-Manville had analyzed were requested and received from Johns-Manville on May 22, 1975. Lamar assured the author by telephone on May 21, 1975, that the eight (8) samples sent were representative portions of the materials examined by them. Four (4) of the eight samples received were selected as representing the four (4) materials Johns-Manville analyzed for "fiber" counts and split in half using a Caipco microsplitter. Two (2) of the RTV "off the shelf" samples (mentioned above) were also selected, and all six (6) samples coded as follows for further study:

<u>RTV Lab. No.</u>	<u>Sample No.</u>	<u>Talc Grade*</u>
CPS-206-1	JM RC-74255-1	NYTAL 200
CPS-206-2	RTV S-106	IT 325
CPS-206-3	JM RC-74255-2	NYTAL 400
CPS-206-4	JM RC-74255-3	ASBESTINE 3X
CPS-206-5	RTV S-123	IT 3X
CPS-206-6	JM RC-74255-4	ASBESTINE 325

* The use of the ASBESTINE trademark would indicate that these materials had been produced several years ago since the International Talc Company discontinued that terminology in 1973.

These six (6) samples labelled with only the RTV Lab. No. were sent to two (2) independent laboratories with the request that the materials be examined by scanning electron microscopy (SEM) coupled with energy dispersive spectrometer (EDS) and by transmission electron microscopy (TEM), selected area diffraction (SAD) to determine the presence or absence of chrysotile. If present, an estimate of the chrysotile content was also requested.

The results obtained by both of these laboratories listed below are attached.

E. M. Ventions, Inc., Microanalysis Laboratory
15825 Shady Grove Road
Rockville, Maryland 20850 (301) 948-7400

Walter C. McCrone Associates, Inc.
2820 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60616 (312) 842-7100

The results show the absence of any detectable chrysotile, confirming the data obtained earlier by RTV laboratory studies. We do not know what Johns-Manville personnel were counting, but it obviously was not chrysotile.