



AMERICAN

INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE

ASSOCIATION

Quarterly

Volume 17

SEPTEMBER, 1956

Number 3

SYMPOSIUM ON THRESHOLD LIMITS

Present Trends in MAC's	Warren A. Cook	273
The Need for Threshold Limits	Miriam Suchs, M.D.	274
Prepared Discussion	Henry F. Smyth, Jr.	279
Methods of Establishing Threshold Limits	James H. Steiner, M.D.	280
Prepared Discussion	Herbert E. Stokinger, Ph.D.	281
Engineering and Chemical Application of Standards	Allen D. Bennett, Sr.D.	286
Prepared Discussion	Arthur C. Stern	292
Prepared Discussion	Theodore C. Watres, I.L.B.	296

AUTOMATIC INSTRUMENTATION FOR AIR POLLUTION MONITORING—A PROGRESS

REPORT ON AUTOMATIC DIRECTIONAL AIR SAMPLING	William A. Mauer	298
--	------------------	-----

A VERSATILE PORTABLE AIR SAMPLER

H. S. Jordan and R. N. Mitchell	302
---------------------------------	-----

DETERMINATION OF INTERNALLY DEPOSITED RADIOACTIVE ISOTOPES

FROM EXCRETION ANALYSES	Wright H. Langham	305
-------------------------------	-------------------	-----

CRITERIA FOR AN EVALUATION OF NOISE PROBLEMS

Charles R. Williams, Ph.D.	319
----------------------------	-----

FLOW CALIBRATION OF HIGH-VOLUME SAMPLERS

Bernard D. Tebbens, Sr.D., and Donald M. Keays, M.S.	327
--	-----

RECENT INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE DEVELOPMENTS—A SYMPOSIUM

In the Field of Air Pollution	Henry N. Dault	330
In the Field of Chemistry	Ralph G. Smith, Ph.D.	332
In the Field of Engineering	Leslie Silverman, Sr.D.	333
In the Field of Noise	Vaughan H. Hill	336
In the Field of Radiation	Saul J. Harris	338
In the Field of Toxicology	Herbert E. Stokinger, Ph.D.	340

HYGIENIC GUIDE SERIES

	345
--	-----

PRESIDENT'S PAGE

	352
--	-----

SELECTED TITLES AND ABSTRACTS

	353
--	-----


BOOK REVIEW

	354
--	-----

AIIA INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATES, OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, AND COMMITTEES

	355
--	-----

AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY, published by the American Industrial Hygiene Association in March, June, September, and December. HOWARD N. SCHULZ, Editor; HERBERT J. WEAVER, Advisory Editor; LOUIS E. SHAW, Associate Editor; WILLIAM S. JOHNSON, Advertising Editor; PAUL D. HILKEY, Circulation Editor; A. D. CLOUD, Publisher; DONALD FLORENOY, Editorial Assistant. Publication and Editorial Office, 605 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago 11, Illinois. Subscription \$4.00 per year in the United States; \$4.50 per year in Canada; \$5.00 per year in other countries. Single copies, \$1.50—except the June, 1956, issue which is \$2.00. Copyright, 1956, the AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE ASSOCIATION. Entered as second class matter May 3, 1949, at the post office at Sheboygan, Wisconsin, under the Act of March 3, 1879. The AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY reserves the right to omit all advertisements and to refuse advertising copy when it does not meet the high professional standards adopted by the Association.



Symposium on Threshold Limits

Present Trends in MAC's

Introduction by WARREN A. COOK, Associate Professor
Industrial Health and Hygiene, School of Public Health
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

THE THINKING today on the concept of threshold limits of injurious materials, designated by whatever term, has passed through an evolution to a gratifying maturity.

Initially the need to know how little of a toxic substance might remain in an industrial atmosphere without injury to those exposed was insistently apparent. Such information began to be supplied through correlation of concentrations of injurious substances with observed effect on the health of the worker for such materials as granite dust¹ and lead compounds.² Results of short-time animal experiments had been available even before the present century from such investigators as K. B. Lehmann³ and later from Yant and others at the U. S. Bureau of Mines,⁴ with the classic combined long-exposure animal experimentation and occupational study on benzene by Greenburg⁵ in the middle twenties.

As these threshold limit values became more numerous and were more widely applied, it is perhaps not surprising that misconceptions and aberrant usages occurred. Some persons erred in considering the levels more precise than the facts justified; others rejected them because the values could not precisely fit all conditions of exposure and physiological response. And the detractors were for a while more vociferous and seemed possibly to be more sound than the protagonists.

With time, there has been a separation of the valuable advantages of the threshold

limits and the improper use of them. Nowhere is the present concept of threshold limits more ably and competently expressed than in the papers and discussions of this Symposium.

That the discussants might not have the very last word, it may be permissible for this prologue to assume in part the prerogative of an epilogue! The following commentaries appear pertinent.

The last publication of the American Standards Association Z-37 Committee on Maximum Acceptable Concentrations of Toxic Dusts and Gases⁶ is reported correctly as 1949 by Sachs who deplored the lack of revision of the 1941 Standard for benzene at the obsolete level of 100 parts per million. It is to be noted that this ASA Committee is now active in the revision and publication of MAC Standards for many of the materials on which information is available.

The term "maximum acceptable concentrations" was adopted by the ASA Committee for a number of reasons. The word "acceptable" does not connote the legal control inherent in the words "allowable" and "limit," but rather a simple acceptability without further implication. Also, the expression, MAC, has been widely used over the years and is now a part of the language. In fact the Germans adopted a wording which gives the abbreviation, MAK, so that this term may be used in international conversation. Their words as used in the title of a paper by Oettel⁷ are "Maximale Arbeitsplatz-Konzentration." It is understood that this same expression is being used in the "MAK" tables of the German Association for Worker Protection.

Presented at the Joint Session of the AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE ASSOCIATION—AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF GOVERNMENTAL INDUSTRIAL HYGIENISTS at the 1955 Industrial Health Conference, Buffalo, April 25, 1955.

However, there can be no really valid objection to the term "Threshold Limits" used by the committee of the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists or to "Hygienic Guides," the term adopted by the American Industrial Hygiene Association committee. This Symposium would not be complete without reference to the availability of the excellent AIIHA Hygienic Guides to which reference is made elsewhere in this Journal.

One of the most perplexing problems in arriving at threshold limits is posed by the cancerogens. Stokinger's statement in this Symposium is the first publication on this phase of the subject. However, the use of the procedure suggested by Stokinger as applied to nickel carbonyl has already drawn some fire. Quoting in part from a private communication from Oettel whose publications on "MAK's" include a well-considered presentation of the general subject: "We suggest that consideration be given to indicating the suspected cancerogens with an asterisk with reference to a footnote that the hazard exists and consequently especially effective control measures be instituted. No man can say today which concentration of the several industrial substances is actually required to be cancerogenic . . ." This statement follows his objection to the present listing by the ACGIH of nickel carbonyl as 0.001 ppm on the basis of its alleged cancerogenicity, which incidentally Oettel's extensive experience with the substance causes him to doubt, while failing to include any acknowledgement of the

known cancerogenicity of arsenic, chromates and asbestos. Says Oettel "In this I see a great danger. The lists should in any event remain logical."

Waters' discussion of Brandt's paper occupies the final pages of this publication of the Symposium, but it is believed that Waters would not wish his comments to be considered the last word on the subject of threshold limits—rather that his observations are limited essentially to the use of these values in legal codes, rigidly fixed by statute. As the last word in this Symposium, this introductory refers the reader to the concluding paragraphs of the paper by Brandt for his discussion of the philosophy of threshold limits.

References

1. RUSSELL, A. E., BRITTEN, R. H., THOMPSON, L. R., BLOOMFIELD, J. J.: The Health of Workers in Dusty Trades II. Exposure to Siliceous Dust (Granite Industry). *Public Health Bull.* No. 187, 1925.
2. RUSSELL, A. E., JONES, R. R., BLOOMFIELD, J. J., BRITTEN, R. H., THOMPSON, L. R.: Lead Poisoning in a Storage Battery Plant. *Public Health Bull.* No. 293, 1933.
3. LAHMANN, K. H.: Numerous papers mostly published in *Archiv für Hygiene* from the 1880's.
4. YANT, W. P., and colleagues: Acute Response of Guinea Pigs to Vapors of Some New Commercial Organic Compounds. A series of papers published in *Public Health Reports* during the 1930's.
5. GREENAUM, L.: Benzol Poisoning as an Industrial Hazard. *Public Health Revue.* 41, 1357, 1410, and 1519: 1924.
6. American Standards Association: Standards on Acceptable Concentrations of Toxic Dusts and Gases. ASA, 70 E. 15th Street, New York 17, New York.
7. OETTEL, H.: Die maximale Arbeitsplatz-Konzentration (= MAK-Wert) schädlicher Gase, Dämpfe und Stäube. *Die Berufsgenossenschaft*, No. 2, February, 1954.
8. OETTEL, H.: Gewerbliche Vergiftungen durch Gase, Dämpfe und Stäube. *Archiv für Toxikologie*, 15:42, 1954.

The Need for Threshold Limits

MIRIAM SACHS, M.D.

New Jersey State Department of Health, Bureau of Adult and Occupational Health
Trenton, New Jersey

PROBABLY one of the most basic needs in human endeavor is for man to have an orderliness set to his manner of thinking. Everyone has a need for discipline, for boundaries to be drawn, and for limits to be defined. It does not matter that the only use for some of the limits so defined may be to ignore them; they have still served their

purpose as a point of aim for individual interpretation. If this seems cryptic, an example concerning a common substance may be cited.

Almost everyone is familiar with the threshold limit values for silica—for dust with a free silica dioxide content above 50%, the limit is given as five million parti-