P. G. Benignus - St. Louis General Office

January 7, 1970

Wildlife

THE POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYL
ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEM - GENERAL
ELECTRIC COMPANY

H. S. Bergen - HSBRG
E. P. Wheeler - EWHEE
D. A. Olson - DOLSO
W. R. Richard - WRICH
W. B. Papageorge - ANNISTON
E. H. Munch - JPQ
J. G. Bryant - JBRYA
W. A. Kuhn - WKUHN

INTRODUCTION

Our long-time close associate, Mr. Edward Raab, of General Electric, Fittsfield is responsible to GE for coordinating the aspects of the PCB problem.

We will visit Monsanto St. Louis Wednesday, January 21 and Thursday, January 22 accompanied by Dr. Horace Gerarde, Toxicologist and Dr. Ken Murphy, Director of GE Environmental Control.

The impact of this problem at GE is hard. Mr. Raab has conducted two meetings in the GE board room in New York attended by top corporate personnel who report directly to Mr. Borsch, the President of GE.

Shortly, we will receive some written documents which arose from these meetings and will spell out details about what GE seeks from Monsanto.

WHAT GE SEEKS

A preliminary and very brief outline as to what GE seeks to accomplish at their visit with us, was given me over the telephone by Mr. Raab as follows:

1. GE seeks to learn Monsanto's corporate stance regards the PCB problem at this time.

2. They seek to explore all Monsanto knowledge of toxicological information and work being done inside at Monsanto and in collaboration with outside people on this PCB problem. Additionally, they seek Monsanto's views of the human toxicological aspects related to the use of epoxides.

DSW 347922

STLCOPCB4085168

3. What is Monsanto doing inside and outside to verify the analytical tools and the validity of the data. What are the channels whereby PCB enters the environment, how does it get into birds off the coast of Scandinavia, in Baja, California, etc., etc.

4. What is now known about biodegradeability of PCB's and what is the validity. What is the correlation of these findings relative to the various structures of PCB's. How does all this relate to lack of finding TCB and TTCB in the environment.

5. What are Monsanto's views about toxicity to humans through the use of epoxide scavengers.

6. What is Monsanto's view about reclamation of scrap PCB from GE, GE service shops, utilities, industrial users, commercial users, etc. What is our view about a buy-back arrangement. What arrangements will be made for incineration, disposal at a toxic dump, reclamation by refining at Monsanto.

7. If Monsanto curtails the production of PCB's for use in non-electrical applications, what effect will this have on GE costs of electrical PCB's.

8. If Monsanto refuses to supply Aroclor 1260, Aroclor 1254 and possibly Aroclor 1248, or if Monsanto's price became too high, or if Monsanto imposed an unrealistic cutoff date -- GE would pursue the following:

   a) To explore having other US chemical manufacturers supply.

   b) Explore importation from ICI, Prodelec or Bayer.

9. Pending developments related to the immediate above, when should the PCB problem be presented to NEMA, ASTM, EEI, and IEEE for appraisal making it an industry-wide matter.

10. Related to the immediate above would follow a highly precarious reassessment of the explosiveness problem vs. the PCB problem.

11. What are the sales in terms of pounds, gallons and costs of PCB materials for all US locations at GE including uses as dielectrics, hydraulic fluids, heat transfer or any other applications. This is to include Aroclor's 1260, 1254, 1248, 1242 and blends.

CONCLUSIONS

1. In coming to St. Louis, GE seeks to collaborate with Monsanto in every way to not kill the dielectric use of PCB materials.

DSW 347923

2. In spending two days or whatever time is required with us at St. Louis, GE seeks to know the specific stance at this time and as may be foreseen for the future by Monsanto on the PCB problem. They seek concrete evidence on which Monsanto bases it's attitude and actions. GE seeks to review this with us for mutual understanding and benefit.

SUGGESTIONS

Because there are many facets to the overall PCB situation GE suggests and we concur that to facilitate the flow of handling, small and separate sessions should be held along the following lines. For

1. First, the toxicity should be covered.

2. A review of the technical aspects, of using various PCB's as transformer dielectrics. This is focused on the explosiveness problem vs. attitudes regards the PCB problem.

3. The practical business aspects, legal attitudes and responsibilities by GE and Monsanto on behalf of the users.

4. Summary of actions that will be taken by Monsanto and GE to serve our best mutual interest.

F. G. Benignus

/dn

DSW 347924