

July 18, 1978

TO: ASBESTOS STUDY COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: Consumer Product Safety Commission Regulations on Recall

In earlier correspondence, with the suggested agenda for the Committee meeting, we listed the resolution passed at the Annual Membership Meeting on June 29, 1978:

That the Friction Materials Standards Institute take an active role with the Consumer Product Safety Commission regarding the position of friction materials manufacturers as to recall procedures that could possibly effect asbestos-containing friction materials.

This resolution was introduced at the Membership Meeting by Mr. Adrian Comins of Auto Friction Corporation. After considerable discussion, the resolution was passed by a vote of the Membership then in attendance. There were 6 affirmative votes for this resolution, 2 negative votes, with 3 abstaining. Eleven Members were present when the vote was taken. The 11 Members comprised a quorum at the Membership Meeting. For background on the motion concerning the Consumer Product Safety Commission you may wish to refer to the Minutes of the January 19, 1978 Asbestos Study Committee Meeting. I'll quote from the first section of those minutes.

The Secretary advised that he had been contacted by Mr. Adrian Comins of the Auto Friction Corporation concerning the Consumer Product Safety Commission and its procedures for recall. He was particularly concerned that if in the future the Consumer Product Safety Commission were to ban the sale of asbestos-containing friction materials, that disastrous costs would be incurred in a major recall. Mr. Comins expressed his concern in a letter that he wrote to the Consumer Product Safety Commission on procedures used during the Tris recall. Mr. Comins wrote indicating his concern that the economic burden of any recall should be borne equally by all Members of the distribution chain. He wrote this as a private citizen on his own letterhead and did not bring in the subject of friction materials.

There was additional discussion at the Committee Meeting in January when Mr. Fenner indicated that there is current litigation as to the definition of a consumer product. This concerned the Anaconda Corporation's aluminum wiring in residential housing. In addition, a study by the W. T. Kearney Associates concerning asbestos in consumer products was discussed and the Institute was to await information on the Kearney study. I have written to the Asbestos Information Association and have now received a copy of the Kearney report submitted to the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

FMSI--0296

6-18
(4)
FMSI 03457

July 18, 1978

I am enclosing a copy of the basic Kearney report to the CPSC. The full text is approximately 200 pages long, and most of that is the Appendix which covers about 150 individual products from "Abrasive wheels " to "Wicks for Oil Burning Apparatus." I have attached four product items including "Friction Materials."

In the "Market Size" section of the report, III - 3, it states:

The major end use of asbestos in friction products is vehicular clutches and brake shoes and pads which are not under the jurisdiction of the CPSC. The friction products market segment which would be considered under CPSC jurisdiction could not be quantified but is estimated to be extremely small.

In the "Market Structure" section of the report, III - 6, it states:

The majority of friction products are produced for automotive use. Manufacturers may fabricate the loose fibers into a felt block or cloth or may buy these products from the primary manufacturer. The friction product is then fabricated and generally sold directly to an automotive manufacturer or through automotive aftermarket channels. The primary users of friction repair or replacement products are professional repairmen; however, consumers can easily purchase friction products to perform their own repairs.

In the "Trends" section of the report, IV - 4, it states:

While some substitutes are being incorporated in a limited number of home appliances, the major users of asbestos containing friction materials, the automotive and related industries find that substitute materials are presently impractical from a cost and performance standpoint. It should be noted that the market is sufficiently attractive to encourage major companies to commit extensive resources to the development of substitute materials. It is reasonable to expect the widespread introduction of substitutes by 1985.

The method of manufacture described in "Market Structure" is not accurate; but the most important item may be the statement under "Market Size" to the effect that the major end use of asbestos in friction products is vehicular clutches and brake shoe and pads which are not under the jurisdiction of the CPSC.

I am attaching also a copy of the regulations to implement the Federal Hazardous Substances Act. The Consumer Product Safety Commission has the responsibility for administering not only the Consumer Product Safety Act but the Federal Hazardous Substances Act. When Tris was recalled it was recalled under the Federal Hazardous Substances Act.

FMSI 03458

July 18, 1978

In discussing this with Counsel, he indicated that friction materials would have to be a "banned hazardous substance" which it is not by definition, in order to be recalled under the Federal Hazardous Substances Act. He indicated also that it was unlikely that action could be taken under the Consumer Product Safety Act because the consumer product definition specifically does not apply to motor vehicle equipment as defined in the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act. Brake linings and clutch facings are motor vehicle equipment. Copies of the letter from Counsel are enclosed.

At the time of my discussion with Mr. Comins in 1977, he felt that Institute Members, by writing as individuals to the CPSC, could indicate their concern over the recall procedures and the possibly crippling effects of the costs of such a recall. At that time the Institute was not being asked to make representations to the CPSC as such. However, as a result of this recent resolution by the Membership the Institute is now being asked to take an active roll concerning CPSC procedures. The Asbestos Study Committee is asked to review this resolution and make its recommendations at the meeting as to how to best execute the intent of this resolution. This is an agenda item for the scheduled committee meeting and we ask that those attending be prepared to help direct the Institute as regards implementing this resolution.

If any additional information comes into the office relative to this item, I will forward it prior to the scheduled meeting.

E. W. Drislane
Executive Director

EWD/e

FMSI 03459