

BRIEFING OUTLINE

I. INTRODUCTION

- * As you know, Monsanto has been testing at the plant for dioxin stemming from the handling of the herbicide 2,4,5-T here in the mid-1960s.
- * Test results show dioxin in soil samples in a small area of the plant ^{between} ~~near~~ the drum and railcar loading facility next to the Amines unit.
- * The dioxin is localized and company medical officials assure us that the dioxin, ~~contained as it is in the soil,~~ poses no hazard to you, the public or the environment.

II. PURPOSE

- * I want to explain to you what the test results were, why no hazards exist and what actions we are taking.
- * There is no reason for alarm, but we want to keep you informed because you work here and you have a right to know.

III. TESTING

- * Water, air and soil samples were taken at several locations around the plant. We concentrated on areas we thought most likely to have dioxin if any existed. If it was here, we wanted to find it.
- * Water -- Five water samples were taken, and none contained dioxin.
- * Air -- Eight air samples were taken. Five contained no dioxin. Three contained virtually non-detectable levels -- .01 part per quadrillion. That's one millionth of a billionth.
- * That level is so small that it presents no risk to people at the plant. It's much lower than levels found in the air of some major cities.
- * Soil -- 26 soil samples were taken. 24 were negative (non-detectable). Two detected dioxin at levels of 125 parts per billion and 49 parts per billion in the top two inches of soil.
- * One of these soil samples had dioxin at levels in the low parts per million range four to six inches below the surface.

CONFIDENTIAL C10322
SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER.

- * These positive soil samples, and the three air samples with sub trace levels, were in the area where 2,4,5-T was handled during two periods from 1965 to 1967. (Nov., 1965, to Jan. 1966 and May, 1967, to Oct., 1967)
- * The plant converted it from a solid into a liquid, then shipped it on for further processing.
- * All the positive soil samples are believed to be the result of inadvertent spillage in the loading and unloading of 2,4,5-T.

IV. LOCALIZED PROBLEM

- * We didn't expect to find dioxin, but it is important that we found it only in one, small area of the plant.
- * The potential for exposure is very low, for four reasons:
 1. First, it wasn't found in the air in any meaningful levels.
 2. Second, the findings in the soil were below the surface.
 3. Third, the dioxin binds tightly to soil particles and stays there.

4. Fourth, sunlight degrades dioxin, so any that was on the surface should be gone, posing no hazard.

* Therefore, Monsanto medical officials say that because the dioxin is below the surface away from contact, it is no danger to you or to anyone in the plant.

V. ACTIONS

* However, we are taking action that should respond to the concerns of any reasonable person, regardless of their knowledge of dioxin and the situation here.

1. First, we will do more testing to define precisely the area around the rail siding which contains dioxin. That work will begin immediately.

2. Second, after the testing is done, we will cover the area with plastic sheeting and with more shell to reduce even further any potential for exposure.

3. Third, we have notified federal, state and parish officials today ~~and will work with them to~~ ^{we will} determine

if any further steps are appropriate ^{and implement} them accordingly

C10324

VI. COMMUNICATIONS STEPS

- * We're talking about this situation now, before all the testing is done, because you deserve to know.
- * As I said, we've also told government officials, and later today we will hold a press briefing to inform the news media and the public.
- * We want people to know that the dioxin is in a localized area, that it presents no hazard, and that other steps are being taken.

VII. FURTHER INFORMATION

- * We've prepared a question and answer sheet that may help you become better informed. Please take it with you.
- * Also, we have available a more detailed background paper on dioxin. If you want one, your supervisor has them available.
- * I'll be glad to answer your questions. If I can't answer them now, I'll get the answers and get back to you.
- * If you have more questions later, ask your supervisor and he'll get back to you as soon as possible.

CONFIDENTIAL C10325
SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER.

(ANSWER QUESTIONS NOW)

VIII. SUMMARY

* Let me summarize:

1. Tests found dioxin in two soil samples in a localized area where 2,4,5-T was handled some 16 years ago.

2. The dioxin in the soil poses no threat to anyone because it is locked tightly to the soil particles below the surface.

3. We are taking a number of actions to inform people of the findings and to continue to act responsibly.

* We will continue to keep you informed of any other significant developments.

* That's important. As you well know, the news media focuses much attention on this issue, much of it sensationalized. That may happen here. If it does, it's important that you, your families and your neighbors and friends know the facts.

C10326

KEY POINTS:

1. Poses no health or environmental threat to anyone.
2. Dioxin is limited to a small, isolated area at least .5 mile from nearest boundary.
3. Dioxin result of brief handling of 2,4,5-T and not from ~~any other source.~~ ~~any other source.~~

PRESS BRIEFING :

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Q: If a company as big as Monsanto handled a substance containing dioxin over a two-year period, why did it take you this long to discover it? Don't you keep better records?

A: We handled 2,4,5-T only eight months over a 24-month period.

We didn't manufacture it, only turn it from solid to liquid form, so no dioxin was generated in manufacture.

It was never a production item, only something we handled twice to avoid bottlenecks at other plants. An intermediate processing step.

2. Q: Why did you start looking for dioxin? What made you suspect that it might be present?

A: Investigation of past operations revealed a handling of 2,4,5-T. ~~Tested in most likely areas of contamination (where it was handled).~~

Knew that 2,4,5-T contains dioxin as a trace impurity.

Tested in areas most likely to contain dioxin, as well as water, air, plant boundaries.

3. Q: If 2,4,5-T is a component of Agent Orange, why did you deny that ~~xx~~ Agent Orange was ever made at Luling?

A: 2,4,5-T is a herbicide on its own.

Agent Orange is a mixture of 2,4,5-T and 2,4-D, which we never made at Luling.

We never made 2,4,5-T either, only converted it from solid to liquid form.

4. Q: How ~~xxxx~~ were the people who handled 2,4,5-T protected?

A: (V.E. Boyen to provide)

C10327

Q5. What waste was generated? How was it disposed of?

Q6. Were there any health problems in the plant at that time? If so, what steps were taken?

Q7. What future health studies are planned now?

Q8. Besides dioxin, what other wastes have been generated at the plant?
Disposal methods?

Q9. Where is the equipment used to handle 2,4,5-T?

Q10. How far is the dioxin site from the nearest residential area?

Q11. What else do you make at Luling that has dioxin in it?

* No other products contain dioxin.

Q12. If dioxin contamination dates to 1965-67, isn't it likely that workers were exposed to much higher levels of ~~the~~ dioxin than those levels that show up now?

*

Q13. If the 2,4,5-T was carried out by railcar, isn't it ~~like~~ likely that there is dioxin contamination outside the plant? Have you tested outside the plant?

CONFIDENTIAL

SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER.

C10328

Max

Chloracne

(1981)

Q14 How can you be sure that the chloracne outbreak was caused by something other than dioxin?

Q15 How long did the chloracne cases last?

Q16 Isn't it true that you experienced another chloracne outbreak in the middle 1960s? What was it attributed to? How long did it last? Did you do anything about it?

Q17 The federal government purchased an entire town at Times Beach, Mo., and moved the people away, yet you tell us that there is no hazard here although the concentrations found amounted to 1000s of times greater concentrations than those found at ~~xx~~ Times Beach. Why?

C10329

CONFIDENTIAL

Q18 How long did you handle 2,4,5-T and how much did you make?

* November, ~~through~~ 1965, through January, 1966. May through

October, ~~1966~~ 1967.

* total of 4.3 ~~million~~ million pounds.

Q19

C10330

PRESS BRIEFING
QUESTIONS
Page two

19. EPA scientists say that dioxin is the most potent cancer-causing substance they've ever studied, yet you say the only long-term health effect is chloracne. Who's right?
20. EPA also says that dioxin presents an unacceptable risk when found in water in parts per quintillion. Since the lowest level of your measurements is .2 parts per billion, how can you be sure dioxin is not in the wastewater leaving the plant?
21. What's the margin of error in the tests you conducted? How many samples did you take? How long did you sample the air?
22. Why did you object to the EPA testing for dioxin at the Luling plant? Is it because you knew you had it all along?
23. If there's no danger to workers, why are you adding more shell? Doesn't adding shell just cover up the problem instead of eliminating it?
24. Have workers reported high incidences of birth defects or miscarriages?

CONFIDENTIAL C10331
SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

PRESS BRIEFING
QUESTIONS
Page three

- 25 28. Will you be doing any studies of long-term health effects of workers at Luling? Mortality studies? Morbidity studies?
- 26 29. Have any soft-tissue sarcomas been discovered among your workers?
- 27 30. What is the EPA, DNR reaction to all this? Will they do their own tests?
- 28 31. If you find more dioxin, will you shut the plant down?
- 29 32. Why did you stop making 2,4,5-T in 1969?
- 30 33. If you knew dioxin was a contaminant in the mid-sixties, why didn't Monsanto do something about it then?
- 31 34. Have you sampled the Mississippi River water? Taken any fish samples?

CONFIDENTIAL C10332
SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

PRESS BRIEFING
QUESTIONS
Page four

32 20. Have you sampled the landfill? What about the flatbed truck that's supposed to be buried on the site? Is it contaminated with dioxin?

33 21. Why are you being sued by a former employee for damage to his liver?

34 22. Have you done any follow-up studies on the people who were treated for chloracne?

35 23. If you knew about this problem last week, why did you allow women and children to take plant tours near the area of contamination?

36 24. Why did you start looking for dioxin on your own?
(Is it because you didn't want to get caught in a lie)(that you didn't make Agent Orange)?

C10333