


FILE NAME: Drilling Specialties (DRSP)

DATE: 1983 Mar 25

DOC#: DRSP024

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Handwritten Notes - Asbestos Labeling & Flosal



PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT
DUAL LOGS

FLOSA
OLD ER REPORTS
3/2/83 -

Asbestos Flosal

ASB 008758

o labelled adequately?

o ACGIH et al asbestos a carcinogen! *Asbestos 2.5-2.5
Asbestos 2.5-2.5
Asbestos 2.5-2.5*

Does adequate product labelling preclude a lawsuit?
*in favor of adequate labeling - product liability
- 5-10 product not involved in litigation*

Labeled adequately?

So the reward/risk ratio: great enough to continue?

ACGIH et al asbestos a carcinogen

*lawsuit set
 = No. of lawsuits set
 offered*

* (settled in favor of plaintiff)

Does adequate & proper labeling preclude a lawsuit?

*Air sampling results 1979 - what happened to other
 panels? / ? Same as those were taken*

So the reward / risk ratio great enough to continue?

figures and the threat of lawsuit in the same year? ...

COD 255181

No #'s sold x profit / # x lawsuit / cost = No. of lawsuits

set stage for potential suits on basis of earlier concern?

DSC 15441

Samples in 1975 were higher had ~~cost~~ ^{STP} relative to 2.1 Hg (59 mg)

652060 HSH
* K

No data in 5/24/79 brochure Fiscal H-0 State
 in 1979. Data collected in 1975 was
 higher in SEER short cancer stem
 in sample made collected by other trained by us. regular of future
 work in the data viz, strong typical policy.
 such to represent as future.
 NO GUARANTEES.

NO. 100-44785

Year	Sample	1975	1979
1974	Floral introduced		

Asbestos causes cancer

Chloroform

COPY 2951 B2

DSC 15442

FLOSA
OLDER REPORTS

3/25/83 -

Asbestos Flosal

✓ ASB 000758

o labelled adequately?

Hester, 21

o ACGIH et al (asbestos) a carcinogen!

Chrysotile	2.0-4.5
Amosite	0.5
Crocidolite	0.2

Does adequate & proper labelling preclude a lawsuit?

in event of cigarette industry lawsuit history - packages labelled
5-11 package not labelled clearly on.

Is the reward/risk ratio great enough to continue?

$$\text{No. of Sales} \times \% \text{ profit} / \# \times \frac{1 \text{ lawsuit SFP}^*}{\# \text{ cat @ } \#} = \text{No. of lawsuits SFP w/ would be afforded}$$

* (settled in favor of plaintiff)

What DMA is spent mud after collection? Any data.
data in brochures - says "a little bit of DMA left in the mud..."

Air sampling results 1979 - what happened to other results? Some of them were higher.

When was Flosal changed?

what is relationship, if any, between airborne concn of asbestos fibers and the Flosal ^{measured} in the same year?

CDD 255181

Would not a discussion & perhaps illustration of changes in Flosal & dust concn show improvement? or would set stage for potential suits on basis of carbon concn?

Samples in 1975 were higher had ^{STE} values up to 2.1 H₂ (39 mm)

DSC 15441

- ~~Air Sample~~
data in 8/23/79 brochure Flosal H²O date
is 1979. data collected in 1975 was
higher in STEL short samples STEL
air sampling results collected by others trained by us. sampled on persons
working on dry rigs, doing typical jobs.
seem to represent exposure.
NO GUARANTEES.

• Flosal introduced 1964 sampling 1975 11 years
next sampling 1979

~~Asbestos~~
Caused cancer