Monsanto

FROM (NAME & LOCATION) E. S. Tucker - R&D Laboratories - South Second Street

DATE September 25, 1969

cc M. W. Farrar - Res. 1
W. R. Richard - GO
E. P. Wheeler - GO

SUBJECT WISCONSIN ALUMINI RESEARCH FOUNDATION INSTITUTE TRIP REPORT - SEPTEMBER 24, 1969

REFERENCE

TO :R. E. Keller - Res. 1

A review and comparison of the PCB analytical methodology developed here and independently in the WARF laboratories was held with F. Coon (director, chemical analysis section), J. Birdsall (project coordinator), and D. Hughes (analyst) in Madison, Wisconsin at their research laboratories. Their procedures, with minor exceptions, were an exact duplication of ours and as such should produce equivalent results.

We, therefore, agreed to exchange a limited number of Lake Michigan samples and extracts for collaborative verification between the two sites. The exchange samples will be restricted to those producing abnormal electron capture chromatograms which could be misinterpreted unless subjected to GC/Mass verification. They do not presently have this capability although they are certainly thinking along these lines. They were also obviously interested in our help in identifying pollutants other than those already identified in these abnormal samples. Whether or not we share information above and beyond the PCB problem is, of course, open and obviously dependent on what other materials, in addition to PCBs, we actually find in these samples.

2# ea sent 9-3-69 by J. Miller

They requested "pint bottle" amounts of Aroclor 1242, 1254 and 1260. The reason given for the rather large amounts requested was that they have had many requests for standard samples of these materials which they would like to fill in order to maintain these contacts. While they would rather dispense the Aroclors themselves, they agreed that they could and would refer all requests to us if we felt this was better.

This laboratory, in my opinion, is well equipped and competently staffed. In addition to this, I found their attitude toward the PCB pollution problem to be acceptably scientific rather than political in nature.

Additionally, I believe that we should consider using WARF facilities to eliminate some of our current manpower and routine sample backlog problems.

The chromatograms I saw of the Lake Michigan samples they had looked at corresponded to the higher chlorinated biphenyls 1254 and 1260. The samples taken in and around the industrial areas (southern one-third of lake) appeared to contain the higher levels.

In view of this, our current Pensacola problem, and other published information, I would suggest that we step up our efforts at finding immediate replacement formulations for Pydraul AC and Pydraul 625. I also feel that Aroclor 1242 should not be used in replacement formulations. If this were done, I firmly believe that in a short period of time analysts would soon be reporting Aroclor 1242 as a significant water pollutant thus seriously endangering a market which so far has not been questioned.

E. S. Tucker

db