October 22, 1971

Dr. E. P. Stefl
Administrative Assistant to President
Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc.
205 Middle Street
Bridgeport, Conn. 06603

Dear Gene:

I'm writing this as a matter of record. I believe I may have mentioned it on the phone.

On Wednesday September 29, 1971 (4:00 P.M.) I was called by a representative of the Center for Political Research in Washington, D. C.

Miss Susan Simon
Center for Political Research
1790 M. Street N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

She had apparently decided (or had been told) to contact the Friction Materials Standards Institute with the impression that we had material or compounding standards. The basic thrust of her question was: "What are the brake lining manufacturers doing about asbestos in the environment?"

I told her we did have a committee studying asbestos in the brake lining industry for (1) general environment emissions, and (2) asbestos in the work place.

I mentioned the Environmental Protection Agency's tests to determine the extent of any asbestos emissions in the general environment from the use of brake lining on vehicles, and the proposed regulations of the Illinois Pollution Control Board.

She brought up fiber glass as a substitute. I believe she is part of the activist anti-everythings, and while our conversation was polite and restrained, I don't believe she had much technical depth - as suggested by the usual "fiber glass substitute" and the apparent pre-judgment that asbestos in brake linings is a serious contaminant from the emission viewpoint in the general environment.

The foregoing is strictly a matter of record.

Sincerely,

EWD/icb

E. W. Drislane
Executive Secretary

C-23

CORPORATE HEADQUARTERS
DR. E. P. STEFL
VICE PRESIDENT
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT TO PRESIDENT

205 MIDDLE STREET, BRIDGEPORT, CONN. 06603

Raybestos-Manhattan

September 27, 1971

Mr. E. Drislane
Friction Materials Standards Institute, Inc.
370 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10017

Dear Ed:

I am returning your draft copy of the minutes of our meeting of the Asbestos Study Committee without change. I think you have covered the matters that were discussed quite well.

As agreed upon at that meeting, I am also enclosing a copy of the Federal proposal for the emission standards for asbestos. You will recall that the members of the committee thought it well to see this draft copy even though we now know that the Federal standards will be quite different. Nonetheless it is being submitted for information purposes. You are to make copies and distribute such to the members of the committee.

In addition I am enclosing a copy of the comments and suggestions that were made regarding this initial draft by the AIA at a recent meeting that was held in Atlanta about mid-August. These comments and suggestions were given to the entire group assembled and we were advised that they would be given consideration in the revised version, which we have yet to see. Again, this is being supplied for information purposes.

Further, I agreed to advise all the Committee members as to what happened at our unofficial meeting with some members of the Illinois Pollution Control Board held in Chicago on September 17. Since that meeting covered matters other than the ban on asbestos in brake lining, I will quote you from portions of the minutes I have received regarding that session. I would urge that you advise our committee members that this information is to be considered extremely confidential at this point, especially since the meeting was held in advance of the public hearings.

C-24
(3)

Those present in Chicago on September 17 were Timothy Harker, Administrative Assistant to the Illinois Pollution Control Board, and Walter Romanok, also of the Illinois Pollution Control Board on a part time basis. Representing them from a technical standpoint was Dr. Colin Harwood, whom I believe was instrumental in writing a great portion of the proposed regulations. He is from an Illinois Institute of Technical Research, I believe is the proper title. Representing our side was Dr. George Wright of St. Luke's Hospital in Cleveland, E. M. Fenner, W. P. Raines and Dr. S. Speil of J/M, and myself.

The two-hour meeting was quite cordial and useful. Despite Harker's great reluctance to schedule the meeting, and his suggestion on September 13 that it be cancelled, he proved to be quite communicative and certainly did not evidence hostility.

We learned that public hearings will be held in Illinois on Wednesday, October 6, in Granite City at 9:30 A.M. in the court house; on Friday, October 15, in Chicago at the Field Museum at 10:00 A.M.; and Tuesday, October 19, in Waukegan at 10:00 A.M. at the public library.

Harker indicated a preference that the asbestos industry, through the AIA/NA, testify as a unit rather than each asbestos company testifying separately. Harker indicated a strong preference that the industry present its testimony at the Waukegan hearing rather than at the Chicago hearing. They expect the Chicago hearing to be "crowded". It is neither necessary nor desirable to appear at more than one of the hearings.

Testimony should be given verbally and in writing. Ten copies of the written version should be submitted to the Board in advance. We advised Harker that we would let him know which hearing we would present our testimony at, who would testify for the industry, and the amount of time that we would require.

On the matter of the brake lining ban, this subject required surprisingly brief discussion. Harker called it "a weak point in our regulations". He implied--though he did not say so--that it was inserted in order to gain publicity for the proposed regulations and hearings. He said it would "stimulate discussion". Harker did say that one automobile company had told him that their company would be using only asbestos-free disc brakes by 1975 and that the asbestos ban would thus not affect them.

Dr. Harwood said that GM and Chrysler had told him that they saw no way of eliminating asbestos from brake blocks or discs without seriously diminishing the effectiveness of the brakes. Harker seemed impressed by this and commented that the Board didn't want to kill more people than it "saved" by any such ban.

We mentioned the Bendix studies being conducted for the EPA relative to the emissions of moving vehicles. The Illinois people seem to know very little aboutwhat the Federal EPA is doing relative to asbestos emission standards and what the Bendix test involvement is.

Harker also mentioned that New York City is testing the air in subways and other closed in areas to see what the asbestos fiber level is there, presumably being produced from vehicles.

I believe that summarizes what transpired to a great extent at that meeting. In view of the time limitations for these hearings, from the standpoint of getting prepared, it would seem that the AIA/NA will carry the ball for the entire group since I do not think that the FMSI Committee can function with any realistic data at this point. This is a personal opinion of mine and I would appreciate any comments anyone might care to make regarding such a position. In the meanwhile, through Johns-Manville, the AIA has testified at various city and state hearings on the ban of asbestos in spray coating and also testified in Washington in a written form regarding the hazardous nature of asbestos so I believe we have a format which can be presented from that group in Illinois and be effective. Some of it will be written and in addition we will probably have people testify on the aspects other than the brake lining ban. I believe the portion on the brake lining ban will be limited to the publications which I submitted to each committee member at our first meeting.

I believe this concludes my report to you and the items that I agreed to take care of. If there are any other areas where I can be of help, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

E. P. Stefl

Attachments

P.S. I have just been advised that the AIA/NA testimony will be presented on Friday, 10/15, in Chicago. Perhaps you would care to be present.