(98)

BCC: W. S. CLARK

July 1, 1970

Mr. Donald W. Weimer
Director of Purchasing
Koppers Company
Koppers Building
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Dear Mr. Weimer:

I understand from Monsanto's Mr. Guy Busch that representatives of your company were very distressed at Monsanto's decision to discontinue the sale of Aroclors for certain specific uses. You apparently believed that the action was unjustified and precipitous without any consideration given to the problems it would create for you.

I fully understand and appreciate your feelings. However, I believe you too will appreciate that Monsanto did not make such an important economic decision without due consideration of all the information available.

There are at present about 75 industrial, university and regulatory laboratories throughout the world studying PCB's and their effect on the environment. Monsanto, frankly skeptical initially, is now convinced PCB's are being found ubiquitously in the environment and that they do effect some species of birds and marine life.

Recently, PCB's have been found in milk in Ohio. The source of contamination was traced to Aroclor 1254 used in the silo coating which was applied in 1967. No tolerance levels for PCB in food have been established, but as a result of this finding the FDA is seriously considering setting limits of 0.5 ppm in milk and 5.0 ppm in other food.

I mention this specific case as an example of the type of discoveries that are being made and how they could influence the various federal and state regulatory agencies.

I am told that your company is using Aroclor 1254 in coatings for swimming pools and water reservoirs. Although these applications were acceptable in the past, in my opinion I don't believe any governmental agency would today approve such an application. It would behoove you to seek an alternate formulation regardless of any action Monsanto would take.

Faced with the growing evidence that PCB's are contaminating the environment, Monsanto decided that some applications were vital to our society and must be retained, but with tight control to dramatically reduce escape to the environment. Those applications, such as yours, in which the escape to the environment is beyond tight control must be sacrificed in order to protect those controllable applications for which no economically acceptable substitute exists.

I recognize that withdrawal of Aroclors from your application will result in problems for you, but as we see it the writing is on the wall and the stakes are high. Continued use of Aroclors in applications such as yours is not considered a wise business decision when considering the public relations, governmental relations, legal ramifications, employee relations and moral obligations which are involved.

I wish you success in your search for an acceptable substitute and I assure you our Monsanto representatives are extremely anxious to help.

Sincerely,

W. B. Papageorge
Manager
Environmental Control

ms

cc: Mr. William Herman
Buyer
Koppers Company

Mr. Guy J. Busch - Akron

MONS 089526