October 20, 1971

ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD HEARING ON ASBESTOS
WAUKEGAN, ILLINOIS - OCTOBER 19, 1971

This hearing was presided over by Board Member Samuel Lawton and was also attended by his Assistant, Timothy Harker. Others in attendance included representatives of the Johns-Manville Local 600 of the International Chemical Workers Union, Dr. Colin Harwood, of Illinois Institute of Technology Research Institute, Reporter Steve Rothman of the Waukegan "News-Sun", the newspaper that blasted J-M on the asbestos and health issue last summer, and a representative of the Illinois Department of Labor.

Johns-Manville was represented by Plant Manager Chuck Wikel, Dr. Tom Davison, Cliff Sheckler, Roy Winkworth (employee relations) Frank Angelos, (Environmental Control) J. Robbin (P&FM District Sales Office, Chicago) and Bill Raines. Dr. Eugene Stefl of Raybestos and Attorney Carol Halfpenny, representing Raybestos, also were present.

The first witness was Mr. Gaddam Reddy, Environmental Control Engineer, Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. Mr. Reddy, a native of India, spoke with such a decided accent that it was difficult to understand what he was saying. The gist of it appeared to be that the EPA (enforcement arm of the Illinois Pollution Control Setup) did not have the personnel nor the

equipment to do the kind of sampling of ambient air that the regulations called for.

The second witness was Cliff Sheckler, speaking for the National Insulation Manufacturers Association. He gave a statement on the health aspects of Fiber Glass. This was intended to counter the allegations made by Mr. Golinken at Chicago, although no reference to those allegations was made by Sheckler. There were no questions from the Board.

The third witness was Fred Engelking of Caterpillar Tractor. He is a Chemist who is in charge of Research and Development on Friction Materials in the Research Department of Caterpillar. He gave an excellent slide presentation covering the types of equipment that Caterpillar makes that use brakes, the five different types of braking systems and some of the research Caterpillar has done. He states that no safe substitute has ever been developed for asbestos in brake linings. He showed very impressive graphs demonstrating the difference in "slip time" of asbestos containing brake linings versus sintered metal. The latter are very noisy and, worse, tend to lock, throwing the driver into the windshield.

Caterpillar has done research somewhat to that of Lynch. They see no fibers larger than 5 microns; their results generally parallel those of Lynch.

Caterpillar wants the brake lining ban modified so that:

1. Asbestos brake linings would be permitted if in totally enclosed brake compartments.
2. Asbestos containing brake linings would be permitted in any event until conclusive medical evidence has been shown to prove the need for a ban on them. Even then, a threshold limit value should be assigned rather than a complete ban. (An interesting contrast to Nicholson's "Make Industry Prove It's Safe" Testimony in Chicago.)

The fourth witness was Dr. Howard Ayer of the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, H.E.W. He talked about sampling and calculating methods and the great variations in sampling. He talked about reliability, reproducibility and cost of sampling techniques, particularly those that would have to be used for the ambient air. It appeared that his testimony was aimed at supporting a "visible emission" versus "numerical" standard, although Ayer expressed some doubts about the idea of a visible emission standard. It was never entirely clear who invited him to testify, although he stated that he had been "invited" the previous day.

The final witness was Mr. Middleton of Chemical Workers. He said he wanted to talk about in-plant conditions and gave a bit of background as to his interest in the subject, including the fact that he had attended Dr. Selikoff's seminar in March. He implied strongly that the Union had "discovered" the asbestos health problem and had "brought it to the attention of the company and got the company to do something about it" but when one ignores those jabs, his testimony was helpful in that he said that the company and the Union had setup a joint Environmental Control Committee and that conditions were "improved". He said that J-M was making "progress" on dust control although the Union would take a "wait-and-see" attitude. He pushed for some provision for change of clothing so that workers do not take asbestos-laden clothes home from work. He also said that he wants TLV under the Occupational Safety and Health Act lowered, although he did not cite a figure. He did say that the Union and the company are now cooperating. When he completed his testimony, Cliff Sheckler rose and, speaking for Johns-Manville, thanked him for his comments.

Before adjoining the hearings, Lawton mentioned that there would be additional hearings only if the full Board chooses to make "substantial" changes in the proposed regulations. He implied that he did not think this would happen!

W. P. Raines

mab-12