



Roger J Zipfel
07/27/2001 01:30 PM

To: John E Crum/SE/DuPont@DuPont
cc: Ta-Wei Fu/CL/DuPont@DuPont
Subject: Re: C-8 sampling 

John, this is very perplexing information. I don't in anyway believe this is coming from any liquid solutions of C-8 in B-124. Ron runs a pretty tight ship and there is minimal C-8 laying around. What is happening is that we are not abating the vent from the fine powder scrubbers. This plume of C-8 must be entering the recovery building. We find high levels of C-8 on the roof areas of B-162, levels above the AEL.

I believe this situation will disappear when we get our exhaust filters on line. Prior to that we could do an extensive study to verify one source vs. another.

Again I don't think this is coming from any aqueous leaks. Thus your concern is not the main concern relative to this issue. Roger.
John E Crum



John E Crum
07/27/2001 07:54 AM

To: Ta-Wei Fu/CL/DuPont@DuPont, Roger J Zipfel/AE/DuPont@DuPont
cc:
Subject: C-8 sampling

Please note the attached. The samples seem to be consistantly on the high side. I would like to understand what is causing this? Ta-Wei you inidicated it must be from dry powder over the phone yesterday because of the high vapor pressure of C-8, but somehow I remember in the old days of us saying that C-8 azeotroped with water in the dryer and that we needed water in order to help remove the C-8 from the polymer. Otherwise the dryer could not "evaporate" C-8 and it would remain with the polymer. My concern is the extra exposures that will occur with the new RO units!! We will be releasing a lot more dilute C-8 liquids to the floor area in the building and determine if this is coming from vapor concentrations rather than particle concentrations. Dried C-8 particles can be kept to a minimum by hosing down the floor well, but we will have difficulty in keeping vapor concentrations down.

And whether this is from the present units or new units, I would assume that having this restriction is going to be a long term problem/concern that we may want to deal with. Can we live with having a 15 min exposure limit in the room for the long term?

----- Forwarded by John E Crum/SE/DuPont on 07/27/2001 07:34 AM -----



Donald E McKown
07/26/2001 05:03 PM

To: John E Crum/SE/DuPont@DuPont, John S Hammond/HO/DuPont@DuPont
cc:
Subject: C-8 sampling

----- Forwarded by Donald E McKown/SE/DuPont on 07/26/2001 05:03 PM -----



Jack L. Offenberger
07/26/2001 01:21 PM



EID339020

To: James W Hunt/CL/DuPont@DuPont
cc: Donald E McKown/SE/DuPont@DuPont, Becky Szakats Dines/CL/DuPont@DuPont, Nicholas K
Reed/AE/DuPont@DuPont, Mark D Cothorn/SE/DuPont@DuPont, Anthony J
Playtis/CL/DuPont@DuPont, Fred M Lentz/SE/DuPont@DuPont
Subject: C-8 sampling

We have had some complaints regarding the posted signs in the C-8 Recovery building requiring Respiratory Protection while working in the building over a 15 minutes time frame. We have done some extra sampling in the building to see if the levels are low enough to remove the signs. Below are the results of the most recent sampling.

DATE	RESULT	% of AEL	Sample
7/3	0.31	55.4	Routine sample
7/20	0.52	92.9	Extra Sampling
7/20	0.46	82.1	Extra Sampling
7/24	0.48	85.7	Extra Sampling
7/24	0.52	92.9	Extra Sampling

Out of the last 25 samples taken in that area, 4 have been over the AEL, another 13 have been well over 1/2 of the AEL and 8 were less than 1/2 the AEL. Should we continue with the extra sampling? Based on these results, I lean towards keeping the respiratory protection requirement.

Thanks
--Jack Offenberger, Teflon® S&OH Coordinator
ext. 4959

EID339021