W. R. Richard - Research Center

February 4, 1971

R. E. Keller - S.2ndSt.
H. Munch - S.2ndSt

BIODEGRADATION RATES AND
NATURE'S EVIDENCE OF BIODEGRADATION
- CHLORINATED BIPHENYLS

E. S. Tucker - S. 2nd St.

I would like to set a target date of Monday, February 8, to have a written document which could help answer G.E.'s questions on MCS 1016, its degradation rate; and why MCS 1016 is a better fluid in the environment than Aroclor 1242 and Aroclor 1254.

We agreed to use Ruabon's degradation rates, supplemented by our own evidence. We need to place these rates relative to alkylbenzene sulfonate rates.

We were to examine the rat tissue, fish samples, milk samples, chicken samples, etc., for evidence of biodegradable vs. non-biodegradable chlorinated biphenyl isomers.

For our internal use this document should also review the Ruabon reports on which isomers will and won't degrade. We need to evaluate which isomers in MCS 1016, MCS 1043 may cause problems and evaluate the chances that culture C_3 or solubilization of particular isomers will result in a biodegradation of refraction isomers such as 4,4'.

At the earliest time possible, preferably before Thursday, February 11, I will need for internal use a report on the biodegradation of chlorinated phenyl ethers of:

trichlorodiphenyl ether
2,2'-dichlorodiphenyl ether
2, 2,4' } chlorophenyl butyl ether
} or whatever ones we have done

as compared with MCS 1016 and MCS 1043. I have a review session on the biodegradation program with Howard Bergen on Friday, February 12, and this is the critical issue.

Thanks.

W. R. Richard

/is

TRAN 037146

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

#361 Tucker