

**UNION
CARBIDE**

INTERNAL CORRESPONDENCE

SOLVENTS & INTERMEDIATES DIVISION

P. O. BOX 471, TEXAS CITY, TEXAS 77590

To: See Attached List

Date December 17, 1981

Subject Epidemiology - Texas City

The attached response to comments made by the NIOSH public relations office subsequent to our Texas City press conference has been handed by line supervision to all Texas City Plant employees this week. Also attached are two slightly different stand-by statements to be used with the letter in responding to any further press contacts prior to release of the NIOSH study. At this time, our plan is to remain silent until that time unless we find it necessary to respond to some inquiry.

The distribution list for this note is an effort to close the loop on a number of internal inquiries, in addition to our usual contacts. If I've missed someone, it's inadvertent; please copy for them.

Primary press contacts remain Bill Hoerger in Corporate Communications, Dr. Glenn or myself.



D. L. Engle

DLE/gt
Attachments

UCC 097127



UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION
SOLVENTS AND INTERMEDIATES

P. O. BOX 471, TEXAS CITY, TEXAS 77590

December 14, 1981

TO ALL TEXAS CITY UNION CARBIDE EMPLOYEES:

The news media have reported results released by NIOSH which seem to differ from those we presented to you by letter on November 11. The difference in numbers come from a different study base in that NIOSH included all employees and extended the study two additional years. They also divided the population into subgroups to focus on longer term employees to emphasize the latency period of brain tumors. NIOSH did not notify us of this change in our original agreement.

The news media did quote NIOSH as saying "our results are not too different--we only disagree as to interpretation of the results." They have stated that they feel that the excess number of brain tumors are not related to chance but are occupationally related. We believe that no occupational relationship has been established because: (1) we have not been able to associate these brain cancer cases with any particular chemical exposure; (2) the types of brain cancer are present in the same percentages as that seen in the general population, and (3) no occupational relationship to brain cancer has been found in studies of chemical plants similar to ours in other parts of the country.

We strongly feel that neither study is conclusive. Continuing studies of our own and elsewhere in the chemical industry will be necessary before definite conclusions can be reached. We have yet to see the NIOSH report, and we may want to comment further when we have studied it. It is most important, however, that neither our study nor the NIOSH press report suggest any change we should make in our present employee protection policies or operating procedures. We've been saying for two and a half years on this issue, "If we have a problem, tell us what it is. We'll find a way to solve it."


D. H. Glenn, M.D.
Gulf Coast Medical Director


D. L. Engle
Plant Manager

DHG/DLE/gc

UCC 097128