PESTICIDE CHEMICAL NEWS

Editor: Cathy Cooper
Assistant Editor: Gail Tapscott
Circulation Director: Shirley Galant
Production Manager: Dorothy Hill
Publisher: Louis Rothschild, Jr.
Managing Editor: Raymond Galant
Associate Editors: Eileen Kugler, Natalie Pargas

VINYL CHLORIDE AIR EMISSION DATA REQUESTED BY EPA FROM 27 FIRMS

Vinyl chloride air pollution control standards are inevitable and perhaps imminent. The Environmental Protection Agency (See May 29, Page 21) might set an ambient air standard before the Labor Department sets its worker protection limit.

EPA last week asked 27 vinyl chloride and polyvinyl chloride manufacturers to give the agency process emission and air quality data "for possible use" in the development of air pollution control standards. The firms were told to respond by June 14.

EPA plans to release results of its vinyl chloride and polyvinyl chloride air monitoring program this month. Ambient air samples were taken near plants in seven EPA Regions. The agency does not intend to use the monitoring data to prosecute any firms, an EPA official said.

The May 30 data request covers 14 vinyl chloride and 35 polyvinyl chloride plants operated by the following 27 companies:

PPG Industries, Inc.; Shell Chemical Company; Air Products and Chemicals, Inc.; American Chemical Corporation; Bordon Chemical, Inc.; Continental Oil Company; Diamond Shamrock Chemical Company; Ethyl Corporation; Firestone Plastics Company; General Tire and Rubber Company; B. F. Goodrich Chemical Company; Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company; Great American Chemical Company; Hooker Chemical; Keysor-Century Corporation; Monsanto Company; National Starch and Chemical Corporation; Olin Corporation; The Pantasote Co. of New York, Inc.; Robintech, Inc.; Stauffer Chemical Company; Tenneco Chemicals, Inc.; Union Carbide Corporation; Uniroyal Incorporated; Allied Chemical Corporation; Dow Chemical Company; and Monochem, Inc.

EPA asked the firms to identify: (1) emission control procedures which are in use or could be used along with estimates of the cost and efficacy of the devices or procedures; (2) emission points and amount of emissions from each point; and (3) ambient air data.

The data submitted by the firms will be available to the public "unless a satisfactory showing has been made to the Administrator that the release of the information obtained would divulge a trade secret," according to the agency's letter to the 27 companies. The letter, signed by Don R. Goodwin, Director, Emission Standards and Engineering Division, EPA, stated:

> "If you believe that any of the information we are requesting would reveal a trade secret if divulged, you should clearly identify that information, and set forth reasons for your claim, including supportive data or legal authority. Your reasons and supportive data should be presented separately for each item of information. Unsupported statements that you consider certain information confidential will not be accepted. Emission data, however, will always be available to the public."

EPA has asked for the amount of vinyl chloride or polyvinyl chloride produced in each of the 49 plants.

•

DIELDRIN-POULTRY INDEMNITY BILL MAY BE DEAD

The dieldrin poultry indemnity bill (See May 22, Page 4) may be dead.

The sponsors' plan to gain time to line up sufficient favorable votes on the measure may have backfired. The delay in House action appears to have eroded the strength of the bill's backers and provided an opportunity for those against the legislation to increase their numbers.

If the House leadership agrees, the bill (S 3231) might get to the House floor during the week of June 10. The leadership agreement is doubtful. But the decision on whether to bring the bill to the floor might be left with the sponsors who will have to weigh the risk of being tied to a proposal which has a good chance of being defeated.

The Health, Education and Welfare Department has "strongly" recommended against enactment of the bill. HEW suggested that the poultry producers should attempt to recoup through civil damage suits, rather than be reimbursed by the government. The Department's letter to Rep. Poage (D-Tex.) Chairman, House Agriculture Committee said, in part:

> "Thus far, the Food and Drug Administration investigation has produced no evidence that any of the poultry producers involved knowingly purchased any of the oil designed for industrial use or other contaminated oils for use in their feed. But neither have we uncovered any equities in this case which would justify a government subsidy to the producers and employees involved, nor have we learned of any negligence on the part of the Federal Government in approving dieldrin for use, by involvement in the process by which the poultry feed became contaminated, or in enforcing the Federal food laws. Furthermore, those processors and growers who have suffered economic losses as a result of the feed contamination have recourse against third parties through private actions for damages."