

For: LEAD INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION, INC.

FOR RELEASE: MONDAY AFTERNOON, APRIL 13, 1970

TOP LEAD INDUSTRY SPOKESMAN TELLS PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATURE THAT REMOVAL OF LEAD FROM GASOLINE MAY INCREASE POLLUTION PROBLEMS.

HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA (April 13) -- A spokesman for the nation's lead industry warned the Pennsylvania State Legislature today not to be trapped into believing that the banning of leaded gasoline is going to control auto emission problems.

"It will not, and indeed there is good evidence that removal of lead may even increase noxious gaseous emissions from present gasolines used in present automobiles," said J. L. Kimberley, executive vice president of the Lead Industries Association in an appearance before the House Committee on Health and Welfare of the Pennsylvania General Assembly. The legislative body is conducting hearings to ban lead additives in gasoline by mid-1972.

Kimberley warned, "It is astounding to find gross misconceptions, misrepresentation and false conclusions are being used officially to support the drive to get the lead out." The executive cited a document used as a guide to California legislators last week as an example. He cited several examples of errors in the brief.

"The most advanced emission control devices that have actually been demonstrated -- and are presently available for adapting to mass production for use on present cars -- have been shown to be effective with today's present leaded gasolines." He cited a thermal reactor system as an example. On March 20, the California Air Resources Board completed tests which indicated the system came well under the 1975 Federal emissions goals and came close to meeting 1980 goals.

"It is strange," said Kimberley, "that so much reliance is placed on vague promises of emission control approaches that may be developed after there is lead-free gasoline. Stranger still is the delay in adopting and improving control methods that have already been shown to work with existing gasolines and automobiles.

"It stands to reason that if the emotional drive succeeds to force the automobile public to use non-leaded gasoline, this may well close off one promising alternative to the solution of automobile exhaust problems. Today the most advanced and demonstrated methods for such emission control work with leaded gasoline. Should leaded gasoline be banned, obviously research on and further development of such systems compatible with leaded gasoline will be greatly hampered if not brought to a standstill."

Kimberley added, "All the problems involved in removing lead would be worth tackling if there were to be shown any need for getting lead out of gasoline on the grounds of public health or even nuisance. Lead is not involved in photochemical smog formation, nor in irritation of eyes or other membranes, nor has lead in the air, from whatever sources, been shown to present a danger to public health.

"In addition, there is considerable belief and evidence that non-leaded fuels could actually increase, rather than decrease, the more noxious and obnoxious auto fumes. This is a vast unknown." Kimberley, a metallurgical and mechanical engineer, advised the Committee to reserve final decision until careful study and development of emission control systems, particulate controls and polluting effects of unleaded fuels are completed.

PNYC00001199

N10185

Report on Meeting with Department of Health, Education and Welfare Officials
HEW Headquarters Conference Room, Washington, D.C.
Tuesday, April 14, 1970

Present: Robert V. Pauley, Special Assistant to HEW Secretary
Roger Strelow, Special Assistant to HEW Secretary
John T. Middleton, Commissioner, National Air Pollution Control
Administration
Eric Stork, Legislative Liaison, NAPCA Bureau of Criteria and Standards
Richard Jones, NAPCA Bureau of Criteria and Standards
J.L. Kimberley, Executive Vice President, Lead Industries Association
Carl Thompson, Senior Vice President, Hill and Knowlton, Inc.

This memo will not attempt a chronological account but is organized by major subject areas covered.

The atmosphere of the session was at all times cordial and friendly, beginning with the coincidence of Kimberley and Thompson getting on same elevator with Middleton and his colleagues to go to the HEW Secretary's office where they met with Pauley and went to large conference room. Meeting was at one end of long table (originally set up, it was explained, by Nelson Rockefeller when he was HEW Undersecretary). The conference lasted about an hour and a half, with the last few minutes only with Pauley and Strelow.

After Kimberley briefly outlined industry's failure to understand why such urgency behind the drive to "get the lead out of gasoline," the give and take was generally informal, with all taking some part but Middleton and Kimberley being primary spokesmen.

On concern of lead industry: Middleton asked specifically to know more about Lead Industry Association. The membership, concern of industry, sources of lead, relative importance of lead, relative importance of lead additives to gasoline, to total use and domestic mining, etc. were outlined.

At close of meeting, Pauley and Strelow asked specifically for fact sheet about importance of lead additives to lead industry. This is to be provided to Pauley.

Group had not seen Wall Street Journal story and copies were provided to each.

On automotive emissions: Middleton and Finch's assistants pulled no punches in expressing determination to accomplish drastic reduction in major automotive emissions. The setting of 1975 and 1980 goals was to make clear to auto makers what would be expected so there could be no question about at least 10 years goals. Middleton was not happy about tests that show consumer cars -- as contrasted with tested prototypes -- were not meeting even present emission standards. He briefly outlined NAPCA's intention to intensify testing and to insist that automobiles meet the control requirements or not be allowed on the market.

Particulates are of especial concern and lead bearing particulates are of especial importance.

PNYC00001200

Thus the concern over lead was not solely related to its effect on control systems that will reduce the carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, and nitrous oxides.

However, since leaded gasoline seems to have universally adverse effects on control systems the removal of lead from gasoline would open up a number of other possibilities that are not now immediately evident. They are looking toward getting emission standards down as soon as possible -- i.e., 1975 and 1980 -- but also toward getting below these goals eventually. It is felt much more may be able to be accomplished in reducing all emissions once the lead is removed.

As to the danger of higher aromatics, this is fully recognized, but they feel the Bureau of Mines data is not as clearcut as, for example, the concise quotation LIA has been using. In any event, the control standards would not permit increased emissions even if aromatics were to be increased in the fuel. Jones said their experiments indicated perhaps better control of emissions with the higher aromatics.

As to systems developed for leaded gasoline, Middleton had no definite answer as to why auto makers were by-passing these -- except his several general observations that leaded gasoline seemed to be detrimental -- in varying degrees -- to all systems and that non-leaded gasoline offered more possible control measures in the long run.

And again, none of the present systems appeared to be sufficiently effective on particulate

Before July 1, he said, the Federal Register would carry the NAPCA proposed definitions and measurement procedures for auto emission particulates.

Lead in the air and health concern: Middleton stated he knew that demonstrable health effects were primarily associated with ingestion, as per children eating old paint, or with industrial exposure. But he added that human health is not measured solely by whether a person is in the hospital or not or has impaired activity.

He cited questions raised about lead's effect on ALA (delta-aminolevulinic acid) as indication that the biochemical system may be distressed by lead. Although conceding this work was still in serious contention, he said it was receiving serious research attention from DuPont.

He also accepts the reports of higher blood levels in city dwellers vs. rural dwellers as evidence that auto exhaust lead is raising blood leads in urban people.

Aside from specific health effects, the concern is over the general environmental impact of continued emission of lead into the air, waters, soils, fish and other organisms. Conceding that Patterson is not a medical scientist, Middleton cited the work by him and associates as showing the lead burden in the environment is increasing -- largely due to leaded gasoline. He cited Schaefer's studies on the effect of lead particles on formation of ice crystals and rain.

Others joined in to question what becomes of the lead emitted from automobiles. The possible correlation between carbon monoxide levels and lead levels in residential areas near freeways was discussed. A sampling of people in one area of California was said by Strelow to show a relationship of increased cancer with proximity to freeways and although there was no suggestion of lead being involved in this it was cited as a possible effect of auto emissions.

PNYC00001201

Middleton was especially concerned about the submicron (below 1 micron) particles of lead. These comprise a large part of particulate exhaust, remain airborne indefinitely, and are most easily respirable.

In brief, it would seem that NAPCA and HEW have no intention of waiting for any demonstrable health effects on human beings even to be approached. They feel that the very fact of lead constantly being spewed into the air -- to find its way to soils, waters, food supplies and, most important, air supplies -- must be slowed and halted.

Middleton said that the lead criterion document on which the NAPCA has been working for some time is now scheduled for some time in 1971. He said that this document would be run through a special committee of the National Academy of Sciences to write and approve the portions relating to health. This would mean, he said, that the technical data available would be reviewed by the nation's highest scientific body before it was issued.

On lead emissions specifically, Middleton and others said that they did not really care how the emissions standards were reached so long as they are achieved. This means that if a satisfactory lead trap could be demonstrated this would be an acceptable alternative to removing lead from gasoline. However, it was clear that none of the HEW people are optimistic about a lead trap and emission control system that will be sufficiently effective with leaded gasolines. They do not rule out the possibility -- it is only that they have been told by the auto companies that the number of alternatives and number of possible avenues that could be followed for emission control are much greater with leaded gasoline than with non-leaded. However, Strelow said that HEW was trying to keep the future picture open and not close off alternatives as various kinds of technology were developed.

PNYC00001202