

MCA VINYL CHLORIDE RESEARCH COORDINATORS MEETING
FEBRUARY 13, 1975
WALTER D. HARRIS

There are several points which came up during this meeting which are of general interest.

1. The Connecticut cases have been narrowed down to two which might have been due to VC. These are the GE electrical insulation worker and the accountant who worked in a fabricating plant.

There is some confusion as to the exact job of the GE worker and no data on actual exposure. The accountant did go to get coffee, etc. in the general area where fabrication went on but apparently his office should not have been an exposed area.

Dr. Falk of the General for Disease Control says that these angiosarcomas are not quite typical of other VC induced angiosarcomas. Of course, it could be that the exact nature of the tumor could vary with intensity and time of exposure.

2. Although the general feeling of the committee is that VC is not as carcinogenic as portrayed by some, there is little hope that the courts will greatly change the recent court decision. In other words, the 1 ppm will probably stand, right or wrong.
3. Mayo Smith of Air Products says they are running into a strong tendency on the part of management to avoid PVC if there is any possible substitution, even though it is higher priced. They don't want the risk. This has been the historic approach with proven carcinogens. However, only asbestos can compare with VC in regard to potential economic impact. I would expect uses for which there are suitable substitutes which are nearly as cheap will drop out and that the volume will decrease for a time. Depending on outcome of present studies, growth may resume at a later date.
4. CDC have tracked down about 200 cases of angiosarcoma (about 10 years at 20/yr). They find VC, arsenic and thorium dioxide all cause similar angiosarcomas. They also note that most of VC workers at Louisville, S. Charleston and Pottstown also had exposure to vinylidene chloride and/or acrylonitrile. They are not sure yet about Niagara Falls.
5. Most people acquainted with the program accept that other tumors may be caused, but will be harder to pin down as due to PVC. From a compensation standpoint, this means that management will find it very difficult to prove to a court that a deceased worker's cancer might not have been caused or made worse by his exposure to VC, however slight. The long range liability is very large.
6. A recent BNA issue implied that chloroprene impurity might be a factor. This was an error. Shell makes 3-chloropropene (allyl chloride). Someone thought this was the same as chloroprene and in spite of Shell's efforts to clear it up, the mistake persisted.

URL 17505

7. Mayo Smith says Train (EPA) thinks he has enough data to close down the industry.
8. Dr. Duffield (ICI) says their practice differs from much of the U.S. industry in that poly-cleaners are operators who do cleaning on a part-time basis. Their one case was a 71 year old man in line with a probably lower exposure.
9. MCA is one of several parties sued in a VC exposure case because they supplied information leading one to think it is safer than it is. We urged MCA to review all data sheets and be sure they make it clear that they simply compile information. They do not set TLV's. They supply information as a service but are not a standards setting group.
10. It is felt that if the courts finally decide VC is carcinogenic, DOT will issue very strict regulations. Longshoremen in certain areas are wanting double pay to handle any type of container which has the OSHA cancer label, even a sealed container.
11. We will probably never have a better opportunity to study the carcinogenic response. It would be unwise to economize to the point of not finishing the job. Otherwise, we may get the zero concept on all carcinogens by default.

W.D. Harris

W. D. Harris, Ph.D.
Corporate Industrial Toxicologist

WDH/mab

cc: C. D. McCleary, EMIC
R. J. Dowling, EMIC
B. R. Leach, Painesville
D. E. Dudrow
J. D. Forbes, M.D.
R. E. Lowell

URL 17506