

November 1992

TIN TIT: AIBR/AMIS

Contractor says crew
exposed to asbestos

Inconsistencies Mar VA Asbestos
Project

MMBB-8806442

Is Globe asbestos dangerous?

EPA faults school's way
of taking out asbestos

Asbestos
work halts
at Capitol

Ex-workers say company
polluted Stanhope water

Asbestos Bill
Passes Senate

Removal of asbestos will begin

03113859



Summer, 1984

Quotes Without Comment

A monthly sample of news items from the
Nation's Press about Asbestos in buildings

As the Quotes Without Comments title implies these articles have been selected from newspapers and magazines from around the country. They do not necessarily represent recommended practices or the opinion of the National Asbestos Council and its members.

Ex-workers say company polluted Stanhope water

By FRED AUN **FRONT PAGE**
Staff Writer

STANHOPE — Former employees of U.S. Mineral Products Co. say that the firm routinely dumped asbestos in a backyard landfill adjacent to the Musconetcong River and a borough well now contaminated with asbestos fibers.

The workers contend the company deposited substantial amounts of excess asbestos in the dump site up until 1971, when it stopped using the carcinogenic material.

REPRESENTATIVES of the firm, contacted Wednesday, said they had no knowledge of the alleged dump. The firm's lawyer and its spokesman agreed that U.S. Mineral used asbestos until 1971, but both said they had not been employed by the firm long enough to confirm or deny the asbestos dump allegations.

The state's Department of Environmental Protection also knows nothing about the alleged dump, according to its spokesman.

A report released in January revealed Stanhope's water had more dissolved asbestos than any other New Jersey water system tested in a random sampling of 56 municipal systems. The town's Plane Street well, a short distance away from the U.S. Mineral plant on Furnace Street, had the highest concentration of the fiber, according to the report.

A **STATE** study by the state Geological Survey released last week says an industrial source, rather than a natural deposit, is the more likely cause of the contamination, according to Mayor Michael Bender. But Bender added he thinks more definitive tests are needed before U.S. Mineral can be blamed.

The workers making the accusation are less uncertain.

"There's no doubt in my mind...I really, honestly, believe it came from U.S. Mineral," said former plant maintenance mechanic Richard Snook. "They dumped it out there for years and years and years."

SNOOK, of Kemah Lake, said he was replaced by the firm after joining a strike last year. He said he would have been working at the company for 18 years this month.

Before becoming a mechanic, he held several positions in the company, some of which required daily handling and dumping of asbestos, he said.

"Oh, they were dumping it for the longest, longest time," said Snook. "I saw it. I took it out. I used to dump it in the old pit."

Another worker who said he was replaced because of the strike is Ray Garrigan of Cranberry Lake. Garrigan said he used to mix asbestos with wool fiber, plaster and cement for sale as a water-soluble insulation material to be sprayed on building beams.

"I handled it in 100-pound blocks," he said. "I'm telling you, I worked there...I worked in asbestos hip deep."

Editor's Note: This issue of "Quotes Without Comment" replaces the July and August issues. As you may appreciate, the editorial committee has had a very hectic summer. We plan to bring you "up-to-date" with the issue following this one (hopefully by late September).

I would appreciate any comments you might have on content, format, or other topics. Please feel free to write Mark Shearon, Harmon Engineering & Testing, 1550 Pumphrey Avenue, Auburn, Alabama 36830, or Stewart Huey, CAE, Executive Director, National Asbestos Council, at the address shown below.

A member service of

NATIONAL ASBESTOS COUNCIL

2786 North Decatur Road • Suite 220 • Decatur, Georgia 30033 • Phone 404/292-1113

03113850

WVBB-0006444

November 1992

IN THE AIR, AIMS

EPA faults school's way of taking out asbestos

Pocono elementary school checks out OK

By MARGARET REGAN
Express education writer
SWIFTWATER — The Environmental Protection Agency has found that Pocono Mountain School District workers did not use proper precautions when they removed asbestos from the Pocono Elementary Center in the spring of 1983.

In a June 8 letter to the district, W. Ray Cunningham, director of the EPA's Air Management Division, outlined the steps the workers should have taken when they handled the hazardous materials.

The EPA's role in the case is ended, spokeswoman Janet Luffy said this morning, because the amount of asbestos in the school was below the level that the EPA can regulate.

"In order for our regulations to apply, there has to be 260 feet of pipe covered with asbestos," Luffy said. "The amount in the school was not that high. But we wanted the school district to be aware of our concerns."

Peter Nish, director of curriculum and instruction for the district, said he believes the letter finally closes the long and controversial case on asbestos in the school.

"We would like to think it's the end," he said, adding, "All three tests we did on the school after the asbestos was removed were negative."

The asbestos was used as insulation on heating pipes in several classrooms and a hallway in the 1925 building. Nish said the school has been safe since the asbestos was removed in April 1983.

Asbestos, formerly used often in school construction, has been found to be dangerous when its fibers are inhaled.

Parents who disagreed with that assessment were responsible for bringing the EPA into the case. They complained to the federal agency that tests were done while children were sitting in school, and that the removal had been done haphazardly. They also argued that there was more asbestos in the school than the administration was willing to admit.

Investigators from the EPA office in Philadelphia came to the district to interview parents and to speak with workers who had done the removal, Luffy said. While EPA agreed with the district that there was only a small amount of asbestos in the building, they agreed with parents that the

removal had not been properly handled.

"There were inconsistent records and inconsistent information," Luffy said. She noted that workers removed the asbestos from the building in a school van normally used to transport children.

"It would have been better to do it in truck that could have been easily cleaned," she said.

According to Cunningham's letter, the Pocono Mountain workers neglected to moisten the insulation before they began removing it — a technique that helps cut down on asbestos dust; failed to seal off the work space; did not label the bags of asbestos; and failed to clean the space immediately after they finished removing the asbestos.

The district, he added, did not provide the workers with appropriate safety equipment.

"We believe all these steps should be taken when handling asbestos," Cunningham said. "Without judging the truth or falsity of any person's account, EPA wants to make the point strongly that asbestos is a very hazardous material."

The Pocono Mountain Elementary Center was just one of thousands of schools, hospitals and other public buildings in the country containing asbestos. The material was frequently used in the 1950s and 1960s for fireproofing, insulation and noise-muffling.

Toward the end of the 1960s, medical experts began to trace the connection between asbestos and various lung diseases, including lung cancer. If flakes or microscopic particles of asbestos escape into the air, people in the building breathe them into their lungs.

The EPA requires schools to investigate whether there is any asbestos in their building and whether it is likely to crumble and pose health hazards.

Many schools and other public buildings around the country have been checked for asbestos contamination in recent years, and a few have even had to be closed.

EXPRESS, Easton, PA
June 20, 1984

As I See It

Being an 'Enemy' of the Cooperative

By Daniel Grant

When my apartment building "converted to cooperative ownership" a few years ago, I wasn't in the market for a real estate investment. But it was an eviction plan, and I could afford the "insider's price." What was I to do? I bought in.

Having purchased my first piece of real estate ("air space," not to be confused with a house or even land), I was dismayed to learn that I — a cooperative apartment owner — now had fewer rights than a tenant who rents from a more disinterested landlord.

Before, when my landlord was responsible for building repairs, the superintendent courteously completed the job. Now, the cooperative undertakes major capital improvement projects with no such guarantees to its shareholders.

I could list many examples, but most recently, a simple problem that could easily have been resolved has become a power struggle in which I have lost, and for which I have no legal protection.

The co-op board of my building decided to replace the old and corroded water pipes with new ones. A good idea, but it's not that easy. I live in an apartment which was subdivided many years ago and, unlike all of the other apartments in the building that have exposed pipes, mine are within the walls. To get at the pipes, both on the kitchen and bathroom lines, the plumbers had to break into the walls.

This created a lot of plaster dust, but that was expected and I had placed drop cloths over furniture. It was just an off-hand remark, though, that one of the workmen made which frightened me no end — the plaster contained asbestos. Dust was flying, and it contained asbestos! I asked the foreman of this group if, indeed, there was asbestos coming out of the wall. "Sure," he said, "this kind of plaster always has it." He added that I shouldn't worry, relating stories of people who had worked with asbestos for years and never looked better.

As soon as I heard this, I phoned the co-op board member who was in charge of the plumbing repairs at his law office. He first tried to cheer me with stories of his acquaintance with asbestos, but I wasn't cheered.

continued on another page -

Asbestos Bill Passes Senate

The Senate Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education today amended and passed legislation which would create the Asbestos Removal Act out of committee unanimously.

Sen. Richard F. Kelly, (D-Hazelcrest) who is a committee member and a co-sponsor of the bill, explained the reason for amending the bill, "Prior to the amendment, the bill designated removal as the only means of ridding Illinois schools of the friable (crumbling) asbestos problem."

"Due to the cost and time burden which would be placed on the school districts if removal is the only measure allowed, the committee has approved the amendment which now allows alternative but still safe methods of ensuring the air our children and school employees breathe while at school is free of asbestos particles."

If enacted, the bill, as amended, would require both public and private school in Illinois which have friable asbestos to remove, encapsulate, or enclose the problem. Friable asbestos has been found to cause lung diseases and in some cases cancer.

Several organizations voiced support of the legislation, two of which testified in favor of the bill. Representatives of the Service Employee's Union and the Illinois Association of School Boards testified for the legislation, recommending some improvements to the bill in the areas of funding, removal and certification of inspectors and contractors doing the identification and the abatement.

The AFL-CIO, State Board of Education, and the Illinois Catholic Conference, also registered in favor of the legislation.

Kelly commented on concerns expressed by the Department of Public Health who said although they favored the concept of the legislation, they did not "have the people or the funding" to do what the legislation would mandate if enacted. The legislation designates that the DPH would be in charge of training and certifying inspectors.

"The Department's concerns are justified," Kelly said. "However, we would not place a burden on the Department without appropriating the funds to allow them to do the job we have given them."

"In passing legislation which would require school districts to take actions to identify and contain the problem, we will be assured the health of our children. Asbestos is a problem which concerns our entire State, not just one area," Kelly said, noting several Chicago area schools have inspected and found friable asbestos.

Kelly recognized that the amount of funding for the project is still an unanswered question. "Presently \$20 million in School Construction Bond funds have been marked for the project. Experts have told us this will not be enough to fund the abatement project. Since many Illinois schools have yet to be inspected, we have only a rough idea of the number of schools we're dealing with and the amount the project will cost."

BREMEN MESSENGER

Midlothian, IL, May 3, 1984

Asbestos removal program shifted by Senate to EPA

A federal program of technical and financial assistance aimed at eliminating potential dangers from asbestos in school buildings has been shifted by the Senate to the Environmental Protection Agency, Sen. John Melcher announced Thursday.

Melcher said the proposal making the shift, which he cosponsored, was approved by the Senate as an amendment to S. 1285, a measure to improve mathematics and science instruction in the U.S. The House approved similar legislation and included it in its omnibus education reauthorization bill.

Congress in 1980 provided for a program to assist schools in removing asbestos, Melcher explained. The program was placed in the Department of Education but it was never funded, partly because the department did not give the program high priority and partly because it does

not have expertise in the area of asbestos.

Melcher said it was sensible to shift the program to the EPA, which since 1980 has required local school districts to inspect school buildings for asbestos contamination. However, EPA has not had the legal authority to require repairs.

The amendment would authorize \$50 million for each of fiscal years 1984 and 1985 and \$100 million for each of five subsequent years to remove or encapsulate asbestos, Melcher said. Assistance would be provided in both loans and grants to financially needy school districts in which asbestos is a significant health threat.

The senator said it is estimated there are 14,000 public and private schools in the U.S. in which asbestos was used, mainly as a material sprayed on ceilings. This material can become loose and flake off. He

said there is solid evidence linking inhalation of asbestos to lung cancer and other respiratory ailments. Children are thought to be especially susceptible, he added.

"We have had a situation where school officials have been required to inspect for asbestos and then share the results with parents and teachers, but remedial steps could be taken only if the state or local board could provide the funding. In school districts with serious financial problems, this has meant being subject to a choice between top priorities," Melcher said.

RANGER REVIEW, Glendive, MT,
June 10, 1984

Inconsistencies Mar VA Asbestos Project

By James Crawford

FEDERAL TIMES, Wash. D.C.
May 21, 1984

The Veterans Administration needs to centralize its asbestos control efforts, says a supervisor of VA safety inspectors in Madison, Wis., who is concerned about careless handling of the cancer-causing fibers at many hospitals.

"That's the only way to maintain some continuity nationwide," Brian Durtschi told *Federal Times*. "There's a fair amount of resistance out there" to following asbestos precautions ordered by Washington.

Of 25 VA medical centers in the midwest, none is fully in compliance with the agency's rules, the inspector said in a report last August.

Durtschi said many asbestos removal projects now under way were poorly planned — without the aid of experts — but hospital managers are often reluctant to re-evaluate or alter them. "There are lots of dollars involved," he said.

Disputes also arise over whether to remove all asbestos encountered in renovation projects, Durtschi added.

Yet in the face of these problems, responsibility for VA's

asbestos program remains fragmented.

The agency's central office does not monitor compliance with rules for handling the toxic material safely. Nor does it settle disputes between inspectors and hospital managers.

And safety officials, located in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, have no say over asbestos removal by VA's Office of Construction, which is in charge of an increasing share of this work. Months of negotiations have still not produced an agreement between the two bureaucratic rivals on asbestos policy.

The safety office largely plays a technical and educational role, said its chief, William Brooks. "On asbestos, it's just awareness-raising right now. It's all we can do," he said in an interview.

"It's very difficult. If the importance of a regulation is not understood by the person im-

plementing it, you'll never get the intent of that regulation served."

Such a lack of awareness made for a dangerous situation last year at the Lincoln, Neb., VA hospital, according to an American Federation of Government Employees representative there.

A contractor removed asbestos-laden steam pipes through hospital corridors and stairways, leaving chunks of the hazardous material everywhere, said local union president Jerry Haggerty.

When he confronted medical center director Max Lybarger about the risk to employees, Haggerty said, the official told him the asbestos hazard had been overstated.

"The director said he sat at his desk while [the contractor] removed it from his own office and that it wasn't visible in the air," Haggerty recalled. "The implication was that if you

couldn't see it, it wasn't dangerous."

Lybarger said he could recall no such conversation. "I don't know what they're talking about," he said. "We're as concerned about the employees' health as much as the union is — probably more so. We don't want any employee to be exposed unnecessarily."

It's the job of VA safety and fire protection engineers to police such situations. But few have the expertise to cite violations and are thus timid in doing so, AFGE representatives complain.

When inspectors cite asbestos violations, they are not reported to Washington — except on an anecdotal basis.

Durtschi compiled his scorecard on midwest facilities at his own initiative. He's now developing a more detailed system to report compliance, which he hopes will eventually be used throughout VA.

At present, however, the central office has no plans to institute formal reporting from facilities, officials said.

Follow-up on violators, as well as resolution of any disputes about inspectors' find-

Schools reject share

By Lynne Royce
News-Times staff

DANBURY — The Board of Education is not responsible for paying for school asbestos removal projects, Chairman Philip Fenster says.

Fenster's comment came in response to mayoral aide Robert Steinberg's suggestion that the board pay half of the \$193,000 project proposed for this summer.

Steinberg wants the board to use funds from its 1984-85 budget or out of its \$146,765 surplus from this year's budget.

But spending money for asbestos removal work would "shortchange"

educational accounts, Fenster said.

Asbestos removal is part of a proposed \$5.7 million project to bring schools into compliance with state and federal fire, safety, health and building codes.

Architects recommended to school and city officials that asbestos be removed from eight schools this summer because it is located in areas near staff and students.

The board will decide how to spend its surplus when it meets tonight and plans to adopt its 1984-85 budget on June 26. Both meetings will take place at 7:30 p.m. at Mill Ridge Intermediate School.

Because asbestos removal and

code compliance projects may be reimbursed by the state by 56.7 percent, Steinberg predicts the board would be reimbursed by a little less than \$50,000 for paying for half of the summer project.

"Frankly," he wrote in a letter to Fenster, "I cannot understand why the Board of Education would send the message to our students, parents, and staff that for the risk of \$50,000, out of your 32-plus million 1984-85 budget, you would not approve first phase asbestos removal immediately and allocate the funds necessary to do the work. Your budgets are not inflexible."

The City-Wide Parent-Teacher Or-

NEWS-TIMES, Danbury, CT, June 13, 1984 (Cont'd on next page)

INCONSISTENCIES MAR PROJECT (Cont'd from previous page)

ings, is left to VA's six regional directors. The priority of asbestos control varies in different areas.

Brooks's superior, deputy planning and engineering director Richard Falco, defended VA's decentralized management. "We've made a choice to manage with a very, very small corporate headquarters," he said.

"Although there are some questions of compliance or non-compliance, we look at the line supervisor in the field to manage this like they manage resources, like they manage who works where. It's just one more thing a line official is responsible for doing."

But Falco conceded, "These line officials have external forces operating on them from several different directions. They react as best they can."

Where asbestos is concerned, the most effective external pressures have come from outside the agency.

An internal history of VA's asbestos efforts, obtained under the Freedom of Information Act, is candid on this point:

"Laws governing employee exposure to asbestos have been in effect since 1971, but VA central office management action lagged until 1979. Fortunately for the agency, employee/public awareness of the substance was negligible during the same time period."

"Increasing labor and media involvement in asbestos has resulted in central office activity at VAMC Atlanta, VAMC Baltimore and VAMC Beckley."

This year, the Department of Medicine and Surgery will spend \$8 million on 18 specific asbestos removal projects and plans to spend \$7.5 million on 38 projects in 1985.

The Office of Construction has a \$4 million asbestos fund to use as needed in fiscal 1984, with \$25 million requested for next year.

With separate funding and organizational autonomy, the two VA branches almost inevitably cross swords over asbestos policy.

In a September 23 memo, safety official Brooks expressed concerns about construction officials' attempts to set their own asbestos policy, contained in a set of guidelines he characterized as "confusing, inadequate and possibly harmful to the interests of the Veterans Administration."

"I must re-emphasize that asbestos must be treated with extreme caution," Brooks added. "Unlike many other aspects of construction, improper asbestos procedures can result in a direct threat to a facility during the project, as well as create future liabilities."

The construction office recently revised these guidelines — a four-page jumble of policy statements and technical specifications — again without the use of a staff expert.

Associate construction director Chin Fun Kwok said industrial hygiene consultants will be hired for each project and will advise contractors on whether all asbestos needs to be removed.

Well-contained asbestos may not always be removed, he said — another point of contention with DM&S officials, who want the hazard removed wherever possible in the course of construction work.

On the recommendation of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, VA recently upgraded the authority of its top safety and health official.

The post, held by deputy chief medical director John Gronvall, is still in DM&S. In a recent interview, however, he expressed his hope of working out jurisdictional problems with VA's deputy administrator, Everett Alvarez.

These organizational rivalries extend well beyond the construction office. In a recent memo, Brooks complained about the safety office's lack of jurisdiction over VA cemeteries, supply depots and office space managed by the General Services Administration.

Officials have postponed asbestos clean-up outside DM&S until a consultant completes an industrial hygiene guide — a project expected to take at least a year.

Waiting that long "to alert these people to their current

responsibilities," Brooks said, "could result in unnecessary and preventable exposure to VA beneficiaries, employees and visitors."

SCHOOLS REJECT SHARE (Cont'd from previous page)

organization doesn't care which agency is financially responsible for the project, said Marilyn Dietrich, vice president.

"Asbestos should be definitely removed this summer while children are not in school," Dietrich said. "City Hall and the Board of Education have a moral obligation to the children of Danbury to take care of the asbestos problem as soon as possible."

Common Council Chairman Constance McManus said she believes the majority of the council wants asbestos removed this summer.

"The council wants to work with the (school) board and make sure schools are brought into compliance with state guidelines. The council's only goal is to make sure children go to safe schools," McManus said.

Funding recommendations will have to be made to the council by its public works committee, which is reviewing the architect's report, McManus said.

Both McManus and committee Chairman Joseph DaSilva said the council will support a bond issue referendum to raise the \$5.7 million. Neither would predict if the committee would ask the school board to help pay for the summer asbestos project.

Barbara Baker, chairman of the board's committee which oversees building maintenance, said she doesn't "understand what all the rush is about" to get asbestos out of some schools this summer.

"The Health Department in Danbury indicated there was no immediate danger," Baker said. "The school board does not have any money for the project. If the city does not have \$200,000, then this work should be included in the bond issue."

Frable (deteriorating) asbestos should be removed "sometime, as soon as possible," said Jack Kozuchowski of the city Health Department. He said the material is not located in many areas students frequent.

Is Globe asbestos dangerous?

Is it or isn't it dangerous?

The long-time controversy over asbestos that remains at a closed mill and adjacent trailer court in Globe has flared up again.

The controversy was renewed by the clash between a report recently released by a national research group and the continuing efforts by a large number of Globe residents to force state officials to "remove the health stigma" on the area.

A study by the National Research Council, an arm of the National Academy of Sciences, was conducted at the request of the Environmental Protection Agency.

It attempted to measure the risks of asbestos exposure to the general public, but came under fire from critics who contend the most common form of asbestos is not harmful.

A petition drive in Globe recently urged state officials to either prove the risk of cancer among the population or give the area a clean bill of health.

A presentation was made April 12th to two committees of the Arizona Legislature in Phoenix by a delegation of approximately 100 Globe residents. They asked members of the House Natural Resources Committee and Health Committee to help them assert that the type of asbestos found in the Globe area is safe.

The delegation was led by Hubert Wood and Alvin Gerhardt, who brought with them petitions which they said had been signed by more than 4,000 county residents. The petitions said unfavorable publicity has blighted Globe's image as a desirable place to live.

The committee members listened for about 90 minutes, but took no immediate action.

EXPERT SAYS 'NO'

Dr. Malcolm Ross of the United States Geological Survey told Globe residents recently that the type of asbestos mined in the area and processed at a now-closed mill on the east side of the city is not dangerous.

Ross has been involved with the asbestos controversy for years. The fuss in Globe, said Ross, has "gotten out of hand."

In 1980, a state of emergency was declared at a Globe mobile-home park built adjacent to the old asbestos mill site, with some of the residual asbestos used as fill material.

In 1983, the federal Environmental Protection Agency decided on a "buyout" of Mountain View Mobile Home Estates. The site was considered Arizona's top priority for federal "Superfund" cleanup money.

Ross, who also presented a talk at the University of Arizona, said 95 percent of the commercial asbestos used in the United States is chrysotile or "white" asbestos. This is the type mined in Globe.

Ross contends the culprit in the asbestos scare is crocidolite, or "blue," asbestos, which, he said, is a known carcinogen and should be banned. The blue variety and amosite, or "brown," asbestos each account for two percent of the asbestos used in this country, he said.

According to Ross, despite the wide dissemination of white asbestos in our environment, there is no evidence that very frequent non-occupational exposures to the material is harmful.

Ross cited studies of the Thetford mines in Canada where no appreciable difference in asbestos-related diseases was found.

"I have read thousands of papers on asbestos and related topics...I consider myself an expert on asbestos, yet I have never been invited to testify before a federal committee on this topic," he said.

Ross said there are several areas, including national defense, for which there is no substitute for asbestos. "We can't float a nuclear submarine without it," he said.

"GUILT BY ASSOCIATION"

Dr. H. Wesley Peirce, a geologist with the Arizona Bureau of Geology and Mineral Technology, wrote recently that, "Like the word 'snakes,' asbestos is not a scientific word. Both are lumping terms encompassing a group of similar, yet different species.

"Such general terms do not acknowledge component parts and, therefore, perpetuate misunderstanding of specific characteristics," Peirce said.

Asbestos is composed of tiny fibers that are both incredibly strong and light enough to be inhaled. "These fiber types act differently because of the contrasting physical and chemical attributes. For instance, chrysotile fibers curl into spirals, whereas crocidolite and amosite develop straighter, more needle-like fibers, and appear to penetrate more deeply into the terminal air sacs of the lungs," said Peirce.

"Chrysotile may have become the victim of 'guilt by association,' having been lumped with the more dangerous minerals, crocidolite and amosite, under the general term, asbestos.

"Studies of the non-occupational health risk of chrysotile suggest no detectable excess disease; therefore, the prevailing generalization that any non-zero exposure to chrysotile can cause any serious medical problems should be questioned," Peirce concluded.

Peirce's comments appeared in a recent issue of FIELD-NOTES, the quarterly publication of the Arizona Bureau of Geology and Mineral Technology.

The previously-mentioned study by the National Research Council, however, contends that exposure to any type of asbestos is harmful, including exposure to chrysotile.

The work was a compilation of data from nine previous studies of workers in insulation and other asbestos-related industries.

The study contends that a person breathing a "typical" amount of asbestos, a relatively tiny amount of 400 fibers per cubic meter, would have a nine in a million chance of developing mesothelioma, a cancer of the chest and abdominal cavities.

Testing of the area near Mountain View Estates at Globe

in 1980 showed levels of 400,000 fibers per cubic meter. A Research Council staff member said such levels would indicate a cancer risk of nearly one case in 100 people.

He conceded, however, that the study's risk ranges could be faulty. He added that chrysotile is less hazardous than other types of asbestos.

D.W. Jaquays, president of Jacquays Asbestos Corp., an Arizona company, said the study was "a lot of rehash of old stuff. They have no research and no figures to back it up."

Jaquays' firm was a leading developer, miner and miller of asbestos in the Globe area for many years. Most of the mines, now closed, were located along the south rim of the Salt River Canyon.

BREWERY GULCH GAZETTE
Bisbee, AZ, May 10, 1984

Water

Continued from Page A1

He said the unusable asbestos and asbestos mixtures were scooped up with bucket loaders each day and brought out to the dump.

BUDD LAKE resident Henry Ullrich, another former U.S. Mineral worker who confirmed the asbestos dumping, said much of the material also was trucked to the Cat Swamp area in Byram.

"They used to truck some out and some they put in their own dump," Ullrich said.

"We used to use the 100-pound blocks of asbestos," said Ullrich. "Sometimes we got a broken block and the whole block would go out."

When asked how far the local dump is from the Musconetcong River, Ullrich said, "You could throw a stone and you wouldn't have to use all your might," to reach it.

ACCOUNTS of the asbestos dump were confirmed by another former worker, who asked that his comments or name be unpublished, and one man who still works at U.S. Mineral who also requested anonymity.

"They dumped it right out there in their dump, which is right above that number five well they're talking about," said the man. "So naturally, it would have to go somewhere."

U.S. Mineral spokesman Peter Rushton said the company voluntarily stopped using asbestos in 1971, two years before its use was banned in the state.

REGARDING the employees' assertions about dumping, Rushton said he had "only hearsay information" he would not divulge. He said he has been a U.S. Mineral worker for five years.

Company president James Verhalen, who has been with the firm for several years, was out of state. U.S. Mineral's attorney, Leonard Pasculli, said he would try to contact Verhalen. No call was returned to the Herald Wednesday night.

Pasculli said the only company dump he is aware of is a storage facility near the plant classified by the DEP as a "non-hazardous, non-toxic landfill." He said that facility is used to store basalt, a mineral now used instead of asbestos in the insulation material.

PASCULLI SAID the DEP has asked the company to make some changes to the basalt piles, but the

agency has made no mention of a buried asbestos dump.

"That's about the only investigation the DEP's been doing," he said. "There's been no testing or question about asbestos testing in the recent past."

James Staples, DEP spokesman, informed of the former employees' accusations, said finding an asbestos dump there "would be a great, simple breakthrough."

However, he said the state has no regulation against asbestos in drinking water, since asbestos has been proven to be carcinogenic only when inhaled.

BENDER, who worked at U.S. Mineral for a short time in the late 1970s, said the borough has asked the state to take surface water tests upstream and downriver of the plant. He said tests have also been requested for Lake Musconetcong and the Morris Canal.

Regarding the employees' claims, Bender said, "I have heard these rumors mentioned, even at council meetings. I had heard rumors and stories but I'm not ready to blame anyone until I have more facts, and now we're talking about giving somebody a really bad name."

He said he thinks U.S. Mineral would be held responsible for cleaning up the site if a dump is found, even though there may not have been laws against landfilling the fiber in former years.

SUSSEX COUNTY Health Department Director Paul Wegmann, when asked about the alleged dump, said, "I can't honestly say I've heard that rumor before. This is a new report to me."

Referring to the employees, Wegmann added, "I'm sure we'd be very interested in talking to those folks." He said that, should the Health Department come up with "hard data...good evidence...we'd probably take some decisive action."

The director said that action might include ordering test borings ~~to see~~ if the dump exists.

NEW JERSEY HERALD,
Newton, NJ, June 28, 1984

Asbestos Work at Capitol
POST-TRIBUNE,
Jefferson City, MO,
May 17, 1984

Asbestos work halts at Capitol

FRONT PAGE

Concerns over the safety of workers removing asbestos insulation in a basement area of the Missouri Capitol has brought the work to a temporary halt, according to Walter Johnson, director of the state's Division of Design and Construction.

Johnson said on Wednesday that Harold G. Butzer Inc. of Jefferson City, the contractor for the asbestos removal, had been told to stop work until it showed it was complying with state safety regulations.

The firm's president, Harold Butzer, said there were no safety problems, only different interpretations of safety rules by the state and the contractor. Butzer also said he expected work to resume shortly, when state officials and the contractor worked out their differences.

Johnson said he had ordered the Butzer firm to stop work last Friday on the removal of asbestos pipe insulation in the Capitol's basement cafeteria. The actual insulation removal was subcontracted by the Butzer firm to F.O. Rutherford Insulation of St. Louis, but as contractor Butzer was responsible for the work, Johnson said.

The main problem was that workers were not using required protective gear, such as masks to cover their full head and disposable coveralls to be left each day at the job site, Johnson said.

"All they were using were just painting masks" covering the nose and mouth, Johnson said.

In addition, inspectors found a work supervisor was not present as required by state regulations, Johnson said.

"They have not yet come back and told us how they're going to move to rectify the situation," Johnson said.

However, Butzer denied the workers were using improper protective gear, and said the only problem was the state's differing interpretation of safety regulations.

Butzer also said concerns about asbestos dust leaving the work area, which is surrounded by plastic sheeting, probably arose because dust from unrelated construction work in the Capitol sometimes drifted to other areas of the building.

"In a sense we're being tarred by somebody else's brush," Butzer said, adding the state Department of Natural Resources had determined asbestos was not drifting away from the work site.

Removal of asbestos will begin

HWB-0806451

ATLANTA—Removal of friable crumbling asbestos at the site of the former Swainsboro Print Works manufacturing firm in Swainsboro will begin Tuesday, according to Charles R. Jeter, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regional administrator.

The asbestos was discovered during an earlier clean-up at the site in February, 1984, when waste chemicals were removed from the abandoned building under the federally-financed Super Fund Program.

The asbestos clean-up will also use federal monies and is expected to take several weeks for completion.

Asbestos-containing material has been widely used as a flame retardant and insulator and when dry and friable may be released into the air. The fibers are harmful when inhaled and can cause asbestosis, a lung ailment. Asbestos must be removed by qualified contractors to minimize exposure to workers and the public, Mr. Jeter said.

The Swainsboro facility, damaged by fire in December 1983, was involved in bleaching, dying and printing of cloth before it closed in 1980.

Asbestos in the facility was disturbed during recent salvage operations to recover machinery

and materials from the plant.

Removal of the asbestos is being undertaken while the material is still wet and less likely to be disbursed into the environment. Safety procedures in effect during the clean-up will assure workers and residents are not exposed to dangerous materials, the EPA official said.

Roger Shaw, county manager, who is acting as local coordinator for the clean-up operation, said local and state officials will work closely with EPA officials to assure local services are available as needed.

Super Fund is a \$1.6 billion program administered by EPA to clean up abandoned waste sites.

BLADE, Swainsboro, GA, June 6, 1984.

Contractor says crew exposed to asbestos

By Mary Ann Roser
Herald-Leader staff writer

A demolition contractor claims that he and seven of his workers were exposed to harmful asbestos while removing ceilings at Leestown Junior High School in Lexington.

After the asbestos was discovered 11 days ago, the Lexington-Fayette County Health Department halted work on the ceilings and sealed off a portion of the building, said Larry Delph, supervisor of the health department's environmental protection section.

"We have cautioned those gentlemen that they were exposed and to see a physician," Delph said.

School officials and those working on the school renovation project knew that the hazardous material was in the ceilings at Leestown. But it was supposed to have been taken out by Superior Systems Inc. of St. Charles, Mo. — before the ceilings were re-

moved by Ray Hundley, owner of Odine Demolition of Nicholasville, and his crew.

"For some reason, some small amount was left in the ceiling," said Robert Cocanougher, an assistant superintendent for the school system. But the workers might not have been exposed to asbestos, and if they were, it is uncertain that such an amount could pose a health risk, he said.

Officials with Superior Systems could not be reached for comment yesterday. A man who answered the phone at the St. Charles office said company President Bob Canaday was "on the road" and would not be calling in for messages until Thursday.

"I feel like they got paid to take it out and we didn't even get paid to eat it," Hundley said yesterday.

His crew had been working on the ceilings for a week and a half before they found that not all the asbestos had been removed, he said.

"Being an 'Enemy'..."

continued below

You live in New York, and New York has plenty of stuff in the air, he said, but I wasn't wild about this line of argument either.

I told him that the Environmental Protection Agency requires special procedures and equipment for removing asbestos from schools. Should his fellow shareholders deserve something less? He was unimpressed. Live with it, he said, and if I didn't like it, move out. I said that I would like to have the plaster sealed off and the air sampled before the job went any further. At this, he threatened a lawsuit if work was interrupted in any way.

The hole in my wall stayed open for 15 days, with the asbestos-plaster percolating out all the while. During this time, I spoke with five lawyers, all of whom stated that there was nothing I could do. The work was necessary, so I could not legally stop the workmen. "If it comes down to who knows best how the work should be done," one attorney said, "who would a judge believe — you or the guys doing it for a living?"

I also was told that the issue is really a political one and not legal — I should organize fellow shareholders who must be equally affected. They listened but did nothing more than shake their heads. They didn't have the problems because they weren't having their walls broken into.

I called back the lawyer. "I guess you lose," he said, advising me not to make too much of a big deal of it, since the co-op board could make reprisals against me by disqualifying any buyers of my apartment when I decide to sell it.

What's left? I put on a workman's mask and begin the expensive and time-consuming task of cleaning up a mess I had nothing to do with creating. The hazards to my health are quietly forgotten by fellow shareholders who have chosen not to acknowledge their existence.

Majority rule, in this instance, has voted through silence to deny the rights of a minority. "Rights," however, is the wrong word. It's a legal word, and the law afford me nothing. Consideration and fairness cannot be legislated.

HERALD-LEADER, Lexington, Kentucky