(e) Questions at the meeting may be asked only by members of the Advisory Panel.

(f) Seating for the public will be made available on a first-come first-served basis.

(g) Copies of minutes of public sessions will be made available for copying, following their certification by the Chairman, in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, at the U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration's Public Document Room, 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, DC, upon payment of all charges required by law.

HARRY L. PEEBLES,
Deputy Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc.76-16784 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL 557-4]

AMBIENT AIR MONITORING REFERENCE AND EQUIVALENT METHODS

Receipt of Application for Reference or Equivalent Method Determination

Notice is hereby given that on May 7, 1976, the Environmental Protection Agency received an application from ASARCO Incorporated to determine if its Model 500 Sulfur Dioxide analyzer should be designated by the Administrator of the EPA as an equivalent method under 40 CFR Part 53, promulgated February 28, 1975 (40 FR 7044). If, after appropriate technical study, the Administrator determines that this method should be so designated, notice thereof will be given in a subsequent issue of the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Dated: June 3, 1976.

WILSON K. TALLEY,
Assistant Administrator for Research and Development.

[FR Doc.76-16742 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[FRL 557-6; OTS-01-76]

CHLORALKYLENE FLUIDS

Opinion Regarding Use as Dielectric Fluids

On May 14, 1976, the Environmental Protection Agency received a request from the Prodelec Company for the Agency's opinion regarding the environmental risk involved in using chloralkylene fluids as a substitute for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB's) as dielectric fluids. The Agency responded to this request with the following correspondence:

PRODELEC Specialites Rhone-Progil, Ugine-Kuhlmann, Pour L'Industrie Electrique, 21, Rue Jean Goujon, 75008 Paris Tel.: 256-46-00; Telex: Rhone x 640100 F; Telegr.: Rhodia-Paris 066.

E.P.A., OFFICE OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES, 401 M Street, S.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. (U.S.A.)

Subject: Chloralkylene/substitute dielectric fluid.

Paris, 10th May 1976.

ATTENTION: Russell Train.

DEAR MR. TRAIN: We wish to thank Mr. Schweitzer and his group for the informal meeting at which we discussed the environmental impact study and the other aspects of our proposed replacement for the polychlorobiphenyls used in the American capacitor industry.

We would like to propose our product as the best temporary solution to this problem and we would very much appreciate learning the reaction of the EPA to our request for Chloralkylene to be accepted on a temporary basis until such time a more suitable product can be found completely acceptable for both the environment and for use in the capacitor industry.

Our Chloralkylene is based on mono and dichloro biphenyl which have not been found in the environment (although dichlorobiphenyl amounts to 20% in commercial PCB's). The tests carried out on Chloralkylene which could be completed by some additional studies as suggested during our meeting with Mr. Schweitzer, indicate in particular that this product is fairly easily metabolized in different biotas and does not offer the risks of persistency and accumulation which in the case of PCB's are of so much concern to the ecologist.

However, we do not think our product cannot be proved to be completely safe for the environment but at this time it is clear that it fulfills all the requirements of the capacitor industry and could be considered as a biodegradable replacement for PCB's and a comparatively non toxic substitute.

Therefore, we would appreciate your information at this time concerning, whether or not we should continue our studies and whether the EPA is willing to consider Chloralkylene as a suitable temporary replacement.

Yours faithfully,

G. FAINSAVOINE.
B. REY COQUAIS

MR. GERARD FAINSAVOINE,
Directeur,
MR. BRUNO REY-COQUAIS, *Ingenieur I.C.P.I.*
Societe Prodelec, 21, rue Jean-Goujon, 75380 Paris, Cedex 08, France.

GENTLEMEN: We have received your letter of May 10, 1976, requesting our views on the environmental acceptability of Chloralkylene, a mixture containing polychlorinated biphenyl compounds and alkylchlorobiphenyl isomers, in electrical capacitors with a potential production level for such applications of several tens of millions of pounds annually. Our preliminary conclusions concerning the environmental aspects of this proposed replacement fluid for Aroclor 1016, based on your technical briefing and your supporting documentation, are set forth below.

The data that have been developed on Chloralkylene are inadequate to assess the environmental acceptability of a product with a chemical structure so closely related to other polychlorinated biphenyls which have caused considerable environmental damage. For example, not a single lifetime animal feeding study has been conducted on Chloralkylene nor is one planned. Also, there are serious unresolved questions concerning the persistence of Chloralkylene. Its effects on aquatic organisms are not well understood. We also are concerned that your studies apparently show that metabolites of Chloralkylene may include the hydroxylated biphenyl, which could be of even greater concern than the starting material.

In the absence of more definitive data demonstrating the likelihood that Chloralkylene will not present environmental problems, we must recommend against the introduction of Chloralkylene for use in capacitors.

We are aware that some specialists believe that the less highly chlorinated biphenyls may present less of an environmental hazard than the more highly chlorinated ones. In the absence of more persuasive documentation than is currently available, however, we do not share the view that the degree of chlorination is the only determining factor in considering the environmental acceptability of this class of chemicals. Furthermore, even if some polychlorinated biphenyls are somewhat less toxic, less bioaccumulative, and less persistent than others, we consider that the properties of all members of the class are sufficiently undesirable to warrant major environmental concerns.

Sincerely,

GLENN E. SCHWEITZER,
Director,
Office of Toxic Substances.

The Agency would like to receive any additional information available on this issue. Members of the public or other Federal agencies are invited to submit written comments and other information relevant to this issue or to the correspondence contained in this notice to Dr. I. E. Wallen (WSME 711), Office of Toxic Substances (WH-557), Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 20460. All written comments filed pursuant to this notice will be available for public inspection in the above office from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. during normal working days.

Dated: June 4, 1976.

A. W. BREIDENBACH,
Assistant Administrator for Water and Hazardous Materials.

[FR Doc.76-16744 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[FRL 558-1; OTS-02-76]

POLYDIMETHYLSILOXANE

Opinion Regarding Use as Coolants for Use in Transformers

On May 5, 1976, the Environmental Protection Agency received a request from the Dow Corning Corporation for the Agency's opinion regarding the environmental risk involved in using polydimethylsiloxane fluids as a substitute for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) as coolants for electrical transformers. The Agency responded to this request with the following correspondence:

DOW CORNING

April 30, 1976.

DR. I. E. WALLEN,
Office of Toxic Substances, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 20460.

DEAR DR. WALLEN: Enclosed is a copy of our answers to the questions that were raised during our informal technical meeting on March 23. We also have enclosed a number of supporting documents pertinent to these answers.

As you know, we are currently actively carrying out further research into environmental transport and decomposition routes of polydimethylsiloxane. As our information in this area grows, we are designing new experiments to investigate any potential toxicity of decomposition products. It is our in-

MONS 057944

tention to keep you advised of our progress and to rapidly make you aware of significant results, particularly if they are contrary to the general trends we have reported to date.

We request your office to provide us with a statement stating your opinion as to the environmental risk involved in using polydimethylsiloxane fluids as coolants for electrical transformers.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. RYAN, PH. D.,
Manager Fluids Research,
Dow Corning Corporation.

DR. JOHN W. RYAN,
Manager, Fluids Research, Dow Corning Corporation, Midland, Michigan 48640.

DEAR DR. RYAN: We have received your letter of April 30, 1976, requesting our views on the environmental acceptability of polydimethylsiloxane fluids to be used in electrical transformers. The potential production level of this type of chemical for such applications would be several tens of millions of pounds annually. Our preliminary conclusions concerning the environmental aspects of this fluid as a potential replacement for one of the major uses of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), based on your technical briefing and your supporting documentation, are set forth below. However, we have not attempted to assess the performance, flammability, or economic aspects of the use of these fluids in transformers.

We are unaware of any incidents of adverse health or ecological effects associated with the production, use, or disposal of polydimethylsiloxane fluids, which have been produced in the United States at an estimated level of about 340 million pounds for a variety of applications, including applications which result in substantial environmental discharges. Similarly, available laboratory test data do not suggest the likelihood of environmental problems. At the same time, however, we are unaware of any systematic epidemiological or other field efforts to search for adverse effects, and we would like to see more data on chronic health effects and effects in aquatic systems.

Despite the incompleteness of our knowledge concerning the environmental effects of polydimethylsiloxane fluids, we believe that the available information indicates that these fluids are far preferable to PCBs for use in transformers from the environmental viewpoint. Further, we have no basis for suspecting that this closed-system application will result in serious environmental problems.

Given the widespread use of polydimethylsiloxane fluids in open systems, as well as their potential use in transformers, we would encourage expanded efforts to acquire more definitive data as to the health and ecological aspects of these fluids, in addition to your current efforts directed to environmental transport and decomposition. Given the long history of usage of these fluids, epidemiological investigations of workers and users who have been exposed to them for long periods of time at relatively high concentrations should not be too difficult to organize and carry out. The single chronic toxicity animal study conducted in the 1940s was not performed at today's standards for content nor length of study. Additional animal studies of the chronic effects, particularly on the circulatory and respiratory systems, are in order. Finally, we would suggest further investigations of the likely impact of spills of polydimethylsiloxane fluids into confined aquatic areas on aquatic life, including surface dwelling insects. Since previous testing was all done with static bioassay, we would recommend, as a minimum, flow-through bioassay with fathead minnow, sheepshead minnow, and/or Daphnia.

Sincerely yours,

GLEN E. SCHWEITZER,
Director,
Office of Toxic Substances.

The Agency would like to receive any additional information available on this issue. Members of the public or other Federal agencies are invited to submit written comments and other information relevant to this issue or to the correspondence contained in this notice to Dr. I. E. Wallen (WSME 711), Office of Toxic Substances (WH-557), Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 20460. All written comments filed pursuant to this notice will be available for public inspection in the above office from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. during normal working days.

Dated: June 4, 1976.

A. W. BREIDENBACH,
Assistant Administrator for Water and Hazardous Materials.

[FR Doc.76-16745 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

VINYL CHLORIDE

Recommended Procedures for Disposal of Aerosol Cans

Background. On January 22, 1975, the Environmental Protection Agency in the FEDERAL REGISTER canceled certain indoor aerosol pesticide products which contain vinyl chloride as a propellant (40 FR 3494). Following that action, the Office of Solid Waste Management Programs (OSWMP) of EPA developed internal guidance for the use of its Regional Offices should they be requested to provide disposal advice to affected parties.

On September 5, 1975, and again on February 6, 1976, the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) reaffirmed in the FEDERAL REGISTER its regulation declaring *any* self-pressurized products intended or suitable for household use that contain vinyl chloride monomer as an ingredient or in the propellant to be "banned hazardous substances". That action included certain repurchase requirements for manufacturers and had obvious disposal implications. In fact, CPSC in the September 5, 1975, FEDERAL REGISTER notice requested appropriate industry officials to conduct their repurchase and disposal actions in accordance with EPA guidelines (40 FR 41170). It was also noted "• • • that many States and municipalities have adopted codes for the disposal of hazardous wastes • • • [which, in many instances] are in conformity with EPA guidelines and will insure the proper disposal of the products involved." No seizure actions have been initiated to date, but the CPSC, if necessary, "will recommend to the Courts disposal methods consistent with EPA guidelines."

Purpose. Pursuant to section 204(b)(1) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, the Administrator may issue guidance and recommendations to State and local government, industry, organizations, and individuals, related to the disposal of waste materials.

The purpose of this publication is to provide guidance for the disposal of vinyl chloride-containing aerosol cans. This guidance is addressed primarily to holders[1] of large quantities of vinyl chloride-containing aerosol cans, although the recommended procedures are appropriate to disposal of any such wastes. These recommended procedures represent the best information available on preferable disposal options for vinyl chloride-containing aerosol cans.

When the problem of disposal surfaced, little was known about the chemical interactions of vinyl chloride monomer (VCM) with the environment. While the chemical and physical properties of VCM as they generally relate to its manufacture and use are known, there is limited information on how VCM reacts in a land disposal site environment. However, comparison of the known properties of VCM to those of other gases has been attempted in order to provide a base for recommended procedures for the disposal of VCM-containing aerosols. The following recommendations reincorporate recommended procedures for pesticide disposal as well as procedures for disposal of heavy-metal containing materials.

Technical background. Vinyl chloride monomer (VCM) is a chlorinated alkene hydrocarbon with a density of twice that of air. Since VCM boils at −13.37 C, it is a gas at normal atmospheric temperature and pressure. Vinyl chloride is highly flammable having a flash point of −78 C. The explosive limits are from 4 to 22 percent VCM in air by volume.

VCM is soluble in organic solvents but not very soluble in water. The quantity of VCM that dissolves in water depends on the partial pressure of the gas above the solution. If the partial pressure of the gas above the water is reduced, VCM will escape into the gas phase and be released to the ambient air. Chemical reactions, which can occur because of water impurities, might tend to inhibit escape of vinyl chloride. Certain salts have the ability to combine with VCM; for example, soluble silver and copper salts increase the solubility of VCM in water by forming complex dissolved salts.

VCM makes up about 20 percent by volume (equivalent to about 16 percent of the net weight) of the propellant in most of the canceled pesticide aerosols. The pesticides involved are mainly pyrethrins, lindane, and malathion. In hair sprays, deodorants, paints, etc., however, VCM may constitute as much as 40 to 45 percent by volume of the contents. Other propellants are chlorofluorocarbons 1

[1] The CPSC estimated in its September 5 1975, *Federal Register* notice that an estimated 3.3 million cans of vinyl chloride aerosols were in existence. Of these, approximately one million were in the hands of manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers. The remaining 2.3 million cans were in the possession of the consumer.

MONS 057945