Aerovox® INDUSTRIES, INC.

740 Belleville Ave.
New Bedford, Mass. 02741
617-994-9661

March 12, 1975

TO: PCB AD HOC COMMITTEE

To those of you who attended the March 4 EIA meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on PCB, go my thanks. For those who could not be there, you will be glad to know we had a good turnout and much was accomplished. Ty Nourse of EIA will issue a short set of minutes but, due to time pressures, I thought it best that I publish the notes I took and, more specifically, the plan of action upon which we agreed. NOTE THAT SECTION 4i LISTS INFORMATION EACH PLANT IS TO SUPPLY ME. PLEASE DO THIS A.S.A.P.

1. Bill Papageorge told us that Ken Ballentine has taken Hugh Thompson's place at EPA. Ballentine has a new boss whose name is Ken MacKenthun. Ballentine is going to writeup a new advance notice and hopes to publish it in June followed by hearings in August, with the final regulations being issued in the fall. He apparently does not want to battle with industry and understands our problems.

2. Wayne Peterson of CD pointed out he thought we had a major problem in that, at present, no company had a plan to take care of a tank car spill as required by Section 311. Bill Papageorge agreed that Monsanto would prepare such a general plan and see that it was disseminated to all members of our industry. All attendees agreed that with the railway system being in the condition that it is, the likelihood of a tank car being derailed and perhaps breaking open was fairly good. Therefore, they welcomed the Monsanto offer.

3. Rich Rollins volunteered a letter his company received from Calgon relative to the cost of a system for the treatment of discharges in order to reduce PCB concentration. He pointed out that this would be an expensive undertaking since Calgon wanted $5,000 to $25,000 just for analytical work (a copy of Calgon's letter to the Jard Company is attached). It may be of interest that Bill Papageorge stated

that Calgon will undoubtedly be offering testimony during the hearings and such testimony probably will be slanted towards their treatment system.

4. An analysis of the tabulated data followed (a copy of the EIA tabulation is attached which includes the reports of three companies whose data was not available at the time the initial tabulation was made). As this was the first time anyone had had a chance to see the extent of the Aroclor 1016 problem in the capacitor industry, a lively discussion followed. It was generally agreed that with a few exceptions the situation was not as dramatic as many had originally believed. Still, it was thought advisable that the industry, as a whole, should take a stand with EPA via a lengthy letter; the suggested contents of which are outlined below.

   It was agreed that this letter would not be sent unless all fourteen companies in the industry accepted it and gave their individual acceptance that it be sent. It was further agreed that the letter should be signed by Jim Adduci, President of EIA if this could be arranged. In this case, Jim would be speaking for the fourteen capacitor manufacturers that comprise the customer base for Monsanto's 1016. The names of the fourteen companies would be mentioned. Other suggested points in the letter were:

   a. only industry totals or averages would be used. No individual company data would be made available to EPA or anyone else outside of the 14 manufacturers;

   b. once the letter is prepared, the draft will be submitted to all 14 companies for their comments. After that, a final meeting would be held and all 14 companies will have a chance to see the letter in its final form. At that time, each company would be requested to put in writing its permission that the letter be sent from EIA to EPA;

   c. the letter would explain that the discharge data gives no consideration to background and it is impossible to evaluate the effects of previously used non-biodegradable materials;

d. the letter would point out that the plants making up this survey may differ somewhat individually since they vary in size, equipment, and product and even age - 2 to 35 years old;

e. the letter would point out that there was considerable concern about the accuracy of measurement because measuring techniques and instrumentation were not available to insure error-free data;

f. the letter would point out that, while input water flow, discharge flow, and Aroclor usage were based on daily averages over the year 1974, the actual PCB's being discharged were measured in the late fall of 1974. This was at a time when the industry's production rate was considerably lower than normal due to the economic picture that prevailed. Based on this, the letter would compare EIA's reported sales figures for the 4th quarter of '74 with the fiscal year July, 1973 through June 30, 1974 and factor-up the total PCB discharge by this number. This would mean the letter would contain both the tabulated data as well as data factored upwards to offset the low production levels.

g. the general tone of the letter would be to show industry's concern with the PCB problem and industry's desire to co-operate with EPA. At the same time, the letter should communicate industry's feeling that the magnitude of the problem seemed much less than originally believed. Lastly, it was felt the letter should document industry's feeling that the proposed maximum discharge per plant was low and, more importantly, unfair since it penalized a larger plant versus a smaller one.

h. the following statistical data would be included in the letter:

    1. data volume of input water (question 1.d);

2. average PCB concentration of input water (a combination of question 1.a.2 and 1.b.2);

3. average industry concentration in micrograms per liter (average of answers to questions 2.a.3, 2.b.3, and 2.c.3.);

4. total daily industry discharge PCB (total of answers to question 5). This will be expressed both as measured and with a factor to represent normal production;

5. total daily industry consumption of Aroclor (answer to question 6);

6. industry "efficiency factor" (answer to question 5 divided by question 6).

i. The following additional information will also be in the letter to comply with EPA's requested format. Each of the 14 companies are to send to the writer, within two weeks, an outline of what they suggest be included as representing their facility on these points which are listed below:

1. what improvement does the data generated from the Monsanto samples indicate over prior tests, if any;

2. an outline what has been done to reduce PCB discharges;

3. an outline what is planned to be done to reduce PCB discharges;

4. a listing of any specific plans for the treatment of effluents (it was suggested that the Calgon system be played down; it was pointed out that Monsanto is trying to develop a treatment system);

5. an outline of plans now in effect for the monitoring, measuring and recordkeeping of discharges;

6. a listing of future plans for monitoring, measuring and recordkeeping of discharges.

j. copies of the letter to EPA are to be sent by member companies to their regional congressman and senators as well as certain key legislators on various committees.

If there are any questions or comments by attendees at the March 4 meeting or by those who did not attend, the writer would appreciate their being relayed by phone in the interest of time. At a meeting held later the same day, comprised of the total capacitor subdivision, it was recommended that the Ad Hoc working group do its best to secure General Electric's participation in the preparation of the initial draft of the letter. Incidentally, Roger Wills, Jr., an attorney for Westinghouse, has agreed to join the working group bringing it back up to its original number of 4 since Don Wilson of Mallory had resigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Clifford H. Tuttle

Attachments

Distribution

T. L. Browne	C. Lopes	E. Stewart
R. Buss	T. Nourse	G. Wallis
J. Butner	W. Papageorge	W. White
N. R. Clark	W. Peterson	R. Wills
H. Dublier	S. Richel	J. R. Willy
R. Hauser	R. Rollins	
J. Herger	R. Stenger	