

ZEB G. BELL, Jr., Sc.D., Director
Environmental Control, Industrial Chemical Division

Mr. John Stender
Assistant Secretary
Department of Labor
Room 3115
14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20210

The reason for this correspondence is to express my objection to the position taken by the American Chemical Society on the proposed permanent standard for vinyl chloride presented at the Public Hearing in Washington, DC.

The American Chemical Society ad hoc Task Force met on May 21, 1974. The basic questions confronting the ACS were:

- 1) Should the Society take a position on the proposed standard?
- 2) Is VCM the chemical that has caused the problem?
- 3) In the opinion of the Society, is the proposed standard reasonable and appropriate?

The ad hoc Task Force on Vinyl Chloride had only two members currently employed in industry--myself (representing AIIA) and Mr. George Wilson of Firestone Tire and Rubber (representing the ASTM, E-34).

OCC 1447

Mr. John Stender
July 31, 1974
Page 2

The attendance at the ad hoc Task Force meeting on May 21 is shown in Enclosure No. III.

The outgrowth of this meeting was a draft of a position to be taken by the Society (Enclosure IV - May 23, 1974, cover letter from H. H. Fawcett and copy of first draft). This draft addressed itself to the basic rationale used in setting the proposed standard and not directly to the specifics of the proposed standard. Further, this draft did not indicate any endorsement of the proposed "non-detectable" level concept nor was technical feasibility discussed at the May 21, 1974, meeting. Upon review of the draft position by the Society, I had no major objections.

In the subsequent correspondence package from the Society (Enclosure No. V - transmittal letter from Mr. Halley Merrell, dated June 12, 1974, and from Mr. S. T. Quigley, dated June 7, 1974), it can be seen that a deadline of 5:00 p.m., June 12 was set for comments on the third revision of the draft. However, this draft was received in my office on June 13, 1974. Concurrently, I was on vacation during that entire week. In addition, the accompanying cover letter stated: "It would likely be helpful if the ad hoc Task Force and CCS members were on record as recommending Board approval of the statement. If you approve the statement, may I request that you telephone me immediately." I did not telephone approval.

Through retrospective deduction, I must assume there was a second draft which I did not receive or review.

Because of my extensive traveling, a recent bereavement, and a presumption that subsequent drafts would not deviate substantially from the original draft, I did not appreciate the substantive changes that were incorporated in the latest draft or the final testimony given by the American Chemical Society.

I was given no further opportunity to review the final position taken by the American Chemical Society nor was any other meeting of the ad hoc Task Force members called before the final position was presented at the Public Hearing.

OCC 1448

Mr. John Stender
July 31, 1974
Page 3

I personally cannot support the final position taken by ACS nor do I believe that it is proper to necessarily imply that the AIHA endorses the American Chemical Society's position.

Very truly yours,



Zeb G. Bell, Jr.

ZGB:mal

Attachments

cc: Daniel Boyd - OSHA
Howard H. Fawcett - National Academy of Sciences
Paul Halley - Standard Oil Co.
Jerome H. Heckman - Keller and Heckman
Edward Kline - Office of the Solicitor
Donald Lassiter - OSHA
William E. McCormick - AIHA
John A. Pendergrass - AIHA
Stephen T. Quigley - ACS
Jerome T. Siedlecki - AIHA
W. Mayo Smith - Air Products
Henry Stremba - ASTM
George L. Wilson - Firestone

OCC 1449