WHHUNT
WHUNT

L. D. Press - St. Louis General Offices

September 10, 1968

AROCLOR 1254

KIMBERLY CLARK

CHICAGO
G. L. JUDY

D. H. Bechtold - Chicago
D. R. Hansen - Chicago
E. Muschick
K. A. Wells

Lee, thank you for your memo of September 4 further questioning the applicability of Aroclor 1254 for Kimberly Clark's application.

Aroclor 1254, as indicated in the bulletin, was tested on 200 volunteers. The test was conducted using per se Aroclor and a calendered PVC film containing 11% by weight Aroclor 1254. The work was done at Washington University in 1948.

In some cases skin contact with various Aroclors has led to the condition referred to as chloracne as described in the next paragraph of the Aroclor bulletin.

As you are well aware, with Santicizer 141 we found that our patch testing information based on stabilized calendered PVC film showed Santicizer 141 not to be a skin irritant, yet in Kimberly Clark's application it was shown to be a skin irritant. This likely results from a different type of stabilization system used in Kimberly Clark's application as well as different processing techniques.

I would still suggest, Lee, that before we could say that Aroclor 1254 could safely be used by Kimberly Clark it should be patch tested in their formulation on material produced by Kimberly Clark's process. This will be the only definitive evaluation. A statement by us that the Aroclor 1254 will definitely not cause skin irritation or sensitization could again turn out to be incorrect and cause further problems at Kimberly Clark.

The Aroclors are most frequently handled in the product group by Ken Wells, since most Aroclor applications are not for PVC. However, in this case Kimberly Clark is interested in using the Aroclor 1254 in a PVC application, so for this reason, plus the reason of maintaining continuity it would be best if you would continue to direct call reports and correspondence to me.

The situation remains that you may well have a good chance with Kimberly Clark on Aroclor 1254, but I do not feel that we should be too fast in suggesting they adopt its use without thorough skin testing. I realize this adds a time delay, but I do not feel it is worthwhile to push through the use of Aroclor only to find ourselves in deeper trouble. Do you agree?

L. D. PRESS

MONS 097899