EXHIBIT # 4

Monsanto

PUBLIC RELATIONS DEPARTMENT

Monsanto Company
800 N. Lindbergh Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63166
Phone: (314) 694-1000

reading

June 30, 1981

Mr. John Pillow
WHAS-TV, Channel 11
Box 1084
Louisville, Kentucky 40201

Dear Mr. Pillow:

Enclosed is the material you requested for Channel 11's background file on PCBs. If you need additional information or have specific questions on PCB health effects, safety, disposal, etc., please let me know.

I will be available to give you the information or arrange an interview with a Monsanto technical spokesperson for you.

Sincerely,

Sarah Gainer Collins
Manager
Environmental Communications

SGC:kw
Enclosure

SCM 075883

Bishop Ex #4
CK 6-29-87

00027

WATER_PCB-SD0000002387

Note to Editors from Monsanto Company September 26, 1980

PCB HAZARDS -- FACTS & FALLACIES

Monsanto made polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) until 1977, primarily as fire-resistant insulating fluids for electrical power-supply functions in transformers and capacitors. For more than 40 years their use was required in most high-rise buildings, schools and hospitals, where the risks of fire or explosion were major concerns.

Unfortunately, the very properties that made PCBs ideal for these uses, proved in the early 1970s to be creating environmental problems. PCBs are highly stable compounds that do not readily break down in the environment. Consequently, used PCB material remains intact in the ground and water for many years. Also, PCBs build up (or bioaccumulate) in the fatty tissue of lower forms of animal and aquatic life that consume them -- eventually reaching highly toxic levels in these life forms.

However, the hazards of PCBs to humans have been greatly exaggerated. PCBs are not human "cancer-causing agents" and they are not "deadly toxins." PCBs are considered only mildly toxic on an acute basis when ingested by humans -- about on the same order as common table salt.

There has never been a single documented case in this country where PCBs ever caused serious human health problems. From the many animal studies that have been

-more-

done with PCB compounds, however, it is clear that exposure should be avoided. These animal studies have consistently shown PCBs can cause skin irritation; and repeated, prolonged exposure can produce liver injury in test animals.

The "cancer-causing" label resulted from a single animal study conducted by a Public Health Service researcher in 1975 -- and later discredited by peer review. The cancer stigma has persisted, however, despite this and the results of a later animal study performed by the National Cancer Institute (1978). The conclusion of the NCI study was that PCBs were not cancer-causing compounds. (Copy of NCI news release attached).

This conclusion is further supported by the human experience. Monsanto is aware of seven studies done in the United States of groups of people exposed to PCBs. None of these studies found PCBs to cause cancer in humans.

In summary, there are enough real, legitimate concerns about potential environmental harm from PCBs without unnecessarily alarming the public with labels like "cancer-causing" and "deadly toxin."

-oOo-

For additional information contact: Dan R. Bishop, Director, Environmental Communications, Monsanto Company (314) 694-2891

HEW NEWS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

FOR RELEASE IN A.M. PAPERS
Friday, April 21, 1978

National Institutes of Health
Office of Cancer Communications
(301) 496-6641

Availability of a report on animal tests of Aroclor 1254 for cancer-causing activity (carcinogenicity) was announced by HEW's National Cancer Institute in today's Federal Register.

Aroclor, a polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) used as a heat transfer agent, was given in feed to rats for 104 to 105 weeks. According to a summary of the report included in the announcement, Aroclor 1254 was not carcinogenic to the rats under the test conditions.

The tests are part of the Institute's Carcinogenesis Testing Program. Copies of the report, Bioassay of Aroclor 1254 for Possible Carcinogenicity, are available from the Office of Cancer Communications, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Maryland 20014..

-30-

SCM 075886

WATER_PCB-SD0000002390

Chemicals

HAZARDS OF PCBs CALLED OVERBLOWN, CAUSING NEEDLESS DISPOSAL PROBLEMS

TAMPA, Fla. — (By an Environment Reporter staff correspondent) — The hazards of PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls) are overblown, causing needless disposal problems, according to scientists, engineers, and Environmental Protection Agency officials speaking at a hazardous waste management seminar.

PCBs are a "political pollutant" — a substance which EPA, the Food and Drug Administration, or some other federal agency has banned, resulting in no one wanting to touch, or dispose of the material, said John Dickinson, chief of the hazardous waste section of EPA Region IV in Atlanta, Ga. Dickinson told the October 15-19 seminar, sponsored by the Toxic Substances Control Institute, that "political pollutants" are ones which can be safely and securely disposed of, but ones which industry does not want to handle or "take the heat" from society for disposal.

Dickinson said the reason for concern about PCBs is that the substance is bioaccumulative and persistent in the environment and does not break down into simpler chemicals.

Dickinson said, however, that other chemicals are much more dangerous than PCBs, but just have not received the media attention that PCBs have.

He said that incineration of PCBs is the "sleeping giant" because EPA has not yet begun evaluating emissions from burning PCBs, and EPA does not know the products of its combustion.

PCBs Caught in Political Controversy

Dickinson's views were supported by Raymond D. Harbison, director of the toxic substances control laboratory at Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tenn. Harbison said PCBs are totally immobile and not carcinogenic to humans. According to Harbison, benzpyrene and other chemicals are far more hazardous to humans and the environment than PCBs and are proven human carcinogens.

Harbison pointed to many cases of human ingestion of PCBs without resulting carcinogenic side effects.

An April 1979 EPA environmental impact statement and economic impact analysis of the PCB regulations said that PCBs are carcinogenic to rats and mice and "pose a carcinogenic risk to man."

"The hysteria and money spent over PCBs are not worth the human health effects," Harbison said. "I see no reason why we are having problems disposing of PCB," he said in referring to industry problems in obtaining PCB disposal permits because of public opposition to disposal facilities.

PCBs, the only substance specifically outlawed by Congress in the Toxic Substances Control Act, are the target of very strict federal disposal regulations.

Robert Landmesser, president of Advanced Environmental Technology Corp., Morrisplains, N.J., recommended that industry get rid of its transformers and capacitors containing PCBs as soon as possible. Many seminar participants from industry said they had large quantities of PCBs stored onsite and were looking for permanent ways to dispose of the substance.

Industry Must Police Itself

Industry must police its own hazardous waste transportation and disposal activities more than it ever has in the past, according to Landmesser.

Landmesser said increased federal enforcement of EPA's soon-to-be released hazardous waste regulations (Current Developments, October 19, p. 1423) and the Department of Transportation's hazardous materials handling rules will be an incentive for industry to police itself to avoid expensive prosecution and violations.

According to Landmesser, of all the federal agencies his firm comes in contact with, DOT has the strongest and largest enforcement staff to deal with the hazardous materials handling regulations. He said that DOT intends to upgrade its enforcement staff for the regulations. He said that, because DOT's hazardous materials handling regulations are strong, consistent, and already on the books, unlike EPA's yet-to-be-released hazardous waste regulations, firms must comply with all aspects of the DOT regulations. "Compliance with DOT's [hazardous materials handling] regulations is imperative from top to bottom," Landmesser said.

Landmesser recommended that industries not mix different types of their wastes into one waste stream. "Classification and separation of materials will be most important for offsite disposal," he said.

Landmesser also said that industry generally has "not had a consistent moral hazardous waste policy." He said in the past industry may have been disposing of its wastes legally under then-existing laws, but quite often industry knew it was polluting groundwater and land and endangering the environment (April 13, p. 2326). He said industry has been legally, but not morally, correct in the way it handled hazardous wastes.

Discussions at the seminar also focused on the difficulty of siting hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities.

SCM 075887

Copyright © 1979 by The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc
0013-9211/79/0000

WATER_PCB-SD0000002391

AKRON BEACON JOURNAL

Founded April 10, 1839
C. L. KNIGHT, Publisher, 1897-1933

John S. Knight, Editor Emeritus

PAUL A. POORMAN
Editor and Vice President

JAMES V. GILS
Vice President and General Manager

DAVID S. COOPER
Associate Editor

ALBERT S. FITZPATRICK
Assistant Editor

DALE ALLEN
Executive Editor

A4 Friday, Sept. 12, 1980



Editorials

Debates could help us sort out our problems

RONALD REAGAN'S speech in Cleveland on energy provided an example of why the country needs debates between the presidential candidates to help sort out their positions.

The process, however, in this election year amounts to more than just sorting out who among the three candidates is the best choice. In this year, it is also a means for the country to sort out where it should be headed during this crucial decade.

In Cleveland, Mr. Reagan delivered a blistering attack on the Carter energy program, contending that the country has plenty of oil, gas and coal for many years and that the problem is not the supply but administration policies that have discouraged its exploitation.

The microphones were barely turned off after Mr. Reagan's speech in Public Square when President Carter fired back from Washington that the Republican candidate had "again made an accusation without checking the facts."

Well, as is often the case in political battle, it is not as simple as either candidate pretends. There is some truth on both sides.

Yes, as Mr. Reagan said, there is a lot of gas, oil and coal in the ground in America. In the case of oil and gas, artificial price controls, in part kept in place by Republican presidents who were part of Mr. Reagan's own party, helped contribute to lax exploration. Mr. Carter, to the dismay of some within his own party, took the lead toward gradually eliminating price controls.

Coal is a different matter. It is dirty and its effects are often dangerous to health. When oil and gas were still cheap, the nation abandoned coal as a matter of policy; now it is going back to coal, which is, as Mr. Reagan said, an abundant energy resource.

In this part of the country, to which the Republican candidate was directly speaking, the problems of exploiting coal for energy have been heightened by the long lead between the Environmental Protection Agency and the state over its use. Both sides have too often been intransigent. The Carter administration has not worked diligently enough to end the dispute. Neither have Ohio's Gov. Rhodes and his Republican administration.

Mr. Carter's angry statement of rebuttal to the Reagan comments conveniently made no mention of the President's discredited U.S. Department of Energy. This newly-created federal agency is full of bureaucratic bloat; whether its existence has helped or hurt the country's energy program is hard to tell. It is expensive, overstuffed in size and needlessness in some instances when that might well be unnecessary.

Mr. Reagan's speech made it sound as though everything would automatically be fine if the government played no role at all in the country's energy future. That notion should be too simplistic even to those in the energy business who can make a strong case that there is too much government regulation.

Again, the political point and counterpoint have not addressed the



Voice of the people

PCBs' indictment is premature

AS AN environmentalist, I must comment on Bill O'Connor's Aug. 29 article concerning PCBs.

All would naturally applaud Gaylord Nelson, and Dean Porter in particular, for their efforts to break down PCBs.

My comments relate to his descriptive characterization of PCBs, which was contrary to the facts as the scientific community now knows them (National Academy of Science studies published in 1979).

Though PCB is bioaccumulative, this in itself does not demonstrate its toxicity. PCBs are nowhere listed in EPA, DOT, or OSHA hazardous substance lists as "high toxic." It is only correct to call PCBs a "priority pollutant."

The only consistent findings from 1968 to 1968 are industrial chloracne eruptions on the skin.

To give the complete story, the public should know that several authorities, including Dr. Frank Whitmore representing EPA head, believe that the real culprit in the 1968 Japanese incident was not a "normal" PCB at all, but one by-product of a heated PCB (600 degrees F) — polychlorinated dibenzofurans, which may be 500 times more toxic than PCBs.

Ironically, EPA stated that "it is probably inappropriate to use the data from the (Japanese) episode to make



Robert Farrish

quantitive estimates of the toxic hazard posed by PCBs to humans." It is like comparing apples with oranges.

Yet this is just what EPA considers now as their primary evidence in indicting all PCBs.

Like everything else, it seems we go from one extreme to the other. All I ask is that we look at the PCB issue rationally.

The obvious conclusion that the National Academy made was that more extensive testing is required before any definite conclusion can be made.

It is fair to say that the long-term effect of PCBs on the food chain may not be known for 20 or 30 years. There is no supportive evidence today that ordinary PCBs are a human carcinogen or mutagen. At the same time, the best practice is then to minimize PCB exposure to the environment because of the unknown factor.

Therefore, during this time of uncertainty, let the media seek out the full story rather than stating opinions as facts.

Since environmental needs are so many and our financial resources are limited, I want us to deal with the environmental issues that are indeed significant and will require all the public support that has to be mustered.

ROBERT H. FARRISH
Stow

Catcher is happy

I WOULD LIKE to take this opportunity to thank everyone who helped to make my Guinness' world record attempt a success. The biggest thanks goes to the friends and relatives who came to watch my catch and cheered me on.

JEFF KURTZ
Brimfield

Editor's note: Kurtz, a 21-year-old Kent State University senior, caught a

WATER_PCB-SD0000002392
SCM 075888
00032