INTERNAL CORRESPONDENCE

UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION • 270 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10017

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT
UC-2903

To (Name) Mr. J. L. Myers
Division Mining and Metals
Location Niagara Falls, N. Y.

Date June 1, 1972

Originating Dept. Medical Department

Answering letter date

Subject

Copy to Mr. W. N. Johnson
Mr. R. Marsden
Mr. J. W. Rawlings
Dr. J. J. Welsh/Dr. K. S. Lane

Dear Mr. Myers:

On May 24, 1972, Mr. R. Marsden (of King City Mining and Metals) and I conducted a study at American Biltrite Co., Los Angeles, California to evaluate exposure of personnel to asbestos dust in selected operations involved in the production of vinyl floor tile. Air samples were collected at breathing level as close as possible to operating personnel at these locations for periods not less than 15 minutes per sample as generally recommended for OSHA Compliance studies. Fiber content of the samples was determined by phase microscopy in accord with the procedure specified in OSHA regulations.

Effort was made to determine if a difference in airborne fiber concentration could be detected between the handling and dumping of pellets (UCC) into the mix blenders and the handling and dumping of open fiber (Atlas Co.) into the blenders. Unfortunately, the two blenders,

A23876 RECEIVED JUN 2 1972 UCC-CALIDRIA NIAGARA FALLS, N.Y.

which were side by side, were operated in an overlapping series time-wise so that there was never a period during which pelletized material was the exclusive new source of fiber. In addition the fact that open fiber had been handled most of the time prior to our tests made it unlikely that we would have been able to find a period during that day in which all the existing fiber came from pellets. To obtain this condition, I now think that pellets would have to be run alone for several days for comparison with open fiber used over a similar period of time.

Our results do not indicate the presence of heavy concentrations of fiber in the air. There might be short intervals (5-10 minutes) during the loading of a blender when the concentrations near the operator may be higher, but weighted exposure of personnel would still be low. While there was much visible particulate matter in the work environment, it apparently was plasticizer, limestone or something else but not fiber. The fiber shown for locations other than the blender platform could have been from either source (pellets or open fiber).

Very truly yours,

Paul W. McDaniel

Paul W. McDaniel
Industrial Hygiene Engineer

PWM:lk
Attachments

A23877

SAMPLE RESULTS
May 24, 1972

reduce to 1 page

Location and Sample No.	Fibers 5 micron or more in length per ml of air
Blender Charge Platform	
In front of blender #1 (blending Atlas fiber) during charging of #2 with pellets (#1DM)	0.8
In front of blender #2 during same period as above (#1PM)	0.6
In front of blender #1 during period following charging of #2 with pellets. (#2DM)	0.6
In front of blender #2 during same period (#2PM)	0.5
Bucket Location (ground level)	
Below blenders during blender operation and blender unloading to conveyor (#3DM)	0.3
(#3PM)	0.4
Blender Charge Platform	
In front of blender #1 during charge with Atlas open fiber (#4DM)	1.0
In front of blender #2 during same period. Blender #2 running pellets. (#4PM)	0.3
In front of blender #1 during loading of #2 with Atlas Fiber. (#6DM).	3.4
In front of blender #2 during same period. (#6PM).	1.9

A23878

Location and Sample No.	Fibers 5 micron or more in length per ml of air
Sweco Screen Area	
General area around screen (#5DM).	1.0
Beside operator loading conveyor feeding hammer mill (#5PM).	2.0

A23879