

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS À LA CHEMSTAR

Overseas companies are not "foreign" to CHEMSTAR anymore. Over the past decade, panels have greatly expanded their international focus. Nineteen of the 204 companies represented on CHEMSTAR Panels are non-US and non-Canadian. CHEMSTAR panels interact with chemical companies and organizations in Australia, Europe, the Orient, and other areas. Overseas panel activities range from information exchanges to co-sponsorship of research and coordinated advocacy.

OVERSEAS MEMBER COMPANIES

Foreign companies often belong to CHEMSTAR panels. Fourteen of the Fluorocarbons Panel's members are non-US companies. US member companies sometimes have overseas counter-

parts that have representatives on the same panel. The Methyl Bromide Panel, for example, has representation from Ameribrom Inc. in New York and its parent company, Dead Sea Bromine Compounds Ltd. in Israel. *Many panels consider foreign producers' inputs valuable in discussions of world-wide health, safety, and environmental concerns.*

The Hydrogen Fluoride Panel includes three Mexican companies that joined to share informa-

tion on safety in manufacturing, handling and transportation. These companies regularly give presentations at the Panel's annual HF Safety Seminar. Foreign members on the Crystalline Silica Panel are concerned with legislative and legal ramifications of the silica exposure effects debate in this country and abroad. Together, the foreign and American companies assess world-wide implications of toxicological and regulatory issues and coordinate responses. The Chlorinated Pool Chemicals Panel,

consisting of US, Japanese, Canadian, and Israeli companies, is producing a videotape the on handling of pool chemical emergencies and publishing a bulletin on safe handling and storing of pool chemicals. The Panel plans to translate the videotape and bulletin into several languages.

IN THIS ISSUE

OECD, Voluntary Testing and . . . (More)	3
TQC Meets FQI	4
Not Toxic? Not So, Says EPA	5
SPOTLIGHT: Rubber Additives	7
News Briefs	9
New Panels and Councils	9
Panel Completion: Vinyl Chloride	11
People	12
Recent Releases	
Federal Register Notices	13
Comments	15
Final Reports	15
Upcoming Events	16

**INFORMATION EXCHANGE/
RESEARCH COORDINATION**

CHEMSTAR panels also exchange information with organizations in many countries through joint meetings and correspondence. The Water Additives Panel works with KIWA, the Netherlands Waterworks Testing & Research Institute, to influence government regulations on drinking water. KIWA has followed Water Additives Panel activities in the US for over five years and would like to implement a similar program. KIWA advocates adoption of government limits on the product rather than the US enforced limits at the end of the pipe or faucet. The two groups will continue to share information — KIWA will supply the Water Additives Panel with its program guidelines and the Panel will share toxicology data on electrolytes.

The Phthalate Esters Panel engages in information exchanges and research coordination with the Plasticizers Sector Group of the Conseil Européen des Fédérations de L'Industrie Chimique (CEFIC). On June 22-23, the two groups held their second annual joint meeting in Washington, DC to discuss research programs related to health and the environment, implications of upcoming European unity, and the US regulatory process. CEFIC will host the 1991 joint meeting in Europe.

The Brominated Flame Retardants Industry Panel regularly confers with its CEFIC counterpart, the

European Brominated Flame Retardants Industry Panel, on regulatory and research activities. Representatives of the two groups met in Germany in early September to discuss issues of mutual concern.

**SUBMISSIONS TO FOREIGN
AGENCIES**

Many CHEMSTAR panels respond to regulatory or government agencies in different countries.

Submitting comments to international organizations is one way in which panels express opinions on worldwide regulatory activities.

The Polychlorinated Biphenyls Panel submitted comments in 1988 to the Ontario Workers' Compensation Board in Canada, challenging the conclusions of the WCB Industrial Disease Standards Panel study titled, "Occupational Exposure to PCBs and Cancer." The Panel stated that PCBs are not associated with cancer sites and that the WCB should not adopt compensation eligibility rules for cancer claims. The Panel also submitted comments to the World Health Organization on its Draft Environmental Health Criteria Document and Health and Safety Guide on Polychlorinated Biphenyls.

The Methyl Bromide Panel submits toxicological information to

Canada and Germany to maintain pesticide registrations of methyl bromide in these countries.

TESTING AGREEMENTS

CHEMSTAR panels are involved in several international testing agreements. Panels and foreign organizations or companies often agree to exchange information from ongoing research testing programs. The Phthalate Esters Panel and the CEFIC Plasticizers Sector Group sponsor testing and exchange study results. In this way, the groups avoid duplicate testing and share the cost of implementing the phthalate esters data base. The Butadiene Panel and the European Ad Hoc Butadiene Task Force are considering a similar arrangement in addition to exploring joint sponsorship of a research program.

Joint sponsorship is a more intricate form of international testing agreements. The Dinitrotoluenes Panel and Bayer AG of Germany are jointly sponsoring a pharmacokinetics study at Huntingdon Research Laboratories in England. EPA and Federal Republic of Germany government agencies suggested DNT for cooperative testing to promote cost sharing and ensure hazard data availability in both countries. The Panel will send completed study results to EPA and FRG regulatory agencies in 1991.

The Petroleum Additives Panel and the European Additives Technical Committee will jointly sponsor ecotoxicity testing to satisfy

European Economic Community legislative requirements. The tests include: acute toxicity to fish, algae, or Daphnia; biodegradability; octanol/water partition coefficient, bioconcentration factor, and a long-term aquatic toxicity test.

OBSTACLES

Obstacles are inherent in international relations. Distance and language barriers are obvious problems. Another concern is variance in country data acceptance standards. Because countries often have different requirements, mutual acceptance of data is a difficult feat. Panels also face fundamental conflicts of opinion between countries on data needs. What may be an important health or environmental issue in one country may be low priority in another. The OECD Existing Chemicals Testing Program (see update in this Newsletter) is an attempt to overcome some of the problems in obtaining mutual acceptance of data across country boundaries. The success of this program could have a profound, positive impact on international cooperation in testing.

A GLOBAL FUTURE

Strong international relations of panels will be invaluable to future industry successes. Panel progress should stimulate broader international cooperation especially as European boundaries are reduced in 1992. When CHEMSTAR panels look to the future, they look across the seas.

A. Kosko

OECD, Voluntary Testing and ... (more)

The Story Thus Far:

The OECD, an organization of 24 industrialized countries, initiated a voluntary program to investigate the health and environmental effects of high production volume chemicals. A Screening Information Data Set was designed by scientists from several countries to provide baseline information on the potential hazards of these chemicals. OECD identified 147 chemicals as Priority 1—substances for which no data are publicly available. In Phase I of the program, 53 of these chemicals are being addressed.

The US and 13 other countries agreed to participate in the program by taking the lead on specific chemicals, collecting existing data, and conducting tests to complete the needed data set. In Phase I, the US has the lead on nine chemicals. US companies, in compliance with a request from EPA, are assembling data and preparing to conduct testing on these chemicals. Testing is expected to begin in December 1990. An OECD evaluation of Phase I is planned for January 1991. (See CHEMSTAR News, Volume 2, No. 1, March 1990 and No. 2, June 1990 for background information.)

In November, the OECD will hold a meeting to review progress of Phase I and judge the viability of the program. The meeting will also focus on identifying lead countries for the remaining Priority 1 chemicals, which will be addressed in Phase II. (Key events of Phase II are shown in the box.)

The US is expected to acquire responsibility for data on 20-30 of

the Phase II chemicals, and EPA has indicated that CMA will again be asked to coordinate the voluntary efforts of domestic companies.

The CMA Board of Directors, at its meeting on September 10-11, prepared for this occurrence by approving continued CMA member company involvement in the OECD program, and endorsing an action plan for Phase II.

Identification of CMA member company sponsors for data collection and generation is central to the Association's action plan. Very recently, letters were sent to the CMA Executive Contacts of candidate companies seeking commitments to participation. The volunteers will be announced at the Board meeting in November.

OECD Existing Chemical Testing Program Phase II

- Formal Announcement of Lead Countries -- January 1991
- Complete Collection and Sharing of Existing Data -- August 1991
- Review of Existing Data and Testing Proposals -- December 1991
- Testing Begins -- April 1992

The CMA action plan also includes developing a long-term strategy to integrate existing chemical testing requirements internationally. The first step is to advocate that EPA nominate chemicals already subject to US testing requirements as part of Phase II. By spring 1991, the Association will develop recommendations to improve international sharing of existing chemical data. At the same time, CMA will develop a framework for evaluating the results of the screening tests conducted in Phases I and II.

What are the options if your company manufactures a chemical that is a potential candidate for Phase

II? Essentially there are three possibilities:

- o An individual company may take the sole responsibility for specific data collection and testing, and interact directly with EPA.
- o An individual company may take responsibility for specific data collection and testing, and then request that the CMA CHEMSTAR Division establish a panel to interact with EPA and OECD.
- o Coproducers of a chemical may form a consortium for specific data collection and testing, and request that the CMA

CHEMSTAR Division establish or augment a panel to facilitate testing and/or interactions with EPA and OECD.

Requests for additional copies of the Phase II candidate list of high production volume chemicals should be addressed to Sandra Tirey of CMA. Should your company wish to participate in Phase II of the OECD program, your notification also should be sent to Ms. Tirey.

If you are interested in forming a panel to participate in Phase II, contact Dr. Langley A. Spurlock, CHEMSTAR Division Director, at 202/887-1187 for information.

L. Spurlock

TQC MEETS FQI

Frank Lewis, Assistant Director of the Federal Quality Institute (FQI), briefed the Total Quality Council on September 6, 1990. As part of its education process, the Council is inviting representatives of other quality organizations to share ideas and experiences with members. Mr. Lewis outlined the purpose and activities of the Institute, and encouraged industry support of its aims.

The Office of Management and Budget, the Office of Personnel Management, and the President's Council on Management Improvement jointly founded the FQI in 1988. The Institute's mandate is to promote and facilitate the implementation of total quality man-

agement throughout the executive branch of the federal government in order to "improve the quality, timeliness and efficiency of Federal services to the American people."

The Institute conducts one-day quality awareness training courses for federal government management teams. These courses, divided into five sessions, address the following areas: the concept of total quality management; the relationship between quality and productivity; the roles of the executive and the employee in achieving quality goals; the team concept; methods for maintaining continuous improvement; the concept of the cost of quality and

the benefits of a focus on prevention; identifying positive and negative forces both within and external to a specific agency; and strategies for implementation of total quality management by an agency. The FQI currently is planning to expand this program into hands-on implementation programs lasting 18-20 days.

Through a federal master contract, the FQI has retained the services of a number of private sector quality expert groups that agency management teams may call upon to assist in implementing total quality management. In addition, the FQI maintains the Quality and Productivity Resource Information Center, an extensive library of

materials on quality practices and training for use by all employees.

Continuous improvement is a major goal of the FQI program. Consequently, the Institute seeks feedback from the private sector on the importance and success of its efforts. The Total Quality Council plans to express its support for the Institute's efforts in a letter to FQI Chairman John Franke.

T. Messenger

NOT TOXIC? NOT SO, SAYS EPA

On August 3, EPA published a final rule on a petition by the governors of New York, New Jersey, and Vermont to add seven chlorofluorocarbons and halons (see box this page) to the list of toxic chemicals under the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (SARA Section 313). EPCRA requires that EPA respond to petitions for the addition of chemicals within 180 days, by initiating a rule on the chemicals or by publishing an explanation as to why the chemicals do not meet suitable criteria. EPA chose not to act within the time limit, and therefore, the chemicals were automatically listed.

Between January and May 1990, thirty-seven of thirty-nine responding parties submitted comments objecting to the listing of these seven chemicals. The CHEMSTAR Panels on Butadiene (Ethylene/Propylene), Cyclohexane, and Fluorocarbons collaborated with the Reporting Issues Task Group of the CMA Environmental Management Committee. These comments were among those opposed to the listing. In its *Federal Register* Notice, EPA responded to the arguments presented in the opposing comments. EPA affirmed that the additions to the list are in accordance with the Agency's position.

Most comments opposing the petition focused on the fact that the

seven chemicals are not directly toxic. EPA stated in response that the concern is not whether toxicity is direct or indirect and agreed that the chemicals' direct toxicity levels are low or nonexistent. Rather, the Agency claimed that it must consider indirect toxicity which is caused by the ozone depleting effects of these chemicals. According to EPA, stratospheric ozone depletion is associated with adverse health effects from increased UV-B radiation exposure. For this reason, EPA believes that ozone depleting chemicals qualify for SARA Section 313 listing.

Many who objected to the ruling believe that if EPA can list chemicals based only on "indirect effects," then the Agency will have broadly based power to include many other chemicals without direct toxicity. The Agency believes it has not abused responsibility of interpreting criteria in the past, and claims that this concern of the commenters is unnecessary.

Most commenters argued that the public would mistakenly view listed chemicals as directly toxic. According to producers, it would be unfair for chemicals which are only indirectly toxic to have such a stigma. However, EPA stated that the public will understand the listing and recognize the distinction between direct and indirect toxicity of chemicals. Therefore, if a chemical meets Section 313

NEW ADDITIONS TO SARA SECTION 313 LIST:

Trichlorofluoromethane
(CFC-11)

Dichlorodifluoromethane
(CFC-12)

Dichlorotetrafluoroethane
(CFC-114)

Monochloropentafluoroethane
(CFC-115)

Bromochlorodifluoromethane
(Halon 1211)

Bromotrifluoromethane
(Halon 1301)

Dibromotetrafluoromethane
(Halon 2402)

criteria, EPA will not refrain from listing it because of a potential injurious reputation.

In addition to their concern about type of toxicity, the commenters noted that the effects of the seven chemicals are difficult to assess based on a reporting of local emissions. The chemicals do not remain within the areas from which the chemicals are released, but drift broadly and upward to the stratosphere. However, EPA stated that emission location is not part of Section 313(d)(2)(B) and (C) criteria.

Many commenters also objected to the listing because only a small percentage of the facilities from which the chemicals are emitted are subject to Section 313 standards. The reported emissions, therefore, would be only a small percentage of the actual amount of chemicals released. EPA countered this argument by restating that toxicity, not release percentage, is the important factor when evaluating a chemical using Section 313 criteria.

Many of those who submitted comments also pointed out that producers of CFCs and halons already report production and importation figures under the Clean Air Act Section 157 (Montreal Protocol). EPA stated that these emissions reports are irrelevant to Section 313 toxicity criteria.

EPA also addressed objections to the automatic addition of the seven chemicals to the SARA list. Many commenters believed that they did

not have ample time to comment and compile information. Commenters argued that if EPA initiates a formal rulemaking procedure, then the public will have additional opportunity to respond. EPA, however, denied this argument by saying that the public had sufficient time to respond within the 180-day review period. EPA also stated that from the comments submitted during the review period, no new information surfaced, nor is any new material on the nature of the chemicals likely to arise.

Essentially, EPA considers indirect toxicity a valid reason for a chemical to be listed under Section 313. The Agency believes that the effect of the seven chemicals on stratospheric ozone merits their place on the EPCRA list. EPA's favorable response to the petitioners serves as a new concern for producers of other indirectly toxic chemicals.

For a copy of the jointly submitted panel comments, please contact Amy Kosko at 202/887-1345 or Trish Messenger at 202/887-1169.

A. Kosko

SPOTLIGHT:

RUBBER ADDITIVES

This is the twentieth article in a series which highlights the activities of the various CHEMSTAR Panels.

The Rubber Additives Panel formed in 1979 to support studies that would expand the database on safety and health issues relevant to rubber additives. The Panel also sought to coordinate U.S. activity with the International Working Group on the Toxicology of Rubber Additives (WTR), located in the Federal Republic of Germany. Members of the Panel currently include: BFGoodrich Company, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, Monsanto Company, R.T. Vanderbilt Company, Inc., and Uniroyal Chemical Company, Inc. The Chairman of the Panel is Bernard Hill of Monsanto.

PROACTIVE RESEARCH

The Panel initially sponsored a toxicological research program which involved short term *in vitro* testing for potential mutagenicity/carcinogenicity of 2-mercaptobenzothiazole (MBT) and N-oxydiethylene-2-benzothiazole sulfenamide (OBTS). After completing these studies, the Panel sponsored a series of pharmacokinetics and comparative metabolism studies on MBT and 2-mercaptobenzothiazole disulfide (MBTS).

TSCA TEST RULE

In 1984, the Interagency Testing Committee designated MBT for

priority testing consideration in its 15th Report. ITC recommended MBT to EPA for chemical fate tests, including dissociation constant, persistence in water and soil, and leaching and migration; and environmental effects testing, including acute and chronic toxicity to fish, aquatic invertebrates and plants, and terrestrial plants. The EPA responded to these suggestions by issuing a proposed rule in 1985. The Agency recommended the following tests: oral and dermal pharmacokinetics, developmental toxicity, reproductive toxicity, neurotoxicity, mutagenic effects, aerobic aquatic biodegradation, indirect photolysis screening level, chemical mobility, fish chronic toxicity, and daphnid chronic toxicity.

EPA justified its recommendations by stating that MBT was produced in substantial quantities both directly during manufacture and indirectly in the breakdown of MBT-derived accelerators during vulcanization. The Agency indicated that MBT may enter the environment from processing, disposal, coolants, and direct and indirect discharges, as well as from the breakdown of MBT-derived accelerators in discarded rubber products. EPA also indicated that there may be substantial human exposure to MBT, estimating potential hu-

man exposure in the chemical industry at 558,000 people.

The Panel submitted written comments to the Agency which opposed this position on MBT and requested a public meeting with EPA officials to address these issues. The Panel maintained that existing evidence did not justify the proposed requirement for teratogenicity testing in two species. Furthermore, available data could not justify the multigeneration reproductive study nor indicate that MBT is a potential neurotoxic agent. To support these positions, the Panel provided EPA with the results of a worker exposure survey and a survey of Midwest and Eastern US surface waters which showed that MBT is not a widespread aquatic contaminant. The Panel also commented that the National Occupational Exposure Survey indicated that only 2,400 workers were actually exposed to MBT. The Panel noted that ITC's initial recommendation did not include health effects testing. The Panel then submitted results of its five pharmacokinetic studies of MBT and MBTS, which compared the kinetics and metabolism of the oral and dermal routes of exposure. The Panel suggested that EPA wait for the evaluation of results of NTP's ongoing pharmacokinetic studies and completed bioassay tests before requiring further health effects studies. The

Panel stated that any additional required testing should be in a tiered approach.

After considering the Panel's information, the Agency issued a Final Test Rule in 1988. EPA did not require further pharmacokinetic testing for MBT. However, the Test Rule required manufacturers and processors of MBT, and importers of rubber articles containing MBT, to perform testing for persistence and mobility, chronic aquatic toxicity, developmental toxicity, reproductive toxicity, neurotoxicity, and mutagenic effects in the dominant lethal assay. Additionally, the Agency agreed that if the dominant lethal assay was negative, it would not require further chromosomal aberration testing.

Companies currently participating in the test monitoring phase of the program are: Akzo Chemicals Inc.; The BFGoodrich Company; The Firestone Tire and Rubber Company; The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company; Mobay Corporation; Monsanto Company; Quimica Organica De Mexico, S.A. de C.V.; R.T. Vanderbilt Company, Inc.; and Uniroyal Chemical Company.

RESULTS

In 1990, the Panel will complete the testing program required under the TSCA Section 4 Test Rule and submit all required data and reports to EPA. Results of the various studies completed with MBT indicate that the compound is not expected to produce devel-

opmental, reproductive, or neurotoxic effects at anticipated levels of human exposure. In the dominant lethal assay, treated animals did not show any evidence of an effect resulting from treatment, therefore, the Panel will not have to sponsor any further chromosomal aberration testing. The Panel is completing the preparation of a layman's toxicology summary of the MBT research. The Panel will disseminate the summary among the joint test sponsors/importers of rubber articles containing MBT.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

To date, the Panel has collected data on approximately 65 chemicals classified as rubber additives, including MBT. Additionally, the Panel has sponsored more than \$800,000 in research on rubber chemicals. The Panel will continue to collaborate with the WTR, in efforts to monitor, review, and sponsor health and safety studies on rubber additive chemicals. Additionally, Panel members would like to collaborate with ITC in compiling a sufficient database on rubber additives which the Committee lists as priority chemicals.

In the near future, the Panel plans to focus on matters relating to residual nitrosamines in rubber additives. Monitoring the activities of OSHA, NIOSH and international regulatory bodies in regulatory actions on nitrosamines in the workplace will be important. This summer, an interindustry group met to discuss common concerns with the FRG workplace

regulation of nitrosamines and potential OSHA workplace regulations. As a result of this meeting, members of the Panel and other companies formed a Nitrosamines Panel under CHEMSTAR. This Panel will represent the rubber industry, producers of secondary amines and metalworking fluids, the cosmetic industry, and the soap, detergent and surfactant industry. The Nitrosamines Panel will be primarily an advocacy Panel, while the Rubber Additives Panel will continue to develop health and safety information on rubber additive chemicals.

Susan Howe is the Rubber Additives Panel Manager.

PE PANEL SHOWS BAY FREE OF DEHP

(Annapolis, MD, June 18)

The Chesapeake Bay Advisory Committee removed di-2-ethylhexyl phthalate (DEHP) from the list of Toxics of Concern under the Chesapeake Bay Toxics Reduction Program. The Committee has developed a prioritized list of chemicals, ranking chemicals by toxicity and occurrence. High priority chemicals will be regulated in an effort to clean up the Bay.

The Phthalate Esters Panel submitted information to the Committee on the health and environmental effects of DEHP, along with data from monitoring studies that showed little or no DEHP in the Bay. Based upon the Panel information comments, the Advisory Committee removed DEHP from the list.

BUTADIENE PREVAILS IN CALIFORNIA

(Sacramento, CA, June 18) The California Advisory Committee on Airborne Contaminants reviewed a number of chemicals, including butadiene, for possible revision of workplace standards. The committee includes representatives of government, industry, contract laboratories, and academia. Comments submitted by labor advocates recommended a permissible exposure limit of 0.2 ppm. The Butadiene Panel submitted comments on toxicity, metabolism,

NEWS BRIEFS

species differences, and epidemiology. Panel members Larry Griffis of Chevron and John Acquavella of Monsanto presented the data to the committee. Following the Panel presentation, the committee agreed to recommend a PEL of 2 ppm to CalOSHA.

TD PANEL CORRECTS PUBLISHER

(New York, NY, July 26) In a letter to Titanium Dioxide Panel Manager Jonathon Busch, the publishing firm of Van Nostrand Reinhold agreed to lower the hazard rating listed for titanium dioxide in *Dangerous Properties of Industrial Materials*, Seventh Edition (ed. Irving Sax). The Titanium Dioxide Panel, in responding to the issued hazard rating of 3, submitted comments to the publisher urging a significantly lower toxicity level and offered scientific data to support the position. Van Nostrand Reinhold reviewed the Panel submission and reexamined IARC's toxicity assessment for titanium dioxide. The publisher then decided to lower the classification rating to 1, which signifies a "minimal" toxicity level. In addition, Van Nostrand Reinhold will remove from future publications the erroneous statement that titanium dioxide appears on the SARA Community-Right-to-Know List.

DIOXIN PANEL WINS WITH EPA

(Washington, D.C., July 27)

On behalf of EPA, the Dioxin Panel successfully intervened in the resolution of the Environmental Defense Fund's and National Wildlife Federation's appeal of a District Court decision against the two organizations' joint petition to force a TSCA Section 6 rulemaking on dioxin. The DC Court of Appeals affirmed the original District Court opinion that EDF and NWF could not raise Administrative Procedure Act claims in a TSCA Section 21 petition lawsuit. The court held that although an APA challenge may exist to a Section 21 petition denial, a plaintiff cannot seek both APA and de novo review. In such an instance, the plaintiff must choose one remedy or the other. As EDF and NWF chose originally to pursue and settle the de novo claim, no APA claims are now permissible. This decision will prevent petitioners who unsuccessfully pursue APA claims from requesting de novo review. Future TSCA Section 21 judicial appeals likely will be de novo proceedings.

PE PANEL CRITIQUES CRITERIA

(Washington, D.C., August 13)

The Phthalate Esters Panel commented to EPA on the criteria for DEHP included in the proposed Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Protection of Aquatic Life (see

FR Notices this issue). The Panel has conducted environmental fate and aquatic toxicity testing for 14 phthalate esters under a TSCA Section 4 voluntary testing program. The Panel therefore was able to supply unique information relevant to the proposed ambient water quality criteria for DEHP.

In its comments, the Panel agreed with EPA that existing guidelines are inappropriate to determine criteria for DEHP. However, the Panel suggested several alternatives to the DEHP strategy outlined by EPA in the *Federal Register*. The Panel supported Agency efforts to remove the uncertainties in setting a Criteria Maximum Concentration and a Criteria Continuous Concentration for DEHP. The Panel comments also argued that EPA should publicly withdraw its ambient water value published in 1980 for all phthalate esters because, as even the Agency acknowledges, this value reflects erroneous DEHP data. The Panel also suggested that EPA establish separate criteria for aquatic life and human health to allow adequate protection during different uses of water.

CS PANEL LABELS

OSHA

(Washington, DC, August 15) The Crystalline Silica Panel submitted comments to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration in response to the Agency's solicitation of suggestions for improving the presentation and quality of chemical hazard information transmitted under its Hazard Communications Standard. The HCS

requires cancer labeling of products containing IARC Group 2A chemicals (see *FR Notices* this issue).

The HCS requires "appropriate" hazard labeling. OSHA generally accepts a weight-of-evidence assessment in determining which hazards should be mentioned on a label. For cancer warnings, however, the Agency interprets the standard to have automatic triggers precluding any weight-of-evidence assessment.

The Panel believes that OSHA's current interpretation of cancer labeling requirements does not allow for best professional judgment and other advantages of the weight-of-evidence approach. The automatic labeling triggers result in overlabeling products for cancer hazards, therefore, the Panel urged OSHA to eliminate the triggers. CMA submitted general comments in addition to the CS Panel comments. For copies of Panel comments, please contact Judith Olagues at 202/887-1195.

PHENOL PANEL SALUTES SAFETY STARS

(Washington, DC, September 19)

The Phenol Panel held its first Proactive Safety Awards ceremony attended by Panel members and CMA representatives. Dr. Langley Spurlock, CHEMSTAR Division Director, and Susan Howe, Senior Panel Manager, presented two awards in recognition of outstanding efforts. The Industry Leader in Safety Performance Award went to Texaco Chemical

Company. David L. Ford, the Panel representative for Texaco, accepted the award. The Most Improved Safety Performance Award was given to Georgia Gulf Corporation. Charles P. Freeburgh is the Panel representative.

Earlier this year, the Panel developed criteria for evaluating worker safety performance in phenol production facilities. The Panel designed the worker safety evaluation process to enhance and promote safe practices in the manufacture, transportation and use of phenol. Criteria used to judge performance include: OSHA-reportable lost time injury; employee days away from work as a result of workplace accidents; EPA-reportable spills; first aid (an injury requiring medical treatment); and emergency response to workplace incidents. The results from each Panel member's company survey were submitted to CMA in preparation for announcement of awards. For additional information, please contact Susan Howe, Phenol Panel Manager, at 202/887-1293.

FPP HAS LAST HURRAH

(Wiesbaden, FRG, September 19)

The Fluorocarbon Panel met for the 139th and final time. The Panel will cease all activities as of September 30 and will have ended all ongoing projects by the end of the year. As a closing effort the Panel is preparing a brochure describing its 18-year history of supporting research on the atmospheric effects of chlorofluorocarbons.

NEW PANELS AND COUNCILS

CHEMICAL DISTRIBUTORS

At an exploratory meeting on June 6, six chemical distributor members of CMA agreed to form the Chemical Distributors Council. The Council's goal is to increase industry awareness of the chemical distributor sector and address concerns specific to distributors. As a next step, the Council will explore pursuing the following issues: Responsible Care Compliance; legal defense; insurance; hazardous waste minimization and disposal; tank testing and monitoring; control of vapor emissions in transfer and filling operations; monitoring of pending legislation and regulations at all levels; employee safety and training; standardization of site audits; and shipping codes of practice. To date, representatives of Council member companies have already begun exploring the Responsible Care, Site Audits, and Legal Defense issues.

Council membership is open to CMA member companies with a significant distribution activity. Since June, four more companies have joined the original six on the Council. In addition, the National Association of Chemical Distributors has accepted an invitation to join the Council as a full member. Membership dues for this fiscal year are \$5000. For more information, contact Dr. Langley Spurlock at 202/887-1169.

METHYL BROMIDE

The Methyl Bromide Industry Panel was chartered under CMA in August to address health, safety, and environmental issues. The Panel, which is comprised of producers and formulators of methyl bromide, began operating in 1982 as the independent Methyl Bromide Industry Panel. Under the auspices of CMA, the Methyl Bromide Industry Panel will focus on maintaining pesticide registration of methyl bromide under FIFRA. The Panel also will sponsor toxicological and other types of testing that may be required by federal or state agencies. Panel member companies are: Ameribrom Inc./Dead Sea Bromine Compounds Ltd.; Ethyl Corporation; Great Lakes Chemical Corporation; and TriCal. Dr. Thomas Duafala of TriCal serves as Panel Chairman. For more information, contact Jon Busch, the Methyl Bromide Panel Manager, at 202/887-1189.

NITROSAMINES

The Nitrosamines Panel formed this summer to address impending federal agency concerns about nitrosamines. The Panel will develop advocacy positions and support research to clarify the potential effects of nitrosamines on health and the environment. When OSHA develops a workplace standard for nitrosamines, the Panel will convey the industry response. Panel member companies include:

Akzo Chemicals Inc.; Dow Chemical U.S.A.; Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company; Mobay Corporation; Monsanto Company; R.T. Vanderbilt Company, Inc.; Texaco Chemical Company; Tremco Inc./The BFGoodrich Company; Union Carbide Corporation; Uniroyal Chemical Company, Inc.; and Witco Corporation. Dr. Mark Thomson of Uniroyal serves as Panel Chairman. For more information, contact Susan Howe, Nitrosamines Panel Manager, at 202/887-1293.

OXO PROCESS

The 2-Ethylhexanoic Acid and 2-Ethylhexanol Panels merged in July to form the Oxo Process Panel. The Butyraldehyde Task Group, a recent addition to the 2-Ethylhexanol Panel, will continue its activities as part of the Oxo Process Panel. Companies comprising the new Panel are: Aristech Chemical Corporation; BASF Corporation; Eastman Kodak Company; Exxon Chemical Company; Filo Chemical Inc.; Hoechst Celanese Corporation; Hüls America Inc.; Shell Oil Company; and Union Carbide Corporation. Richard Wise of Union Carbide is the Panel Chairman. For more information, contact Dr. Has Shah, the Oxo Process Panel Manager, at 202/887-1192.

PETROLEUM ADDITIVES

In August, the new Petroleum Additives Panel formed to focus on improving the quality of automotive engine fuels and lubricants through the use of additives. The existing Lubricant Additives Panel will become a task group under the Petroleum Additives Panel. The Task Group will continue to address environmental regulations and health and safety issues.

The Product Approval Protocol Task Group, a new subgroup, will provide more industry input into the product approval process. This Task Group will advocate consistent and reproducible engine testing procedures, standard test development methodology, cost-effective testing, and quality finished products. The Task Group will interact with the American

Petroleum Institute, the Independent Lubricant Manufacturers Association, and the Society of Automotive Engineers.

Panel members include: Amoco Petroleum Additives Company; Chevron Chemical Company-Oronite Additives Division; Ethyl Corporation; Exxon Chemical Company-Paramins; Lubrizol Petroleum Chemical Company; Mobil Chemical Company; Shell Chemical Company; Shell International Chemical Company; and Texaco Chemical Company-Additives Division. The Panel Chairman is John R. Sanders of Chevron. For more information, contact Dr. Carol Stack, the Petroleum Additives Panel Manager, at 202/887-1196.

SODIUM BROMIDE

The Sodium Bromide Panel was chartered under CMA in August.

The Panel began operating in 1986 as the independent Sodium Bromide Industry Panel. Under CMA, the Panel will address safety, health, and environmental issues associated with sodium bromide and bromine chloride. The Panel will adopt and convey advocacy positions, monitor pertinent regulatory activities, and sponsor research to clarify potential health and environmental effects. Current focus of the Panel is on the conduct of research to support NPDES permits for use of sodium bromide in industrial water purification applications. The Panel member companies are: Dead Sea Bromine Compounds Ltd., Ethyl Corporation, and Great Lakes Chemical Corporation. Louise Wen of Ethyl serves as Panel Chairman. For more information, contact Jon Busch, the Sodium Bromide Panel Manager, at 202/887-1189.

PANEL COMPLETION

Vinyl Chloride

The Vinyl Chloride Panel completed its research goals and decided to terminate activities in 1990. The Panel formed in 1973 to accumulate and assess health and safety data on vinyl chloride monomer. After funding several animal studies, the Panel's emphasis on research shifted from toxicological investigations to early diagnosis and clinical management of injuries. Subsequently, the Panel

focused on epidemiological studies of workers.

Recently, the Panel reevaluated its 1974 epidemiologic study on vinyl chloride workers. Panel scientists could not determine what proportion of the observed non-angiosarcomas and biliary tract tumors were really misdiagnosed angiosarcomas. Despite rigorous efforts, the scientists were unable to diagnose the liver cancers in the

study. No further activity therefore seemed appropriate.

William Gaffey of Monsanto Company chaired the Panel. For further information on Panel research, contact Susan Howe, Vinyl Chloride Panel Manager, at 202/887-1293. Other interests of vinyl chloride manufacturers are being pursued at the Vinyl Institute, a segment of the Society for the Plastics Industry.

PEOPLE

GORMLEY PROMOTED

In July, Elizabeth Gormley was promoted to Associate Director in the CHEMSTAR Division. She has been a member of the Division managing staff for six years. Elizabeth joined CMA from the staff of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association. In her tenure in CHEMSTAR, Elizabeth has served as Manager of the Crystalline Silica, Dibenzofurans/Dibenzodioxins, Fluorocarbons, and PCB Panels. Congratulations to Elizabeth on a well deserved recognition of accomplishment!

SHAH, STACK PROMOTED

In August, Dr. Hasmukh Shah and Dr. Carol Stack were promoted to Director, CHEMSTAR Panels.

The new titles reflect superior accomplishment and extended supervisory responsibilities.

Has Shah joined CMA and the Division eleven years ago from Equitable Environmental Health. He has managed many panels over the years. He currently manages the Arsenic Acid, Biocides, Brominated Flame Retardants, and Oxo Process Panels.

Carol Stack came to CMA and the CHEMSTAR Division in 1980, also from Equitable Environmental Health. In her tenure she has managed a wide variety of panels. Her current responsibilities include the Benzene, Chlorobenzenes,

Ethylene Glycol, Glycol Ethers, Hexamethylene Diisocyanate, and Petroleum Additives Panels.

Congratulations to Carol and Has on recognition of their achievements!

MORAN RETIRES . . .**FROM PHTHALATES PANEL ONLY**

After managing the Phthalate Esters Panel for ten years, Dr. Elizabeth Moran will pass the responsibility to Marian Stanley. Bette will continue to oversee the Panel's activities until the end of the year. By that time, she will reach the unusual longevity mark of having staffed one hundred meetings.

RECENT RELEASES

FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES

AMBIENT WATER QUALITY CRITERIA (55 FR 19986, May 14, 1990).

REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AND INFORMATION REGARDING OSHA'S HAZARD COMMUNICATION STANDARD (55 FR 20580, May 17, 1990).

RESPONSE TO PETITION TO INITIATE PROCEEDING TO REVISE FINANCIAL ASSUR-

ANCE CRITERIA AND MECHANISMS FOR COMMERCIAL STORAGE AREAS OF POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS (55 FR 24638, June 18, 1990).

TSCA CHEMICAL TESTING; RECEIPT OF TEST DATA ON ISOPROPANOL (55 FR 25366, June 21, 1990).

ORGANIC CHEMICALS, PLASTICS AND SYNTHETIC FIBERS

CATEGORY (OCPSF); EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS GUIDELINES, PRETREATMENT STANDARDS, AND NEW SOURCE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS (55 FR 26691, June 29, 1990).

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR NEW STATIONARY SOURCES: VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUND (VOC) EMISSIONS FROM THE SYNTHETIC ORGANIC CHEMICAL

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY (SOCMI) AIR OXIDATION PROCESSES (55 FR 26912, June 29, 1990).

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR NEW STATIONARY SOURCES: VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUND (VOC) EMISSIONS FROM THE SYNTHETIC ORGANIC CHEMICAL MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY (SOCMI) DISTILLATION OPERATIONS (55 FR 26931, June 29, 1990).

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR NEW STATIONARY SOURCES: VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUND (VOC) EMISSIONS FROM THE SYNTHETIC ORGANIC CHEMICAL MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY (SOCMI) DISTILLATION OPERATIONS (55 FR 26953, June 29, 1990).

PROPOSED SIGNIFICANT NEW USES OF CHEMICAL SUBSTANCES (40 CFR 721, 55 FR 27257, July 2, 1990).

NATIONAL TOXICOLOGY PROGRAM; AVAILABILITY OF TECHNICAL REPORT ON TOXICOLOGY AND CARCINOGENESIS STUDIES OF HYDROQUINONE (55 FR 27508, July 3, 1990).

TOXIC AND HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES; CERTAIN CHEMICALS PREMANUFACTURE NOTICES (55 FR 27681, July 5, 1990).

PROCESS SAFETY MANAGEMENT OF HIGHLY HAZARDOUS CHEMICALS (55 FR 29150, July 17, 1990).

REPORTING CONTINUOUS RELEASES OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES (55 FR 30166, July 24, 1990).

NATIONAL PRIMARY AND SECONDARY DRINKING WATER REGULATIONS; SYNTHETIC ORGANIC CHEMICALS AND INORGANIC CHEMICALS (40 CFR Parts 141, 142, and 143, 55 FR 30370, July 25, 1990).

COMMUNITY RIGHT-TO-KNOW REPORTING REQUIREMENTS (55 FR 30632, July 26, 1990).

CORRECTIVE ACTION FOR SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT UNITS AT HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES; PROPOSED RULE (40 CFR Parts 264, 265, 270, and 271, 55 FR 30798, July 27, 1990).

NOTICE OF INTENT TO REMOVE CERTAIN ACTIVE INGREDIENTS FROM REREGISTRATION LIST B AND TO CANCEL PESTICIDES CONTAINING THOSE INGREDIENTS (55 FR 31164, July 31, 1990).

OZONE DEPLETING CHEMICALS; TOXIC CHEMICAL RELEASE REPORTING; COMMUNITY RIGHT-TO-KNOW; ADDITION OF CHEMICALS (40 CFR PART 372, 55 FR 31594, August 3, 1990).

NONFERROUS METALS MANUFACTURING POINT SOURCE CATEGORY EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS GUIDELINES, PRETREATMENT STANDARDS AND NEW SOURCE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS (55 FR 31692, August 3, 1990).

FUELS AND FUEL ADDITIVES REGISTRATION (55 FR 32218, August 7, 1990).

OCCUPATIONAL EXPOSURE TO FORMALDEHYDE (55 FR 32616, August 10, 1990).

OCCUPATIONAL EXPOSURE TO 1,3-BUTADIENE (55 FR 32736, August 10, 1990).

AVAILABILITY OF FINAL VERSIONS OF TOXICOLOGICAL PROFILES (55 FR 33172, August 14, 1990).

GUIDELINES ESTABLISHING TEST PROCEDURES FOR THE ANALYSIS OF POLLUTANTS (55 FR 33434, August 15, 1990).

TSCA CHEMICAL TESTING; RECEIPT OF TEST DATA (55 FR 33556, August 15, 1990).

UNDERGROUND INJECTION CONTROL PROGRAM; HAZARDOUS WASTE INJECTION RESTRICTIONS, LAND DISPOSAL RESTRICTIONS FOR THIRD THIRD SCHEDULED WASTES; CORRECTION (55 FR 33693, August 17, 1990).

DISCLOSURE OF NAMES OF INERT INGREDIENTS IN CURRENTLY REGISTERED PESTICIDE PRODUCTS (55 FR 33762, August 17, 1990).

AVAILABILITY OF THE TSCA INVENTORY 1990 SUPPLEMENT (55 FR 33959, August 20, 1990).

EXTREMELY HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE LIST: AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS FOR FLAMMABLES AND EXPLOSIVES (55 FR 35012, August 27, 1990).

FOREIGN IMPORT RESTRICTIONS (55 FR 35323, August 29, 1990).

MEETING ON PESTICIDE REREGISTRATION POLICY ISSUES (55 FR 35346, August 29, 1990).

DENIAL OF PETITION TO REVOKE FOOD ADDITIVE REGULATIONS FOR ETHYLENE OXIDE (55 FR 35347, August 29, 1990).

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY [ATSDR-19]; AVAILABILITY OF HEALTH ASSESSMENT GUIDANCE MANUAL (55 FR 35463, August 30, 1990).

COMMENTS

Comments to the California Health & Welfare Agency on the PROPOSED "NO SIGNIFICANT RISK" LEVEL FOR BENZENE UNDER PROPOSITION 65 (filed by the Benzene Panel, July 18, 1990).

Comments to the California Department of Health Services on the PROPOSED "NO SIGNIFI-

CANT RISK" LEVEL FOR NICKEL UNDER PROPOSITION 65 (filed by the Metal Catalysts Producers Panel, July 18, 1990).

Comments to EPA on the PROPOSED SIGNIFICANT NEW USES OF CHEMICAL SUBSTANCES (filed by the Specialty Acrylates & Methacrylates Panel, August 1, 1990).

Comments to EPA on the PROPOSED AMBIENT WATER QUALITY CRITERIA FOR DEHP (filed by the Phthalate Esters Panel, August 13, 1990).

Comments to OSHA on the HAZARD COMMUNICATION STANDARD (filed by the Crystalline Silica Panel, August 15, 1990).

FINAL REPORTS

"Pharmacokinetic Studies with 14C-Diethylene Glycol Butyl Ether and 14C-Diethylene Glycol Butyl Ether Acetate After Dermal Application to the Male and Female Sprague-Dawley Rat" (Glycol Ethers Panel, July 27, 1990)

"Delayed Contact Hypersensitivity in the Guinea-Pig with (1) Phenyl Mercuric Acetate (2) For-

malin" (Biocides Panel Mercury Compounds Task Force, August 24, 1990) Protected under FIFRA

"Phenylmercuric Acetate: An Acute Oral Toxicity Study with the Northern Bobwhite" (Biocides Panel Mercury Compounds Task Force, August 24, 1990) Protected under FIFRA

"Phenylmercuric Acetate: A Dietary LC50 Study with the Northern Bobwhite" (Biocides Panel Mercury Compounds Task Force, August 24, 1990) Protected under FIFRA

"(Arsenic Acid) - Acute Toxicity to Daphnids (*Daphnia magna*) under Static Conditions" (Biocides Panel Arsenic Acid Task Force,

September 5, 1990) Protected under FIFRA

"(Arsenic Acid) - Acute Toxicity to Mysid Shrimp (*Mysidopsis bahia*) under Static Conditions" (*Biocides Panel Arsenic Acid Task Force, September 5, 1990*) Protected under FIFRA

"(Arsenic Acid) - Acute Toxicity to Rainbow Trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) under Static Conditions" (*Biocides Panel Arsenic Acid Task Force, September 5, 1990*) Protected under FIFRA

"(Arsenic Acid) - Acute Toxicity to Sheepshead Minnow (*Cyprino-*

don variegatus) under Static Conditions" (*Biocides Panel Arsenic Acid Task Force, September 5, 1990*) Protected under FIFRA

"Chromic Acid: A Dietary LC50 Study with the Northern Bobwhite (WIL Project No.: 264-107)" (*Biocides Panel Arsenic Acid Task Force, September 5, 1990*) Protected under FIFRA

"Chromic Acid: A Dietary LC50 Study with the Mallard (WIL Project No.: 264-108)" (*Biocides Panel Arsenic Acid Task Force, September 5, 1990*) Protected under FIFRA

"(Chromic Acid) - Acute Toxicity to Bluegill Sunfish (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) under Static Conditions" (*Biocides Panel Arsenic Acid Task Force, September 5, 1990*) Protected under FIFRA

"(Chromic Acid) - Acute Toxicity to Daphnids (*Daphnia magna*) under Static Conditions" (*Biocides Panel Arsenic Acid Task Force, September 5, 1990*) Protected under FIFRA

"Chromic Acid: An Acute Oral Toxicity Study with the Northern Bobwhite (WIL Project No. 264-109A)" (*Biocides Panel Arsenic Acid Task Force, September 5, 1990*) Protected under FIFRA

"Mutagenicity Test on Isopropanol in the CHO/HGPRT Forward Mutation Assay with Independent Repeat (*Isopropanol Panel, May 31, 1990*)

UPCOMING EVENTS

GLOBAL CLIMATE WORKSHOP

The CMA Ad Hoc Global Climate Group is holding a two day workshop on global climate research relative to the chemical industry on November 28-29, 1990 in the Washington area. The first day will be a working session of leading scientists to identify specific recommendations for research focus. Their recommendations will be presented to start the second day's activities which will address what the chemical industry should do to respond to this public issue. CMA members are welcome to attend either or both days. For information contact Teresa Punaro at 202/887-1261.

WANT A CHEMSTAR ANNUAL REPORT?

Copies of the 1989-90 CHEMSTAR Annual Report will be available as of November 1 to all interested persons. The Annual Report contains summaries of all CHEMSTAR Panel activities for the past fiscal year. The Annual Report will help you keep up with what each Panel is doing and plans to do. To request a copy write:

Devonne Bilal
CMA CHEMSTAR Division
2501 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20037

CHEMSTAR NEWS is published quarterly as a service of the Chemical Manufacturers Association, Chemical Self-funded Technical Advocacy and Research Division.

Correspondence may be sent to **CHEMSTAR NEWS**, 2501 M Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037; Telephone 202/887-1337; Fax 202/887-1237.

*Veronica Johnson and
Amy Kosko, Editors*