CE100620475

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT JM-1934

June 18, 1970

F. J. Solon, Jr.

Report on Underwriters Laboratories
Meeting re Asbestos Spraying - June 17, 1970

ATTENDEES

See List - Attachment "A"

BACKGROUND

This meeting was called by UL, ostensibly as a result of the recent article about asbestos spraying that appeared in ENGINEERING NEWS-RECORD. Invitation letter, article, etc., are attached. ("B")

INTRODUCTION

The UL representatives defined the subject of the meeting as: "Determining if there is a health hazard in asbestos fireproofing spraying and, if so, whether substitute materials should be sought."

(Later, the discussion brought out the fact that - prodded by Ralph Nader and the "National Commission on Product Safety", UL is increasingly sensitive to the consumer safety of all of its "listed" (i.e. tested and approved for the UL label) products, as regards all hazards, including possible health hazards. The UL people also did not deny Mr. Gropp's assertion that they fear law suits over asbestos spray)

DISCUSSION

Most of the participants appeared to be well informed about the asbestos/health question in general and asbestos spray question in particular. Mr. Richardson of Atlas Asbestos (Turner & Newall) was up-to-date on Asbestosis Research Council and Asbestos Information Committee (UK) activities. He presented to UL a rebuttal to the ENGINEERING NEWS-RECORD article, from Wilfred Howard (AIC-UK) and a copy of the A.R.C. Guide # 2, "The Application of Sprayed Asbestos Coatings." He and others were familiar with and quoted British studies of buildings that show no asbestos in the air circulating within the occupied building.

Mr. Leff of Philip Carey also is well informed on the overall problem and helped place it into perspective for the UL people.

The Sprayed Mineral Fibers Manufacturers Association is about to issue a "code of practice" which will embody the recent New York City rules promulgated by D.A.R. Commissioner Nickles.

Mr. Egan of Grace attempted to broaden the discussion to include "hazards" from demolition and from asbestos sprayed plenums. The UL people showed little interest in demolition but considerable interest in plenums. In this connection UL Vice President Davis mentioned that the UL is "concerned" about reports of erosion of fiber glass ducts.

The UL people kept asking why the publicity in the general press has been so anti-asbestos spraying and why "the industry" does not reply and get "equal time."

As the only public relations person there, I replied to this question - - touching upon the emotion-laden, political issues - - the obvious motives of the Ottingers -- the old, but true cliche that "bad" news will always out run "good" news for editorial space. I did point to some "balanced" articles (CHEMICAL WEEK, TIME MAGAZINE, FAMILY HEALTH), etc.

I pointed out that the Federal Government is moving to set permissible TLVs for both occupational exposure to asbestos and for the ambient air and that here is where the "battle" will be won or lost.

I gave to UL - for their review:

Dr. Wright's Miami paper (Booklet)
J-M's paper "Asbestos and the General Public"
INDUSTRIAL MEDICINE & SURGERY Reprint on IIHRP

CONCLUSION

Mr. Davis summed up the meeting by saying that UL will launch a study of the available "literature" (including what those of us at this meeting gave them) and will "determine" whether there is indeed a health hazard to the public in asbestos fireproofing spraying with UL tested products.

If they decide there is no hazard, the matter will be dropped.

If they decide there is a hazard and that it can be solved by proper methods of application (like NYC rules), UL will insist that such [illegible]

It [illegible] that there is a hazard that cannot readily be solved. They will [illegible] the findings for these products.

In the meantime, Mr. Davis urged the spray manufacturers to [illegible] warning labels on the bags in which they ship their compounds, said labels to refer to the new NSPAA code of practices.

MISCELLANEOUS OBSERVATIONS

There are meetings/hearings coming up soon with officials of [illegible] Buffalo, New York and San Francisco on asbestos surveying.

Mr. Kempthorne has invited the NEW YORK TIMES, UPI, [illegible] NEWS-RECORD and FAMILY HEALTH magazine to a meeting on [illegible] in New York at which he says he will "confront" Dr. [illegible] "destroy" his arguments. (Note: I have seen some of Dr. [illegible] "ammunition" and it is sadly inadequate. For example, he [illegible] fastly maintains that less than 3% of the material [illegible] ings misses the beams, spandrels, etc., and gets into the [illegible] onto the floor or ground. That simply doesn't square with [illegible] and observations by Bill Nelson and many others. He also [illegible] medical report on five spray workers to "prove" that [illegible] hazard to this trade.

Mr. Egan of Grace seems intent on pushing asbestos [illegible] as well as out of spraying. I wonder if some day at [illegible] question W. R. Grace as to the wisdom of "switching" [illegible] favor of vermiculite, etc., in view of the fact that [illegible] for example, is likely to ban all spraying, regardless of [illegible] in the spray compound.

W. P. Rainey

wpr/mb 6/28/78

Jack [illegible]	Sprayon Research Corporation
A. C. Richardson	Atlas Asbestos Co. (Turner & Newall
E. J. Corson	Midwest Mechanical Products (Distributor for Atlas) Chicago
William K. Curtis	National Gypsum Co.
C. M. Brookie	Philip Carey Lindsay, N.J.
Morris Leff	" "
Lee Jones	Keene Corp., [illegible]
Dick Kempthorne	Sprayon Research [illegible]
Harry Gropp	U.S. Mineral Products Co. [illegible]
Bill Medlyn	USM Company Stanhope, N.J.
R. J. Wenk	U. S. Gypsum Co. Des [illegible]
Fred Kastner	" "
Ed W. Davis	Underwriters Laboratories [illegible] Northbrook
Jack A. Bono	" " "
Henry Marraffa	Univ. Fire-Bar, Inc. Arlington
George Wright	ULI Chicago
W. F. Raines	Johns-Manville Corp N.Y.C.
[illegible]	" " " [illegible]
	W. R. Grace