

C  
O  
P  
Y

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH LABORATORIES

211 MILBY ST.

HOUSTON 3, TEXAS

PHONE CAPITOL 7-5708

TO: Thomas L. Shipman, M.D.  
Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory  
P.O. Box 1663  
Los Alamos, New Mexico

November 7, 1955

Dear Sir

I appreciate your letter of November 3, 1955 and wish to assure you that I do not consider E.D.T.A. a panacea, for the industrial lead problem. We recommend first of all the installation of adequate exhaust ventilation at those positions where the workers show abnormally high lead values in urine or where the maximum allowable concentration in the air is constantly exceeded.

Secondly, I recommend the use of E.D.T.A., not routinely and not prophylactically, but in those workers with high urinary lead values (with confirmed urinary lead values of 0.20 mgm/liter and over).

I have observed increased urinary lead excretion from the oral administration of E.D.T.A. in 4 gm. daily doses. Our urinary lead findings were confirmed by the Industrial Hygiene Laboratory of the University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, Texas.

I am presently treating twelve workers with 4 gms. E.D.T.A. orally, daily. Pre-treatment spot urinary samples with adequate specific gravity and volume showed urinary lead values over 0.2 mgm/liter. Pre-treatment urinalyses were negative for albumin, sugar and blood. I shall re-check all twelve men this week with urinary examinations and blood urea nitrogen studies if felt indicated.

Again, I thank you for your interest; since without your letter this matter might not have been brought to my attention. Please ask Dr. Harry Foreman to mail me a re-print of his toxicological studies of E.D.T.A.

SINCERELY,  
/s/

William U. Giessel, M.D.  
Medical Director

WUG:coa

copies made for: M. Bowditch  
H. Hardy  
R. Johnstone  
R. Kehoe ←  
J. Sterner

C  
O  
P  
Y

N22146