Subject: NIOSH Visit to
Aroclor Dept 11/22/74

To: Paul Heisler

A 7 to 8 man contingent from NIOSH visited the 60 to 70 Mich Corp. Medical concerning PCB's. Recent studies conducted by NIOSH on rats indicated a high probability that PCB's (Aroclor 1260 was test material) are carcinogens. The purpose of the visit was for them to determine whether they would undertake a study of personnel who have worked in the Aroclor Dept. at MCH.

Two of the group, Mr. Jay Jones and Mr. Ralph Bicknell, visited the Aroclor Dept. presumably to determine exposure potential of personnel to PCB's.

Preliminary to touring the dept., I sat down with them to answer questions. First they wanted to know how we made Aroclor. I briefly told them that we chlorinate biphenyl and distill the product. I spent some time explaining the end product and their uses. No process details were given.

They wanted to know numbers of personnel in plant and dept. I answered 1200-1300 in plant and 15 to 20 in Aroclor Dept.

DSW 310364

STLCOPCB4070351

They did not seem concerned with obtaining a more precise answer. They also wanted to know what other products are made here. I answered sulfuric acid, chlorine/caustic, a family of products beginning with benzene that are chlorinated and then nitrated, PCA and several phosphorous derivative products. They asked if we were a union plant and what union and local.

During the tour, Gary Johnson accompanied us and we probably completed the tour in less than 20 min. We stayed mainly on the main operating level. They seemed concerned with drawing a flow sheet. T/C to biphenyl stg, biphenyl from stg to the chlorinators, etc. They agreed that the flow sheet would be a block diagram and would not show number of chlorinators, for instance.

We showed them the chlorinated sampling points and the spot where the operators analyze the samples for quality. We pointed out the hood arrangements for fume removal. They did not ask about other sampling points.

DSW 310365

We toured the control room and walked by the loading dock area. In the control room, they asked where the fresh air supply came from and the relative time the operators spend

indoors vs outside. We answered, on the average, more time indoors.

After the tour, they wanted to know the number of operator classifications and how many in each classification which we also answered. They also wanted to know the stability of the dept workforce. We answered that it was more stable than many in the plant but we were not specific.

My general impression was that these individuals were not very sharp. I doubt if they got much from their visit. They did not ask such questions as How often do we clean tanks, etc? What trays do we take samples? Where do we take samples, how many and how often? They did not ask to inspect our documents facilities although they knew we drum some product.

Also they did not seem unduly concerned that Gary Johnson was not in any office.

Bill Engwall

DSW 310366