Johns-Manville

Internal Correspondence

To: J.C. Jackson - AACPP

Date: September 25, 1981

From: S.W. McCallie - 2-20 (4953)

Copies: See Distribution*

Subject: UTAH A/C PIPE CANCER STUDY

PRIVILEGED
J-M 83

I appreciated the opportunity to review the Utah study offered by your memorandum of September 8, 1981. My comments are set forth below.

Abstract. The last sentence describes the results of the study as "nonconclusive." If we have the freedom to suggest some editorial changes, I would recommend that the last sentence end ". . . the results of the study provided no consistent evidence that asbestos/cement pipe use was linked to cancer."

1,¶2. I do not know if the comment about environmental exposure is supported by the references.

2,¶2. Did Cook show that ingested asbestos is "absorbed" through the GI tract, or did he find penetration of fibers through the GI tract? Absorption seems inapposite for a solid state material, and I would be worried that this sentence might be read out of context by the lay public to mean that close to 100% of ingested fiber is absorbed through the gut wall, just as are water and nutrients.

2,¶2. The San Francisco study had nothing to do with "the use of asbestos-cement pipe," and largely involved environmental asbestos. It is my understanding that the San Francisco city area had among the highest cancer rates found in the study, and I have also been told that this city uses no A/C pipe.

2,¶3. Pretend you are in Connecticut and take the first two sentences out of context. I would suggest that the second sentence start as follows: "This study sought to determine if this ingestion may increase . . . ."

10,¶1. Again, the use of "nonconclusive" is misleading. Also, the reference to increased cancer risk for older men for kidney cancer as being "disconcerting" is completely misleading in light of the further discussion of kidney cancer at 11,¶2, 11,¶4, 12,¶1, and the conclusion at 14,¶3 that the study "found no association of . . . kidney neoplasms with asbestos."

000088

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/11835/1

PRIVILEGED
J-M-83

UTAH A/C PIPE CANCER STUDY

September 25, 1981
Page Two

10,¶2. The reference to the Pontefract studies, particularly the placental membrane study, without mention of the confounding factor of the formaldehyde contaminated by asbestos, is unscientific. Has this confounding factor ever been identified in writing in any journal or letter by Pontefract?

13,¶4. Technically, waters with an AI of 10 or less are considered "highly" aggressive, and it takes an AI greater than 12 before waters are considered non-aggressive. I have long recommended that the AWWA and ASTM specifications be changed to get away from the problem of having the adjective "aggressive" describe waters between 10 and 12, whereas the substance of the specifications is that autoclaved A/C pipe is not attacked by "aggressive" waters, but only by "highly aggressive" waters. The language used by the Utah study is more in keeping with the spirit of the AWWA and ASTM specifications than the actual language used in those specifications, and thus I would not recommend that we suggest any changes to the study.

14,¶3. The conclusion is remarkably straight-forward and is inconsistent with the earlier quibbling about "nonconclusive" and "disconcerting."

I have mixed feelings about this study. Certainly its conclusions are beneficial to the industry. On the other hand, it looks to me like it was written to please Jim Millette, and there are numerous phrases or sentences that, taken out of context, would seem to bolster the idea that, all things considered, it would be prudent not to use A/C pipe. Rather than have the entire study printed in the AWWA Journal, I would prefer to see a short news article about the study quoting the unequivocal conclusion on page 14.

SWM:shs

*T. Dougherty - Certain-teed Corp.
H.L. Olson 3-01
J.P. Reis 1-03
J.P. Leineweber 1-06
J.R. Chase 1-06
C.G. Linke 1-04
P. Kotin 1-06

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/11835/2