
Tox File - Asbestos

## HEALTH STANDARDS UPDATE: AUGUST 1984




### ASBESTOS

The OSHA Asbestos Hearings were held from June 19 to July 12, 1984. ORC and a number of member companies submitted written testimony to OSHA. ORC, Tenneco, (Newport News Shipyards) Union Carbide Corporation and Raymark all presented oral testimony during the course of the hearings. ORC supported a two level standard, 0.5 fibers/cc for ambient concentrations, and 0.2 fibers/cc for actual human exposure. ORC defined exposure as that which was actually inhaled into the lungs.

ORC's recommendations included the mandatory use of engineering controls, work practice controls and/or administrative controls to reduce ambient concentrations to or below 0.5 f/cc. From 0.5 f/cc to 0.2 f/cc the mandatory use of appropriate negative pressure respirators was recommended. If ambient concentrations of airborne asbestos fibers could not be reduced to or below 0.5 f/cc, then the use of supplied air respirators was recommended.

During the hearings, the use of respirators and, particularly, the use of disposable or single use respirators, was condemned by the unions and academics. The only kind of respiratory protection considered acceptable by most commenters was supplied air. However, many of those recommending their use were forced to admit that supplied air respirators were often impossible or unreasonable to use.

During the hearings, OSHA commented that it expects to have a final asbestos standard out around July of 1985. Post hearing comments must be submitted to OSHA by August 27, 1984, and the legal briefing period runs from August 27 to October 11, 1984.

### BENZENE

The mediation process between OSHA, labor and industry is still being pushed by the administration. Organized labor does not seem to be optimistic about the chances of reaching agreement on benzene, but is still willing to give it a try. Overall, it seems that there is a general lack of enthusiasm on the part of most concerned with the benzene mediation efforts.

While the mediation effort continues, there has been little progress toward the completion of a final version of the benzene standard. OSHA and OMB have disagreed on several elements of a final standard including respirators, medical surveillance, and risk. At present the standard is at OSHA.

On July 27, 1984 the National Toxicology Program (NTP) released a draft bioassay showing that, under the conditions of the study, there is clear evidence that benzene is capable of causing cancer in both sexes of rats and mice; the study is not yet final. 99.7% pure benzene in corn oil was administered by gavage at doses of 0, 50, 100, or 200 milligrams/kilogram of body weight for 103 weeks. In spite of the unrealistic conditions of the animal study, it is probable that this study will have a strong impact on the final outcome of OSHA's benzene standard.

LEAD

This standard is still over at OMB and because of disagreements with OSHA over some elements of the draft document, it seems unlikely that it will be published during the present year.

OSHA has a field directive ready for publication that will give compliance officers guidance in applying the requirements for engineering and work practice controls to reduce employee exposure to airborne lead to the lowest feasible level even if they are not sufficient to reach the PEL. OSHA is allowing a degree of flexibility in complying with this requirement. If an employer has initiated a long-range study of options for reducing employee exposures to lead, they would not be cited for failure to meet the deadline for preparation of compliance plans in primary and secondary lead smelting and battery manufacturing.

OSHA still must report to the courts at set intervals its progress in resolving the issues that led to the administrative stay on the mandatory use of HEPA filters for respirators used to protect against lead dust and fumes. Presently OSHA is enforcing a more relaxed approach, allowing respiratory protection that is "appropriate" to the situation. The courts may force action on the issue.

FORMALDEHYDE

Next to benzene, this substance is causing OSHA the most concern. On July 2, 1984 the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia ordered OSHA to "reconsider" its denial of a petition by the UAW and other unions for an Emergency Temporary Standard. The UAW petitioned OSHA in December of 1981, and their request was denied by OSHA in 1982.

In 1983 the UAW petitioned the court to force OSHA to issue an ETS for formaldehyde. In defending its denial of an ETS, the agency told the court that there was insufficient evidence to justify a finding of grave danger.



UCC 010752

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-4238: Organization Resources Counselors, Health Standards Update on OSHA Asbe... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 18829 · Page 2 of 11 asbestosclaims.law/library/18829/2

On July 12, 1984 the UAW petitioned the U.S. District Court to set an October 2, 1984 deadline by which OSHA would have to respond to the unions request for an ETS on formaldehyde. OSHA has ten days in which to respond to the petition.

The court told OSHA to review the scientific evidence and see how it related to its regulatory options. OSHA responded that it would need at least four months to study the justification for an ETS and at least nine months to consider the need for a regular rulemaking. The court responded by requiring OSHA to prepare a time-table outlining when its regulatory decision making would be complete and to submit it to the court by August 10, 1984.

OSHA's response to the court was based, in part, on the findings of an international formaldehyde workshop held October 1983. The National Center for Toxicological Research, which issued a final report on this workshop, found that there was not sufficient human data to give a quantitative link between exposure to formaldehyde and various kinds of cancer.

RESPIRATORS

The draft document on the revision of 1910.134 is, for the present, not being actively worked on. In part, this is due to the fact that the asbestos hearings were heavily focused on the use of engineering controls as opposed to respirators. Until all of the written comments and the oral testimony are reviewed and evaluated, OSHA is reluctant to again begin actively working on this standard. The second reason is that OSHA and OMB have basic disagreements on the appropriate use of respirators.

The ORC Respirator Task Force will be meeting soon to consider updating our 1982 Recommended Revision of 1910.134 and resubmiting it to OSHA as the basis for discussions concerning respirators.

COTTON DUST

In the fall of 1983, Dan River Inc. asked OSHA for a variance from requiremnts associated with the Cotton Dust Standard so that they could conduct a research study on a potential cause of byssinosis. OSHA endorsed the plan and granted a six-month variance. A large amount of unfavorable criticism resulted from the grant of variance, aimed about equally at Dan River and OSHA.



Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-4238: Organization Resources Counselors, Health Standards Update on OSHA Asbe... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 18829 · Page 3 of 11 asbestosclaims.law/library/18829/3

On July 12, 1984 Dan River withdrew its request for a variance and indicated it intended to install ventilation systems in the affected mills.

OSHA has finished a final draft of its Cotton Dust standard, and it is in final review within the agency. There are two main issues, (1) Scope; how many non-textile industries will be included, and (2) how to modify the standard to make it more cost effective for the primary cotton industry.

ETHYLENE OXIDE

On June 22, 1984 OSHA published in the Federal Register (49 FR, 25734) a standard for Occupational Exposure to Ethylene Oxide. This standard established a PEL of one ppm and an action level of 0.5 ppm as eight hour time weighted averages.

At the same time, OSHA announced that it was continuing rulemaking on the issue of short-term exposure limits, (STEL). The record will be reopened with respect to this specific issue and further evidence sought.

The STEL was deleted from the standard at the last moment, causing some parts of the standard to read strangely. The deletion of the STEL came largely because OSHA had a very weak justification for a STEL, and as a result of the inability of the Office of Managment and Budget (OMB) and OSHA to agree on the extent to which the use of respirators was to be allowed in the standard. OSHA insisted on the maximum use of engineering controls, and OMB on the equivalent use of respirators.

OMB had received a heavy volume of comments regarding this issue, and this has continued since the publication of the standard.

The Ralph Nader Public Citizen Health Research Group (HRG) along with three unions filed suit against OSHA in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, contesting OSHA's deletion of the STEL.

4,4' METHYLENEDIANILINE

Responsibility for the control of methylenedianiline has been shifted to OSHA by the EPA. OSHA received on August 6, 1984, a Section 9 (TSCA) referral from the EPA, in effect transfering responsibility for MDA to OSHA. According to Section 9, of TSCA the EPA must also publish this referral in the Federal Register.



*Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-4238: Organization Resources Counselors, Health Standards Update on OSHA Asbe...* Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 18829 · Page 4 of 11 asbestosclaims.law/library/18829/4

OSHA will then have no less than 90 days in which to respond to the EPA referral. OSHA is required to publish a detailed response in the Federal Register.

ETHYLENE DIBROMIDE

OSHA is still working on a final draft of this standard, and while there have been several drafts completed, it does not seem likely that there will be a final this year.

NITROUS OXIDE

There has been some pressure on OSHA to take action to reduce exposure to operating room personnel in hospitals. For the most part, this push has come from hospital unions. OSHA is collecting information at this point and it does not seem likely that we will see anything within the next three months.

INTERAGENCY RISK MANAGEMENT COUNCIL (IRMC)

This group composed of a number of federal agencies, was originally established at the instigation of the EPA to supply a means to resolve differences between various federal agencies concerning the regulation of chemical substances. On June 5, 1984, OSHA testified that the IRMC could meet the need for risk assessment called for in a bill sponsored by Rep. Don Ritter (R-Pa). Concern has been expressed that the IRMC could become politicized as was its predecessor the IRLG. In response to this concern, OSHA commented that the IRMC could avoid politicization by avoiding risk managment and sticking with risk assessment.

Under the leadership of Ms. Betty Anderson of the EPA, the IRMC is preparing for an expanded role in the area of reproductive hazards. Ms. Anderson has, in the past, taken a key role in the carcinogen debate as head of the EPAs Carcinogen Assessment Group (CAG). Ms. Anderson has earned a reputation as a bright, hardworking and determined regulator. This is an area that we need to watch very closely.

1,3-BUTADIENE

The EPA has made a decision to refer action on this substance to OSHA under Section 9(a) of TSCA. This is the second substance that the EPA has referred to OSHA, the first being MDA. The National Resources Defense Council (NRDC), in written comments to the Agency, has argued that control over the regulation of 1,3-butadiene should remain with the EPA.



Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-4238: Organization Resources Counselors, Health Standards Update on OSHA Asbe... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 18829 · Page 5 of 11 asbestosclaims.law/library/18829/5

Tox File - Asbestos

# HEALTH STANDARDS UPDATE: AUGUST 1984

## ASBESTOS

The OSHA Asbestos Hearings were held from June 19 to July 12, 1984. ORC and a number of member companies submitted written testimony to OSHA. ORC, Tenneco, (Newport News Shipyards) Union Carbide Corporation and Raymark all presented oral testimony during the course of the hearings. ORC supported a two level standard, 0.5 fibers/cc for ambient concentrations, and 0.2 fibers/cc for actual human exposure. ORC defined exposure as that which was actually inhaled into the lungs.

ORC's recommendations included the mandatory use of engineering controls, work practice controls and/or administrative controls to reduce ambient concentrations to or below 0.5 f/cc. From 0.5 f/cc to 0.2 f/cc the mandatory use of appropriate negative pressure respirators was recommended. If ambient concentrations of airborne asbestos fibers could not be reduced to or below 0.5 f/cc, then the use of supplied air respirators was recommended.

During the hearings, the use of respirators and, particularly, the use of disposable or single use respirators, was condemned by the unions and academics. The only kind of respiratory protection considered acceptable by most commenters was supplied air. However, many of those recommending their use were forced to admit that supplied air respirators were often impossible or unreasonable to use.

During the hearings, OSHA commented that it expects to have a final asbestos standard out around July of 1985. Post hearing comments must be submitted to OSHA by August 27, 1984, and the legal briefing period runs from August 27 to October 11, 1984.

## BENZENE

The mediation process between OSHA, labor and industry is still being pushed by the administration. Organized labor does not seem to be optimistic about the chances of reaching agreement on benzene, but is still willing to give it a try. Overall, it seems that there is a general lack of enthusiasm on the part of most concerned with the benzene mediation efforts.

While the mediation effort continues, there has been little progress toward the completion of a final version of the benzene standard. OSHA and OMB have disagreed on several elements of a final standard including respirators, medical surveillance, and risk. At present the standard is at OSHA.



Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-4238: Organization Resources Counselors, Health Standards Update on OSHA Asbe... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 18829 · Page 6 of 11 asbestosclaims.law/library/18829/6

On July 27, 1984 the National Toxicology Program (NTP) released a draft bioassay showing that, under the conditions of the study, there is clear evidence that benzene is capable of causing cancer in both sexes of rats and mice; the study is not yet final. 99.7% pure benzene in corn oil was administered by gavage at doses of 0, 50, 100, or 200 milligrams/kilogram of body weight for 103 weeks. In spite of the unrealistic conditions of the animal study, it is probable that this study will have a strong impact on the final outcome of OSHA's benzene standard.

LEAD

This standard is still over at OMB and because of disagreements with OSHA over some elements of the draft document, it seems unlikely that it will be published during the present year.

OSHA has a field directive ready for publication that will give compliance officers guidance in applying the requirements for engineering and work practice controls to reduce employee exposure to airborne lead to the lowest feasible level even if they are not sufficient to reach the PEL. OSHA is allowing a degree of flexibility in complying with this requirement. If an employer has initiated a long-range study of options for reducing employee exposures to lead, they would not be cited for failure to meet the deadline for preparation of compliance plans in primary and secondary lead smelting and battery manufacturing.

OSHA still must report to the courts at set intervals its progress in resolving the issues that led to the administrative stay on the mandatory use of HEPA filters for respirators used to protect against lead dust and fumes. Presently OSHA is enforcing a more relaxed approach, allowing respiratory protection that is "appropriate" to the situation. The courts may force action on the issue.

FORMALDEHYDE

Next to benzene, this substance is causing OSHA the most concern. On July 2, 1984 the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia ordered OSHA to "reconsider" its denial of a petition by the UAW and other unions for an Emergency Temporary Standard. The UAW petitioned OSHA in December of 1981, and their request was denied by OSHA in 1982.

In 1983 the UAW petitioned the court to force OSHA to issue an ETS for formaldehyde. In defending its denial of an ETS, the agency told the court that there was insufficient evidence to justify a finding of grave danger.



Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-4238: Organization Resources Counselors, Health Standards Update on OSHA Asbe... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 18829 · Page 7 of 11 asbestosclaims.law/library/18829/7

On July 12, 1984 the UAW petitioned the U.S. District Court to set an October 2, 1984 deadline by which OSHA would have to respond to the unions request for an ETS on formaldehyde. OSHA has ten days in which to respond to the petition.

The court told OSHA to review the scientific evidence and see how it related to its regulatory options. OSHA responded that it would need at least four months to study the justification for an ETS and at least nine months to consider the need for a regular rulemaking. The court responded by requiring OSHA to prepare a time-table outlining when its regulatory decision making would be complete and to submit it to the court by August 10, 1984.

OSHA's response to the court was based, in part, on the findings of an international formaldehyde workshop held October 1983. The National Center for Toxicological Research, which issued a final report on this workshop, found that there was not sufficient human data to give a quantitative link between exposure to formaldehyde and various kinds of cancer.

RESPIRATORS

The draft document on the revision of 1910.134 is, for the present, not being actively worked on. In part, this is due to the fact that the asbestos hearings were heavily focused on the use of engineering controls as opposed to respirators. Until all of the written comments and the oral testimony are reviewed and evaluated, OSHA is reluctant to again begin actively working on this standard. The second reason is that OSHA and OMB have basic disagreements on the appropriate use of respirators.

The ORC Respirator Task Force will be meeting soon to consider updating our 1982 Recommended Revision of 1910.134 and resubmiting it to OSHA as the basis for discussions concerning respirators.

COTTON DUST

In the fall of 1983, Dan River Inc. asked OSHA for a variance from requiremnts associated with the Cotton Dust Standard so that they could conduct a research study on a potential cause of byssinosis. OSHA endorsed the plan and granted a six-month variance. A large amount of unfavorable criticism resulted from the grant of variance, aimed about equally at Dan River and OSHA.



UCC 010758

*Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-4238: Organization Resources Counselors, Health Standards Update on OSHA Asbe...* Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 18829 · Page 8 of 11 asbestosclaims.law/library/18829/8

On July 12, 1984 Dan River withdrew its request for a variance and indicated it intended to install ventilation systems in the affected mills.

OSHA has finished a final draft of its Cotton Dust standard, and it is in final review within the agency. There are two main issues, (1) Scope; how many non-textile industries will be included, and (2) how to modify the standard to make it more cost effective for the primary cotton industry.

ETHYLENE OXIDE

On June 22, 1984 OSHA published in the Federal Register (49 FR, 25734) a standard for Occupational Exposure to Ethylene Oxide. This standard established a PEL of one ppm and an action level of 0.5 ppm as eight hour time weighted averages.

At the same time, OSHA announced that it was continuing rulemaking on the issue of short-term exposure limits, (STEL). The record will be reopened with respect to this specific issue and further evidence sought.

The STEL was deleted from the standard at the last moment, causing some parts of the standard to read strangely. The deletion of the STEL came largely because OSHA had a very weak justification for a STEL, and as a result of the inability of the Office of Managment and Budget (OMB) and OSHA to agree on the extent to which the use of respirators was to be allowed in the standard. OSHA insisted on the maximum use of engineering controls, and OMB on the equivalent use of respirators.

OMB had received a heavy volume of comments regarding this issue, and this has continued since the publication of the standard.

The Ralph Nader Public Citizen Health Research Group (HRG) along with three unions filed suit against OSHA in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, contesting OSHA's deletion of the STEL.

4,4' METHYLENEDIANILINE

Responsibility for the control of methylenedianiline has been shifted to OSHA by the EPA. OSHA received on August 6, 1984, a Section 9 (TSCA) referral from the EPA, in effect transfering responsibility for MDA to OSHA. According to Section 9, of TSCA the EPA must also publish this referral in the Federal Register.



*Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-4238: Organization Resources Counselors, Health Standards Update on OSHA Asbe...* Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 18829 · Page 9 of 11 asbestosclaims.law/library/18829/9

OSHA will then have no less than 90 days in which to respond to the EPA referral. OSHA is required to publish a detailed response in the Federal Register.

ETHYLENE DIBROMIDE

OSHA is still working on a final draft of this standard, and while there have been several drafts completed, it does not seem likely that there will be a final this year.

NITROUS OXIDE

There has been some pressure on OSHA to take action to reduce exposure to operating room personnel in hospitals. For the most part, this push has come from hospital unions. OSHA is collecting information at this point and it does not seem likely that we will see anything within the next three months.

INTERAGENCY RISK MANAGEMENT COUNCIL (IRMC)

This group composed of a number of federal agencies, was originally established at the instigation of the EPA to supply a means to resolve differences between various federal agencies concerning the regulation of chemical substances. On June 5, 1984, OSHA testified that the IRMC could meet the need for risk assessment called for in a bill sponsored by Rep. Don Ritter (R-Pa). Concern has been expressed that the IRMC could become politicized as was its predecessor the IRLG. In response to this concern, OSHA commented that the IRMC could avoid politicization by avoiding risk managment and sticking with risk assessment.

Under the leadership of Ms. Betty Anderson of the EPA, the IRMC is preparing for an expanded role in the area of reproductive hazards. Ms. Anderson has, in the past, taken a key role in the carcinogen debate as head of the EPAs Carcinogen Assessment Group (CAG). Ms. Anderson has earned a reputation as a bright, hardworking and determined regulator. This is an area that we need to watch very closely.

1,3-BUTADIENE

The EPA has made a decision to refer action on this substance to OSHA under Section 9(a) of TSCA. This is the second substance that the EPA has referred to OSHA, the first being MDA. The National Resources Defense Council (NRDC), in written comments to the Agency, has argued that control over the regulation of 1,3-butadiene should remain with the EPA.



Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-4238: Organization Resources Counselors, Health Standards Update on OSHA Asb... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 18829 · Page 10 of 11 asbestosclaims.law/library/18829/10

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
**asbestosclaims.law/library/18829/11**