

CODING FORMS FOR SRC INDEXING

Microfiche No.	OTS0559623-1		
New Doc ID	89000000115	Old Doc ID	8EHQ-0100-14302
Date Produced	12/14/99	Date Received	01/28/00
		TSCA Section	8E
Submitting Organization	DOW CHEMICAL CO		
Contractor			
Document Title	SUPPORT: RECORD OF PHONE MESSAGE FROM DOW CHEMICAL CO RESPONDING TO USEPA REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFOR RE EMPLOYEE FATALITY FOLLOWING EXPOSURE TO 2,4-DICHLOROPHENOL, DATED 122999		
Chemical Category	2,4-DICHLOROPHENOL		

OFFICE OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES
CODING FORM FOR GLOBAL INDEXING

REV. 7/27/82

Microfiche No. (7) *		1		No. of Pages	
Doc I.D.		OTS 0559623			
Case No. (s)		3		Old Doc I.D.	
89000000115				8EHQ-0100-14302	
Date Produced (6)		6		Date Rec'd (6)	
				7	
				Conf. Code *	
				N	
Check One:		<input type="checkbox"/> Publication		<input type="checkbox"/> Internally Generated	
Pub/Journal Name				<input type="checkbox"/> Externally Generated	
Author(s)					
Organ. Name					
Dept/Div					
P.O. Box		13		Street No./Name	
City		15		State	
				16	
				Zip	
MID No. (7)				17	
				Country	
Contractor		19		D & B NO. (11)	
Doc Type					
Doc Title				8E	
Chemical Name (300 per name)		25		CAS No. (10)	

12/29/99

8EHQ-0100-14302

RECORD OF PHONE MESSAGE

Caller: Paul Wright, Dow Chemical Company

Date: 12/14/99

Notes created by: Matt Gillen on 12/29/99 based on playing of phone message.

Message:

PW received the EPA fax containing our 2 questions about his 11/24/99 letter. The fax was helpful, and he had challenged his technical folks on both issues. What they told him was as follows:

1) On the clarification of point #2 (#2 in the 11/24/99 letter), the internal Dow doctors are telling him that the level of detection (for 2,4-DCP in blood and urine) that were likely in effect at that time (i.e. 1980) were not sensitive enough and that the doctors now suspect that because of the low levels found in the more recent fatality (i.e. 1998), that it is likely that the worker did in fact experience exposure and that the levels of detection were just too high and that the previous fatality was likely due to DCP and not steam.

2) On clarification of point #5 (#5 in the 11/24/99 letter), the information contained in the 11/24 letter referred to the general case. According to his technical folks, the SKIN notation for this particular case(i.e. 2,4-DCP) was put on there because of the skin absorption hazard. Thus the 11/24/99 text is not correct. The SKIN notation for DCP is there because it can be absorbed through the skin in toxic amounts.



8EHQ-98-14302

Contains No COI

00 FEB 11 AM 10:22

RECEIVED
OPPT NCIC

00 JAN 28 PM 3:25

RECEIVED
OPPT NRI



89000000115