

8EHQ-92-12044 INT.
88920010284

Contains No CBI



LEGAL
Wilmington, Delaware 19898

1992 OCT 27 PM 2:12

OTS DRIC

21

A

No CBI

**Certified Mail
Return Receipt Requested**

October 15, 1992

Document Processing Center (TS-790)
Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics
Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460
Attn: Section 8(e) Coordinator (CAP Agreement)

Dear Coordinator:

8ECAP-0025

On behalf of the Regulatee and pursuant to Unit II B.1.b., Unit II B.2.a. (human effects) and Unit II C of the 6/28/91CAP Agreement, E.I. Du Pont de Nemours and Co. hereby submits (*in triplicate*) the attached studies. Submission of this information is voluntary and is occasioned by unilateral changes in EPA's standard as to what EPA now considers as reportable information. Regulatee's submission of information is made solely in response to the new EPA §8(e) reporting standards and is not an admission: (1) of TSCA violation or liability; (2) that Regulatee's activities with the study compounds reasonably support a conclusion of substantial health or environmental risk or (3) that the studies themselves reasonably support a conclusion of substantial health or environmental risk.

The "Reporting Guide" creates new TSCA 8(e) reporting criteria which were not previously announced by EPA in its 1978 Statement of Interpretation and Enforcement Policy, 43 Fed Reg 11110 (March 16, 1978). The "Reporting Guide states criteria which expands upon and conflicts with the 1978 Statement of Interpretation. Absent amendment of the Statement of Interpretation, the informal issuance of the "Reporting Guide" raises significant due processes issues and clouds the appropriate reporting standard by which regulated persons can assure TSCA Section 8(e) compliance.

For Regulatee,

Mark H. Christman
Counsel
Legal D-7158
1007 Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19898
(302) 774-6443

MM
12/1/94

ATTACHMENT 1

Submission of information is made under the 6/28/91 CAP Agreement, Unit II. This submission is made voluntarily and is occasioned by recent changes in EPA's TSCA §8(e) reporting standard; such changes made, for the first time in 1991 and 1992 without prior notice and in violation of Regulatee's constitutional due process rights. Regulatee's submission of information under this changed standard is not a waiver of its due process rights; an admission of TSCA violation or liability, or an admission that Regulatee's activities with the study compounds reasonably support a conclusion of substantial risk to health or to the environment. Regulatee has historically relied in good faith upon the 1978 Statement of Interpretation and Enforcement Policy criteria for determining whether study information is reportable under TSCA §8(e), 43 Fed Reg 11110 (March 16, 1978). EPA has not, to date, amended this Statement of Interpretation.

After CAP registration, EPA provided the Regulatee the June 1, 1991 "TSCA Section 8(e) Reporting Guide". This "Guide" has been further amended by EPA, EPA letter, April 10, 1992. EPA has not indicated that the "Reporting Guide" or the April 1992 amendment supersedes the 1978 Statement of Interpretation. The "Reporting Guide" and April 1992 amendment substantively lowers the Statement of Interpretation's TSCA §8(e) reporting standard². This is particularly troublesome as the "Reporting Guide" states criteria, applied retroactively, which expands upon and conflicts with the Statement of Interpretation.³ Absent amendment of the Statement of Interpretation, the informal issuance of the "Reporting Guide" and the April 1992 amendment clouds the appropriate standard by which regulated persons must assess information for purposes of TSCA §8(e).

²In sharp contrast to the Agency's 1977 and 1978 actions to soliciting public comment on the proposed and final §8(e) Policy, EPA has unilaterally pronounced §8(e) substantive reporting criteria in the 1991 Section 8(e) Guide without public notice and comment. See 42 Fed Reg 45362 (9/9/77), "Notification of Substantial Risk under Section 8(e): Proposed Guidance".

³A comparison of the 1978 Statement of Interpretation and the 1992 "Reporting Guide" is appended.

Throughout the CAP, EPA has mischaracterized the 1991 guidance as reflecting "longstanding" EPA policy concerning the standards by which toxicity information should be reviewed for purposes of §8(e) compliance. Regulatee recognizes that experience with the 1978 Statement of Interpretation may cause a review of its criteri. Regulatee supports and has no objection to the Agency's amending reporting criteria *provided that* such amendment is not applied to the regulated community in an unfair way. However, with the unilateral announcement of the CAP under the auspices of an OCM enforcement proceeding, EPA has wrought a terrific unfairness since much of the criteria EPA has espoused in the June 1991 Reporting Guide and in the Agency's April 2, 1992 amendment is new criteria which does not exist in the 1978 Statement of Interpretation and Enforcement Policy.

The following examples of new criteria contained in the "Reporting Guide" that is not contained in the Statement of Interpretation follow:

- o even though EPA expressly disclaims each "status report" as being preliminary evaluations that should not be regarded as final EPA policy or intent⁴, the "Reporting Guide" gives the "status reports" great weight as "sound and adequate basis" from which to determine mandatory reporting obligations. ("Guide" at page 20).
- o the "Reporting Guide" contains a matrix that establishes new numerical reporting "cutoff" concentrations for acute lethality information ("Guide" at p. 31). Neither this matrix nor the cutoff values therein are contained in the Statement of Interpretation. The regulated community was not made aware of these cutoff values prior to issuance of the "Reporting Guide" in June, 1991.
- o the "Reporting Guide" states new specific definitional criteria with which the Agency, for the first time, defines as 'distinguishable neurotoxicological effects'; such criteria/guidance not expressed in the 1978 Statement of Interpretation.⁵;
- o the "Reporting Guide" provides new review/ reporting criteria for irritation and sensitization studies; such criteria not previously found in the 1978 Statement of Interpretation/Enforcement Policy.
- o the "Reporting Guide" publicizes certain EPA Q/A criteria issued to the Monsanto Co. in 1989 which are not in the Statement of Interpretation; have never been published in the Federal Register or distributed by the EPA to the Regulatee. Such Q/A establishes new reporting criteria not previously found in the 1978 Statement of Interpretation/Enforcement Policy.

⁴The 'status reports' address the significance, if any, of particular information reported to the Agency, rather than stating EPA's interpretation of §8(e) reporting criteria. In the infrequent instances in which the status reports contain discussion of reportability, the analysis is invariably quite limited, without substantial supporting scientific or legal rationale.

⁵ See, e.g., 10/2/91 letter from Du Pont to EPA regarding the definition of 'serious and prolonged effects' as this term may relate to transient anesthetic effects observed at lethal levels; 10/1/91 letter from the American Petroleum Institute to EPA regarding clarification of the Reporting Guide criteria.

In discharging its responsibilities, an administrative agency must give the regulated community fair and adequate warning to as what constitutes noncompliance for which penalties may be assessed.

Among the myriad applications of the due process clause is the fundamental principle that statutes and regulations which purport to govern conduct must give an adequate warning of what they command or forbid.... Even a regulation which governs purely economic or commercial activities, if its violation can engender penalties, must be so framed as to provide a constitutionally adequate warning to those whose activities are governed.

Diebold, Inc. v. Marshall, 585 F.2d 1327, 1335-36 (D.C. Cir. 1978). See also, Rollins Environmental Services (NJ) Inc. v. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 937 F. 2d 649 (D.C. Cir. 1991).

While neither the are rules, This principle has been applied to hold that agency 'clarification', such as the Statement of Interpretation, the "Reporting Guide" nor the April 1992 amendments will not applied retroactively.

...a federal court will not retroactively apply an unforeseeable interpretation of an administrative regulation to the detriment of a regulated party on the theory that the post hoc interpretation asserted by the Agency is generally consistent with the policies underlying the Agency's regulatory program, when the semantic meaning of the regulations, as previously drafted and construed by the appropriate agency, does not support the interpretation which that agency urges upon the court.

Standard Oil Co. v. Federal Energy Administration, 453 F. Supp. 203, 240 (N.D. Ohio 1978), aff'd sub nom. Standard Oil Co. v. Department of Energy, 596 F.2d 1029 (Em. App. 1978):

The 1978 Statement of Interpretation does not provide adequate notice of, and indeed conflicts with, the Agency's current position at §8(e) requires reporting of all 'positive' toxicological findings without regard to an assessment of their relevance to human health. In accordance with the statute, EPA's 1978 Statement of Interpretation requires the regulated community to use scientific judgment to evaluate the significance of toxicological findings and to determining whether they reasonably support a conclusion of a substantial risk. Part V of the Statement of Interpretation urges persons to consider "the fact or probability" of an effect's occurrence. Similarly, the 1978 Statement of Interpretation stresses that an animal study is reportable only when "it contains reliable evidence ascribing the effect to the chemical." 43 Fed Reg. at 11112. Moreover, EPA's Statement of Interpretation defines the substantiality of risk as a function of both the seriousness of the effect and the probability of its occurrence. 43 Fed Reg 11110 (1978). Earlier Agency interpretation also emphasized the "substantial" nature of a §8(e) determination. See 42 Fed Reg 45362, 45363

(1977). [Section 8(e) findings require "extraordinary exposure to a chemical substance...which critically imperil human health or the environment"].

The recently issued "Reporting Guide" and April 1992 Amendment guidance requires reporting beyond and inconsistent with that required by the Statement of Interpretation. Given the statute and the Statement of Interpretation's explicit focus on substantial human or environmental risk, whether a substance poses a "substantial risk" of injury requires the application of scientific judgment to the available data on a case-by-case basis.

If an overall weight-of-evidence analysis indicates that this classification is unwarranted, reporting should be unnecessary under §8(e) because the available data will not "reasonably support the conclusion" that the chemical presents a substantial risk of serious adverse consequences to human health.

Neither the legislative history of §8(e) nor the plain meaning of the statute support EPA's recent lowering of the reporting threshold that TSCA §8(e) was intended to be a sweeping information gathering mechanism. In introducing the new version of the toxic substances legislation, Representative Eckhart included for the record discussion of the specific changes from the version of H. R. 10318 reported by the Consumer Protection and Finance Subcommittee in December 1975. One of these changes was to modify the standard for reporting under §8(e). The standard in the House version was changed from "causes or contributes to an unreasonable risk" to "causes or significantly contributes to a substantial risk". This particular change was one of several made in TSCA §8 to avoid placing an undue burden on the regulated community. The final changes to focus the scope of Section 8(e) were made in the version reported by the Conference Committee.

The word "substantial" means "considerable in importance, value, degree, amount or extent". Therefore, as generally understood, a "substantial risk" is one which will affect a considerable number of people or portion of the environment, will cause serious injury and is based on reasonably sound scientific analysis or data. Support for the interpretation can be found in a similar provision in the Consumer Product Safety Act. Section 15 of the CPSA defines a "substantial product hazard" to be:

"a product defect which because of the pattern of defect, the number of defective products distributed in commerce, the severity of the risk, or otherwise, creates a substantial risk of injury to the public."

Similarly, EPA has interpreted the word 'substantial' as a quantitative measurement. Thus, a 'substantial risk' is a risk that can be quantified, *See*, 56 Fed Reg 32292, 32297 (7/15/91). Finally, since information pertinent to the exposure of humans or the environment to chemical substances or mixtures may be obtained by EPA through Sections 8(a) and 8(d) regardless of the degree of potential risk, §8(e) has specialized function. Consequently, information subject to §8(e) reporting should be of a type which would lead a reasonable man to conclude that some type action was required immediately to prevent injury to health or the environment.

Attachment

Comparison:

Reporting triggers found in the 1978 "Statement of Interpretation/ Enforcement Policy", 43 Fed Reg 11110 (3/16/78) and the June 1991 *Section 8(e) Guide*.

<u>TEST TYPE</u>	<u>1978 POLICY CRITERIA EXIST?</u>	<u>New 1991 GUIDE CRITERIA EXIST?</u>
ACUTE LETHALITY		
Oral	N}	Y}
Dermal	N}	Y}
Inhalation (Vapors)	} ⁶	} ⁷
aerosol	N}	Y}
dusts/ particles	N}	Y}
SKIN IRRITATION	N	Y ⁸
SKIN SENSITIZATION (ANIMALS)	N	Y ⁹
EYE IRRITATION	N	Y ¹⁰
SUBCHRONIC (ORAL/DERMAL/INHALATION)	N	Y ¹¹
REPRODUCTION STUDY	N	Y ¹²
DEVELOPMENTAL TOX	Y ¹³	Y ¹⁴

⁶43 Fed Reg at 11114, comment 14:

"This policy statements directs the reporting of specific effects when unknown to the Administrator. Many routine tests are based on a knowledge of toxicity associated with a chemical. Unknown effects occurring during such a range test may have to be reported if they are those of concern to the Agency and if the information meets the criteria set forth in Parts V and VII."

⁷Guide at pp.22, 29-31.

⁸Guide at pp-34-36.

⁹Guide at pp-34-36.

¹⁰Guide at pp-34-36.

¹¹Guide at pp-22; 36-37.

¹²Guide at pp-22

¹³43 Fed Reg at 11112

"Birth Defects" listed.

¹⁴Guide at pp-22

NEUROTOXICITY	N	Y ¹⁵
CARCINOGENICITY	Y ¹⁶	Y ¹⁷
MUTAGENICITY		
<i>In Vitro</i>	Y ¹⁸	Y ¹⁹
<i>In Vivo</i>	Y}	Y}
ENVIRONMENTAL		
Bioaccumulation	Y}	N
Bioconcentration	Y ²⁰	N
Oct/water Part. Coeff.	Y}	N
Acute Fish	N	N
Acute Daphnia	N	N
Subchronic Fish	N	N
Subchronic Daphnia	N	N
Chronic Fish	N	N
AVIAN		
Acute	N	N
Reproductive	N	N
Reproductive	N	N

¹⁵Guide at pp-23; 33-34.

¹⁶43 Fed Reg at 11112
"Cancer" listed

¹⁷Guide at pp-21.

¹⁸43 Fed Reg at 11112; 11115 at Comment 15

"Mutagenicity" listed/ *in vivo* vs *invitro* discussed; discussion of "Ames test".

¹⁹Guide at pp-23.

²⁰43 Fed Reg at 11112; 11115 at Comment 16.

CAS # 4719-04-4

Chem: hexahydro-1,3,5-tris 2(hydroxyethyl) triazine

Title: Letter hexahydro-1,3,5-tris (2-hydroxyethyl) triazine

Date: 5/2/77

Summary of Effects: strong sensitizer

Central Medical Group
~~South Lodge~~
~~Harefield House~~
PO Box 3 Fulshaw Hall
Wilmslow Cheshire
SK9 1QB



Imperial
Chemical
Industries
Limited

Telephone Alderley Edge ~~2828~~ 582828
Telex 668411

Mr P J Lardear
Haskell Laboratory for Toxicology
& Industrial Medicine
E I du Pont de Nemours & Co
Newark
Delaware 19898

Your ref	Our ref	Tel ext	Date
	DMF/CMC	5308	2 May 1977

Dear Mr Lardear

'GROTAN BK' (hexahydro-1,3,5-tris (2-hydroxyethyl) triazine)

I must apologise for taking so long to reply to your letter on the above topic, but have been paying the penalty for my visit to N America viz a substantial backlog of correspondence!

My interest in 'Grotan BK' goes back some time. Originally, one of our manufacturing Divisions sent to me data provided by the UK suppliers of this bacteriocide which indicated that it had been comprehensively tested for skin sensitising potential, with negative results. Our Central Toxicology Laboratory (CTL), however, subsequently had occasion to test the bacteriocide in the Magnusson & Kligman maximisation test for sensitisation and to our surprise, it gave strongly positive results. At about the same time, a colleague from the Tunstall Laboratory of Shell Research International informed me that he had also found 'Grotan BK' to be a strong sensitiser in the same test and mentioned that Shell appeared to have a number of cases of human sensitisation resulting from the use of 'Grotan BK' in a cutting fluid.

More recent work at CTL has shown that the skin-sensitising activity of the bacteriocide is concentration dependent. At concentrations of up to 0.4% (v/v) of the formulation in water, no sensitisation response was elicited, whereas at a concentration of 3%, 100% of the animals showed marked sensitisation reactions. In terms of human experience, we have had no problems of contact dermatitis associated with the use of 'Grotan BK' as a component of textile spin finishes provided the concentration is kept at 0.15% or below. The attached papers and associated references, however, clearly indicate that this bacteriocide has been a common cause of contact sensitisation in other industries. This apparent contradiction is perhaps explained by differences in the irritancy of the material to which 'Grotan BK' has been added and in the final concentration of the bacteriocide in the mixture. I should perhaps add that we have had contact dermatitis problems at one of our sites at which another biocide - 'Grotan HD' (N-methylol chloroacetamide) - was used in spin finishes. This use has been phased out.

Finally, I enclose for your interest, a recent paper by Urwin et al (1976) indicating that 'Grotan BK' is negative in the micronucleus test for mutagenicity.

continued/...

I hope that this information is of some help to you. Please give my kind regards to Ray Morrow.

Yours sincerely

David M. Ferguson

D M Ferguson (Dr)
Central Toxicology Adviser

Enclosures



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

Mark H. Christman
Counsel
E. I. Du Pont De Nemours and Company
Legal D-7010-1
1007 Market Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19898

OFFICE OF
PREVENTION, PESTICIDES AND
TOXIC SUBSTANCES

FEB 13 1995

EPA acknowledges the receipt of information submitted by your organization under Section 8(e) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). For your reference, copies of the first page(s) of your submission(s) are enclosed and display the TSCA §8(e) Document Control Number (e.g., 8EHQ-00-0000) assigned by EPA to your submission(s). Please cite the assigned 8(e) number when submitting follow-up or supplemental information and refer to the reverse side of this page for "EPA Information Requests".


All TSCA 8(e) submissions are placed in the public files unless confidentiality is claimed according to the procedures outlined in Part X of EPA's TSCA §8(e) policy statement (43 FR 11110, March 16, 1978). Confidential submissions received pursuant to the TSCA §8(e) Compliance Audit Program (CAP) should already contain information supporting confidentiality claims. This information is required and should be submitted if not done so previously. To substantiate claims, submit responses to the questions in the enclosure "Support Information for Confidentiality Claims". This same enclosure is used to support confidentiality claims for non-CAP submissions.

Please address any further correspondence with the Agency related to this TSCA 8(e) submission to:

Document Processing Center (7407)
Attn: TSCA Section 8(e) Coordinator
Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C. 20460-0001

EPA looks forward to continued cooperation with your organization in its ongoing efforts to evaluate and manage potential risks posed by chemicals to health and the environment.

Sincerely,


Terry R. O'Bryan
Risk Analysis Branch

Enclosure

12044A



Recycled/Recyclable
Printed with Soy/Canola Ink on paper that
contains at least 50% recycled fiber

Triage of 8(e) Submissions

Date sent to triage: MAR 08 1995

NON-CAP

CAP

Submission number: 12044A

TSCA Inventory:

Y

N

D

Study type (circle appropriate):

Group 1 - Dick Clements (1 copy total)

ECO

AQUATO

Group 2 - Ernie Falke (1 copy total)

ATOX

SBTOX

SEN

w/NEUR

Group 3 - Elizabeth Margosches (1 copy each)

STOX

CTOX

ERI

RTOX

GTOX

STOX/ONCO

CTOX/ONCO

IMMUNO

CYTO

NEUR

Other (FATE, EXPO, MET, etc.): _____

Notes:

~~THIS IS THE ORIGINAL EIS SUBMISSION. PLEASE REFILE AFTER TRIAGE DATABASE ENTRY~~

For Contractor Use Only

entire document: 0

1

2

pages

1, 1st tab

pages

1, all tabs

Notes:

Contractor reviewer :

LPS

Date:

1/25/95

CECATS DATA
 Submission # BEHO-1092-12044 SEQ. A

TYPE: INT. SUPP FLWP

SUBMITTER NAME: E. I. DuPont de

Novec and Company

INFORMATION REQUESTED: FLWP DATE: _____
 6561 NO INFO REQUESTED
 6562 INFO REQUESTED (TEC/I)
 6563 INFO REQUESTED (VOL. ACTIONS)
 6564 INFO REQUESTED (REPORTING RATIONALE)
 DISPOSITION:
 REFER TO CHEMICAL SCREENING
 CAP NOTICE

SECONDARY ACTIONS:
 6601 NO ACTION REQUIRED
 6602 STUDIES PLANNED/IN PROGRESS
 6603 INTERACTION IN WORKS REPORTED
 6604 LABEL AIDS (TIANG'S)
 6605 PROCESS/ANAL. INC. (TIANG'S)
 6606 APP. AISE DISCONTINUED
 6607 PRODUCTION DISCONTINUED
 6608 CONFIDENTIAL

SUB. DATE: 10/15/92 10/27/92 CRAD DATE: 12/01/94

CHEMICAL NAME: Groton BK

CASE
4719 - 04-4

INFORMATION TYPE:	P.F.C.	INFORMATION TYPE:	P.F.C.	INFORMATION TYPE:	P.F.C.
0201 ONCO (HUMAN)	01 02 04	0216 EPICLIN	01 02 04	0241 IMMUNO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04
0202 ONCO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0217 HUMAN EXPOS (PROD CONTAM)	01 02 04	0242 IMMUNO (HUMAN)	01 02 04
0203 CELL TRANS (IN VITRO)	01 02 04	0218 HUMAN EXPOS (ACCIDENTAL)	01 02 04	0243 CHEM/PHYS PROP	01 02 04
0204 MUTA (IN VITRO)	01 02 04	0219 HUMAN EXPOS (MONITORING)	01 02 04	0244 CLASTO (IN VITRO)	01 02 04
0205 MUTA (IN VIVO)	01 02 04	0220 BOD/MOULA TOX	01 02 04	0245 CLASTO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04
0206 REPRO/TERATO (HUMAN)	01 02 04	0221 ENV. OCCUR/EFATE	01 02 04	0246 CLASTO (HUMAN)	01 02 04
0207 REPRO/TERATO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0222 EMER INCI OF ENV CONTAM	01 02 04	0247 DNA DAM/REPAIR	01 02 04
0208 NEURO (HUMAN)	01 02 04	0223 RESPONSE ROBERT DELAY	01 02 04	0248 PRODUSE/PROC	01 02 04
0209 NEURO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0224 TROPOCARCHEM ID	01 02 04	0251 MSIDS	01 02 04
0210 ACUTE TOX (HUMAN)	01 02 04	0225 REPORTING RATIONALE	01 02 04	0259 OTHER	01 02 04
0211 CHR. TOX (HUMAN)	01 02 04	0226 CONFIDENTIAL	01 02 04		
0212 ACUTE TOX (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0227 ALLERG (HUMAN)	01 02 04		
0213 SUB ACUTE TOX (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0228 ALLERG (ANIMAL)	01 02 04		
0214 SUB CHRONIC TOX (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0229 METAB/PHARMACO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04		
0215 CHRONIC TOX (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0230 METAB/PHARMACO (HUMAN)	01 02 04		

TRIGGER: NON-CELL INVENTORY ONGOING REVIEW: YES (DROPPED/REFER) SPECIES: HUMAN TOXICOLOGICAL CONCERN: LOW USE: backriocide PRODUCTION: _____
 CAS SR: NO NO (CONTINUE): REFER MED: HIGH

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EQMS Ratings on 8(E) Submissions--CAP Set 48--July 28, 1995

8E Number and Chemical Name	Rank	Reason or Brief Description
<p>-11924 Pentaerythritol triacrylate, PETA, CAS 3524-68-3</p>	<p>Med</p>	<p>In 1965 a large chemical manufacturer screened its printing-ink mixtures for irritancy/sensitivity by submitting three proprietary formulations to an outside university consultant dermatologist. One of the mixtures containing PETA consistently induced reactions typical of sensitization, under occlusive conditions at 1 % concentration.</p>
<p>-12044 Hexahydro-1,3,5-tris-2(hydroxyethyl) triazine, CAS 4719-04-4</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>1977 correspondence from a European chemical company identified the subject chemical as a concentration-dependent sensitizer, despite an earlier report from the original manufacturer that it was not. Appended are handwritten animal results. The latter contains anecdotal human reports of sensitization in a cutting fluid use. At the time of correspondence the chemical was to be a component of textile spin finishes at 0.15% concentration or below.</p>
<p>-12143 Methyl isocyanate, TDI</p>	<p>Med</p>	<p>A 1970 report submitted in 1992, that 8 volunteers exposed for one minute to 1.75 ppm showed transient irritation effects. Six of them were also exposed ten minutes to 0.5 ppm and all showed eye irritation, and 4 showed nose irritation. The report does not indicate which exposure occurred first.</p>



-CPSS- 1005950831

0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

> <ID NUMBER>

8(e)-12044A

> <TOX CONCERN>

H

> <COMMENT>

SKIN SENSITIZATION IS HIGH CONCERN. NO SPECIES WAS MENTIONED. A 3% CHALLENGE CONCENTRATION RESULTED IN 20/20 POSITIVE RESPONSES AT 24 AND 48 HOURS. IN A SECOND STUDY, A 3% CHALLENGE CONCENTRATION RESULTED IN 13/20 AND 11/20 POSITIVE RESPONSES AT 24 AND 48 HOURS, RESPECTIVELY. IN THREE OTHER STUDIES, CHALLENGE CONCENTRATIONS OF 0.3%, 0.4%, AND 0.15% ALL RESULTED IN 20/20 POSITIVE REACTIONS.

\$\$\$\$