LG-4878 REV. 9/89

(1)

DUPONT

Contains No CBI

1992 OCT 27 PM 2:24
OTS CBIC

LEGAL
Wilmington, Delaware 19898

(A)

No CBI

Certified Mail
Return Receipt Requested

October 15, 1992

8EHQ-92-12162
INIT
88920010399

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. 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

RECEIVED
3/30/95

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 standard[2]. 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).

---

[2]In 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".

[3]A comparison of the 1978 Statement of Interpretation and the 1992 "Reporting Guide" is a 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 intent[4], 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.
- othe "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];

- othe "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.
- othe "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 .

---

[4]The '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 Environemntal 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.*

TEST TYPE	1978 POLICY CRITERIA EXIST?	New 1991 GUIDE CRITERIA EXIST?
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]

[6] 43 Fed Reg at 11114, comment 14:

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

[7] Guide at pp.22, 29-31.

[8] Guide at pp-34-36.

[9] Guide at pp-34-36.

[10] Guide at pp-34-36.

[11] Guide at pp-22; 36-37.

[12] Guide at pp-22

[13] 43 Fed Reg at 11112

"Birth Defects" listed.

[14] Guide at pp-22

NEUROTOXICITY	N	Y[15]
CARCINOGENICITY	Y[16]	Y[17]
MUTAGENICITY		
In Vitro	Y}[18]	Y} [19]
In Vivo	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
Reprodcutive	N	N

---

[15] Guide at pp-23; 33-34.

[16] 43 Fed Reg at 11112
"Cancer" listed

[17] Guide at pp-21.

[18] 43 Fed Reg at 11112; 11115 at Comment 15
"Mutagenicity" listed/ *in vivo* vs *invitro* discussed; discussion of "Ames test".

[19] Guide at pp-23.

[20] 43 Fed Reg at 11112; 11115 at Comment 16.

CAS# 1879-09-0
Chem: Phenol, 6-tertiary-butyl-2,4-dimethyl
Title: Acute Inhalation Toxicity
Date: 7/12/74
Summary of Effects: Tremors

Copies to: J. McConell, Jr. (6)
D. J. Van Bramer (1)

E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company
Haskell Laboratory for Toxicology and Industrial Medicine

HASKELL LABORATORY REPORT NO. 395-74 MR NO. 1938-001

terial Tested: Phenol, 6-tertiary-butyl-2,4-dimethyl Haskell No.: 8683

terial Submitted by: D. J. Van Bramer, Plastics Department, Parkersburg Other Codes: AO-30, Topanol A, 24M6B

ACUTE INHALATION TOXICITY

ocedure: Fifty to sixty grams of 2,4-dimethyl-6-tertiary-butyl phenol (AO-30) was weighed into a three-necked ask and heated to various temperatures with a heating mantle for each four-hour exposure. Houseline air was ssed over or into the test material with any resultant vapors rising into the bottom of a 20-liter exposure amber. Temperature of the AO-30 was monitored during the exposures by a ¼" thermocouple attached to a tentiometer.

Six male ChR-CD rats (initial weight 250-300 grams) were used for each four-hour exposure. Pathology s not requested. Animals were observed and weighed daily for 14 days post-exposure.

Analysis was done using a Beckman UV spectrophotometer. A measured amount of chamber air was drawn to two midget impingers in series - each impinger contained 10 ml of ethanol. Samples were read at 278 millicrons and compared to a standard curve of known amounts of AO-30 in ethanol (weight/volume). Analytical concentations are expressed in parts per million (volume/volume) after conversion from the weight/volume data.

sults:

	Temperature in °C	Time-Weighted Average Concentration in ppm	Mortality Ratio	
#1	38*	21	0/6	(3 liters/minute air over material)
#2	38*	25	0/6	(5.6 liters/minute air over material)
#3	38*	38	0/6	(3 liters/minute air into material)
#4	54	145	0/6	(4.1 liters/minute air into material)
#5	105	385	0/6	(3 liters/minute air into material)
#6	150	560	2/6	(3 liters/minute air into material)

38°C = 100°F which is the maximum process temperature.

linical Signs

During Exposure:

At maximum process temperatures, little effect was seen on animals. Rats remained inactive, but did show moderate hyperemia.
At 54°C, hyperemia and slight face pawing were noted.
At 105°C and 150°C, violent face-pawing, marked hyperemia, body tremors, unresponsiveness to tapping on the glass exposure chamber, and lack of coordination upon removal were all evident.

Post-Exposure:

At 38°C no post-exposure effects were seen. Rat gained weight even 24 hours post.
At 54°C slight weight loss occurred one day post-exposure, and then normal weight gain resumed.
At 105°C severe weight loss was seen 24 hours post-exposure which continued for several days. Weight gain resumed slowly after four days. Bilateral corneal opacity was seen in 4/6 rats two days post-exposure.
At 150°C, 2/6 rats died 24 hours post-exposure. The surviving 4/6 rats lost weight up to six days post-exposure and then gained. Bilateral corneal opacity was found in 2/4 rats one day post-exposure and appeared in the other 2/4 rats after one week post-exposure. Opacity lasted throughout the 14-day recovery period.

---

ummary: At the maximum process temperature, inhalation of _ 38 ppm \0-30 for four hours was nonlethal to young adult 250-300 g.) male ChR-CD rats. In order to find a lethal concentration, the temperature was raised well above process emperature. Rats were not killed until a temperature of 150°C was used to heat the material. However, effects ere moderate at 105°C, including marked weight loss and corneal opacity. Pathology was not requested so tissue amage cannot be assessed. The compound is relatively non-toxic at maximum process temperature, where ~ 20-40 ppm ere found at various exposure conditions. No serious clinical signs were seen at 54°C - 145 ppm. However, if oncentrations were to reach 400-500 ppm at higher temperatures, the compound would be moderately toxic.

Report by: Theresa K. Bogdanowicz
Theresa K. Bogdanowicz
Inhalation Toxicology Section

Approved by: Charles F. Reinhardt
Charles F. Reinhardt
Associate Director

<B·dhg
ate Issued· July 12, 1974
eport No. 395-74
.B. E-3313, pp. 88-100.

Triage of 8(e) Submissions

Date sent to triage: 2/5/96

NON-CAP CAP

Submission number: 12162A

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	EPI	RTOX	GTOX
STOX/ONCO	CTOX/ONCO	IMMUNO	CYTO	NEUR

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

Notes:

THIS IS THE ORIGINAL 8(e) SUBMISSION; PLEASE REFILE AFTER TRIAGE DATABASE ENTRY

For Contractor Use Only

entire document: 0 1 2 **pages** 1, 1st TAB **pages** 1, TABS

Notes:

Contractor reviewer : PM **Date:** 5/11/95

CECATS\TRIAGE TRACKING DBASE ENTRY FORM

CECATS DATA:
Submission # 8EHQ- 1092 - 12162 SEQ. A

TYPE: INT. SUPP FLWP

SUBMITTER NAME: E. I. Dupont de Nemours and Company

INFORMATION REQUESTED: FLWP DATE:
0501 NO INFO REQUESTED
0502 INFO REQUESTED (TECH)
0503 INFO REQUESTED (VOL ACTIONS)
0504 INFO REQUESTED (REPORTING RATIONALE)

DISPOSITION:
0639 REFER TO CHEMICAL SCREENING
0678 CAP NOTICE

VOLUNTARY ACTIONS:
0401 NO ACTION REPORTED
0402 STUDIES PLANNED/UNDERWAY
0403 NOTIFICATION OF WORKER/OTHERS
0404 LABEL/MSDS CHANGES
0405 PROCESS/HANDLING CHANGES
0406 APP/USE DISCONTINUED
0407 PRODUCTION DISCONTINUED
0408 CONFIDENTIAL

SUB. DATE: 10/15/92 OTS DATE: 10/27/92 CSRAD DATE: 03/30/95

CHEMICAL NAME:

CAS#
1879-09-0

INFORMATION TYPE:		P F C	INFORMATION TYPE:		P F C	INFORMATION TYPE:		P F C
0201	ONCO (HUMAN)	01 02 04	0216	EPI/CLIN	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	ECO/AQUA TOX	01 02 04	0245	CLASTO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04
0206	REPRO/TERATO (HUMAN)	01 02 04	0221	ENV. OCCC/REL/FATE	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 REQEST DELAY	01 02 04	0248	PROD/USE/PROC	01 02 04
0209	NEURO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0224	PROD/COMP/CHEM ID	01 02 04	0251	MSDS	01 02 04
0210	ACUTE TOX. (HUMAN)	01 02 04	0225	REPORTING RATIONALE	01 02 04	0299	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	0239	METAB/PHARMACO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04			
0215	CHRONIC TOX (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0240	METAB/PHARMACO (HUMAN)	01 02 04			

TRIAGE DATE:	NON-CBI INVENTORY	ONGOING REVIEW	SPECIES	TOXICOLOGICAL CONCERN:	USE:	PRODUCTION:
	YES	YES (DROP/REFER)	RAT	LOW		
CAS SR	NO	NO (CONTINUE)		MED Acute Inhalation Toxicity		
	DETERMINE	REFER		HIGH		

[illegible]

#12162A
M

Acute inhalation toxicity is of medium concern based on the following mortality and doses (ppm) in rats: 0/6 (21, 24, 38, 145, 385), and 2/6 (560). Clinical signs included hyperemia (≥145), tremors, unresponsiveness, lack of coordination and corneal opacity (≥385).