

6(b) CLEARED *product*  
✓ No Mfrs Identified  
— Excepted  
— Mfrs Notified  
— Comments Processed



*Libray*  
ADVISORY OPINION

~~#273~~ #273

U.S. CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20207

October 11, 1978

William Brown, Esq.  
Hertlein, Brown and Paulino  
1110 Morse Rd.  
Columbus, Ohio 43229

Dear Mr. Brown:

This is in response to your letter of September 18, 1978 concerning pentachlorophenol treated lumber. In your letter you ask whether such lumber is required to be labeled under the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (FHSA), whether the Commission has undertaken any studies concerning the toxicity of pentachlorophenol, whether the Consumer Product Safety Act (CPSA) requires registration of compounds such as pentachlorophenol with the Commission, and whether the Commission has taken any regulatory action with regard to pentachlorophenol.

As you may know, under the CPSA, the Commission is authorized to take regulatory action to address unreasonable risks of injury associated with consumer products. "Consumer product" is defined in the Act as "any article or component part thereof, produced or distributed for sale to ... or for the use... of a consumer in or around a permanent, or temporary household or residence, a school, in recreation or otherwise." (see section 3(a)(1)). Articles not customarily produced or distributed for sale to or use by consumers are excluded from the definition and are outside the Commission's authority under the CPSA.

Under the FHSA, products intended or packaged in a form suitable for use in the household which present one or more of the enumerated hazards (that the product is toxic, corrosive, an irritant, flammable, combustible, and so forth) and which may cause substantial personal injury or

William Brown, Esq.  
Page -2

illness during or as a proximate result of reasonably foreseeable handling or use are considered "hazardous substances" and are required to be labeled in accordance with the Act. (see FHSA, section 2(f)).

You should be aware, however, that "pesticides" as that term is used in the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) are specifically excluded from Commission jurisdiction under the CPSA. (section 3(a)(1)(D)). The FHSA also specifically excludes "pesticides," as that term is used in FIFRA. ("Pesticide" is defined in FIFRA as "any substance or mixture of substances intended for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating any insects which may be present in any environment whatsoever." Since it appears that the only reason pentachlorophenol would be added to lumber for barns would be to mitigate pests, we assume that the compound is a pesticide). The FHSA further provides that an article which is not in itself a pesticide but which bears or contains a pesticide is a hazardous substance, if the article meets one of the definitions of "hazardous substance" in section 2(f)(1) of the Act. (see section 2(f)(2)). Similarly, under the CPSA, articles which merely bear or contain pesticides but are not in themselves pesticides may be subject to the Act if they meet the definition of "consumer product."

From the information in your letter, we are unable to determine whether pentachlorophenol treated lumber would be a hazardous substance subject to the FHSA labeling requirements because we do not know whether the lumber is intended or packaged in a form suitable for household use and whether the treated lumber itself would meet one of the definitions of "hazardous substance" contained in the Act. If you wish to submit more detailed information on the product, the Commission's Directorate for Compliance and Enforcement may be able to advise you on the applicability of the FHSA labeling requirements. You may write to: Mr. David Schmeltzer, Associate Executive Director for Compliance and Enforcement, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, D.C. 20207.

William Brown, Esq.  
Page -3-

As to your question concerning registration of pentachlorophenal, while section 13(a) of the CPSA authorizes the Commission to issue regulations requiring the registration of new consumer products with the CPSC, the Commission has never implemented this section. The CPSA contains no general authority for the Commission to require registration of consumer products and no registration of pentachlorophenal is required. In addition, the Commission has not taken any regulatory action with regard to pentachlorophenal.


As to any Commission studies concerning the toxicity of pentachlorophenal, we have referred this question to the Commission's technical staff for response. You should be hearing from them shortly.

I hope this information is helpful.

Sincerely,

*Margaret A. Freeston*

Margaret A. Freeston  
Acting General Counsel



October 31, 1978

William Brown, Esq.  
Hertlein, Brown and Paulino  
1110 Morse Road  
Columbus, Ohio 43229

Dear Mr. Brown:

Your letter of September 18, 1978, to the Consumer Product Safety Commission regarding pentachlorophenol, was forwarded by the Office of General Counsel to the Division of Toxicology and Medicine for additional comment.

Pentachlorophenol (PCP) and several salt derivatives are registered as pesticides by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for home and industrial use. Consumer products containing PCP as the active ingredient also include lesser amounts of tetrachlorophenol which is formed in the manufacturing process. Several dioxin and furan derivatives are present as contaminants.

Substances defined as hazardous under the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (FHSA) must bear a label, which, among other things, states: the name of the hazardous substance, the nature of the hazard, required warnings or cautions, and first-aid instructions. For certain substances that are considered to present a particular hazard, additional labeling statements are deemed necessary for the protection of the public health.

It is the responsibility of a manufacturer to assure that his products are labeled according to the provisions of the law. The Code of Federal Regulations, Title 16, Subchapter C, Federal Hazardous Substances Act Regulations, Section 1500, contains statutory definitions including those for "toxic" and "highly toxic" and appropriate biological tests to supplement these definitions. For example, an oral LD<sub>50</sub> of 50 mg/kg or less in rats would classify a substance as "highly toxic"; 50 mg to 5 gm/kg would be considered "toxic." The Commission may conduct laboratory tests to make the determination that a consumer product is hazardous as defined

William Brown, Esq.

- 2 -

by the FHSA. Compliance may also be accomplished by the Commission field staff monitoring products at the manufacturing level or in the marketplace.

Human and animal experience reported in the scientific literature indicate that PCP can cause toxicity through all portals of entry. Systemic intoxication, manifest as hyperpyrexia, can occur through accidental ingestion, absorption of solutions through the skin or inhalation of vapor. Prolonged or frequent skin contact may cause an acneform dermatitis and allergic response. In addition, vapor and dust can also produce local irritation of eyes, nose and throat. The toxic properties of the contaminants are relatively unknown.

Recently, potential adverse effects on the reproduction system and/or fetus of animals treated with PCP have been identified by EPA. These toxicological data will be evaluated by EPA to determine if, in the light of potential human exposure, an adequate margin of safety exists (see Federal Register, October 18, 1978, pp 48446-48617, enclosed). It is our understanding that in the interim, PCP can continue to be used for the uses for which it is registered.

The Commission has not performed any toxicity studies with PCP or its contaminants and none are ongoing. Further, at this time no toxicological studies are planned for the future.

We hope the above information has been helpful.

Sincerely,

Rita A. Orzel, Ph.D.  
Division of Toxicology and Medicine

Enclosure

cc:


Central File  
Reading File  
OGC  
ESHT  
OPM

ESHT/ROrzel:ko

Law Offices  
Hertlein, Brown & Paulino  
1110 Morse Road  
Columbus, Ohio 43229

Donald A. Hertlein  
William W. Brown  
Harry R. Paulino

September 18, 1978



The General Council  
U.S. Consumer Safety Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20207

Re: Labeling of Pentachlorophenol  
Hazardous Substances Control Act 15 USC 1261

Dear Sir:

This office represents several dairy farmers who have constructed large dairy barns of pentachlorophenol treated lumber. The pentachlorophenol treated lumber has created injury to both the cattle and the human beings that have come in contact with it due to the presence of chlorinated dibenzodioxins in the pentachlorophenol. It is our understanding that both the Hazardous Substances Control Act and the Consumer Products Safety Act, are both contained in 15 USC 2051 and 1261 and are administered by the Consumer Products Safety Commission. The Hazardous Substances Control Act has certain definitions which make certain substances either toxic, highly toxic or corrosive. The effect of falling within one of these would seem to require labeling of the product or any other product which incorporates the substance which is toxic by nature. We would be interested to find out whether your commission has in any way either undertaken a study of pentachlorophenol and its contaminants or made any determination as to whether or not pentachlorophenol or the contaminants within pentachlorophenol have been determined to be toxic or highly toxic. We would also request that you advise whether the Consumer Products Safety Act requires a manufacturer of pentachlorophenol to register said compound with the Consumer Products Safety Commission or whether your commission has taken any action of a regulatory nature in regard to pentachlorophenol.

We are aware that this substance is registered under the Federal Insecticide, Pesticide and Rodenticide Act however this does not fall within the jurisdiction as I understand it.

Please advise at your earliest opportunity.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "W.W. Brown".

William W. Brown

WB?jt



September 7, 1974

Mr. John Stackhouse  
Director  
Ohio Department of Agriculture  
Ohio Departments Building  
Columbus, OH 43215

Dear John:

Yesterday I visited a dairy farm in western Ohio owned by **Feucht** - owner, that has had a catastrophic loss of livestock in the **last several years**. The owner lives in the area and has been moving into a new barn constructed with some quality materials. He has entered into litigation. It was, in fact, an early year crop that the problems to my attention.

The farmer is literally bankrupt and lost almost all his livestock including calves and heifers since 1974. He has not been permitted to ship milk because of a milk quality problem. The problem is an unbelievable 5-10 pound per hundred pound milk residue. Many people including FDA, EPA, and the Ohio Department of Agriculture. But what disturbs me is that no systematic effort has been done to arrive at a diagnosis of the problem. Because the owner has entered litigation, there is a reluctance for anyone to become involved. The owner and I have discussed the possibility that the problem is related to the water table. He has promised that the true source of the problem may be of some help, but the promise of financial rescue. This may indeed be the case, but too little has been done to establish cause of death and to eliminate other possible causes.

I am writing to you because I am disturbed that such a catastrophic problem could persist over a period of about two years with no diagnosis. None of the many visitors to the farm have even been able to find a sense of direction. Statements of poor management are not solutions to problems. But even a poorly managed farm would not have such a loss. Mr. John Staubus and I have reviewed the feeding program with Mr. Feucht and if the information provided is accurate, he has been feeding the herd quite adequately.

Mr. John Stackhouse  
September 7, 1978  
Pg 2

What is needed is some rolled up dirt sleeves. There were eight deaths last week and I found out Feuchts have had to obtain other clothing. The herd is almost decimated, and the Department of Agriculture be brought to the aid.

RAY:am