



President

Anwer Hussain
CHS Inc.

Vice President

Ronald M. Powell
Moroil Technologies

Treasurer

Catherine C. Novak
Eastern Oil Company

Secretary

Rhett Francisco
Cincinnati Vulcan Company

Immediate Past President

Greg T. Julian
Advanced Lubrication
Specialties

Executive Director

Celeste M. Powers, CAE

General Counsel

Jeffrey L. Leiter

July 30, 2008

James H. Price, CIH
Director of Science
American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists
1300 Kemper Meadow Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45240-1634

Dear Mr. Price:

With reference to my letters of July 28, 2006 and July 30, 2007, the Independent Lubricant Manufacturers Association ("ILMA") submits these additional comments on the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists' (ACGIH) proposed Threshold Limit Value - Time Weighted Average for "Mineral Oil Used in Metal Working."

ILMA, established in 1948, is a national trade association of 135 manufacturing member companies. As a group, ILMA member companies blend, compound and sell over 25 percent of the United States' lubricant needs and over 75 percent of the metalworking fluids (MWF) utilized in the country. Independent lubricant manufacturers by definition are neither owned nor controlled by companies that explore for or refine crude oil to produce lubricant base stocks. Base oils are purchased from refiners, who are also competitors in the sale of finished products. Independent lubricant manufacturers succeed by manufacturing and marketing high-quality, often specialized, lubricants. Their success in this competitive market also is directly attributable to their tradition of providing excellent, individualized service to their customers.

In this letter, ILMA re-emphasizes key points made in our letters of July 28, 2006 and July 30, 2007 and highlights several new relevant technical publications. As indicated last year, ILMA and its cosponsors are planning the 3rd Symposium on the Assessment and Control of Metal Removal Fluids, October 5-8, 2008, in Dearborn, MI (<http://www.mrf2008.org/>) and, in this letter, provide an update on this exciting opportunity.

July 28, 2006 Letter

In 2006, ILMA suggested three fundamental defects in the proposed TLV: (1) definitional defects; (2) conceptual defects, and (3) quantitative/measurement defects. Additionally, ILMA presented an in-depth technical review of key references upon which ACGIH relied in their determination. We concluded that these defects, coupled with the technical analysis then presented, precluded the proposed TLV from presenting any positive value in the effort to protect worker health and safety. Based on these continuing conclusions, we again respectfully request that the proposed TLV for "Mineral Oil used in

400 N. Columbus Street
Suite 201
Alexandria, VA 22314
phone: 703/684-5574
fax: 703/836-8503
email: ilma@ilma.org
web: www.ilma.org

Definitional Defects

We noted in 2006 that most MWF products fall into four basic categories: (1) straight or neat oils; (2) soluble oils; (3) semi-synthetics; and, (4) synthetics. We also noted that three of the four general categories of MWFs, straight, soluble and semi-synthetics, all contain some quantity of mineral oil, ranging from as little as 5% (in some semisynthetics) to over 90% (in many straight oils). Though the proposed TLV did not define "Mineral Oil Used in Metal Working," it noted that the proposed TLV of 0.2 mg/m³ was "recommended for occupational exposure to mineral oil aerosols in metal working operations where additives and metal or microbial contaminants are present." We said that this statement appeared to suggest that any MWF that contained some unspecified amount of mineral oil would be subject to the proposed TLV for mineral oil. Though ACGIH's stated goal was to reduce the alleged health impacts of mineral oil mist, the practical impact was to regulate thousands of metalworking products, some of which contain only a small fraction of highly refined mineral oil.

We noted that the practical effect of the definition (setting a TLV for most metalworking fluids regardless of mineral oil content) was in direct conflict with ACGIH's decision to limit TLV documentation to studies on straight mineral oil used in metalworking operations only, and to expressly exclude studies on the alleged health effects of metalworking fluids. ACGIH, in other words, proposed a *de facto* TLV for metalworking fluids while simultaneously and expressly excluding all studies of metalworking fluid.

Both of these definitional defects with the proposed TLV are still present.

Conceptual Defects

ILMA noted in 2006 that the TLV distinguished between "pure" mineral oils and mineral oils used in metal working operations. The proposed TLV for "pure" mineral oil 5 mg/m³ was twenty-five times higher than the proposed TLV for mineral oil used in metalworking, *i.e.*, 0.2 mg/m³. It appeared ACGIH premised this distinction primarily on the presence of additives in metalworking fluids (the existence of metals and microbial contaminants was also cited).

ILMA also noted that the proposed TLV also contained the following language:

A wide range of additives are used at concentrations ranging from a few parts per million to about 20% to modify the physical and/or chemical characteristics of mineral base oils in order to provide the performance requirements of specific applications. Additives are often proprietary materials and composition details will vary between individual suppliers.

This distinction suggested that the alleged health effects of mineral oil in metalworking operations were *due to constituents other than highly refined mineral oil* - the additives, microbial contaminants and small pieces of metal commonly known as "fines" or "swarf" generated by the metalworking process. ACGIH identified neither additives nor microbial contaminants with any specificity, other than noting that these things "vary."

It stood to reason then and stands to reason now that if ACGIH's hypothesis was that constituents "in" or "added" to mineral oil when mineral oil is used in metalworking are the source of the alleged health effects, most of their attention should be focused on those constituents. In other words, rather than dramatically lowering the TLV for mineral oil when used in metalworking, ILMA again recommends that efforts should be undertaken to at least identify *which* constituents or combination of constituents (be they additives, microbial contamination or metal fines or swarf) could be associated with any of the alleged occupational health effects.

Once identified, suspect additives or microbial contamination phenomena should then be studied directly. This is an important point: by proposing to dramatically lower the TLV for mineral oils used in metalworking, ACGIH again misses the significant opportunity to focus the resources of the organization on what might be truly causing the adverse health effects sometimes observed: microbial contamination.

To the extent that an additive, a combination of additives or microbial contamination actually does present an occupational exposure risk, a TLV for mineral oil used in metalworking does *nothing* to protect against *other* occupational exposures to the same additives or combination of additives or contaminants. Since those same additives or contaminants could be found in synthetic metalworking fluids or metalworking fluids containing animal or vegetable oil - neither of which contain any mineral oil - ACGIH misses a significant opportunity to focus its resources on what could be one of the factors responsible for the occupational health effects observed.

Measurement/Quantitative Defects

In our letter of 2006, ILMA said there were a number of critical quantitative interpretation and measurement errors in the proposed TLV and submitted the document, "The Independent Lubricant Manufacturers Association Technical Review of the ACGIH Draft Proposed TLV-TWA for Mineral Oil Used In Metalworking, 0.2 Mg/M³, Inhalable Particulate Mass, July 28, 2006," in which these errors were cited.

ILMA drew the following conclusions in that technical review:

- 1) There was significant cross-contamination between straight and soluble MWF aerosols at the plant that was the subject of the principal study upon which ACGIH relied (Kriebel et al. [1997]). As a result, the observed health effects reported in the study were not due to straight MWF aerosol exposure as ACGIH concluded.
- 2) Other references cited by ACGIH did not support the proposed TLV.
- 3) 13-week subchronic laboratory animal tests of aerosolized formulated lubricants had not shown significant adverse health effects.
- 4) The preponderance of evidence suggested that respiratory impacts experienced by machinists are not due to mineral oil, but to a combination of other causes including microbial and microbial decay products, irritation from specific chemical components, and possible effects of hypotonicity and pH.
- 5) Mineral oil was not an appropriate surrogate for formulated MWFs.

Mr. James H. Price
July 30, 2008
Page 4 of 6

ILMA believes the conclusions noted in our 2006 technical review are still valid today.

July 30, 2007 Letter

Last year, we noted that several authors had presented new technical information which suggested even more strongly that contaminants in in-use MWF, primarily bacteria and bacterial decay products, are responsible for the acute respiratory effects sometimes noticed among workers exposed to MWF. Among the literature we cited:

- Gordon, et al., (2006) found that hypersensitivity-like histological changes occurred in 3 of 8 strains of mice treated with heat-killed and lysed *M. immunogenum* and with used MWF contaminated w/ *M. immunogenum*. Virgin MWF did not produce similar responses.

- Thorne, et al. (2006), with C57B1/6J mice exposed intranasally for 3 d/week for 3 weeks to *M. immunogenum*, to endotoxin, and to MWFs spiked with endotoxin and/or MI or used MWFs, found that mice exposed to MI in MWFs developed lung pathology consistent with HP. Endotoxin co-exposure augmented lung pathology.

These publications, not reviewed by ACGIH, added to the body of evidence that it is the contaminants in MWF, not the MWF as formulated, which are primarily responsible for any adverse respiratory health effects observed.

New Technical Publications

Since our letter of last year, several authors have presented additional new technical information which suggests even more strongly that contaminants in in-use MWF, primarily bacteria and bacterial decay products, are responsible for the acute respiratory effects sometimes noticed among workers exposed to MWF. For example:

- Glaser et al., (2007) evaluated NIOSH Method 5524/ASTM D7049-04 in a six-laboratory round robin and concluded that aerosolized MWF samples can be shipped unrefrigerated, stored refrigerated for up to seven days and analyzed quantitatively and precisely for MWF using these procedures. Thus, there is now a proven, standardized method for quantitatively measuring MWF mist and distinguish that component from non-MWF mist components.
- Rhodes, et al., (2008), using real-time qualitative Taqman PCR, showed that *Mycobacterium immunogenum*, can be quantitatively detected in MWF samples from the UK and the USA at levels between 3.4×10^1 and 1.9×10^4 cell equivalents per ml, even if the bacteria could not be detected via other methods. *Mycobacterium immunogenum* has been associated with outbreaks of hypersensitivity pneumonitis among machinists.
- Steinhauer, et al., (2008) showed that treatment of water-based MWFs with methyloxazolidine-based microbiocide formulations were most effective in preventing microbial contamination by mycobacteria, associated with outbreaks of hypersensitivity pneumonitis among machinists.

Mr. James H. Price
July 30, 2008
Page 5 of 6

- Crook, et al., (2007) found that, in the UK, bulk sampling of metalworking fluids showed that metalworking fluids had the highest measurements of endotoxin in bulk sampling of many occupational environments, including grain handling. Endotoxin exposure is a known cause of acute respiratory distress in many occupational settings.
- Passman and Eachus (2008) examined three bio-aerosol risk hypotheses and found that there is strong evidence that exposure to elevated concentrations of bioaerosols (>100 EU/m³) in MWF mist poses an increased respiratory health risk.
- Park, et al., (2008), using questionnaires/interviews with grinders handling synthetic MWF, found a significantly higher frequency of complaints for nasal stuffiness, anosmia, runny nose and headache among those grinders in an automotive ring manufacturing plant as compared to administrative workers in the absence of *any* mineral oil in the formulation used at the plant.

These publications, also not reviewed by ACGIH, add to the body of evidence that it is the *contaminants* in MWF, not mineral oil nor the MWF as formulated, which are primarily responsible for any adverse respiratory health effects observed.

Conclusion

ILMA believes now, as it did in 2006 and 2007, that many of the health issues associated with MWF use have very little, if anything, to do with how these products are currently manufactured, but rather how they are used. We again respectfully request that the proposed TLV for "Mineral Oil used in Metal Working" be withdrawn and suggest again that a traditional "single number" industrial hygiene model may not be the best approach to protect worker health and ensure occupational safety and that a multi-dimensional approach, including focus on microbial contamination, would be far more fruitful than a single-minded focus on a TLV for mineral oils used in metalworking.

ILMA, along with the Automotive Industry Action Group (AIHG), American Industrial Hygiene Association (AIHA) and the Independent Union of the European Lubricants Industry (UEIL), have collaborated in sponsoring and organizing the 3rd Symposium on the Assessment and Control of Metal Removal Fluids, October 5-8, 2008, in Dearborn, MI. ILMA, along AIAG, AIHA and UEIL and other partners, expects this symposium, which will feature over sixty technical presentations, to provide new supportive information for our conclusions stated above. We invite ACGIH members to attend this symposium to learn first-hand the latest in research related to potential health effects of exposure to metalworking fluids.

Sincerely,



Celeste M. Powers, CAE
ILMA Executive Director

Mr. James H. Price
July 30, 2008
Page 6 of 6

References:

Glaser, R., Kurimo, R, Schulam, S., Performance Testing of NIOSH Method 5524/ASTM D7049-04 for Determination of Metalworking Fluids, *J Occup Environ Hygiene*, **4**:8 583-595 (2007)

Rhodes, G., Fluri, A., Henderson, A, Ruenfenacht, A., and Pickup, R., Detection of *Mycobacterium immunogenum* by real-time quantitative Taqman PCR, *J Microbiol Methods*, **18**: March 18, 2008

Steinhauer, K. and Goroncy-Bermes, P., J Appl Micro, Treatment of water based metalworking fluids to prevent hypersensitivity pneumonitis associated with *Mycobacterium spp.*, **104**: 454-464 (2008)

Crook, B. Spendiff, M., Stagg, S., Franks, A., Measurement and control of occupational exposure to endotoxin in the UK, *Gefahrstoffe – Reinhaltung der Luft*, **679** 393-397 (2007) (*Endotoxine an Arbeitsplätzen*, April 23-24, 2007, Dresden, GE)

Passman, F. and Eachus, A., Metalworking-fluid microbes and worker health – a US perspective, presented at the 16th Colloquium on Tribology, January 15-17, 2008, Ostfildern, GE

Park,D-U., Jin, K-W., Koh, D-H., Kim, B-K., Kim, K-S., and Park, D-Y., Association between Use of Synthetic Metalworking Fluid and Risk of Developing Rhinitis-related Symptoms in an Automotive Ring Manufacturing Plant, *J Occup Health*, **50**:1 212-220 (2008)