

This Health Hazard Evaluation (HHE) report and any recommendations made herein are for the specific facility evaluated and may not be universally applicable. Any recommendations made are not to be considered as final statements of NIOSH policy or of any agency or individual involved. Additional HHE reports are available at <http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/hhe/reports>

**HETA 95-0311-2593
Martin's Carstar, Inc.
Lakewood, Colorado**

Charles McCammon

PREFACE

The Hazard Evaluations and Technical Assistance Branch of NIOSH conducts field investigations of possible health hazards in the workplace. These investigations are conducted under the authority of Section 20(a)(6) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, 29 U.S.C. 669(a)(6) which authorizes the Secretary of Health and Human Services, following a written request from any employer or authorized representative of employees, to determine whether any substance normally found in the place of employment has potentially toxic effects in such concentrations as used or found.

The Hazard Evaluations and Technical Assistance Branch also provides, upon request, technical and consultative assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies; labor; industry; and other groups or individuals to control occupational health hazards and to prevent related trauma and disease. Mention of company names or products does not constitute endorsement by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND AVAILABILITY OF REPORT

This report was prepared by Charles McCammon, of the NIOSH Denver Field Office, Hazard Evaluations and Technical Assistance Branch, Division of Surveillance, Hazard Evaluations and Field Studies (DSHEFS). Field assistance was provided by Bambi L. Sorensen and Robb Menzies. Desktop publishing by Pat Lovell.

Copies of this report have been sent to employee and management representatives at Martin's and the OSHA Regional Office. This report is not copyrighted and may be freely reproduced. Single copies of this report will be available for a period of three years from the date of this report. To expedite your request, include a self-addressed mailing label along with your written request to:

NIOSH Publications Office
4676 Columbia Parkway
Cincinnati, Ohio 45226
800-356-4674

After this time, copies may be purchased from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) at 5825 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161. Information regarding the NTIS stock number may be obtained from the NIOSH Publications Office at the Cincinnati address.

For the purpose of informing affected employees, copies of this report shall be posted by the employer in a prominent place accessible to the employees for a period of 30 calendar days.

**Health Hazard Evaluation Report 95-0311-2593
Martin's Carstar, Inc.
Lakewood, Colorado
August 1996**

Charles McCammon

SUMMARY

On June 24, 1995, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) received a request from the President of Martin's Carstar in Lakewood, Colorado, for help in assessing worker exposure to isocyanates during spray painting of automobiles. Martin's Carstar is an autobody repair shop whose other concerns for worker exposure included solvents, total dusts, noise, carbon monoxide (CO), and metals. An initial survey was conducted in August 1995 and an interim report was issued in December 1995. To assess effects of seasonal variation, a second survey was conducted on March 8, 1996. This report summarizes the exposures from both surveys.

Activities in the repair shop include frame straightening, panel repair/replacement, body filling, and final painting and detailing. Martin's uses the BASF Corp. Glasurit isocyanate catalyzed paints. In general, the paints are composed of a base coat, a reducer, and a hardener. The percentage and make-up of each component varies depending on the type of paint, i.e., a base coat, a color coat, or a top (clear) coat. The paints contain hexamethylene-1,6-diisocyanate (HDI) polymer and very small amounts of the monomer (<0.006%). Some of the hardeners also contain isophorone diisocyanate (IPDI) polymer and monomer. All of the various components contain solvents, especially the reducers which are all solvents.

Personal breathing zone (PBZ) and area airborne levels of isocyanate (HDI only) monomer and oligomers, various solvents (including n-butyl acetate, toluene, xylene, and ethyl acetate), total dust (paint overspray), metals (from welding), carbon monoxide, and noise levels were measured. All of the oligomer and most of the monomer samples collected in August 1995 were below the analytical limit of detection of 2 micrograms (μg) per sample. One area sample collected within the spray booth found a trace amount of the oligomer. One personal sample collected on the head painter at the end of the day when he was applying clear coat paint measured 99 micrograms per cubic meter, ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) which is above the NIOSH REL of $35 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for an 8-hr TWA but below the $140 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ceiling REL. The head painter's TWA for the day was $29 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The samples from February 1996 showed all monomer exposures as below the analytical limit of detection; most oligomer samples had detectable results. These ranged from 83 to $482 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$.

Air samples for solvents (n-butyl acetate, toluene, xylene, or ethyl acetate) did not exceed their respective REL or PEL, nor did the mixture summation exceed any evaluation criteria. Generally, the levels of organics measured in February were higher than those in August. Area total dust samples ranged from 4 to $36 \text{ mg}/\text{m}^3$. Most of these samples were collected in the spray booth. PBZ total dust samples ranged from non-detectable ($0.02 \text{ mg}/\text{filter}$) to $7.5 \text{ mg}/\text{m}^3$. All PBZ samples were below the PEL of $15 \text{ mg}/\text{m}^3$. Generally, the results from August were higher than those collected in February. The CO levels averaged 27 ppm for the 8-hr sampling period. The peak CO

level was 450 ppm and the highest 15-minute average was 105 ppm. The high peaks were associated with moving vehicles in and out of the shop. A personal noise monitor was placed on a body repair worker. The average noise level (using the OSHA criteria) was 79 dBA, resulting in a 21% dose of the maximum allowable noise exposure (projected to 28% for a full 8 hours). The maximum peak level measured was 115 dBA. Using a 3 dB exchange rate (NIOSH criteria), the dose percent was 78% with a projected 8-hr dose of 106%. One PBZ welding sample was collected. Exposures to all metals were well below the respective evaluation criteria.

A potential health hazard exists from exposure to peak levels of carbon monoxide during the cold weather months. Levels of isocyanates, solvents, total dust, and noise were below respective evaluation criteria. Area levels of total dust in the spray booths were above the OSHA PEL but workers were wearing either dust/mist/organics cartridge air-purifying or air-supplied respirators. The use of air-purifying respirators was deemed sufficient for the exposures documented. Recommendations are presented for control of exposures to CO and to help reduce other exposures.

Keywords: SIC 7531(automotive body shops), isocyanates, solvents, total dust, carbon monoxide, noise, respirators

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	ii
Acknowledgments and Availability of Report	ii
Summary	iii
Introduction	2
Background	2
Methods	2
Isocyanates	2
Total Dust	3
Organics (solvents)	3
Carbon Monoxide	3
Noise	3
Evaluation Criteria	3
Carbon Monoxide	4
Organic Solvents	4
Isocyanates	5
Diisocyanate-induced sensitization	6
Prevention and treatment	6
Noise/Hearing Loss	7
Results	9
Discussion	10
Conclusions	10
Recommendations	11
References	12

INTRODUCTION

On June 24, 1995, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) received a request from the President of Martin's Carstar in Lakewood, Colorado, for help in assessing worker exposure to isocyanates during spray painting of automobiles. Martin's Carstar is an autobody repair shop whose other concerns for worker exposure included solvents, total dusts, noise, carbon monoxide (CO), and metals. An initial survey was conducted in August 1995 and an interim report completed in December 1995. To assess seasonal variations, a second survey was conducted on March 8, 1996. This report summarizes both investigations.

BACKGROUND

The auto body repair work includes frame straightening, panel repair/replacement, body filling, and final painting and detailing. Repair is conducted in an open shop with body work performed in the north end, detail and cleaning in the center, and painting in the south end. Most top coat spraying is conducted in a paint spray booth located near the south end of the shop. Adjacent to the spray booth is a paint mixing room where the paint components are stored and mixed. The paint mixing room is ventilated with a separate supply duct located near the door and an exhaust at the far (north) end of the room. The side-draft spray booth has a separate one-pass exhaust system. The booth also has the capacity to be heated to accelerate paint drying.

When painting, multiple thin layers of the different paints are applied. When base metal is exposed, these areas are first covered with a primer. Once the vehicle is ready for final painting, several base coats are applied, the paint is allowed to sit a short while (10-20 minutes), then the color paint is applied, again in several thin coats. Lastly, the clear top coat is sprayed on until a uniform gloss is achieved. The vehicle is then allowed to sit overnight or in a heated booth for 1-2 hours to allow the paint to dry.

Total Dust

New, high volume, low pressure (HVLP) spray guns are used to reduce the amount of paint over-spray. However, most of the painters still used the conventional spray gun to some degree, especially when applying the clear coats of paint. While most painting was done in the spray booth, sometimes, due to the number of cars being painted and the limitations on drying times, many of the various primer, base, and color coats were applied outside the spray booth. Most of the clear coats were applied in the spray booth to insure a dust-free finish coat.

METHODS

Isocyanates

Air samples for isocyanates were collected in 20-mL of an absorbing solution in a midget impinger at a flow rate of 1.0 liter per minute using MSA Model G sampling pumps. The absorbing solution contained a reactive chemical dissolved in dimethyl sulfoxide. The samples were analyzed by high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) according to NIOSH Analytical Method #5522.¹ Since it is difficult to attach midget impingers in the breathing zone of workers, particularly since they had to bend over and move around, the impingers were attached to the sampling pumps on the worker's belt. Bulk samples of the various paint components were analyzed by HPLC to determine the amount of free isocyanate monomer present.

Isocyanate wipe samples were collected on work surfaces and worker's hands using colorimetric SWYPE™ skin and surface wipe tests developed by Colorimetric Laboratories, Inc (CLI, Des Plaines, Illinois). Perma-Tec™ glove breakthrough indicators also developed by CLI were used to detect any isocyanates penetrating through gloves worn by workers.

Air samples for total dust were collected on 35-

millimeter pre-weighed glass fiber filters housed in plastic cassettes. Air was drawn through the filters at a flow rate of 2 liters per minute using battery operated Gilian Model HFS 513A high flow pumps. The filters were analyzed gravimetrically according to NIOSH Analytical Method # 0500.¹

Organics (solvents)

Air samples for organic chemicals (n-butyl acetate, xylene, toluene, and ethyl acetate) were collected on standard 150-milligram charcoal tubes at 200 milliliters per minute using battery operated Gilian model LFS 113D-C. The samples were analyzed by gas chromatography according to NIOSH Analytical Methods #1450 and 1501.¹ One charcoal tube sample from each location was screened by gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (GC/MS) to determine what specific hydrocarbons were present in the air and approximate levels of each.

Carbon Monoxide

Carbon monoxide (CO) levels were measured with a Draeger Model 190 Datalogger. This instrument uses an electrochemical sensor for CO. It was calibrated on the day of use and zeroed in the field.

Noise

Personal noise measurements were taken with Quest Technologies Model M-27 Noise Logging Dosimeters. The unit stores and interprets data for a variety of different thresholds and exchange rates allowing comparison to different recommended evaluation criteria.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

As a guide to the evaluation of the hazards posed by

workplace exposures, NIOSH field staff employ environmental evaluation criteria for the assessment of a number of chemical and physical agents. These criteria are intended to suggest levels of exposure to which most workers may be exposed up to 10 hours per day, 40 hours per week for a working lifetime without experiencing adverse health effects. It is, however, important to note that not all workers will be protected from adverse health effects even though their exposures are maintained below these levels. A small percentage may experience adverse health effects because of individual susceptibility, a pre-existing medical condition, and/or a hypersensitivity (allergy). In addition, some hazardous substances may act in combination with other workplace exposures, the general environment, or with medications or personal habits of the worker to produce health effects even if the occupational exposures are controlled at the level set by the criterion. These combined effects are often not considered in the evaluation criteria. Also, some substances are absorbed by direct contact with the skin and mucous membranes, and thus potentially increase the overall exposure. Finally, evaluation criteria may change over the years as new information on the toxic effects of an agent become available.

The primary sources of environmental evaluation criteria for the workplace are: (1) NIOSH Recommended Exposure Limits (RELs)¹, (2) the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists' (ACGIH) Threshold Limit Values (TLVsTM)², and (3) the U.S. Department of Labor, OSHA Permissible Exposure Limits (PELs)³. In July 1992, the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals vacated the 1989 OSHA PEL Air Contaminants Standard. OSHA is currently enforcing the 1971 standards which are listed as transitional values in the current Code of Federal Regulations; however, some states operating their own OSHA approved job safety and health programs continue to enforce the 1989 limits. NIOSH encourages employers to follow the 1989 OSHA limits, the NIOSH RELs, the ACGIH TLVs, or whichever are the more protective criterion. The OSHA PELs reflect the feasibility of controlling exposures in various industries where the

agents are used, whereas NIOSH RELs are based primarily on concerns relating to the prevention of occupational disease. It should be noted when reviewing this report that employers are legally required to meet those levels specified by an OSHA standard and that the OSHA PELs included in this report reflect the 1971 values.

A time-weighted average (TWA) exposure refers to the average airborne concentration of a substance during a normal 8-to-10-hour workday. Some substances have recommended short-term exposure limits (STEL) or ceiling values which are intended to supplement the TWA where there are recognized toxic effects from higher exposures over the short-term. A brief discussion of the toxicity and evaluation criteria for the substances monitored follows:

Carbon Monoxide

Carbon monoxide (CO) is a colorless, odorless, tasteless gas produced by incomplete burning of carbon-containing materials; e.g., natural gas. The initial symptoms of CO poisoning may include headache, dizziness, drowsiness, and nausea. These initial symptoms may advance to vomiting, loss of consciousness, and collapse if prolonged or high exposures are encountered. Coma or death may occur if high exposures continue.²⁻⁷

The NIOSH REL for CO is 35 ppm for an 8-hour TWA exposure, with a ceiling limit of 200 ppm which should not be exceeded.^{8,9} The NIOSH REL of 35 ppm is designed to protect workers from health effects associated with COHb levels in excess of 5%.² The ACGIH recommends an 8-hour TWA TLV of 50 ppm, with a ceiling level of 400 ppm. Currently, the ACGIH has published a notice of an intent to change the TLV to 25 ppm as an 8-hour TWA.¹⁰ The OSHA PEL for CO is 50 ppm for an 8-hour TWA exposure. In addition to these standards, the National Research Council has developed a CO exposure standard of 15 ppm, based on a 24 hours per day, 90-day TWA exposure.¹¹

Organic Solvents

Exposure to organic solvents can occur through inhalation of the vapors, skin contact with the liquid, or ingestion. As many organic solvents have relatively high vapor pressures and readily evaporate, inhalation of vapors is considered a primary route of exposure. Overexposure to many organic solvents can result in irritation, central nervous system depression, headache, nausea, and possible effects on the liver, kidney, or other organs.¹²⁻¹⁴ Many industrial solvents are primary irritants, and can cause defatting of the skin and dermatitis. Solvents are among the leading causes of occupational skin disease.¹⁴ Biological effects of exposure can range from practically non-toxic (e.g., some freons) to highly toxic (e.g., carbon tetrachloride) or carcinogenic (e.g., benzene).³ The ability to detect the presence of a solvent by the sense of smell will vary widely depending on the specific substance, and individual sensitivity. Substances are considered to have good warning properties if an average person with normal sensory perception can detect the presence of the chemical at a level below the recommended exposure limit. The following table summarizes the principle health effects associated with these solvents and the NIOSH RELs and odor detection thresholds for these compounds.

Chemical	NIOSH REL	Odor Threshold & Description ¹⁶	Principle Health Effects ^{5,15-17}
ethyl acetate	400 ppm	1 ppm sweet/fruity	central nervous system depression, dizziness, eye irritation

methyl-ethyl ketone (2-butanone)	200 TWA 300 ppm STEL	17 ppm sweet, sharp	headache, dizziness, numbness of extremities, dermal and eye irritation
toluene	100 TWA 150 ppm STEL	1.6 ppm sour, burnt	eye/respiratory irritation, fatigue, headache, narcotic effects
xylene	100 TWA 150 ppm STEL	20 ppm sweet	eye/respiratory irritation, narcosis, headache, dermal effects
acetone	250 ppm TWA	62 ppm sweet, fruity	eye irritation, nausea, headache, central nervous system depression
N-butyl acetate	200 STEL 150 ppm TWA	7 ppm sweet, fruity	eye/respiratory irritation, narcosis

Note:

- TWA = time-weighted average concentration for up to 10 hours/day
C = ceiling limit not to be exceeded
STEL = short-term exposure limit - 15 minute average

Note that many solvents have similar toxic effects. When there are exposures to two or more substances that act upon the same organ system, their combined effect is evaluated. Unless there is scientific evidence to the contrary, the effects are considered to be additive (as opposed to potentiating, synergistic, or antagonistic), and are calculated as follows:

$$\text{Combined REL} = \frac{C_1}{\text{REL}_1} + \frac{C_2}{\text{REL}_2} + \dots + \frac{C_n}{\text{REL}_n}$$

Where: C = measured atmospheric concentration
REL = corresponding recommended exposure limit

If the sum of the above fractions exceeds 1.0, the combined REL is considered to be exceeded.

Isocyanates

The unique feature common to all diisocyanates is

that they consist of two -N=C=O (isocyanate) functional groups attached to an aromatic or aliphatic parent compound. Because of the highly unsaturated nature of the isocyanate functional group, the diisocyanates readily react with compounds containing active hydrogen atoms (nucleophiles). Thus, the diisocyanates readily react with water (humidity), alcohols, amines, etc.; the diisocyanates also react with themselves to form either dimers or trimers. When a diisocyanate species reacts with a primary, secondary, or tertiary alcohol, a carbamate (-NHCOO-) group is formed which is commonly referred to as a urethane. Reactions involving a diisocyanate species and a polyol result in the formation of cross-linked polymers; *i.e.*, polyurethanes. Hence, they are widely used in surface coatings, polyurethane foams, adhesives, resins, elastomers, binders, sealants, etc. Diisocyanates are usually referred to by their specific acronym; *e.g.*, TDI for 2,4- and 2,6-toluene diisocyanate, HDI for 1,6-hexamethylene diisocyanate, MDI for 4,4'-diphenylmethane diisocyanate, NDI for 1,5-naphthalene diisocyanate, etc. Commercial-grade TDI is an 80:20 mixture of the 2,4- and 2,6- isomers of TDI, respectively.

In general, the type of exposures encountered during the use of diisocyanates in the workplace are related to the vapor pressures of the individual compounds. The lower molecular weight diisocyanates tend to volatilize at room temperature, creating a vapor inhalation hazard. Conversely, the higher molecular weight diisocyanates do not readily volatilize at ambient temperatures, but are still an inhalation hazard if aerosolized or heated in the work environment. The latter is very important since most reactions involving diisocyanates are exothermic in nature, thus providing the heat for volatilization. In an attempt to reduce the vapor hazards associated with the lower molecular weight diisocyanates, prepolymer and oligomer forms of these monomers were developed, and have replaced the monomers in many product formulations. An example is biuret of HDI, which actually consists of three molecules of HDI monomer joined together to form a higher molecular weight oligomer with similar characteristics to those found in HDI monomer.

Also, many product formulations that contain MDI actually contain a combination of MDI monomer and MDI oligomer (polymethylene polyphenyl isocyanate). Experience with both the monomeric and oligomeric forms of diisocyanates has shown that the occurrence of health effects is dependent on exposure, not molecular weight.

Exposure to the diisocyanates produces irritation to the skin, mucous membranes, eyes, and respiratory tract. High concentrations may result in chemical bronchitis, chest tightness, nocturnal waking, pulmonary edema, and death.^{18,21} The most common adverse health outcome associated with diisocyanate exposure is increased airway obstruction (asthma), and to a lesser extent dermal sensitization and hypersensitivity pneumonitis.¹⁹⁻²¹

Diisocyanate-induced sensitization

Probably the most debilitating health effects from workplace exposure to diisocyanates are respiratory and dermal sensitization. Exposures can lead to sensitization depending on the type of exposure, the exposure concentration, the route of exposure, and individual susceptibility. Dermal sensitization can result in such symptoms as rash, itching, hives, and swelling of the extremities.^{18,21} Respiratory sensitization from exposure to diisocyanates results in the typical symptoms of asthma. Estimates of the prevalence of diisocyanate-induced asthma in exposed worker populations vary considerably; from 5% to 10% in diisocyanate production facilities,^{22,23} to 25% in polyurethane production plants,^{22,24} and 30% in polyurethane seatcover operations.²⁵

A worker suspected of having diisocyanate-induced sensitization will present with symptoms of traditional acute airway obstruction; e.g., coughing, wheezing, shortness of breath, tightness in the chest, nocturnal awakening, etc.^{18,20} Upon first exposure to diisocyanates, the worker may develop an asthmatic reaction immediately or several hours after exposure, after the first months of exposure, or after several

1. Elimination of the toxic substance from the workplace.

years of exposure.^{18,20,23,26,27} Some evidence exists which suggests that the onset of sensitization occurs after a mean exposure interval of 2 years.²⁸ After sensitization, any exposure, even to levels below any occupational exposure limit or standard, can produce an asthmatic response which may be life threatening. This asthmatic reaction may occur minutes after exposure (immediate), several hours after exposure (late), or a combination of both immediate and late components after exposure (dual).^{20,26} The late asthmatic reaction is the most common, occurring in approximately 40% of diisocyanate-sensitized workers.²⁹ Recurrent nocturnal asthma has been described in workers sensitized to TDI and MDI.^{30,31} An improvement in symptoms may be observed during periods away from the work environment (weekends, vacations).^{18,20,26}

The percentage of sensitized workers with persistent symptoms of asthma after years of no exposure may be 50% or higher. Studies have shown that workers with persistent asthma have a significantly longer duration of symptoms prior to diagnosis, larger decrements in pulmonary function, and a severe degree of nonspecific bronchial hyperactivity at diagnosis.²⁶ These data suggest that prognosis is improved with early diagnosis of diisocyanate-induced respiratory sensitization and early removal from diisocyanate exposure. This emphasizes the need to minimize workplace exposure concentrations, and for active medical surveillance of all workers potentially exposed to diisocyanates.

Prevention and treatment

Whenever there is a potential for a hazardous exposure to diisocyanates, traditional industrial hygiene practice dictates that the following hierarchy of controls, in decreasing order of desirability and effectiveness, be implemented to protect worker health:

2. Substitution of the toxic substance with a less toxic substance.

3. Installation of engineering controls designed to reduce exposure.
4. Use of administrative controls to reduce exposure.
5. Use of personal protective equipment to reduce exposure.

In many instances, it is not possible to eliminate or substitute a diisocyanate from a production process without altering the integrity of the desired product. Thus, most strategies for reducing diisocyanate exposure center on the use of engineering controls and personal protective equipment. Local exhaust ventilation and/or process isolation are commonly used controls for diisocyanate exposure reduction. Personal protective equipment should only be used when engineering controls are not feasible, in the interim when engineering controls are being installed or repaired, or when engineering controls have not sufficiently reduced exposures. NIOSH recommends that whenever there is a potential for exposure to diisocyanates, including concentrations below the NIOSH recommended exposure level, that the employer provide the worker with supplied-air respiratory protection.¹⁸ Air-purifying respirators are not approved for diisocyanates owing primarily to the fact that diisocyanates have poor odor warning properties. However, several studies have demonstrated that air-purifying respirators with combined dust/mist and organic cartridges effectively trap TDI, HDI, and MDI.³²⁻³⁴ Personal protective equipment should also be used to prevent skin and eye contact with diisocyanates.

OSHA currently has standards for only two of the diisocyanates, TDI and MDI. OSHA recommends a ceiling limit of 0.02 parts per million (ppm) [140 micrograms per cubic meter, ug/m^3] for both TDI and MDI. For MDI, NIOSH recommends a TWA of 0.005 ppm ($35 \text{ ug}/\text{m}^3$) and a 10-minute ceiling of 0.02 ppm [$200 \text{ ug}/\text{m}^3$]. NIOSH considers TDI a carcinogen and recommends exposure be limited to the lowest feasible concentration.

For HDI, NIOSH recommends a TWA of 0.005 ppm [$35 \text{ ug}/\text{m}^3$] and a 10-minute ceiling limit of 0.02 ppm

[$140 \text{ ug}/\text{m}^3$]. For isophorone diisocyanate (IPDI), NIOSH recommends a TWA of 0.005 ppm [$45 \text{ ug}/\text{m}^3$] and a ceiling limit of 0.02 ppm [$180 \text{ ug}/\text{m}^3$] with a skin designation. This means that skin absorption is considered the primary route of exposure and skin contact should be avoided.

Neither NIOSH nor OSHA have recommended exposure limits for the polymeric isocyanate groups (oligomers). The United Kingdom Health and Safety Commission set a standard in 1982 for total isocyanate group per cubic meter of air. This standard is 20 ug of isocyanate group/ m^3 for a TWA and 70 ug/m^3 for a 10-minute ceiling.³⁵ Miles Laboratories recommends in their MSDS for the Glasurit HDI-based paints that a limit of 500 ug/m^3 be followed for the polymeric isocyanates.

Noise/Hearing Loss

Noise-induced loss of hearing is an irreversible, sensorineural condition that progresses with exposure. Although hearing ability declines with age (presbycusis) in all populations, exposure to noise produces hearing loss greater than that resulting from the natural aging process. This noise-induced loss is caused by damage to nerve cells of the inner ear (cochlea) and, unlike some conductive hearing disorders, cannot be treated medically.³⁶ While loss of hearing may result from a single exposure to a very brief impulse noise or explosion, such traumatic losses are rare. In most cases, noise-induced hearing loss is insidious. Typically, it begins to develop at 4000 or 6000 Hz (the hearing range is 20 Hz to 20000 Hz) and spreads to lower and higher frequencies. Often, material impairment has occurred before the condition is clearly recognized. Such impairment is usually severe enough to permanently affect a person's ability to hear and understand speech under everyday conditions. Although the primary frequencies of human speech range from 200 Hz to 2000 Hz, research has shown that the consonant sounds, which enable people to distinguish words such as "fish" from "fist," have still higher frequency components.³⁷

The A-weighted decibel [dB(A)] is the preferred unit

for measuring sound levels to assess worker noise exposures. The decibel unit is dimensionless, and represents the logarithmic relationship of the measured sound pressure level to an arbitrary reference sound pressure (20 micropascals, the normal threshold of human hearing at a frequency of 1000 Hz). Decibel units are used because of the very large range of sound pressure levels which are audible to the human ear. The dB(A) scale is weighted to approximate the sensory response of the human ear to sound frequencies. Because the dB(A) scale is logarithmic, increases of 3 dBA, 10 dBA, and 20 dBA represent a doubling, tenfold increase, and 100-fold increase of sound energy, respectively. It should be noted that noise exposures expressed in decibels cannot be averaged by taking the simple arithmetic mean.

The OSHA standard for occupational exposure to noise (29 CFR 1910.95)³⁸ specifies a maximum PEL of 90 dB(A)-slow response for a duration of eight hours per day. The regulation, in calculating the PEL, uses a 5 dB time/intensity trading relationship, or exchange rate. This means that in order for a person to be exposed to noise levels of 95 dB(A), the amount of time allowed at this exposure level must be cut in half to be within OSHA's PEL. Conversely, a person exposed to 85 dB(A) is allowed twice as much time at this level (16 hours) and is within his daily PEL. NIOSH, in its Criteria for a Recommended Standard,³⁹ proposes an exposure limit of 85 dB(A) for 8 hours, 5 dB less than the OSHA standard. In 1994, the ACGIH changed its TLV to a more protective 85 dB(A) for an 8-hour exposure, with the stipulation that a 3 dB exchange rate be used to calculate time-varying noise exposures.¹⁰ Thus, a worker can be exposed to 85 dB(A) for 8 hours, but to only 88 dB(A) for 4 hours or 91 dB(A) for 2 hours. In 1995, NIOSH also recommended a 3 dB exchange rate.

Time-weighted average noise limits as a function of exposure duration are shown as follows:

	Sound Level dB(A)
--	-------------------

Duration of Exposure (hrs/day)	ACGIH	NIOSH	OSHA
16	82	82	85
8	85	85	90
4	88	88	95
2	91	91	100
1	94	94	105
1/2	97	97	110
1/4	100	100	115*
1/8	103	103	---
	***	***	**

* No exposure to continuous or intermittent noise in excess of 115 dB(A).

** Exposure to impulsive or impact noise should not exceed 140 dB peak sound pressure level.

*** No exposure to continuous, intermittent, or impact noise in excess of a peak C-weighted level of 140 dB.

The duration and sound level intensities can be combined in order to calculate a worker's daily noise dose according to the formula:

$$\text{Dose} = 100 \times (C_1/T_1 + C_2/T_2 + \dots + C_n/T_n),$$

where C_n indicates the total time of exposure at a specific noise level and T_n indicates the reference duration for that level as given in the above table. During any 24-hour period, a worker is allowed up to 100% of his daily noise dose. Doses greater than 100% are in excess of the OSHA PEL.

The OSHA regulation has an additional action level (AL) of 85 dB(A) which stipulates that an employer shall administer a continuing, effective hearing conservation program when the TWA value exceeds the AL. The program must include monitoring, employee notification, observation, an audiometric testing program, hearing protectors, training programs, and recordkeeping requirements. All of

these stipulations are included in 29 CFR 1910.95, paragraphs (c) through (o).

The OSHA noise standard also states that when workers are exposed to noise levels in excess of the OSHA PEL of 90 dB(A), feasible engineering or administrative controls shall be implemented to reduce the workers' exposure levels. Also, a continuing, effective hearing conservation program shall be implemented.

RESULTS

A summary of the isocyanate results from August, 1995 are presented in Table 1. All of the oligomer and most of the monomer samples were below the analytical limit of detection of 1 µg/sample. The less than values (<) in the table represent the lowest detectable concentration for that sample based on the sample volume and the detection limit. Only a trace amount of HDI monomer was detected in sample # MCI-10, which was an area sample within the spray booth. Sample #MCI-12 was a PBZ sample collected on the head painter at the end of the day when he was applying clear coat paint. This sample was 99 µg/m³ which is above the NIOSH REL of 35 µg/m³ for an 8-hr TWA but below the 140 µg/m³ ceiling REL. If the head painter's full-shift exposure is summed and time-weighted (samples #MCI-01, 03, 05, 06, and 12), his TWA was 29 µg/m³, which is below the NIOSH REL.

The sample results for isocyanates from February 1996 are summarized in Table 1a. All the monomer exposures are below the analytical limit of detection of 2 µg/sample, but most of the oligomer samples had detectable results. These ranged from 83 to 482 µg/m³.

Air samples for organics are summarized in Tables 2 (August 1995) and 2a (February 1996). None of the individual chemical levels (n-butyl acetate, toluene, xylene, or ethyl acetate) exceeded their individual REL or PEL. Furthermore, the mixture summation of all organics (the best indicator for total organic exposure), for all samples during both sampling times was not in excess of any evaluation criteria. Generally, the levels of organics measured in February were higher than those in August.

Sample results for total dust are summarized in Tables 3 (August) and 3a (February). In both cases, area samples in the booth exceeded the PEL of 15 mg/m³. None of the PBZ samples exceeded the PEL. Generally, the results from August were higher than those collected in February.

The one datalogger monitor output for CO is shown in Figure 1. The CO levels averaged 27 ppm for the 8-hr sampling period. The peak CO level was 450 ppm and the highest 15-minute average was 105 ppm. The high peaks were associated with moving vehicles in and out of the shop.

A personal noise monitor was placed on a body repair worker for 5 hours and 49 minutes. The average noise level (using the OSHA criteria) was 79 dBA, resulting in a 21% dose of the maximum allowable noise exposure (projected to 28% for a full 8 hours). The maximum peak levels measured was 115 dBA. Using a 3dB exchange rate (NIOSH criteria), the dose percent was 78% with a projected 8-hr dose of 106%.

One welding sample was collected and is summarized in Table 4. Exposures to all metals were well below the respective evaluation criteria.

DISCUSSION

The isocyanate results generally demonstrate low exposures to HDI monomer and oligomers. For both sampling periods, only one sample was in excess of the NIOSH REL of 35 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ yet it was below the more applicable ceiling REL of 140 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. This sample was collected in the warm weather months. The oligomer samples were higher during the winter months but were still below what is recommended by the paint manufacturer (500 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). The isocyanates samples indicate the potential for some exposure exists, but not at levels in excess of existing evaluation criteria.

Exposures to solvents were generally higher in the winter than in the summer. The highest exposures were around 50% (40-56%) of the allowable exposure for solvent mixtures. The highest exposures were consistently to n-butyl acetate and toluene. Use of protective gloves to reduce skin exposure (and absorption) of solvents was inconsistent. Gloves were mostly used when mixing paint and spray painting but were not always used during spray gun cleaning.

Total dust levels due to paint overspray (measured as area samples) were consistently in excess of the OSHA PEL inside the spray booth. Personal exposures to total dust did not exceed the PEL. Since most of the samples were collected inside the spray booth, the levels appear to be about the same during the winter and summer months.

CO levels often exceeded the ceiling limit of 200 ppm. The average exposure for the nearly 8-hr sample (27 ppm) exceeded the ACGIH TLV (25 ppm) and approached the NIOSH REL of 35 ppm. The levels were high enough, consistently enough, that some remediation is necessary to control exposure. Since cars moving into and out of the shop were the source of the CO and since it is very difficult to control these moving sources, the best possible solution is to increase general building dilution ventilation. This increase in ventilation would also help reduce other exposures such as solvents, isocyanates (when sprayed outside the

booth), and total dust.

Noise exposures were below the OSHA exposure limits and the OSHA trigger limit of 85 dBA as an 8-hr TWA. Noise levels did approach the NIOSH REL and the ACGIH TLV. Since body work that produces the highest noise levels is an inconsistent work practice, more measurements representing a wider variety of body work is recommended to increase the baseline monitoring database. This is also true for welding and grinding operations where metal exposure is the issue. The one sample collected during this evaluation may not be representative of the exposure potential, even though the sample results were quite low.

CONCLUSIONS

Isocyanate exposures were below the various evaluation criteria. However, an occasional sample approached the NIOSH REL indicating a need for protective measures. NIOSH recommends air-supplied respirators whenever there is the potential for exposure to isocyanates. There are no NIOSH approved air-purifying respirators for isocyanates because isocyanates have no odor warning properties to indicate breakthrough of the cartridge. Studies have shown that combination dust/mist and organic cartridges effectively stop isocyanates and that the various solvents, particularly n-butyl acetate, will break through the cartridge long before the isocyanates.³²⁻³⁴ Therefore, the combination dust/mist/organic air-purifying respirators should provide adequate protection against the small amounts of isocyanate present and the n-butyl acetate odor can be used to indicate breakthrough of the cartridges. Eye and skin protection also needs to be provided with isocyanate monomers.

Both solvent and total dust exposures approached, but did not exceed, the NIOSH/OSHA evaluation criteria. Use of the combination air-purifying respirators during painting would also provide sufficient protection for solvents and total dust. Use of gloves and eye protection will provide the needed skin and eye protection for the solvents. Eye protections in the entire shop should be a general

requirement due to the potential for flying objects from body work (grinding and welding), detailing , painting , polishing, etc.

The CO levels measured during the winter months, when the shop was fairly airtight, rose to levels in excess of the NIOSH/OSHA ceiling limit and the ACGIH TWA. Since vehicles need to be moved around and in and out of the shop to keep the repair process going, the only real control option is to provide general building ventilation for the shop. The only exhaust in the building occurs through leakage into the spray booth and mixing room or if the exhaust fan in the southwest corner of the building is turned on during any painting outside the spray booth. Outside air needs to be brought into the building, tempered, and partially exhausted. The American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Inc. (ASHRAE) recommends certain levels of outside air in their guideline “Ventilation for Acceptable Indoor Air Quality,” standard ASHRAE 62-1989.⁴⁰ This guideline recommends 1.5 cubic feet per minute of outside air per square feet for auto repair shops and enclosed parking garages to control for CO.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on the environmental sampling results and the observations made during this investigation and are offered in the interest of improving employee health and safety for all employees at Martin’s Carstar.

1. NIOSH recommends air-supplied respirators when there is the potential for exposure to isocyanates. However, if air-purifying respirators are used, there are a few items which should be noted. First, there are no NIOSH approved air-purifying respirators for isocyanates primarily because isocyanates have no odor warning properties. Studies have shown that combination dust/mist and organic cartridges effectively stop isocyanates and that the various solvents will break through long before any isocyanate.³²⁻³⁴ Therefore, the odor property of n-butyl acetate could be used to

determine when respirators need to be replaced. Eye and skin protection should be provided during spray painting. At a minimum, air-purifying respirators are indicated by the organic chemical and total dust exposures.

2. General ventilation for the entire shop is needed to control CO levels in the winter. This ventilation should meet the guidelines recommended by ASHRAE 62-1989.

3. A complete respiratory protection program needs to be implemented as per 29CFR 1910.134. Many of the elements of the 10-point respirator plan are in effect, but all elements must be in place including medical testing of workers for the ability to wear respirators, respirator training, fit testing of respirators, and respirator maintenance.

4. Paint spraying should be conducted in the paint booth as much as possible. The levels of total dust and organics can be substantial, so the best way to control these exposures is to limit spraying to the booth. When any spraying is done outside the booth, all employees in the area should be wearing their respirators.

5. No eating, drinking, or smoking should be allowed in the shop area.

6. Gloves should be worn when mixing paint, cleaning paint guns, or any time when bulk paint and/or solvents may come into contact with the skin. Testing for isocyanate monomers with SWYPE™ samples demonstrated isocyanate content in used solvent. This was confirmed by bulk sample analysis, therefore demonstrating the need to avoid skin contact with this solvent.

7. Noise levels should be remeasured during a variety of different body shop operations for several different days. If average noise levels exceed 85dBA as a TWA, then a comprehensive hearing conservation program needs to be implemented.

8. Additional monitoring for metal exposures should be conducted during grinding and welding jobs to establish a better metal exposure database.

REFERENCES

1. NIOSH [1994]. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. NIOSH Manual of Analytical Methods. 4th ed. Cincinnati, Ohio.

2. NIOSH [1972]. Criteria for a recommended standard: occupational exposure to carbon monoxide. Cincinnati, OH: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Health Services and Mental Health Administration, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, DHEW (NIOSH) Publication No. 73-11000.

3. NIOSH [1977]. Occupational diseases: a guide to their recognition. Revised ed. Cincinnati, OH: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Center for Disease Control, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, DHEW (NIOSH) Publication No. 77-181.

4. NIOSH [1979]. A guide to work-relatedness of disease. Revised ed. Cincinnati, OH: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Center for Disease Control, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, DHEW (NIOSH) Publication No. 79-116.

5. Proctor NH, Hughes JP, Fischman ML [1988]. Chemical hazards of the workplace. Philadelphia, PA: J.B. Lippincott Company.

6. ACGIH [1986]. Documentation of threshold limit values and biological exposure indices (with 1990 supplements). 5th ed. Cincinnati, OH: American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists.

7. NIOSH [1994]. Pocket guide to chemical hazards. Cincinnati, OH: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service,

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 94-116.

8. CDC [1988]. NIOSH recommendations for occupational safety and health standards 1988. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. MMWR 37 (supp. S-7).

9. Code of Federal Regulations [1989]. 29 CFR 1910.1000. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, Federal Register.

10. ACGIH [1992]. Threshold limit values and biological exposure indices for 1992-1993. Cincinnati, OH: American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists.

11. NRC [1985]. Emergency and continuous exposure guidance levels for selected contaminants. Washington, DC: National Research Council. National Academy Press.

12. Axelson O, Hogstedt C [1988]. On the health effects of solvents. In: Zenz C, ed. Occupational medicine, principles and practical applications. 2nd ed. Chicago, IL: Year Book Medical Publishers, Inc., p 775.

13. Cone JE [1986]. Health hazards of solvents. Occupational Medicine: State of the Art Reviews 1(1):69-87.

14. Doull J, Klaassen C, Amdur MO, eds [1980]. Casarett and Doull's toxicology: the basic science of poisons. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.

15. ILO [1983]. Stewart RD, Trichloroethanes. In: Encyclopedia of Occupational Health and Safety. Vol II/1-z. Geneva: International Labour Office. p 2214.

16. AIHA [1989]. Odor thresholds for chemicals with established occupational health

standards. American Industrial Hygiene Association.

17. NIOSH [1981]. NIOSH/OSHA occupational health guidelines for chemical hazards. Cincinnati, OH: U.S. Department of Health, and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 81-123.

18. NIOSH [1978]. Criteria for a recommended standard: occupational exposure to diisocyanates. Cincinnati, OH: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Center for Disease Control, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, DHEW (NIOSH) Publication No. 78-215.

19. NIOSH [1990]. Pocket guide to chemical hazards. Cincinnati, OH: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 90-117.

20. NIOSH [1986]. Occupational respiratory diseases. Cincinnati, OH: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 86-102.

21. Levy BS, Wegman DH (editors) [1988]. *Occupational Health: Recognizing and Preventing Work-Related Diseases*. Second Edition. Boston/Toronto: Little, Brown and Company.

22. Weill H [1979]. Epidemiologic and medical-legal aspects of occupational asthma. *The Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology* 64:662-664.

23. Porter CV, Higgins RL, Scheel LD [1975]. A retrospective study of clinical, physiologic, and immunologic changes in workers exposed to toluene

diisocyanate. *American Industrial Hygiene Association Journal* 36:159-168.

24. Adams WGF [1975]. Long-term effects on the health of men engaged in the manufacture of tolylene diisocyanate. *British Journal of Industrial Medicine* 32:72-78.

25. White WG, Sugden E, Morris MJ, Zapata E [1980]. Isocyanate-induced asthma in a car factory. *Lancet* i:756-760.

26. Chan Yeung M, Lam S [1986]. Occupational asthma. *American Review of Respiratory Disease* 133:686-703.

27. NIOSH [1981]. Technical report: respiratory and immunologic evaluation of isocyanate exposure in a new manufacturing plant. Cincinnati, OH: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 81-125.

28. Burge P [1989]. Diagnosis of occupational asthma. *Clinical and Experimental Allergy* 19:649-652.

29. McKay RT, Brooks SM [1981]. Toluene diisocyanate (TDI): biochemical and physiologic studies. *American Review of Respiratory Disease* 123:132.

30. Zammit-Tabona M, Sherkin M, Kijek K, Chan H, Chan-Yeung M [1983]. Asthma caused by diphenylmethane diisocyanate in foundry workers. *American Review of Respiratory Disease* 128:226-230.

31. Siracusa A, Curradi F, Abritti G [1978]. Recurrent nocturnal asthma due to toluene diisocyanate: a case report. *Clinical Allergy* 8:195-201.

32. Rosenberg C, Tumomi T [1984]. Airborne Isocyanates In Polyurethane Spray Painting:

Determination and Respiratory Efficiency. *Amer. Ind. Hyg. Assoc. Jr* 45: 117-121.

33. Vasta JF [1985]. Respirator Cartridge Evaluation for Isocyanate Containing Imron and Centari Enamals. *Amer. Ind. Hyg. Assoc. Jr* 46:39-44.

34. Dharmarajan V, Lingg RD, Hackathorn DR [1986]. Evaluation of Air-Purifying Respirators for Protection Against Toluene Diisocyanate Vapors. *Amer. Ind. Hyg. Assoc. Jr* 47:393-398.

35. European Chemical News [1982], 39: issue 1057, p. 24.

36. Ward WD [1986]. Anatomy & physiology of the ear: normal and damaged hearing. Chapter 5. In: Berger EH, Ward WD, Morrill JC, Royster LH, eds. Noise & hearing conservation manual. 4th ed. Akron, OH: American Industrial Hygiene Association, pp. 177-195.

37. Ward WD, Flear RE, Glorig A [1961]. Characteristics of hearing loss produced by gunfire and by steady noise. *Journal of Auditory Research* 1:325-356.

38. Code of Federal Regulations [1992]. OSHA. 29 CFR 1910.95. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, Federal Register.

39. NIOSH [1972]. Criteria for a recommended standard: occupational exposure to noise. Cincinnati, OH: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Health Services and Mental Health Administration, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, DHEW (NIOSH) Publication No. 73-11001.

40. ASHRAE [1989]. Ventilation for Acceptable Indoor Air Quality, ASHRAE 62-1989. American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Inc. Atlanta, Georgia.

Table 1

Summary of Air Sample Results for Hexamethylene Diisocyanate
 Martin's Carstar, Lakewood, Colorado
 HETA 95-0311-2593
 August 24, 1995

SAMPLE	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	ON	OFF	SAMPLE TIME (min)	VOLUME at 1 Lpm (m ³)	HDI CONCENTRATION (µg/m ³)#	
						Monomer	Oligomer
MCI-01	Personal-Rich-Vehicle #1	9:23	9:55	32	0.032	<31	<31
MCI-03	Personal-Rich-Vehicle #2	10:21	10:45	24	0.024	<42	<42
MCI-04	Area-Mixing Room #1	9:15	12:34	199	0.199	<5.0	<5.0
MCI-05	Personal-Rich-Vehicle #1	8:40	9:23	43	0.043	*	<23
MCI-06	Personal-Rich-Vehicle #3	11:45	2:00	135	0.135	<7.4	<7.4
MCI-07	Personal-Wade	2:05	5:15	190	0.190	<5.3	<5.3
MCI-08	Area-Paint Booth #1	10:18	12:29	131	0.131	<7.6	<7.6
MCI-09	Area-Mixing Room #2	12:34	4:23	229	0.229	<4.4	<4.4
MCI-10	Area-Paint Booth #2	12:39	3:07	148	0.148	(20)	<6.8
MCI-11	Area-Paint Booth #3	3:38	5:54	136	0.136	<7.4	<7.4
MCI-12	Personal-Rich-Vehicle #4	3:30	5:51	141	0.141	99	<7.1

< values based on analytical limit of detection of 1 microgram per sample

*Sample lost due to spillage

NIOSH Recommended Exposure Limit, HDI Monomer: 35 µg/m³ for TWA, 140 µg/m³ for 10-min Ceiling

OSHA Permissible Exposure Limit: none

Table 1a

Summary of Air Sample Results for Hexamethylene Diisocyanate
 Martin's Carstar, Lakewood, Colorado
 HETA 95-0311-2593
 February 29, 1996

SAMPLE	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	ON	OFF	SAMPLE TIME (min)	VOLUME at 1 Lpm (m ³)	HDI CONCENTRATION (µg/m ³)#	
						Monomer	Oligmer
IMA-20	Area-Paint Booth	8:46	9:11	25	0.025	<80	236
IMA-21	Area-Shop-On Caleb	9:01	9:12	11	0.011	<182	273
IMA-22	Area-Paint Booth	10:42	2:06	204	0.204	<5.8	83.0
IMA-23	Personal-Wade-Paint Booth	10:42	11:15	33	0.033	<61	206
IMA-24	Personal-Cliff-Outside Booth	12:45	1:46	61	0.061	<32.8	128.0
IMA-25	Personal-Wade	1:47	4:02	135	0.135	<14.8	252.0
IMA-26	Personal-Chris-Base & Prime	3:46	4:26	40	0.04	<50.0	<50.0
IMA-27	Personal-Wade	4:02	4:29	27	0.027	<74.1	482.0

< values based on an analytical limit of detection of 2 micrograms per sample

NIOSH Recommended Exposure Limit: HDI Monomer 35 µg/m³ for TWA, 140 µg/m³ for 10-min Ceiling

OSHA Permissible Exposure Limit: none

Table 2

Summary of Air Sample Results for Organics
 Martin's Carstar, Lakewood, Colorado
 HETA 95-0311-2593
 August 24, 1995

SAMPLE	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	ON	OFF	SAMPLE TIME (min)	VOLUME at .2 Lpm (m ³)	CONCENTRATION (mg/m ³)				MIXTURE REL/PEL
						n-Butyl Acetate	Toluene	Xylene	Ethyl Acetate	
CT-20	Personal-Rich-Vehicle #1	8:40	9:55	75	0.0150	30	57	5.8	6.4	0.21
CT-21	Area-Mixing Room #1	9:15	12:19	184	0.0368	5.2	6.5	1.0	1.3	0.03
CT-22	Area-Outside Booth-Westside	10:24	11:08	44	0.0088	120	16	26	9.0	0.28
CT-23	Personal-Rich-Vehicle #3	11:47	2:00	133	0.0266	49	49	15	14	0.24
CT-24	Area-Prep Area-Outside Wall West Side #1	11:55	2:50	175	0.0350	4.3	0.1	0.8	0.1	0.01
CT-25	Area-Mixing Room #2	12:20	3:34	194	0.0388	8.5	15	2.1	1.8	0.06
CT-26	Personal-Wade	2:04	5:15	191	0.0382	50	45	16	11	0.24
CT-27	Area-Prep Area-Outside Wall West Side #2	2:55	3:59	64	0.0128	117	3.4	23	6.9	0.23
CT-28	Area-Mixing Room #3	3:36	4:23	47	0.0094	57	100	19	22	0.41
CT-29	Personal-Eric	4:00	5:11	71	0.0142	48	38	32	1.4	0.24
NIOSH Recommended Exposure Limit - 8 hour TWA - mg/m ³ (ppm)						710 (150)	375 (100)	435 (100)	1400 (400)	1.0
OSHA Permissible Exposure Limit - 8 hour TWA - mg/m ³ (ppm)						710 (150)	375 (100)	435 (100)	1400 (400)	1.0

Table 2a

Summary of Air Sample Results for Organics
 Martin's Carstar, Lakewood, Colorado
 HETA 95-0311-2593
 February 29, 1996

SAMPLE	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	ON	OFF	SAMPLE TIME (min)	VOLUME at .1 Lpm (m ³)	CONCENTRATION (mg/m ³)				MIXTURE REL/PEL
						n-Butyl Acetate	Toluene	Xylene	Ethyl Acetate	
CMA 96-01	Area-Paint Booth	8:46	9:11	25	0.0025	200	36	60.0	68.0	0.56
CMA 96-02	Personal-Chris-Base & Prime	3:46	4:26	40	0.0040	38	67.5	10	4.8	0.26
CMA 96-03	Area-Shop-On Caleb	9:01	9:12	11	0.0011	60.9	21.8	13.6	10.0	0.18
CMA 96-04	Personal-Cliff-Outside Booth	12:45	1:46	61	0.0061	98.4	105	29.5	8.2	0.49
CMA 96-05	Area-Paint Booth	10:42	4:26	344	0.0344	113	13	32	10	0.27
CMA 96-07	Area-Mixing Room	9:15	4:30	435	0.0435	20	55	6	2.2	0.19
CMA 96-08	Personal-Wade	1:47	4:29	162	0.0162	105	68	29	10	0.40
CMA 96-09	Personal-Wade-Paint Booth	10:42	11:15	33	0.0033	54.5	112.1	16.1	6.4	0.42
NIOSH Recommended Exposure Limit - 8 hour TWA - mg/m ³ (ppm)						710 (150)	375 (100)	435 (100)	1400 (400)	1.0
OSHA Permissible Exposure Limit - 8 hour TWA - mg/m ³ (ppm)						710 (150)	375 (100)	435 (100)	1400 (400)	1.0

Table 3

Summary of Air Sample Results for Total Dust
 Martin's Carstar, Lakewood, Colorado
 HETA 95-0311-2593
 August 24, 1995

SAMPLE	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	ON	OFF	SAMPLE TIME (min)	VOLUME at 2 Lpm (m ³)	CONCENTRATION (mg/m ³)
93-4352	Personal-Rich-Vehicle #1	8:40	9:55	75	0.150	ND
93-4351	Area-Paint Booth #1	10:18	12:29	131	0.262	17
93-4358	Personal-Rich-Vehicle #2	10:21	11:45	84	0.168	4.3
93-4357	Personal-Rich-Vehicle #3	11:45	2:00	135	0.270	ND
93-4356	Area-Paint Booth #2	12:39	3:07	148	0.296	19
93-4359	Personal-Wade	2:05	5:15	190	0.380	5.1
93-4354	Personal-Rich-Vehicle #4	3:30	5:51	141	0.282	6.7
93-4347	Area-Paint Booth #3	3:38	5:54	136	0.272	36

OSHA Permissible Exposure Limit = 15 mg/m³ for Total Dust

Table 3a

Summary of Air Sample Results for Total Dust
 Martin's Carstar, Lakewood, Colorado
 HETA 95-0311-2593
 February 29, 1996

SAMPLE	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	ON	OFF	SAMPLE TIME (min)	VOLUME at 2 Lpm (m ³)	CONCENTRATION (mg/m ³)
95-3217	Area-Paint Booth	8:46	9:11	25	0.050	7
95-3216	Area-Shop-On Caleb	9:01	9:12	11	0.022	4
95-3229	Area-Paint Booth	10:42	11:44	62	0.124	5.1
95-3201		1:33	4:26	173	0.346	15.1
95-3210	Personal-Wade-Paint Booth	10:42	11:15	33	0.066	3
95-3198	Personal-Cliff-Outside Booth	12:45	1:46	61	0.122	7.5
95-3200	Personal-Wade	1:47	4:29	162	0.324	6.7
95-3206	Personal-Chris-Base & Prime	3:46	4:26	40	0.08	2

OSHA Permissible Exposure Limit = 15 mg/m³ for Total Dust

Table 4

Summary of Air Sample Results for Metals
 Martin's Carstar, Lakewood, Colorado
 HETA 95-0311-2593
 February 29, 1996

SAMPLE #	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	SAMPLE TIME (min)	VOLUME at 2 Lpm (m ³)	CONCENTRATION (mg/m ³)						
				Aluminum	Barium	Calcium	Iron	Magnesium	Manganese	Zinc
MMA 96-30	Personal-Jeff-Welding	138	0.2760	0.033	0.008	0.286	0.319	0.065	0.065	0.308
NIOSH Recommended Exposure Limit - 8 hour TWA - mg/m ³				10	0.5	2	5	--	1	5
OSHA Permissible Exposure Limit - 8 hour TWA - mg/m ³				15	0.5	5	10	15	C5	5





Figure 1. Carbon Monoxide Levels in Center of Shop, Martin's Carstar 2/29/96



NIOSH

Delivering on the Nation's promise:
Safety and health at work for all people
Through research and prevention