UC 149-2

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

Union Carbide 491

UNION CARBIDE

INTERNAL CORRESPONDENCE

METALS DIVISION

P. O. BOX 579 · 4625 ROYAL AVE., NIAGARA FALLS, NEW YORK 14302

To (Name) Dr. W. B. DeAtley
Division Dr. T. J. Kagetsu
Location Mr. R. W. Rebholz

Date April 5, 1979

Originating Dept. "Calidria" Asbestos

Answering letter date

Copy to Messrs. G. R. Adams
R. E. Byrne, Jr.
H. B. Rhodes
F. J. Shortsleeve
File

Subject Packaging

RECEIVED
APR 9 1979
J. R. LOUGHLIN

As previously discussed with all of you, I suggest that we meet at the King City plant on Wednesday, April 25, 1979 to discuss packaging of our asbestos products. Although our packaging "deficiencies" are not new, (see my letter dated 7/9/76 and HBR's dated 7/8/76, Attachments I and II) we are now being forced by the DOT regulations to take some action. To "kick-off" our discussions, I offer the following comments:

1. All pellets (except bulk) should be packaged in non-breathing paper or plastic bags with stitched, pasted or otherwise sealed fill openings. This would require auger or gravity packers, new bags and the "sealing" equipment. As an interim measure to minimize spout leakage, we should consider the use of a "band-aid" over the fill spout opening, the major source of leakage.

2. The optimum method to package open fiber would probably be to make blocks of no higher packaged density than current and package the blocks in paper or plastic bags or film , which would be pasted or heat-sealed to effect a dust and sift proof bag. An alternate possibility is to use vacuum filling rather than the current air pressure packing. This would eliminate the need for breathing bags and I understand this method is used for Cabosil. An interim method to approach the dust and sift proof bag is our current one of using shrink-film; however, we all recognize this is not a 100% seal and improvements are needed. The fill spout is the real source of excess leakage (see enclosed letter from Tomoe, Attachment III) and we should continue to evaluate an extended sleeve which can be sealed in some manner.

Work done in 1977 on a vacuum packer is described in the enclosed report (Attachment IV), but I have seen no further information.

Special packaging, such as that described for RG-244 and SG-100 in the enclosed correspondence (Attachment V), should also be discussed. It is very possible that we could enjoy increased RG-244/SX-24 sales if we had a package which could be added without opening to a compounding tank. Floor tile companies now do this

A14019

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/20138/1