UC 149-2

INTERNAL CORRESPONDENCE

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT UC-49

METALS DIVISION

P.O. BOX 579 - 4625 ROYAL AVE., NIAGARA FALLS, NEW YORK 1430

To (Name) Mr. W. C. Thurber
Division UCC - Metals Division
Location 38th Floor
270 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10017

Date July 9, 1976

Originating Dept. "Calidria" Asbestos

Answering letter date

Copy to Messrs. R. E. Byrne, Jr.
F. H. Larrison
R. D. Malin
H. B. Rhodes
R. L. Schult
File

Subject Packaging & Transportation Problems with Asbestos Dust

Please reference the attached copy of Harry's letter to me on the same Subject.

With increasing awareness of dust problems, especially asbestos, we are getting an increasing number of customer complaints about our packaging. The principle problems are dust on the external surfaces of bags or shrink-filmed pallets, dust between the paper bag and shrinkwrap, and dust released from pallets when the shrink-film is removed. Almost all competitive products are "block-packs" which are completely sealed in plastic or heavy paper bags. They have no leakage or dusty bag problem except when the bags are punctured in an occasional accident.

I am fully aware that we have different packaging problems than our competitors; e.g., hot pellets and fluffy open-fiber products. However, different problems should have different solutions; and I think it is time to engage the services of Engineering or the Corporate packaging experts from Bound Brook. I am concerned about an OSHA confrontation on our packaging and transportation practices, which may "shut us down" or force us into hasty and expensive solutions which may be avoided by doing something now. Basically, barring accidents, we need to be able to move the product from our plant to the place where the bag is opened for use without any visible leakage or discharge of fiber.

Unless the costs are entirely prohibitive, I think we should start shrink-wrapping all bagged products immediately, and make sure that the shrink-wrap has adequate integrity for shipment on pallets or for loose-loading in containers or railcars. If, as Harry suggests, we must have an inspector at the plant, then this cost should be part of the consideration. If bag vacuum cleaning has not been instituted, then this should also be done as soon as possible.

By no means am I being critical of the plant. Although carloading practices might be reviewed and shrink-wrapping equipment checked, the basic problem is one of unique package development and is beyond the scope of plant expertise and its responsibilities.

A14021

Equipment for densifying "UCAR" silica fume is being evaluated by Jim Downing and NF Engineering. Preliminary results with a vibrating ball mill and corrugated rulls look encouraging and may work on RG-244 and other open fiber products.

I think "us layman" have failed to solve the packaging problem and it should now be turned over to the experts.

John L. Myers

JLM:dal
Attachment

A14022