UCC 149.2

INTERNAL CORRESPONDENCE

RECEIVED
JUL 27 1973
WM. C. THURBER

MINING AND METALS DIVISION

P O BOX 579, NIAGARA FALLS, NEW YORK 14302

Asbestos Application General

To (Name) Dr. H. B. Rhodes
Division Mining & Metals
Location Niagara Falls, N. Y.

Date July 25, 1973

Originating Dept. Research and Development Department

Answering letter date

Subject

Copy to R. E. Byrne
J. L. Myers
W. C. Thurber

[redacted]

Dear Harry:

This letter is written in response to your July 18 correspondence concerning the potential usage of SG-210 in suspension fertilizers by TVA.

Before taking the discouraging course of action it seems we want to take here, I would like to offer an appeal from a sales and marketing point of view. First of all, the potential here of this one product for this one customer from a sales standpoint represents, should we be successful, the total pounds of our whole CALIDRIA product line sold in the Southeast during 1972. We have neither encouraged nor discouraged the use of asbestos in their study work so far, and TVA initially discovered CALIDRIA on their own and came to us for samples. My only personal meeting with TVA people was to lay out the hard, cold facts of both the OSHA and EPA standards on the use of asbestos, and it was presented to them in such a manner that our product would certainly have to have some real advantages for them to get involved with the required dust counts, medical exams and registration needed as an asbestos user. Despite this negative selling approach, it appears they still feel that our material merits continuing their work even though they could easily use attapulgite clay without any restrictions. My feeling is they fully realize the political questions involved here, having been in an internal battle among themselves on asbestos, so I sure wouldn't want to be the guy who presents the final death blow to the project. Part of the consideration also involved here is the fact that Conoco now has a patent using asbestos in almost the same application, and TVA feels that if they are still proceeding forward with asbestos, why should Conoco get all the glory when TVA, which is the fertilizer research center for the U. S., also having a very valuable contribution to offer the industry stop their work.

To sum up, my appeal is based on the potential asbestos we can sell here, the fact that we have not offered them any encouragement at all. Let's also not lose sight of the fact that perhaps the TVA management, who are more familiar in dealing with government people than we may be and would have a

A09983

better feel for the political aspect of the problem, may best be left to make the final decision by themselves on whether or not to use asbestos, rather than our running in and killing off the project for them. It is hard enough to sell asbestos today and it sure doesn't make it easier if new markets are uncovered and we must consider what Dr. Selikoff might think about it. If we are not questioning the safe use of asbestos in the application, I feel the moral or political decision should be made by the potential user and not by us.

Very truly yours,

Jack Walsh

J. E. Walsh

JEW/cs

A09984