INTERNAL CORRESPONDENCE

UNION CARBIDE CHEMICALS COMPANY • INSTITUTE PLANT P. O. BOX 2831, CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA

To: R. J. Sexton, M.D.

From: Medical Department

Date: 3 December 1962

Originating Dept.: Industrial Hygiene - Plant 512

Answering letter date:

Subject: Johns Manville "Thermobestos"

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT
tabbies
UC-247

On 21 March 1962, an Industrial Hygiene Report, i.e., 62-IH-1-6-1, identified the existence of a hazard to health in the Construction Insulation Shop during such times as when insulation blocks manufactured by the Johns Manville Company are being fabricated with exhausted band saws. It was recommended at that time that 18" x 36" x 4" "Thermobestos" insulation blocks* should not be fabricated with the existing equipment unless --

(a) The atmospheric dust problem could be reduced to below 20 mppcf of air through the use of ventilation, etc., or

(b) The producer of this product begins manufacturing an insulation block which will not release upon fabrication with a band saw, dust concentrations in excess of 20 mppcf of air.

In accordance with these recommendations, the Construction Insulation Shop discontinued almost immediately the purchase of "Thermobestos" insulation blocks.

On 20 July 1962, a second Industrial Hygiene Report, i.e., 62-IH-2-C-1, was submitted subsequent to an evaluation of three new insulation materials supplied by the Johns Manville Company. This report concluded that these materials were improved over the original. However, the dust concentrations produced upon fabrication of these insulation blocks were substantially in excess of the recommended safe concentrations of 20 mppcf of air. Therefore, the recommendations contained in this report remained exactly as those stated in the initial report of March, 1962.

On 20 November 1962 the author was contacted by Mr. D. R. Matheny, General Foreman of the Insulation Shop, who stated that three Johns Manville representatives, i.e., Messers. F. E. Saxer, N. Cordon, and H. E. Kaufman, were present and had requested a meeting with the Plant Industrial Hygienist. This meeting was held in the lobby of Building 2, at which time Mr. Saxer produced the accompanying copy of portions of a report submitted by the Johns Manville Industrial Hygiene Laboratory located at Manville, N.J. Mr. Saxer stated that, in accordance with this report, they were not able to produce results which agreed with those contained in the reports submitted by this department. Therefore, they were concerned and interested in learning if their methods of reproducing

*The Johns Manville trade name for their insulation blocks

Deposition Exhibit No 5
5-14-87

our environmental conditions, sampling and evaluating the dust concentrations contained therein were subject to question. At this point he stated also that this conclusion was promoted on the basis of their analysis of the atmospheric dust conditions produced by their competitors product, (i.e., Kaylo or Item # 5AT in the report) which in no way agreed with the data submitted in the Industrial Hygiene Report - IH-62-I-G-I.

It was explained at this point, that this department's interest in this problem is always confined solely to the environmental conditions as they effect the health of our workers, and that no part of the investigation should be construed as an attempt to arbitrarily promote the use of one company's product over that of another.

Upon completion of this statement, Mr. Saxer proposed that Mr. D. R. Matheny and the Plant's Industrial Hygienist make a trip to Manville, New Jersey, at Johns Manville's expense and at a time selected by Union Carbide. This visit would be for the specific purpose of observing, scrutinizing and comparing their method of atmospheric dust evaluation with that as utilitized by the Institute Plant's Industrial Hugiene Department. It was Mr. Saxer's opinion that such a visit would permit a more positive approach to the problem and remove the possibility of misunderstandings, etc., that results from written correspondence. At this point, Mr. Saxer was assured that there would be no personal objection on my part to the performance of such a service. However, a proposal of this nature would have to be submitted to the Plant Manager, Mr. L. N. Dickinson, through appropriate channels before a final decision could be made.

In conclusion, it should be stated that a phone call was received from Mr. F. G. Comerford of Design and Construction on the morning of 21 November 1962, who requested that he be brought up to date on this specific problem. This request was immediately satisified both by verbal explanation and by the promise that copies of both reports, i.e., 62-IH-I-G-I and 62-IH-2-G-1, would be mailed to him immediately. Mr. Comerford further stated that we should not back down on our requirements, but that it probably might be wise to consider their proposal in light of the many ramifications of the problem as it affects the whole company structure, i.e., purchasing, sales, manufacturing, etc.

Very truly yours,

Robert E. Peele

Robert E. Peele
Industrial Hygienist

REP:gh

Enclosure