

FILE NAME: RT Vanderbilt (RTV)

DATE: 1974 Oct 31

DOC#: RTV020

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: J-M Memo RE Phone Call with Bob Bacon,
Stating that RTV believes J-M is Attempting to Hurt Their Company



Johns-Manville

Internal Correspondence

To: F. J. Solon, Jr. ✓

Date: Oct. 31, 1974

From: R. P. Carter

Copies: File & C

Subject: TELEPHONE CONVERSATION WITH BOB BACON

Bob Bacon, Assistant to the President, R. T. Vanderbilt Co., called me this morning to advise that our talc labeling decision is causing a "big stink". Vanderbilt's talc customers are very concerned as to why J-M has decided to commence inserting asbestos caution labels on all packages of talc.

R. T. Vanderbilt Co. is of the opinion that it is Johns-Manville's intention to hurt their company. Bob Bacon requested that I bring this matter to the highest level of management within J-M and indicate that Vanderbilt is "very, very upset" with our labeling decision, which they feel will result in "irreparable damage" to them. Bob Bacon indicated that he is going to request Hugh Vanderbilt to personally call a Senior Officer at Johns-Manville to voice their concern.

It has been obvious for some time from my conversations with Bob Bacon that Vanderbilt is very concerned about our talc labeling decision. Without attempting to characterize the motivating factors behind Bob Bacon's frequent telephone conversations to me, their concern may very well be based on a distinct difference between their "corporate conscience" and ours. Certainly, our decision in no way reflects any intention on J-M's part to hurt or destroy Vanderbilt, which is Vanderbilt's current feeling. It is Vanderbilt's opinion that based on John Stender's letter of October 9, 1974, to Hugh Vanderbilt, their talc does not contain asbestiform minerals such as fibrous tremolite. Perhaps that is true, and it is even possible that our talc does not contain asbestiform minerals based on the definition contained in Stender's letter. Basically, Vanderbilt is requesting, if not demanding, that J-M reverse its talc labeling decision based on Stender's letter.

As you will recall, I recommended several weeks ago that we promptly take the following actions in the sequence listed below:

- (1) Reconvene a meeting of the talc labeling group which met early this past Summer to review R&D's analyses of Vanderbilt's Nytal and to determine J-M policy and action in response to Stender's October 9 letter.

CRMC-ELS-004602

F. J. Solon, Jr.

Page 2

Oct. 31, 1974

- (2) Arrange a meeting in Denver between certain R. T. Vanderbilt personnel and appropriate individuals from R&D to review our analyses of Nylal and to inform Vanderbilt officially as to J-M policy and contemplated actions on this matter.
- (3) Meet with Jon May and perhaps other NIOSH personnel to review the details of their study of tremolitic talc and their recommendations to OSHA, which I have been told were incorporated in Stender's letter.
- (4) Arrange for a meeting with OSHA, including Alexander Reis, Dan Boyd and Howard Schulte, to discuss the talc labeling situation, and perhaps point out the error in Stender's definition of "fibrous, asbestiform minerals".

I believe this matter warrants our immediate attention.



R. P. Carter

RPC/emr

CRMC-ELS-004603