IN RE: ABRAMS November 1992

MWB-0006756

From RESEARCH LABS.
WIN 236-7743
Date February 16, 1976
Subject Possible Substitutes for Asbestos

To EAST PITTSBURGH
LRA-Devl Engrg
Mr. P. R. Heller, Mgr.

cc: R E Fox, Res. Dir., Industry Products, Research Labs.

Russ Fox, Research Director for Industry Products, sent me the attached letter for information. As far as I know, we have no program either for the Micarta Division or LRA to find a substitute for asbestos laminates. If the problem is as urgent as indicated in the attached letter, it would be desirable to establish such a program as soon as possible. Please let me know your thoughts on this subject.

George W. Wiener
George W. Wiener
Research Director
Power Systems

Attch.

03114784

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT A-524

IN THE ARMS November 1992

From: Hampton-Micarta Division
Ext. 422-6320
Date January 26, 1976
Subject Asbestos---
44141-AA, AB, AJ, AK

EAST PITTSBURGH - LRA

Mr. H. Elliot

cc: East Pittsburgh/LRA - Mr. J. Botts
cc: East Pittsburgh/LRA - Mr. R. Sexton
cc: East Pittsburgh/LRA - Mr. S. E. Kriss
cc: Pittsburgh/Chatham Center - Mr. W. A. Hice
✓cc: West Mifflin Headquarters - Mr. E. G. Bittner

Confirming our discussion of January 22, 1976.

The more restrictive law governing exposure to asbestos fibers becomes effective July 1, 1976. This will reduce the permitted exposure from 5 fibers per cubic centimeter to 2 fibers per cubic centimeter. There is a proposed standard which, if implemented, will reduce the exposure level to 0.5 fibers per cubic centimeter.

I do not believe that Hampton can meet the requirements effective in July and it is my understanding that LRA would have great difficulty and probably could not reasonably comply. If we both could comply, I have no assurance that our raw material supply will be continued and your Division has received contracts which specifically prohibit the use of asbestos.

Other divisions use asbestos laminates but the corporate impact is by far more pronounced in your slot-wedge application. Since the asbestos problem effects several divisions, Mr. Bittner has requested corporate sponsorship of a R & D program to eliminate its use.

Potential substitute reinforcing materials are available and perhaps some existing laminates would be satisfactory. I believe the major problem at this time is the ability to determine the exact characteristics required of a substitute material.

R & D could be most helpful in determining required parameters, testing and identifying potential replacement materials but we cannot wait to see if a R & D program will be established. Messrs. Botts and Sexton are generating a set of characteristics which they feel are critical. LRA and Micarta will evaluate as best we can to determine desirable limits on these parameters and to evaluate candidates.

We must be prepared to begin using a substitute material by July 1, 1976. Obviously, we must generate as much confidence as possible to substitute a new material with little, if any, application testing or life testing.

I don't believe we can over-emphasize the urgency or critical nature of this situation.

J. A. Harrington, General Manager
MICARTA Division

IN THE ARCHIVES November 1992

MWBB-0006758

03114786