

FOSECO, INC.

INTER-COMPANY AND INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE



TO: H. D. Shephard

FROM: A. G. Santighian

DATE: September 28, 1973

SUBJECT:

During the week the following developments occurred:

Monday, September 24th, we tried 1-Pc tops using EP-5465 recipe (non-asbestos, non-paper). The run was smooth; no technical problems. The operator's observation was; the slurry is faster than Profax 31. His observation is correct; the total cycle time is 5-8% shorter than Profax 31's cycle time. The tops fit well (checked by Quality Control), and during the experiment the scrap rate was 0%. The tops were already shipped to Republic-Canton and the salesman reported that all tops fit all right.

Also we have started, Tuesday, September 25th, two Mark III machines employing the tool #341 for Armco-Middletown and #718 for Armco-Ashland.

During four day's run, we had only two minor problems: Cavitations due to more arquad added by accident into the slurry and/or less water content than the recipe calls for.

The plant procedure of correcting such a problem occurred to Profax 31 (by adding Kerosene) and this does not help. We instruct the plant people to pay more attention on arquad content and immediately to send over another batch having less arquad.

The second problem is foam forming which in fact is correlated with the above faults (more arquad and/or less water) and could be corrected by the procedures which were mentioned above.

In a telephone conversation with Kurt Tober, he stated that the new recipe is comparable in productivity with Profax 31, even slightly better.

Bearing the above in mind, the main problem with EP 5465 recipe is the raw material's cost. In that respect, taking into consideration the new price for 177A (18.6 c/lb.), the raw material's cost for Profax 31, EP 5465 (using XJ579) and EP 5465 (using 177A) will be:

continued . . .