UNION CARBIDE

INTERNAL CORRESPONDENCE

CHEMICALS AND PLASTICS

120 SOUTH RIVERSIDE PLAZA • CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606

cc: WCT REB HBK

To (Name) M. O. Robinson

Company Latex Plant

Location Tucker, Georgia

Date February 11, 1976

Originating Dept.

Answering letter date

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT UC-543

Copy to

P. E. Bouffard	N.Y.-28
R. A. Daily	N.Y.-33
F. Del Guidice	So. Char.
T. R. Holliger	Atlanta
G. M. Iwaskow	Dallas
R. K. Lopp	Cleveland
R. W. Martin	Jennat - Alsip
H. Mayfield	So. Char.
C. W. McGary	N.Y.-33
C. E. Metten	Long Beach
J. A. Moore	N.Y.-33
E. L. Peterson	N.Y.-27
J. A. Pomeroy	Hackensack
T. L. Proctor	Chicago
D. H. Reed	Garland
J. W. Ross	Atlanta
W. Woolwine	Garland

Subject United States Gypsum Company - Asbestos Free Tape Joint Compounds

RECEIVED
MAR 8 1976
UCC-CALIBRIA

Dear Mo:

Asbestos is on the way out in Tape Joint Compounds. While I cannot speak for all compound producers, U.S. Gypsum will not have any asbestos in their plants by July 1, 1976. They are already virtually asbestos free at New Brighton, Dallas and South Gate. All others are well on the way to converting their customers. With such a sweeping change, we should determine whether UCAR Latex 131 is still the "standard of the industry." As promised during our late December meeting, this letter will cover what I believe will be required in the way of Union Carbide Technical Service.

U.S. Gypsum is convinced that asbestos is through as a material in TJC. The asbestos controversy has reached the consumer level. Articles are appearing in such magazines as Good Housekeeping warning even the home owner to steer clear of asbestos TJC. U.S.G. has assumed that UCAR 131 is still the best latex. They have not run evaluations on other types. Eventually Air Products, DuPont, Celanese, Amsco, RCI, and/or Borden is going to precipitate a review and our 11-16MM #/year of business here could evaporate.

Continued . . . . .

I therefore strongly recommend that we screen our candidates in an asbestos free TJC formulation as soon as possible. The formulation used for screening should be the first one shown in U.S.G.'s patent # 3,891,453 (copy attached). Our Dallas Lab already has the equipment and know how to run the screening tests. Properties to be tested are attached.

Basically, what will eventually replace UCAR 131 is a product that allows USG to 1) lower their overall RMC without affecting performance or 2) improve performance without increasing overall RMC. Improving performance at an increase in cost will not create any excitement.

In addition to screening latexes, we shoule consider their thickener business. They still use over 1MM # of cellulosic thickener (primarily Methocel) here and we do not participate. Since Attogel 40 is a key ingredient in the asbestos free products, we should take a fresh look at what we have to offer now and in the future (2.5, 4.0 M.S., etc).

Mo, it is hoped that this letter will encourage you and the business team to initiate a project in the immediate future. If additional information is required please let me know.

Very truly yours,

A. J. Lyon (E.H.)

A. J. Lyon

AJL/kh
Attachment: