

bcc: F. L. Pundsack
J. H. Swensen

PLAINTIFF'S
EXHIBIT

JM 1084

August 11, 1967

Mr. N. Jerome Rudy, Counsel
Licenses & Litigation
Patent Department
The Dow Chemical Company
Midland, Michigan 48640

Dear Mr. Rudy:

Re: Irradiated Plastic
Pipe Proposal

I am sorry for the delay in answering your queries relative to our final determination of your offer of an option for a license agreement under the patents on the irradiation of plastic pipe. There were many problems that prevented a more prompt response.

Our study into the economics and advantages associated with the irradiation of plastic pipe under your patents has been completed. In relation to the economics, our conclusions are that although we would be able to produce pipe at a lower cost, the savings alone do not justify the extensive modifications to our present manufacturing facilities necessary to produce pipe in this manner. The advantages associated with the resulting products were judged not to be of such significance to justify making the required changes in our manufacturing facilities. Based on these results, it has been concluded that we have no interest in the proposal leading to an eventual license under your patents on the irradiation of plastic pipe.

We appreciated the opportunity to investigate this proposal and are truly sorry that we could not find justification for changing our manufacturing procedures to take advantage of this patented process. If you feel that we have really missed the boat on this idea and think that some benefit could be obtained from a discussion on this subject matter, I am sure that our people would be most willing to meet with you at Midland and explain our reasons for reaching this conclusion.

Very truly yours,

Joseph J. Kelly
Patent Attorney

JJK:adm

MTC 017256