

WESTINGHOUSE
ELECTRIC & MANUFACTURING COMPANY
East Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

COPIES TO MESSRS: F. N. Williams
H. F. Weaver
F. A. Barker
J. Clegorn
H. G. Krumrich (2)-
Plant B
L. A. Watt - St. Louis
F. E. Hubbard

November 27, 1942

Dr. R. L. Jenkins, Director of Research
Phosphate Division
Monsanto Chemical Company
Trenton, Michigan

Dear Dr. Jenkins: SUBJECT: Inerteen
Purchasing Department
Specification No. 6935-1

We are pleased to have received your letter of November 21 under this subject in which you discuss several points in connection with our specifications covering Inerteen. We have the following comments in connection with our tentative Purchasing Department Specification No. 6935-A, dated September 17, 1942.

We are agreeable to changing the specification to call for 600 pounds of Inerteen per drum rather than specifying the Inerteen by weight. We suggest that the specification allow a plus or minus variation of five pounds of Inerteen per drum as a satisfactory commercial variation.

Since the possibility of obtaining drums in accordance with our specification is rather remote at the present time, we will agree to have you furnish the type of drum you have been using for several years. In connection with this particular type of drum which you are using, we are wondering if there would be any objection from the I.C.C. to your shipping the drums upended, that is, with the bungs on the bottom. The purpose of this would be to avoid the possibility of water getting into the Inerteen through the gasket on the bung. When the drums are shipped with the bungs on the top of the drum, quite often the bungs are covered with water and it is entirely possible for the water to get into the Inerteen.

We, of course, realize that there is a possibility of some of the Inerteen being lost due to leakage at the bung if the drums are shipped in an inverted position, however, we feel that the loss of the Inerteen would not be as serious a matter as contamination with water.

If this idea seems feasible and also provided that the I.C.C. has no objections, the drums should be marked in such a manner that the carriers would handle and ship them in the inverted position.

(Over)

DSW 331014

STLCOPCB4077658

November 27, 1942

It will, of course, be satisfactory to mark the net content of the drums in pounds rather than gallons.

We will delete the reference to the Westphal balance in connection with the determination of specific gravity. This deletion will permit determining the specific gravity by any acceptable method, including the hydrometer method you use.

Now in regard to the other proposed changes in our tentative Specification 6935-A, we would like to have your approval or comments on the following proposed revisions.

We would like to change the acidity of the Inerteen to 0.005 mg NaOH/gram in place of the present figure of 0.01. The test reports which we have available indicate that this value can be easily met and we would very much prefer the lower value as the specified limit. In connection with the determination of acidity, we are agreeable to adopting the Monsanto method in place of the method now given in the specification.

We would like to change the test method for determining the presence of free chlorides as given in Section 4 of the specification from the A.S.T.M. method to the Monsanto method which, we assume, will be agreeable to you. It would be our intention to continue to call for the Inerteen to be free of free chlorides.

We would propose a change in viscosity from 46 - 49 seconds to 45-49 seconds. This change is being suggested on the basis of your test reports of 1940, 1941, and 1942.

We believe that it would be desirable to have the Inerteen meet the electrical resistivity test specified in Section 11 without treating it as specified in Section 11 (c). With that in mind, we propose the elimination of Section 11 (c) from the specification.

We plan on eliminating entirely Section 13 of the specification which provides for a power factor determination at 100 C, 60 cycles and 20 - 30 volts per mil.

The heating loss as now specified in Section 14 is set at less than 0.4 per cent. We propose reducing this figure of 0.4 to 0.04 per cent.

Will you please study these proposed changes and let us have your approval or comments on them at your earliest convenience.

Yours very truly,

J. R. Becker
Eng. Labs. & Stds. Dept., 11-1
JRB:MC

Materials Engineer

AB-12-2-42

*Note: This has already been eliminated in our tentative draft.—R.L.J.

DSW 331015

STLCOPCB4077659