

3. Challenge the decision in court in order to either maintain the 2 f/cm^3 or to buy us additional time for the purpose of developing new materials.

Since alternative number one still is not ready for application in all product lines and all part numbers, and since alternative number two will be prohibitively expensive, it appears to me that only alternative number three is viable. It is estimated that taking this issue to court may cost in excess of one million dollars. This cost can be split between the members of the Asbestos Information Association, thereby reducing the expenditure to each corporation to a maximum of approximately \$60,000.

Within the AIA the board of directors is currently doing its homework towards the implementation of this solution. However, should the limit be established at somewhere around 0.5 f/cm^3 , I need to have the authority to commit our corporation to this amount of money on fairly short notice.

As I said, this is only the contingency plan and, for the time being, it looks as if OSHA has its hands full with the benzene ruling. We might, therefore, have enough time to develop an asbestos-free formula for all product lines. Your immediate comments to the above will be sincerely appreciated.



B. Iwarsson

BI:jt

SPNY 004783