bcc: C. [illegible]
H. R. [illegible]
D. [illegible]

September 7, 197[illegible]

Mr. Gil Hall
Coen Company
1510 Rollins Road
Burlingame, Calif. 94010

Dear Gil:

The information you have on our decision to no longer supply Therminol FR fluid to new systems is correct. We have [illegible] this action because the polychlorinated biphenyl ([illegible]) content of the FR fluid has come under increasing scrutiny of various governmental agencies as an undesirable environmental contaminant.

In some studies certain PCBs have been found to be persistent as an environmental contaminant and, possibly, injurious to certain birds, aquatic and animal life.

A satisfactory alternate for the cement plant fuel oil heating application would be either Therminol 55 or Therminol 66. I have included six copies each of the data on these two fluids.

Therminol 55 has a pour point of -40°F which would make it particularly applicable for the pipeline tracing systems presently using Therminol FR-0 or FR Lo-Temp. The cost of Therminol 55 is nominally $1.55 per gallon F.O.B. Alvin, Texas.

Therminol 66 is recommended as a replacement for Therminol FR-1 in the primary heating loop on these heavy oil burner systems. Therminol 66 has a pour point of -15°F to -18°F and will give comparable heat transfer characteristics to Therminol FR-1 at a lower pumping cost. The cost of Therminol 66 is nominally $3.36 per gallon F.O.B. Anniston, Alabama.

We would be pleased to have our Therminol specialists contact your two customers currently considering Therminol fluid systems -- Ideal Cement Co. of Seattle, Washington and Mobile, Ala. and General Portland Cement Co. of Tampa, Fla. Please call me if and when customer contact is desired. Our Mr. John Kriss

MONS 088021

[illegible] Boston [illegible] Area [illegible] Fla., [illegible] Orlando, Fla., [illegible] Fla., [illegible] Fla., [illegible]