Monsanto

FROM (NAME & LOCATION) W. A. KUHN - ST. LOUIS

DATE JANUARY 6, 1970

SUBJECT HB-40/AROCLORS

REFERENCE

cc: R. A. BAXTER - RUABON
H. S. BERGEN
H. N. DAHLSTROM - BRUSSELS
D. B. HOSMER
F. MACDONALD - NEWPORT

TO : E. V. WEEKES - BRUSSELS

Regarding your questions and comments on the above subject in your letter dated 12 December 1969..... This will describe the situation as I understand it after Norbert Dahlstrom's visit here last month.

- The manufacture of HB-40 by MCL still looks appealing and as concluded by the Industrial Organic Chemicals Business Group (MCL), we should proceed to present a C.A.R.

- Evaluation of the profitability of producing solid Aroclor by MCL is appropriate.

- Evaluation of the best means for expanding liquid Aroclor capacity at Newport or Antwerp is also appropriate. We will probably not, however, need to make a decision on expansion for nine months to a year. During this period we will be continually reassessing our position vs. the wildlife problems.

- We have made no specific studies relative to continuous vs. batch Aroclor operations. I would doubt in the 20-40 M pound/year range that there is any significant advantage in favor of continuous operation either in terms of capital investment or manufacturing cost. This should, however, be looked at on a case basis to ferret out any possible labor, maintenance, or other cost savings. Of interest, our original decision to go continuous at Anniston had more to do with a customer relationship than with the economics involved. One obvious disadvantage in converting to a continuous operation is the reduced versatility for producing small quantities of Aroclors other than Aroclor-1242.

W. A. KUHN

ms

DSW 200488

STLCOPCB4058552