Monsanto

FROM (NAME & LOCATION) C. Paton - St. Louis General Offices

DATE November 26, 1969

SUBJECT NCR/AROCLOR 1242 replacements

REFERENCE

cc J. R. Darby - Res.JFQ
J. Garrett - JGARR
J. K. Sears - Res. JFQ
J. E. Smith - JSMIT
W. F. Waychoff/K. A. Wells

TO : [redacted]

I discussed NCR with Pete Maier today.

1. Monsanto Plasticizer Line

In March/April we submitted 22 standard plasticizers to NCR for evaluation. They were all esters with the exception of HB-40 and represented each of the ester classes we produce. They were all turned down by NCR on the basis of "no color development". In the case of DMP and HB-40 this conflicts with the data developed by Kern. He has obtained color development on clay. (NCR now uses PVMMA resins from GAF and have looked at Monsanto's EMA resins).

Pete will try to get more specific answers as to why our standard plasticizers failed and will also try to get us PVMMA resin for our work.

2. MIBP vs. DPO

NCR says that MIBP has gone through 90% of the tests required. Now they will re-check to confirm their initial findings. They have also studied DPO (diphenyl oxide). MIBP and DPO are the best candidates found so far.

DPO has an odor problem and is difficult to retain within the capsule but light stability and color development are very Good. Apparently NCR has been quoted under 30¢/lb. on DPO.

3. NCR's Questions on MIBP

NCR wants to know:

a. Do we have facilities to produce MIBP now? (Attn. JES)

b. What is the toxicity of MIBP (monoisopropyl biphenyl)? (Attention Jack Garrett)

c. Can biphenyl be aromatically substituted? (Attn. MWF)

We will need answers to these questions before you and Jack Garrett visit Dayton on December 16. Thank You.

CP/cs C. PATON