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

December 2, 1942

TO St. Louis

ATTENTION Mr. R. S. Weatherly

I am attaching hereto copies of a tentative draft of specifications for Inerteen 6935-1 (Aroclor 1254).

This draft is based upon (1) a rough draft submitted by Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company at the meeting in East Pittsburgh, (2) a subsequent corrected rough draft which I circulated to the Anniston Operating Department and Analytical Laboratory and to Plant B, and (3) correspondence with J. R. Becker, Materials Engineer, Engineering Laboratories and Standards Department of Westinghouse.

The new draft, attached, is corrected in accordance with suggestions made by Messrs. Weaver and Barker, except that the pour point is retained at 8° to 12°C instead of 8° to 14°C as suggested. Personally, I do not think a widening of pour point limits can be justified in view of the many years that the old limit has applied, and I believe a suggestion to widen the limits would be looked upon with suspicion by Westinghouse. I am open to further suggestions on this point.

The specification of 0.02% for heating loss in the rough draft circulated to Anniston and Plant B was an error of decimal point, like the figure of 0.01 on page 6 of Trip Report No. 214. These figures should have read 0.2% and 0.1% respectively. The Westinghouse chart shows no lots of Aroclor 1254 having greater than 0.10% heating loss since October 1937. Mr. Barker's records show a range of 0.04% to 0.13%. Therefore, it would seem that the 0.2% could be met with ease, and it would seem advisable to accede to Westinghouse's request to tighten up on this specification in view of their special interest in this item. However, we certainly cannot agree to the new limit of 0.04% recently suggested by Mr. Becker. Again, I am open to further suggestions.

I am attaching copy of the last letter received from Mr. Becker, dated November 27, 1942.

I will clear with Mr. Sanderlin the matter of shipping the drums upside down, at least as far as the ICC regulations are concerned, but I would like to have your comments on this unusual request. If approved, we should insert a paragraph on this subject in the specifications.

Mr. Becker's suggestion that we reduce the limit on acidity from 0.01 to 0.005 seems a little out of line. I have left the specification as 0.01, but I would like to have the comments of those who receive copies of this memo. In this connection Trip Report No. 214, covering the conference in East Pittsburgh, should be consulted (see Page 4 of that report).

(Over)

DSW 331012

STLCOPCB4077656

Becker's suggestion of changing the viscosity limits (actually widening them from 46-49 seconds to 45-49 seconds) seems out of line, and I think we had better retain our standard limits of 44.5-47.5 seconds which are in accordance with Anniston control specifications and the Plant B specification of August 27, 1941 for Product 246.

I have received no comments from Plant B on the rough draft which was sent them on November 10. I believe that agreement of Mr. Watt and of Mr. Krummrich should be had before the specifications are written in final form, even though Plant B may not make Aroclor 1254. If this is correct, I would appreciate it if you will get their comments and corrections to the attached draft so that we can make any necessary changes and submit a draft to Westinghouse for the latter's early approval.

R. L. Jenkins

RLJ:AB

DSW 331013

STLCOPCB4077657