FILE NAME: Rogers Corporation (ROG)

DATE: 1976

DOC#: ROG012

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Complaint & Response for Unsatisfactory Product Delivery

Johns-Manville

Correspondance Interne
Internal Correspondence

A-To: H.A. Boisclair - Englewood Cliffs Date: August 13, 1976

De-From: R.D. Mallory - A.F.D. Asbestos

Copies: J.E. Connor - Denver 2S
R.J. Hattersley - Kingston

Sujet: ROGERS CORPORATION
Subject: CONDITION OF ARRIVAL

Further to our recent phone conversations, we have now instigated a complaint investigation into the reasons for the shipment of PB#5 in Maislin van 13190 on EA-3789 shipped July 28/76 being in such poor condition on arrival at the customers plant that he refused to accept it in this condition. As soon as the results of this investigation are known, you will be advised.

D.G. Lamarche /for
R.D. Mallory

RDM/ac

JOHNS-MANVILLE — CALL REPORT — ASBESTOS FIBRE DIVISION

Date of Call 8/18/76 Territory NCR Date of Report 8/23/76

Account	Names	Persons Interviewed Titles
Name Rogers Corp.	C. Welchman	Buyer
Dept.		
Address Rogers Corners	Ed Bevierey	Method Engr.

Subject of Call service

Customer's Product Paper - Plastics

J.M. Product & Grades 5-6- Pap 5

J-M Action Requested

Competitive Situation and/or Sales Resistance

Pertinent Data Last T/L Pap 5 shipped Aug 9th - received to-day. Marsh Van 14060; WH 9 days? Load in very good condition. Releasing another T/L for end of Sept.

R.M. - Bags were NOT glued. Glue specified. Previous T/L rejected; accepted after Marsh cleaned it.

R.M. Rogers would accept shrink wrapped units if we could supply.

J.C.C. - 1977 - Pap 5 at Rogers will remain approx same as 1976. 5K14 and 7R05 may increase at Manchester. Carl will keep us informed of forecast shortly.

Rogers very serious about OSHA regulations and "DUST"

cc: J.C.C.
F.L.P.

Signed R.A. Bassett Jr.

AFD. 3

CRMC-RogersCorp-000079

H. A. Boisclair - Englewood Cliffs

September 3, 1976

R. D. Mallory - AFD Asbestos

J. E. Connor - Ken Caryl Ranch

ROGERS CORPORATION - PAPERBESTOS #5 SHIPMENTS

Further to your call report of August 23, 1976, we can comment as follows:

1. We are investigating why the Van #14060, which left here on August 9th, took 9 days to get to the customer. As soon as we have the answer to this, you will be advised.

2. A formal complaint investigation is now underway into why the bags were not glued correctly in Van #14060 on RA-4375 shipped August 9th. As soon as the results of this investigation are known you will be advised.

3. At the present time shrink wrapping is not available for units which are in the pinwheel pattern, which is 40" x 40", rather than 40" x 48". The shrink wrapping machine and the shrouds are not set up to handle this type of unit. As a matter of fact, we are trying to eliminate the pinwheel pattern as a method of shipping. In order to be shrink wrapped they would have to take the regular 5-bag pattern and on a pallet. From my previous conversations with Carl Welshman, I am sure they are not prepared to do that at this time. As a matter of fact it was on their insistance that we went back to the pinwheel pattern. So for the present time they will have to stick with their present loading without shrink wrapping. We will make every effort to see that these units are properly glued.

The Industrial Engineering Department has a study underway at the present time on a stretch wrap unit. If this unit is brought in for a trial, it is possible that we could stretch wrap the units, as the 40" x 40" dimension should not cause any problems with this type of machine. I will keep you advised on the progress of this project.

R. D. Mallory

RDM/bg

CRMC-RogersCorp-000077