

FOSECO, INC.



*See new
Profax
Proflex
Ferrux*

INTER-COMPANY AND INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

TO: R. C. Phoenix

FROM: E. J. Jago

DATE: April 4, 1972

SUBJECT: TOXICITY OF PROFAX, PROFLEX & FERRUX INGREDIENTS

Introduction

Recently much has been written in various memoranda about the potential danger of asbestos and the necessity of removing it from our insulator formulations. I do not believe, however, that anyone who has been involved has really realized the magnitude of the problems created by O.H.S.A. (1970) and the E.P.A. for it is not simply asbestos that is the problem but possibly every ingredient that we currently employ in our Profax, Proflex and Ferrux formulations. For any dust or fume producing material are now suspect and every chemical substance are ultimately to be controlled.

Problem

Of immediate concern to the SMPD Division are the federal regulations recently issued governing asbestos (state laws already exist in New York) and which could outlaw products containing more than 5% asbestos after 1 June 72. Also of immediate concern are the rules now being proposed for silica which are proposed to become effective in December 1972. These two ingredients make up 80 to 90% of the material currently formulated into Profax and Proflex.

Of less immediate concern are regulators controlling dust and fume emission which could make Ferrux as currently formulated obsolete within the next 12 months.

As the Profax, Proflex, Ferrux heading products make up a total of \$12,000,000 of Foseco sales it obviously is imperative to get action on alternative materials immediately.

Actions

Unfortunately, the staff available in the U.S.A. has been almost entirely engaged in putting out fires in the manufacture of satisfactory Proflex for many months and no major effort has been devoted to the toxicity problem.

Recently a re-shuffle of the staff made it possible to reopen a Ferrux program and a portion of this will be concerned with the development and exploitation of low fume, low toxicity materials. In this work we are leaning heavily on F.I.L. and the F.P. Division and we expect to have the initial products out for field test during April. However, satisfactory con-

FOSECO 1968

FDS-00-0000003646

R. C. Phoenix
April 4, 1972

Page 2

clusion of such a project cannot be hoped for unless one man can devote 100% of his time to the project for at least 6 months.

The problem of asbestos in Proflex and Profax was tackled a year or so ago before the labor crisis developed and the rudiments of a Proflex formulation (contains 1% of asbestos) were developed. Many difficulties remain to be overcome, however, as the products lack green strength, tend to have a low flexural strength and have a lower heat resistance. In addition, the formulations still contain silica. No additional work can be performed on this project on a continuing basis until at least one man can be employed. As the magnitude of the project is enormous it really requires 1-1/2 or 2 men devoting to it if the deadline of December 1972 for an asbestos and silica free product is to be reached.

Aid has been solicited from F.I.L. and (F.S.) Ltd. on the Profax project but as yet nothing of value has materialized. At this stage, it looks as though the work will ultimately have to be done in our own laboratory by workers adding to the data obtained from overseas.

Proposed

1. To increase laboratory effort immediately by 1 laboratory technician (already being processed) and 1 chemist (this man would be chosen so that in a year or so he could be moved elsewhere).
2. Send D. Butler to U.K. as soon as possible to work with Mellows, etc., for 3 weeks to assimilate formulation data.
3. To continue all out effort on Ferrux using R.B.R. and the new laboratory technician.
4. To push for non asbestos and silica free products using D.B.B. and the new chemist.



E. J. Jago

EJJ/btb

cc: W. C. Sutherland

FDS-00-0000023647

FOSECO 1969