

Georgia-Pacific



INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

DATE: November 16, 1973

TO: Mr. C. W. Lenhert

LOCATION: Tigard

FROM: W. A. Nalbhone

LOCATION: Akron

SUBJECT: ASBESTOS FREE MATERIAL

THIS COPY FOR

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

GP-1663

cc: Mr. J. D. Rauch - Akron
 Mr. J. G. Darmstedter - Akron
 Mr. E. B. Hollingsworth - Wilm.
 Mr. J. B. Moss - Wilm.
 Mr. A. J. Petraline - Wilm.
 Mr. O. E. Burch - Portland
 Mr. D. H. Corkhill - Portland

We are sure everyone is aware of the recent problems Akron has encountered with Asbestos-Free Joint Compound; that is, the apparent loss of consistency over a period of time.

Our trials were conducted in Detroit, Michigan and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Favorable results were obtained from all of these areas and in view of the results we changed over to the replacement.

Our attention was called to the immediate Philadelphia, Pa. area thru a JM account on 10/29/73. At that time we investigated the problem first hand and obtained samples. We were unable to duplicate the problem in the Akron lab, except with the addition of a competitive manufacturers product, which was present on the job sites visited. This lead us to believe there was a contamination problem.

We re-visited the Philadelphia, Pa. area again on 11/6/73 and found additional areas affected and no other manufacturers product on the job. It was not until this time that we were aware the problem was with the compound itself. We stopped all production of Asbestos-Free material on 11/7/73 and reverted to our old formula.

Since our return we have been conducting extensive testing. Our initial thoughts were that the water retention agents were breaking down. Examination of each of the water retention agents indicated that they were perfectly satisfactory for use. In order to investigate further we manufactured a lab batch of All Purpose Compound but without any water retention agents. With the addition of 250HXR to the blank we found no apparent problems. With the addition of A-40 to the blank again no apparent problems developed.

However, when these two agents were added to the blank in correct proportion we observed the break down of consistency. Since we had a sample of M-228 on hand, a water retention agent from a different supplier, the same series of tests were conducted. Our results did not indicate a break down to occur when A-40 and M228 were in combination. From this, our conclusion must be that there is an interaction between A-40 and 250 HXR.

SGP 0007322

It should be noted that we are still unable to duplicate the severity as observed on the job. We are investigating this phenomenon further.

At this time we are replacing asbestos-free material out in the field. Some areas are not encountering problems at this time, so perhaps under certain conditions no apparent loss of consistency will be noted. However, we are trying to return as much of the material in order to avoid problems.

We are also making arrangements to obtain a shipment of the alternate water retention agent, due to arrive in Mid-December. We will continue to run Asbestos formulations in the meantime. In addition, we have under investigation the establishment of a program for re-running the material affected.

We will advise the parties involved when additional information becomes available or if conditions change.

W A N. Malone

W. A. N.

k