

SALESMAN'S REPORT ON COMPLAINT

COMPLAINT #46-69

DISTRICT CINCINNATI #20

INVOICE TO: NORWOOD HEIGHTS SUPPLY COMPANY			AT: CINCINNATI, OHIO		
CONSIGNEE TO: CINCINNATI CONSTRUCTION SPECIALTY CO.			AT: FT. THOMAS, KY.		
ORDER NO.: 20073	TERRITORY 341	DATE ENTERED:	DATE SHIPPED: 9/1/67	CAR NO./OR MOTOR CARRIER: Umthou	
PLANT: Ft. Dodge	MATERIAL: Audicote Acoustical Plaster			ROUTE: Truck	
JOB: Andrew Jergens Company		LOCATION: Cincinnati, Ohio		CONTRACTOR: Cinti. Const. Spec. Co.	
NATURE OF COMPLAINT: Dusting					DATE MAT'L WAS USED 10-67
SAMPLES SENT? ☐ NO / ☒ YES, SENT TO Ft. Dodge		DATE SAMPLES SENT 6/11/69	HOW SENT (PP, EXP, ETC) Mailed w/ compl.	IDENTIFICATION OF SAMPLES 2 Kraft Envelopes	
IF DAMAGE OR SHORTAGE GIVE TOTAL WEIGHT OF SHIPMENT →		HAS NOTATED FREIGHT BILL/ OR INSPECTION REPORT OF CARRIER BEEN OBTAINED ☐ YES / ☐ NO		IF "NO" EXPLAIN:	
IF SHORTAGE, WERE CAR SEALS INTACT ON ARRIVAL? ☐ YES / ☐ NO		IF DAMAGE STATE AMOUNT OF SALVAGE AND DISPOSITION OF DAMAGED MATERIAL.			
CODE MARKINGS AS REPORTED BY SALESMAN			DID SALESMAN INVESTIGATE? ☐ NO / ☒ YES ON (DATE) 6/10/69		

R. A. Schulze WRITES ON (DATE) 6/11/69 AS FOLLOWS:

Complaint involves alleged "dusting" or "drop out" of Audicote Acoustical plaster from a stairwell installation in the Andrew Jergens Company office building, Cincinnati. We were initially requested to investigate the condition by the plastering contractor, Cincinnati Construction Specialty, who were not, and are not, questioning the quality of our product, but rather were seeking our assistance in eliminating Audicote as a possible cause for the dusting problem reported by the owner. The job was investigated on or about 2/25/69 by large job salesman, R. A. Schulze and G. Brown, Superintendent, Cinti. Const. Spec. The area in question is a 2-story stairwell ceiling finished with Audicote Acoustical Plaster. The floors of the stairway are terrazo, sealed several times since installation, with a green carpet beginning just past the stairway area. People walking on the stairs and onto the carpeted hallways were observed to be leaving a white film on the latter surface. A condition which the architect felt was attributed to the Audicote. Visual examination of the dust or

(Cont'd. -- Pg. 2)

AMOUNT OF CLAIM	BASED ON WHAT?	
COMPLAINT INVESTIGATED BY SIGNATURE OF SALESMAN _____ DATE OF THIS REPORT _____		
APPROVAL TO ISSUE FORMAL COMPLAINT SIGNATURE OF DIST. MANAGER <u>R. A. Schulze</u> DATE <u>6/11</u>		

COMPLAINT #46-69

CINCINNATI DISTRICT #20

film revealed nothing of significance.

Samples were submitted to Ft. Dodge (#1) with that facility reporting an inability to determine the composition of the dust, but discounting the presence of Audicote. (#2) A synopsis of our findings was then transmitted to the Architect. (#3) Subsequently, the Andrew Jergens Company ran Spectograms of Acoustical plaster samples which purported to clearly establish Audicote in dust samples taken from the area in question. (#4) The job was then inspected by quality consultant, R. Ries, who was unable to find any evidence of faulty application or product failure. He did report minor scars in the ceiling, apparently from people touching the surface while using the stairs. (#5)

Nonetheless, the spectrogram report run by the Andres Jergens Company has convinced that firm, together with the General Contractor and the owner that our product has failed and they are now looking to us for correction.

Additional samples have been obtained from the job and are submitted concurrently-- we must have a more definite laboratory report on the composition of the sample, so that we may handle this complaint from a position of positive knowledge as to whether or not Audicote is involved.