P. Grace 71

DIESEL CONSTRUCTION
A DIVISION OF CARL A. MORSE, INC.
1133 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS · NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036
(212) 581-0300

Document Number 2067

May 18, 1971

Construction Products
Division of the W.R. Grace & Company
51 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10017

Attention: [illegible]
Mr. Tom S. Egan

Gentlemen:

The writer attended your seminar at the Plaza Hotel on Friday, May 14, 1971. It was realized before the start of the seminar that this was to be a sales pitch. However, it was not realized how sales oriented this would be.

The following discussions, or lack thereof, were found to be distressing to the writer. We realize that a question and answer period was offered, but felt some of these questions were too provocative for your carefully put together program. Listed below are some of our thoughts:

Right to Privacy

1. We disagree completely with the idea that spandrels shou be done in some other material than spray fireproofing. Tho we realize the loss of the spandrel would mean a very small in the sale of Monokote K, it would in truth change the ent economic picture of the use of sprayed-on materials. The id not spraying the spandrels has been suggested by the engine employed by the City but has been strongly resisted by our and others who recognize its true important. Your inclusion this idea in your program is bound to give us continued pro with the City officials.

Hills

2. During the film, it was noted that your men were not we any form of respirators. We are sure that you are aware th State of New York is taking strong legal action against ma the applicators insisting that their men wear not only the viously approved respirators but airline respirators.

We know of no research done by your firm or other spray fi proofing firms in this matter. We are sure you are aware t the State is successful that it will be very difficult to any manpower to do the work. We would be particularly int in any research your firm, or any of the other manufactur

done to overcome this major problem. At present, Mt. Sinai's laboratory continues to recommend the use of a special respirator which has never received a BSA from the State of New York nor has it ever been put into manufacture by anyone. It is still a hand made unit.

3. In your discussions on application of your material to painted or unpainted surfaces, you failed to mention the fact that many paints do in fact inhibit a bond between your material and the steel. It is our experience that the applicator is fully qualified to warn us when the steel is too far corroded for his material to bond but cannot warn us if the paint is not of the proper type. The writer has never seen any written material by your or any other firm on which paints are good and which are to be avoided.

Items 3 and 4

4. Your material provides us with a special problem in cleaning. The bond is so good and the material so slippery that it is extremely difficult to clean up the overspray. What research has been done on possible treatment to the floor or in special devi such as vacuums to pick up this material? As you are aware, par of the City regulation requires the use of vacuum cleaners. To date, no one has developed a vacuum cleaner that can meet their specifications.

5. Has an Underwriter Laboratory approval and a BSA ever been obtained on application of your material by hand? While it is that it is more difficult to remove MonoKote than the sprayed fiber, it is also true that the sprayed fiber is considerably easier to patch. It has been our company policy (and a City la that any of the material removed must be replaced. Obviously, would be silly to bring back all of the equipment and mess of cementitious product within a finished or almost finished spac

6. In your program, you also avoided the issue of sealants, ma stating that they should be used if the local governing agenci required them. The City of New York has taken the position tha this material is required simply because there is no data on slough-off of materials versus air velocities. It is quite possible and probable, that this entire program of sealants i not needed.

7. Should sealants actually be required, proper ones should developed along with the right equipment for applying it.

8. We recognize that this program was basically oriented to architects; therefore, it is understandable that you place the entire responsibility for inspection upon the general contractor and owner. With the "other materials" inspection has been placed in the hands of the structural engineer.

9. Last, is the problem of enclosure. Your statements that all the buildings were to be totally enclosed during the winter were nothing short of ludicrous. They made no recognition of the fact that many of the trades have to work at the perimeter of the building and would insist that these enclosures be left down so that they may perform their work. We are not aware of any study done by any of the manufacturers of sprayed-on material on how to construct these enclosures. The design of the tarpulins has been left at a hit-or-miss proposition with no recommendations from the people who are probably benefiting most economically.

To summarize, your company, and all of the others, have directed all of your attentions to the improvement of your products but not at all to the ancillary problems that it develops. You must remember that your material is applied in a relatively fractionalized industry, no member of which is financially equipped involved to do the necessary research and development that is just as necessary as improving your product.

Very truly yours,

DIESEL CONSTRUCTION

Arthur Rusbaum

AR/igl