



INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

DATE: May 8, 1973

TO: Mr. W. A. Kalbone

LOCATION: Akron

FROM: G. W. Green

LOCATION: Tigard

SUBJECT: WALL TEXTURE

cc: Mr. B. Hollingsworth - Wilmington E/O
 Mr. J. D. Rauch - Akron ← THIS COPY FOR
 Mr. R. D. Meyer - Portland
 Mr. R. V. Pavero - Marietta
 Mr. K. M. Brown - Acme

C
O
P
Y

This is in answer to your letter of April 30, 1973, concerning your experience with the new wall texture formula. Thank you for taking time to check out the material so thoroughly and sending me your comments. I will try to answer them as soon as possible.

1. Lumps when mixed: This product is a little more difficult to mix than the casein formula. However, this has not been a problem in any of the field tests we have run where the applicators were using mechanical mixers. When mixing by hand it is easier to mix it somewhat heavy (say at 70 parts water), then thin it down to a sprayable mix.
2. Coverage: The coverage in West Palm Beach and Tulsa were equal to or superior to the old formula according to the applicator. These were both spray applications. We haven't had any field experience with brush or roll application as yet.
3. Spray problems: Spraying properties have been the most difficult part of the reformulation. Many field trials have been run on formulations that did not suit the applicators particularly those who use a "Glover" spray machine. We purchased these machines for the purpose of formulating which it will spray. We have spent many hours spraying with it, and also a Goldblatt hopper gun. Compared to our competitive materials, our casein material, and experimental formulas. We have also done considerable field testing of formulas that did not work. However, this formula sprayed very well in the Glover machine, very well in the hopper gun at all pressures down to 20 psi and very well in Tulsa and West Palm Beach. These contractors use very different spray techniques. In Tulsa they shoot a heavy splatter or heavy orange peel. In West Palm Beach they spray a very fine orange peel sprayed almost in a mist. He sprayed it as is and with paint added to it.

May 8, 1973

4. **Watering** out: This formula does tend to settle **overnight** and a layer of water forms on top. **However**, it is easily remixed, and I don't believe it will be a serious problem.

This of course is a completely different formula, since it contains no casein or asbestos, and so there may be some differences in some of the properties. But since there is a savings of about 35% per bag in raw material costs, we want to get this on the market as soon as possible. We no doubt will get various reactions from different markets and we may need to make adjustments to suit as many customers as possible. So please get the first batch out as quickly as you can.


G. W. G.

GAG:jg



GEORGIA-PACIFIC

INTERNAL COMMUNICATION

DATE: May 8, 1973

LOCATION: Akron

LOCATION: Tigard

TO: Mr. J. L. Smith
FROM: Mr. J. L. Smith
SUBJECT: Bedding and topping

On April 30, I believe the following information was received:

1. The bedding and topping with the following specification number 7891 R & D 347.

2. We are not in a position to formulate a formula for bedding and topping. a) It is impossible to formulate a formula for bedding and topping resulting from field tests. The formula is not in the requirements that we try to formulate. b) Any further changes to either product will require loss of your valuable time.

3. You can use your own judgment in the type of bag to use. We would like to see if we could successfully introduce this product in the bag. It would be a way to utilize the bags that we have on hand.

4. The formula for a clay adhesive based product. It would be compatible with your triple duty or Ready Mix filler but not with your grain product.

5. The specification for product 4928 is raw material specification number 277 (dated 12/13/70).

6. We are in the process of investigating raw material test results for material. We will send the specification out as soon as it is finished. The specification will set the following standards for acceptance:

SGP 0006817

May 8, 1973

a) Particle Size:	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Average</u>
-50 mesh	100.0%	--
-100 mesh	99.9	99.99%
-200 mesh	99.5	99.90
-325 mesh	99.0	99.70

b) Material should be free of grit and hard lumps.

c) Color: light cream (variable)

It should also be noted that in addition to replacement of asbestos, there should have an approximate raw material cost of \$.35 per lb. for the double topping.

Would be happy to answer any further questions.

W. N. G.
W. N. G.

W. N. G.