

Bestwall Gypsum Company

FOR Paoli Lab

DATE 10 3 58

FROM Grand Rapids

OFFICE

ATTENTION OF Mr. J. R. Watt

SUBJECT Carey's 7-D - Asbestos

ANSWERING YOURS 8 29 58

Dictated BY E. Reverski - mk

CC: Mr. A. H. Ten Elshof - Grand Rapids
Mr. J. I. Trolley - Ardmore

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

GP-487

The bag of new 7-D Asbestos was received September 16, 1958. On September 22, 5 charges of acoustical plaster were made. On the 5th and last charge, the new 7-D Asbestos was used. On September 25 we sent a 40 lb. sack of both the 4th and 5th charges for your evaluation to the Paoli Lab along with a 4 lb. sample of the new asbestos.

Screen tests on the asbestos were:

	Thru	8 Mesh	16 Mesh	30 Mesh	50 Mesh	100 Mesh
New 7-D Asbestos		99.9%	92.0%	57.0%	32.8%	23.4%
Stock Asbestos		99.9%	87.2%	50.2%	34.6%	24.8%
Specifications		(100-97)	(98-92)	(65-55)	(40-26)	(30-18)

T.C. of New Asbestos - 332 cc

T.C. " Stock " - 340 cc

The color of the new asbestos, both wet and dry, was a shade darker than our regular stock, the latter having a creamier shade when wet. This is the reverse of Carey & Co. opinion.

FOR MR. WATT AND MR. TEN ELSHOF ONLY

T.C.s of regular acoustical plaster was 260 cc and the new asbestos acoustic was 255 cc. The 1st, 4th and 5th batches of acoustical plaster were filled in 1/2 thick in the 16" x 48" test panels at W/DM ratios of 300, 280 and 260 cc respectively. The remainder from each box mix was applied to a 4' x 7' wall panel by trowel 1/2" thick.

#1 Panel at 300 W/DM dried out OK with very small fissuring but one corner sagged out and did not bond. #2 Panel at 280 W/DM came out perfect. This one was troweled extra to smooth out because on darbying, it took up rather fast and dragged. This compacting aided this panel. The 3rd panel with the new asbestos was struck off with the darby while still fluid and was not troweled until the 3rd day. The 3rd panel showed 3 cracks the next day. On the 3rd day these cracks troweled out but reappeared again but they are small and would be covered by spraying the finish coat on.

RECEIVED
PAOLI, PENNSYLVANIA

OCT 6 1958

BESTWALL GYPSUM
COMPANY

SGP 0018916

Paoli Lab

10 3 58

Due to the wood framework etc., the smaller 16" x 48" test panels were passable whereas the 4' x 7' wall panel was not satisfactory at all. The reason the W/DM was cut from 300 to 260 W/DM was because the acoustic was too fluid to be applied by trowel on the wall panel. On the 1st day of standing, the panel sagged and bulged at the bottom and two slight cracks appeared. Water ran down and wetted the concrete floor. At the end of the 3rd day, all panels were troweled. The fissures disappeared on troweling but a 2 square foot area of the wall panel fell out after troweling. (The gypsum base coats were totally dry on all panels). Fissures started to appear on the panel again the 4th and 5th days. By the 6th day, portions adjacent to the fissure started to bulge out. The W/DM was decreased from bottom to top on the panel and the worst fissuring and bulging occurred at the bottom where the W/DM was the highest. The top part of the panel was in passable shape. On the 8th day the panels were still wet so they were fanned and heated. Drying conditions in this basement laboratory are very poor. By today, the 10th day, the panels are all dry and no further fissuring appeared on the rapid drying. Throughout the 10 days of wetness, the base coat did not soften up to any extent.

From the above tests, I feel that the 16" x 48" test panels will not duplicate job conditions and are not severe enough a test. Also, the acoustical plaster should be applied lower than T.C. to handle properly and to stick to the wall. Tinney's report of September 23 showed a W/DM ratio of 365. I don't see how they could apply this with a trowel. Also, Tinney did not state how thick they applied the acoustic. I feel that 1/2" is too thick to apply in one application, especially with poor drying conditions.

The only shipment we have made on acoustical plaster was down to Ohio so have not followed any jobs on it. So far, we have not heard of the plaster in Ohio being reused. It is now 4 months old.

SGP 0018917

Paoli Lab

10 3 58

Grand Rapids

Mr. J. R. Watt

Carey's 7-D - Asbestos

8 29 58

E. Reverski - mk

CC: Mr. A. H. Ten Elshof - Grand Rapids
Mr. J. I. Trolley - Ardmore

The bag of new 7-D Asbestos was received September 16, 1958. On September 22, 5 charges of acoustical plaster were made. On the 5th and last charge, the new 7-D Asbestos was used. On September 25 we sent a 40 lb. sack of both the 4th and 5th charges for your evaluation to the Paoli Lab along with a 4 lb. sample of the new asbestos.

Screen tests on the asbestos were:

	<u>Thru</u>	<u>8 Mesh</u>	<u>16 Mesh</u>	<u>30 Mesh</u>	<u>50 Mesh</u>	<u>100 Mesh</u>
New 7-D Asbestos		99.9%	92.0%	57.0%	32.8%	23.4%
Stock Asbestos		99.9%	87.2%	50.2%	34.6%	24.8%
Specifications		(100-97)	(98-92)	(65-55)	(40-26)	(30-18)

T.C. of New Asbestos - 332 cc

T.C. " Stock " - 340 cc

The color of the new asbestos, both wet and dry, was a shade darker than our regular stock, the latter having a creamier shade when wet. This is the reverse of Carey & Co. opinion.

FOR MR. WATT AND MR. TEN ELSHOF ONLY

T.C.s of regular acoustical plaster was 260 cc and the new asbestos acoustic was 255 cc. The 1st, 4th and 5th batches of acoustical plaster were filled in 1/2" thick in the 16" x 48" test panels at W/DM ratios of 300, 280 and 260 cc respectively. The remainder from each box mix was applied to a 4' x 7' wall panel by trowel 1/2" thick.

#1 Panel at 300 W/DM dried out OK with very small fissuring but one corner sagged out and did not bond. #2 Panel at 280 W/DM came out perfect. This one was troweled extra to smooth out because on darbying, it took up rather fast and dragged. This compacting aided this panel. The 3rd panel with the new asbestos was struck off with the darby while still fluid and was not troweled until the 3rd day. The 3rd panel showed 3 cracks the next day. On the 3rd day these cracks troweled out but reappeared again but they are small and would be covered by spraying the finish coat on.

SGP 0018918

Paoli Lab

10 3 58

Due to the wood framework etc., the smaller 16" x 48" test panels were passable whereas the 4' x 7' wall panel was not satisfactory at all. The reason the W/DM was cut from 300 to 260 W/DM was because the acoustic was too fluid to be applied by trowel on the wall panel. On the 1st day of standing, the panel sagged and bulged at the bottom and two slight cracks appeared. Water ran down and wetted the concrete floor. At the end of the 3rd day, all panels were troweled. The fissures disappeared on troweling but a 2 square foot area of the wall panel fell out after troweling. (The gypsum base coats were totally dry on all panels). Fissures started to appear on the panel again the 4th and 5th days. By the 6th day, portions adjacent to the fissure started to bulge out. The W/DM was decreased from bottom to top on the panel and the worst fissuring and bulging occurred at the bottom where the W/DM was the highest. The top part of the panel was in passable shape. On the 8th day the panels were still wet so they were fanned and heated. Drying conditions in this basement laboratory are very poor. By today, the 10th day, the panels are all dry and no further fissuring appeared on the rapid drying. Throughout the 10 days of wetness, the base coat did not soften up to any extent.

From the above tests, I feel that the 16" x 48" test panels will not duplicate job conditions and are not severe enough a test. Also, the acoustical plaster should be applied lower than T.C. to handle properly and to stick to the wall. Tinney's report of September 23 showed a W/DM ratio of 365. I don't see how they could apply this with a trowel. Also, Tinney did not state how thick they applied the acoustic. I feel that 1/2" is too thick to apply in one application, especially with poor drying conditions.

The only shipment we have made on acoustical plaster was down to Ohio so have not followed any jobs on it. So far, we have not heard of the plaster in Ohio being reused. It is now 4 months old.

SGP 0018919