EXHIBIT
USM91

May 8, 1956

Mr. W. L. Anderson
The Stebbins Company
1600 Clough Street
Baltimore 13, Maryland

Dear Mr. Anderson:

This is in reference to the trip to the telephone company building at Eardford Road on May 4, 1956 where you and I discussed a dust complaint with the architect, the contractor's representative and a representative from the telephone company. The concern was that the Cafco Spray, which had been oversprayed with two coats of adhesive, was dusting and that this dust was settling on the telephone equipment.

We do not believe that the Cafco Spray will dust if two coats of adhesive are used, since this adhesive is basically a paint without the pigment, and, as such, seals the surface the same way as paint does.

In looking into the plenum chamber the major portion of dust was found on top of the batts (accoustical pads). This dust was a brownish powder and not like Cafco Spray which would be fibrous and somewhat white in color. It is believed that this is ordinary dust brought in by the fresh air, and by the employees or construction workers.

In discussing the application of Cafco Spray and the completion of construction of the building, the following conditions could have occurred and caused some flaking and dusting of the Cafco Spray:

1. In normal applications the entire room is first sprayed and tamped before applying an overspray of adhesive. This is because some of the fibers will float from the gun and stick to the surface already completed. By later applying the adhesive or paint, these loose fibers are sealed in. I understand that immediately upon completing a bay, the other trades moved in to do their work. You consequently applied the adhesive to each bay before going to the next. In this manner some fibers floated to the finished bays and loosely hung to the surface.

00111

2. The sheet metal workers, in moving the hanger wires, probably damaged the sealed surfaces. This would also occur if the workmen bumped the sprayed areas with the air ducts and their bodies. The electricians also installed conduits and wires at this time.

It would appear that the loose carry-over would eventually drop off, or would seal itself with dirt. The surfaces that were broken during construction may continue flaking, provided the air velocity is sufficiently great.

Perhaps the best way to convince the telephone company that Cafco Spray will not flake is to respray one of the small rooms with an exposed ceiling to take care of any portions damaged by the workmen and to watch this for a period of time. With the main room, the air outlet ducts and the open perforated asbestos panels are fairly close to each other. Here the air velocity will be greatest and perhaps only this section needs respraying. While this is being done the batts in the immediate vicinity can also be brushed off.

Should flakes of Cafco Spray still appear, then the entire ceiling should be sprayed. We do not recommend the use of a vacuum cleaner as this may damage the sealed surfaces.

It is our opinion that if it is a condition of flaking, it will eventually clean itself out, and under ordinary conditions would be of no concern in most buildings. We leave you with a warning that dust will continue to form in the plenum chamber due to normal infiltration, and that Cafco Spray should not be blamed for this condition.

Should you have any further questions, please contact us.

Very truly yours,

COLUMBIA ACOUSTICS AND FIREPROOFING COMPANY

F. M. Stumpf
Vice President - Research

FMS/cfc

BCC - Cafco Office
Mr. J. P. Verbalan