PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT USM162

# THE MOUNT SINAI MEDICAL CENTER

ONE GUSTAVE L. LEVY PLACE • NEW YORK, N.Y. 10029

Mount Sinai School of Medicine • The Mount Sinai Hospital

*Environmental Sciences Laboratory*
*Cummings Basic Sciences Building*
*10 East 102 Street*
*New York, New York 10029*
*(212) 650-6173*

July 11, 1983

Mr. Chuck Scarborough
Channel 4 WNBC
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10029

Dear Mr. Scarborough:

Several weeks ago representatives of your television network, in the company of representatives of W. R. Grace and Company, hand delivered to this laboratory a 41 pound bag of Monokote MK-5 spray insulation for the purposes of mineralogical evaluation. This material carried a label which designated it as Lot #2F1. An aliquot of the Monokote was withdrawn from the bag and prepared for analysis by analytical electron microscopy.

This allquot was first passed through a #40-mesh screen for the purpose of separating finer "dust" from dust "clumps". This fraction was then treated with 0.1 molar sulfuric acid to dissolve gypsum. This material was allowed to dry and then prepared for examination with electron beam instrumentation by the "wipe-out" technique. At least 20 grid openings, on 12 grids, were scanned at 13,000X magnficiation. In this area several tremolite fibers were detected and their identities established by means of chemical characterization (energy dispersive x-ray analysis) and with structural characterization as well (selected area electron diffraction). Compared to the other particles present in the preparation, these fibers represent only a trace of the total mass of the aliquot studied. Quantitation of the tremollte content is extremely difficult to establish but it may be estimated to be on the order of ten-thousandths of a percent, or possibly parts per million, by volume.

Several fibers displaying chemistry of titania, and several aluminosilicates were observed as well.

On the basis of this mineralogical characterization, I would consider this material to be virtually free of mineral fiber. The quantities of fiber present in this sample are far less than in the specimen submitted for analysis by Mr. Goldfarb. I have no explanation for this discrepancy.

ANR/d
cc: W. R. Grace
Mr. Goldfarb

Very truly yours,

Arthur N. Rohl Ph.D.
Assistant Professor Mineralogy

EXHIBIT D