E.I.R. EXHIBIT 7
MFR Sullivan
DATE 6-15-93 INSPECTOR [illegible]

PHIFER WIRE PRODUCTS, INC.
P. O. BOX 1700 • TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA 35403-1700 U.S.A.

■ CHARLES E. MORGAN
Executive Vice President and Corporate Counsel

June 2, 1992

Mr. Tim Battersby
The Home Insurance Company
P. O. Box 168
Grand Rapids, MI 49501-1700

Re: Kevin and Carol Chase
Claim Number 262-719639-220

Dear Mr. Battersby:

I was surprised and disturbed to hear that Mr. Chase contends that Phifer Wire was negligent in dealing with the odor problem associated with some of our fiberglass insect screening. I have reviewed our records and spoken with the founders and owners of this company as well as with plastisol engineers and key members of our sales department and, based on that research, will attempt to summarize the history of this problem.

Phifer Wire Products was founded in 1952 and has been the world's leading manufacturer of insect screening for at least the last ten years. We are extremely proud of our record of consistent quality over the past four decades. The cause of the odor coming from the silver-gray screening in the Chases' home was the accelerated deterioration of the product due to ultraviolet sun rays. Prior to 1988, that problem was unknown to this company and even today it is rare.

In January 1988 we changed our plastisol stabilizer in order to make the product environmentally safer. It had never been dangerous to consumers, but the change made disposal of scrap material safer. Though we succeeded in making the product safer, we miscalculated in mixing the plastisol formula for silver-gray screening by not putting enough pigment into it. The result was the material would deteriorate rapidly when exposed to direct sunlight. The odor was associated with this process of rapid deterioration. By the following year, we had had several product failures, discovered their cause, and, in June 1989, improved the plastisol formula (without putting back any dangerous substances), thus ending this problem forever.

Prior to hearing from the Chases, we had replaced deteriorated screening for some homeowners, but not one had complained of any physical effects from the screening (most of these homeowners had the screens mounted on the exterior of their windows so it would be unlikely that the odor would bother them). When I collected some of this defective screen in my office, I noticed that it had

244

E.I.R. EXHIBIT 8
MFR Suntrol
DATE 6-15-93 INSPECTOR

Suntrol, Inc.
3767 East Broadway Road, Suite 6 / Phoenix, Arizona 85040
602 / 437-4431

October 8, 1992

Mr. Charles E. Morgan
Executive Vice President
Phifer Wire Products, Inc.
P. O. Box 1700
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35403 - 1700

Dear Charles:

It has been a week since I mailed a letter to Jerry Liveoak, informing him of the latest problems associated with Phifer's defective sunscreen and there has been no response.

In this letter I suggested that we form a focus group to look at how we can approach this problem together with a plan, rather than the "let's see what tomorrow brings approach" that has been employed to date. I was shocked to learn that Phifer had employee's in Phoenix this week looking in to the situation and they did not even extend us the professional courtesy of a call.

Suntrol's warranty contractor has been waiting for several days now on replacement material for work in process that your distributor, Aluminum Sun Control, could not supply; we have been waiting while other contractors continue to purchase sunscreen. There is and has been plenty of Phifer sunscreen in Phoenix for those contractors not doing warranty work and that are paying for your product. Although ready, willing and able, Suntrol cannot currently provide adequate warranty coverage to their customers, because Phifer and their distributor are not releasing material to cover warranty replacement work in a timely manner. It is obvious that replacing defective sunscreen is very low, or no priority.

Charles, it has always been my position that we take a proactive stance in dealing with this very serious problem. Aside from lost business, there are obvious health problems caused by the volatile emissions of defective sunscreen. Suntrol employees have been made sick by the screen and some of our customers believe that they have been made sick by the "bad smelling screen"; I have talked with people who have been hospitalized due to respiratory problems that they believe were caused by the defective screen!

I do not have the luxury of in-house counsel to look into what possible liabilities face Suntrol, but I am convinced they are out there and I intend to identify them. Phifer must see it differently, since you do not even outfit your own employees in protective clothing or breathing devices when they are inspecting thousands of square yards of defective material. Dr. Crutchfield concludes in his report that "In the absence of information on actual exposure levels to these compounds during handling and processing of the degraded screen material, precautions to preclude excessive skin and respiratory exposures should be taken." The last time I spoke with Joel Hartig, Phifer's employee inspecting the defective material, he was not even aware a study or report had been accomplished.

I have expressed my concerns by phone and in writing, I would appreciate some response as to what Phifers position is in dealing with Suntrol and the replacement of defective sunscreen. I look forward to hearing from you.

This letter will arrive by telefax and mail, in your mailed letter I will include a copy of the package mailed to Jerry Liveoak last week; if anyone cares?

Sincerely,

John N. Edwards
President

cc: Jerry Liveoak

Beverly Phifer

246

E.I.R. EXHIBIT 9
MFR Santrol
DATE 6-15-93 INSPECTOR

PHIFER WIRE PRODUCTS, INC.
P. O. Box 1700 • Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35403 U.S.A.
Telephone: 205/345-2120 • Telex 61326 (PHIF UR)

Please reply to:
FAX # 205/759-4450

FACSIMILE CORRESPONDENCE

To: John Edwards
Santrol, Inc. 602/437-5061

Date: 12/15/92

From: Charles Morgan

No. of Pages: 4

The originals of the following letter and certificate of insurance were mailed to you today.

247

PHIFER WIRE PRODUCTS, INC.
P. O. BOX 1700 • TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA 35403-1700 U.S.A.

■ CHARLES E. MORGAN
Executive Vice President and Corporate Counsel

October 15, 1992

Mr. John N. Edwards
President
Suntrol, Inc.
3767 East Broadway Road-Suite 6
Phoenix, Arizona 85040

HE&CN+

Dear John:

As soon as I received your October 8 fax, I discussed it with Jerry Livecsk. [illegible] gave me copies of your September 28 letter and of Mrs. Stout's [illegible] to you. I understand you spoke with Jerry on Monday and I read your [illegible] letter containing suggestions on how to continue and improve the replacement program for defective SunScreen. I am sure Jerry reaffirmed to [illegible] our commitment to preserving the good names of both our companies by standing behind SunScreen. I am confident that you will reach an understanding on all details of the replacement program when he meets with [illegible] next week.

I was concerned by the reference in your letter to the "obvious health problem caused by the volatile emissions of defective sunscreen" and by your speculation about possible liabilities faced by Suntrol. I do not agree that there are obvious health problems. Although we have replaced a substantial amount of screening that was manufactured in 1988-89, I know of only a handful of "health complaints." I remember you telling me that one of your employees said that the odor might have aggravated a pre-existing problem; and other employees were concerned about potential problems, which is why we sent you the dust/fume masks. (There have been only four other such complaints from other parts of the country.

Two independent laboratories (one in Tucson; the other in Birmingham) have analyzed the odors emitted by this material and both determined that they are non-toxic. Dr. Meeks at the University of Alabama/Birmingham analyzed these emissions even more thoroughly than did Dr. Crutchfield and in his written report (I believe I sent you a copy) concluded that the fumes are only an irritant and any adverse health symptoms should disappear as soon as the defective screening has been removed. That is exactly what happened in the four cases I referred to above.

We are, of course, concerned about the health of Phifer employees as well as the health of Suntrol employees and all customers and consumers. The [illegible] of us, such as Joel Hartig and myself, who have only occasional contact with the defective material, have experienced no irritation or adverse

248

effects of any kind, which is why we do not use masks. In fact, we have hundreds of employees who have worked with our fiberglass products at all stages of production, for eight hours per day, year after year, without a single complaint of adverse health effects.

In response to your concern about possible legal liabilities faced by Suntrol, I can assure you that Suntrol is not at risk. We manufacture safe products. After forty years in business, we have never had to pay a single personal injury products liability claim. However, if we (Phifer or Suntrol) ever should incur legal liability as result of emissions from defective screening, we (both Phifer and Suntrol) will be insured against such loss. I have enclosed a certificate of insurance from our insurance company which shows that Phifer is insured against products liability claims and it certifies that Suntrol has been named an "additional insured" under our policies. This means the Home Insurance Company will defend and indemnify Suntrol against any personal injury claims related to defects in Phifer products.

Although we are both insured, we certainly do not want to be involved in any law suits. It would be terrible publicity for Suntrol and Phifer to be named as defendants in a personal injury claim. Therefore, I urge you to keep this insurance information confidential and not to mention the possibility of adverse health effects unless you receive a specific complaint from a consumer.

I hope this letter, together with the understanding regarding replacement procedures being worked out between you and Jerry, will resolve all your questions regarding the SunScreen problem. I also hope and expect to put the problem behind us in the relatively near future. All the screening that has the potential to prematurely degrade has probably already gone bad by now.

Sincerely yours,

PHIFER WIRE PRODUCTS, INC.

Charles Morgan

Charles Morgan

CM:jh

Enclosure: Certificate of Insurance

249

CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE

ISSUE DATE (MM/DD/YY) 10/14/92

ODUCER

ritchett-Moore, Inc.
O Box 2086
120 Queen City Avenue
uscaloosa, AL 35401
205) 758-4441

THIS CERTIFICATE IS ISSUED AS A MATTER OF INFORMATION ONLY AND CONFERS NO RIGHTS UPON THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER. THIS CERTIFICATE DOES NOT AMEND, EXTEND OR ALTER THE COVERAGE AFFORDED BY THE POLICIES BELOW

COMPANIES AFFORDING COVERAGE

COMPANY LETTER A	Home Insurance Company
COMPANY LETTER B	
COMPANY LETTER C	
COMPANY LETTER D	
COMPANY LETTER E	

SURED

ifer Wire Products Inc
O Box 1700
uscaloosa AL 35403

OVERAGES

IS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE POLICIES OF INSURANCE LISTED BELOW HAVE BEEN ISSUED TO THE INSURED NAMED ABOVE FOR THE POLICY PERIOD DICATED, NOTWITHSTANDING ANY REQUIREMENT, TERM OR CONDITION OF ANY CONTACT OR OTHER DOCUMENT WITH RESPECT TO WHICH THIS RTIFICATE MAY BE ISSUED OR MAY PERTAIN, THE INSURANCE AFFORDED BY THE POLICIES DESCRIBED HEREIN IS SUBJECT TO ALL THE TERMS, CLUSIONS AND CONDITIONS OF SUCH POLICIES. LIMITS SHOWN MAY HAVE BEEN REDUCED BY PAID CLAIMS.

TYPE OF INSURANCE	POLICY NUMBER	POLICY EFFECTIVE DATE	POLICY EXPIRATION DATE	LIMITS	
GENERAL LIABILITY [X] COMMERCIAL GENERAL LIABILITY [ ] CLAIMS MADE [X] OCCUR. [ ] OWNER'S & CONTRACTOR'S PROT. [X] Limited Form Vendors	GLRF728902	01/01/92	01/01/93	GENERAL AGGREGATE PRODUCTS-COMP/OPS AGGREGATE PERSONAL & ADVERTISING INJURY EACH OCCURRENCE FIRE DAMAGE (Any one fire) MEDICAL EXPENSE (Any one person)	$ $ 1 000,000 $ 1 000,000 $ 1 000,000 $ 50,000 $ 5,000
AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY [X] ANY AUTO [ ] ALL OWNED AUTOS [ ] SCHEDULED AUTOS [ ] HIRED AUTOS [ ] NON-OWNED AUTOS [ ] GARAGE LIABILITY [ ]	BAF567969	01/01/92	01/01/93	COMBINED SINGLE LIMIT BODILY INJURY (Per person) BODILY INJURY (Per accident) PROPERTY DAMAGE	$ 1 000,000 $ $ $
EXCESS LIABILITY [X] Umbrella Form [ ] Other Than Umbrella Form	HAUF549032	01/01/92	01/01/93	EACH OCCURENCE AGGREGATE	$ 20,000,000 $ 20,000,000
WORKER'S COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY				STATUTORY LIMITS EACH ACCIDENT DISEASE - POLICY LIMIT DISEASE - EACH EMPLOYEE	 $ $ $
OTHER Texas Automobile Policy	BAF432144	01/01/92	01/01/93	$1,000,000 Single Limit	

SCRIPTION OF OPERATIONS/LOCATIONS/VEHICLES/SPECIAL ITEMS
ertificate Holder is added as additional insured for the coverages hat apply.

ERTIFICATE HOLDER

UNTROL, INC.
764 East Broadway Road
uite #6
hoenix AZ 85040

CANCELLATION

SHOULD ANY OF THE ABOVE DESCRIBED POLICIES BE CANCELLED BEFORE THE EXPIRATION DATE THEREOF, THE ISSUING COMPANY WILL ENDEAVOR TO MAIL 30 DAYS WRITTEN NOTICE TO THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER NAMED TO THE LEFT, BUT FAILURE TO MAIL SUCH NOTICE SHALL IMPOSE NO OBLIGATION OR LIABILITY OF ANY KIND UPON THE COMPANY, ITS AGENTS OF REPRESENTATIVES.

AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE PRITCHETT-MOORE, INC.

250

E.I.P. EXHIBIT 10
MFR Suntrol
DATE 6-15-93 INSPECTOR

Suntrol Window Products, Inc.
3767 East Broadway Road, Suite 6 / Phoenix, Arizona 85040
602 / 437-4431

October 16, 1992

Mr. Charles E. Morgan
Executive Vice President
Phifer Wire Products, Inc.
P. O. Box 1700
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35403 - 1700

Dear Charles:

I am in receipt of your October 15 letter and certificate of insurance that was faxed to our office. Thank you for responding to my letter so quickly, I know that you have been on the road.

I disagree with some of the facts stated in your letter and feel compelled to respond. I do not recall ever telling you or anyone else at Phifer that only one of my employees was made sick by the degraded material. The fact is that several employees developed health problems, myself included, when exposed to the degraded screen. I informed Jerry Liveoak in my October 22, 1991 letter (that you were copied on) that it was apparent that the product had created health problems with Suntrol employees and then went on to describe those problems (see copy enclosed). In re-reading that letter, I find it interesting that the problems described mirror the potential health effects described in the report produced by Dr. Meeks four months later. It is also worth mentioning that Suntrol initiated the first comprehensive report on the volatile emissions of degraded screen by hiring Dr. Crutchfield with the Health Effects Group in Tucson Arizona to analyze degraded screen samples in October of 1991. I have also informed Jerry liveoak in more than one conversation that both Suntrol employees and our customers had complained that the screen made them feel nauseous and sick and as late as last Thursday he told me that there were no health complaints other than those at Suntrol and our customer, Mrs. Kamuda. Now I discover from your letter that there are four other health situations in other parts of the country. In regards to the dust/ fume masks, they were sent by Phifer because OSHA pajd Suntrol a visit and told us to use them, OSHA also told us not to hold the degraded material inside our building; I am requesting a copy of that report and will send one your way.

As far as Phifer employees working with your fiberglass products at all stages of production for eight hours a day without a single complaint of adverse health effects, that does not surprise me, nor does it alter my opinion that the degraded material is unsafe. I have been working with sunscreen for over ten years and I, nor have any of my employees, ever been made sick or have had any health problems due to Sunscreen exposure; until now. This is the defective material we are addressing here and not the typical material that your employees work with everyday. There is no doubt in my mind that the defective sunscreen can make someone feel very sick, I know first hand how the product can effect health. I will not go into detail in this letter but would be happy to share my medical records with you from 1988 to present, if you are interested. We had been working with and storing the defective screen as far back as late 1988 and in November of 1990 I made a formal request to Bo Warren (see copy enclosed) to have the defective screen shipped directly to Phifer, so that we would not have to store it at Suntrol because of the foul odor. However it was not until OSHA came calling two years later that any thing was done in response to our request. I have been suggesting for many months that we need to become more pro-active in dealing with this problem due to the potential health effects and customer perception of quality, Phifer refused to comply and asked that we not tell our customers (solicit) about the problem. Now that the utility companies are taking a second look at sunscreen, Phifer is ready to respond to our suggestions; I hope that Phifers response will not be "to little to late". There has been talk by one utility of totally dismantling their sunscreen program. Charles, I do not want to sound argumentative, but I feel strongly about any down playing of what I have always believed to be a very serious situation. We are not imagining these health problems and it appears that what I have been reporting to Phifer has somehow been diluted or ignored. I also believe that if Phifer does not respond with a strong action plan, we will probably loose our utility support. I dare say that if Suntrol was not here in Phoenix responding to these complaints, we would have already lost our utility support.

Thank you again for your response and I assure you that I will keep Phifers certificate of insurance in confidence. I look forward to Jerrys arrival and hope that we can develop a plan that will salvage our sunscreen program.

Sincerely,

John N. Edwards
President

Tink 1

LIBRARY SEARCH RESULTS

Scan 344 (6.322 min) of KPHS45.D
GRAY VINYL COATED FIBERGLASS FROM MAILING TUBE

Library file: DATA:NBS_REVE.L
Library name: NBS MASS SPECTRAL DATABASE

	CAS #	Library Index #	Match Quality
1: 2-Pentanamine, 4-methyl- (9CI)	108098	1391	9794
2: 2-Hexanamine, 4-methyl- (9CI)	105419	2523	9785
3: 2-Butanamine, 3-methyl- (9CI)	598743	686	9771
4: Dodecanoic acid, 11-amino-, methyl ester	56817926	19553	9771
5: 2-Heptanamine (9CI)	123820	2525	9764
6: 2-Butanamine, 3,3-dimethyl- (9CI)	3850304	1398	9761
7: 2-Hexanamine (9CI)	5329793	1401	9754
8: Cyclopropane, 1-bromo-1,2-dichloro- (8CI	24071634	13622	9733
9: Cyclopropane, 1,1-dibromo-2-chloro-2-flu	24071576	22007	9733
10: Phenol, 4-[2-(methylamino)ethyl]- (9CI)	370989	7330	9726

RETRIEVE
Which match (1 to 10):

Y: Set of 4 MS
X: Scan 344 (6.322 min) of KP

253

Scan 342 (6.282 min) of KPHS45.D
GRAY VINYL COATED FIBERGLASS FROM MAILING TUBE

m/z	abund.	m/z	abund.	m/z	abund.	m/z	abund.
38.10	28	42.10	72	45.95	43	56.05	46
40.00	1531	44.00	10000	55.05	21	57.05	44
41.10	201	45.00	146				

LIBRARY SEARCH RESULTS

Scan 355 (6.526 min) of KPHS45.D
GRAY VINYL COATED FIBERGLASS FROM MAILING TUBE Peak #2

Library file: DATA:NBS_REVE.L
Library name: NBS MASS SPECTRAL DATABASE

		CAS #	Library Index #	Match Quality
1:	Butanoic acid, 3-oxo-, 2-methylpropyl es	7779751	8653	9237
2:	Nickel, [5,6,17,18-tetrahydrotetrabenzo[	72101349	37007	8912
3:	Propane, 2-(ethenyloxy)- (9CI)	926658	637	8745
4:	Propanamide, 2-methyl- (9CI)	563837	676	8634
5:	1H-Cyclonona[1,2-c:5,6-c']difuran-1,3,6,	21794014	36955	8607
6:	Butanoic acid, 2,2-diacetyl-3-oxo-, ethy	19446516	17412	8519
7:	Acetamide, N-[2-(acetyloxy)-2-[4-(acetyl	55145647	28994	8505
8:	1-Butanamine, 3-methyl-N-(3-methylbutyl)	28023747	13259	8481
9:	Pentylamine, N-isobutyl-N-nitroso- (8CI)	28023805	13260	8477
10:	4,15:5,10-Dimethanobenzofuro[3',2':7,8][	24945935	34414	8462

RETRIEVE
Which match (1 to 10):

Y: #8653 Butanoic acid, 3-oxo
X: Scan 355 (6.526 min) of KP

LIBRARY SEARCH RESULTS

Scan 372 (6.832 min) of KPHS45.D
GRAY VINYL COATED FIBERGLASS FROM MAILING TUBE
Peak #3

Library file: DATA:NBS_REVE.L
Library name: NBS MASS SPECTRAL DATABASE

		CAS #	Library Index #	Match Quality
1:	2-Pentanone, 5-chloro- (8CI9CI)	5891214	2947	9869
2:	s-Indacen-1(2H)-one, 3,5,6,7-tetrahydro-	54889597	15484	9780
3:	3-Pentenoic acid, 4-methyl- (8CI9CI)	504858	2318	9765
4:	2-Hexanone, 5-methyl- (8CI9CI)	110123	2398	9765
5:	3(2H)-Furanone, 4-hydroxy-5-(hydroxymeth	66727944	6171	9708
6:	1-Propen-2-ol, acetate (8CI9CI)	108225	1242	9699
7:	3-Penten-2-one, 4-methyl-, O-methyloxime	56336119	3707	9681
8:	2-Propanone, 1-(1-methylethoxy)- (9CI)	42781124	2629	9673
9:	2-Pentanone, 5-(acetyloxy)- (9CI)	5185977	6188	9648
10:	Acetic acid, 2-propenyl ester (9CI)	591877	1249	9632

254

RETRIEVE
Which match (1 to 10):

Y: #2947 2-Pentanone, 5-chlor
X: Scan 372 (6.832 min) of KP

LIBRARY SEARCH RESULTS

Scan 391 (7.204 min) of KPHS45.D
GRAY VINYL COATED FIBERGLASS FROM MAILING TUBE

Library file: DATA:NBS_REVE.L
Library name: NBS MASS SPECTRAL DATABASE

		CAS #	Library Index #	Match Quality
1:	Propane, 1,1'-sulfonylbis- (9CI)	598038	7162	9321
2:	4-Heptan-2-one, (E)- (9CI)	36678430	2150	9318
3:	2-Heptanone, 6-methyl-5-nitro- (9CI)	66972029	11269	9296
4:	2,4-Oxazolidinedione, 5,5-dimethyl- (8CI	695534	4000	9293
5:	Propane, 2-methyl- (8CI9CI)	75285	98	9290
6:	4-Penten-2-one (8CI9CI)	13891877	522	9282
7:	Butane, 2,2-dichloro-3-methyl- (8CI9CI)	17773669	5489	9241
8:	4H-Pyran-4-one, 3,5-diacetyltetrahydro-2	55030665	17148	9239
9:	2,3-Pentanedione, 4-methyl- (8CI9CI)	7493585	2346	9195
10:	Acetic acid, 2-propenyl ester (9CI)	591877	1249	9188

RETRIEVE
Which match (1 to 10):

Y: #5489 Butane, 2,2-dichloro
X: Scan 391 (7.204 min) of KP

LIBRARY SEARCH RESULTS

Scan 404 (7.436 min) of KPHS45.D
GRAY VINYL COATED FIBERGLASS FROM MAILING TUBE

Library file: DATA:NBS_REVE.L
Library name: NBS MASS SPECTRAL DATABASE

		CAS #	Library Index #	Match Quality
1:	Ethanone, 1-cyclobutyl- (9CI)	3019258	1083	8964
2:	3-Octen-2-one, 7-methyl- (9CI)	33046810	5670	8842
3:	1-Butanol, 3-methyl-, acetate (9CI)	123922	4155	8543
4:	Cyanic acid, 2,2-dimethylpropyl ester (9	1459445	2250	8541
5:	2-Pentanone, 3-methylene- (8CI9CI)	4359777	1088	8514
6:	2H-Pyran, 3,4-dihydro-6-methyl- (8CI9CI)	16015115	1098	8500
7:	3-Hepten-2-one (8CI9CI)	1119444	2110	8480
8:	3-Butyn-2-ol (8CI9CI)	2028639	214	8405
9:	1-Propanone, 2-methyl-1-[2-(1-methylethy	56259155	7837	8394
10:	5-Undecene, 8-methyl-, (E)- (9CI)	39546855	10358	8373

RETRIEVE
Which match (1 to 10):

Y: #5670 3-Octen-2-one, 7-met
X: Scan 404 (7.436 min) of KP

LIBRARY SEARCH RESULTS

Scan 418 (7.690 min) of KPHS45.D
GRAY VINYL COATED FIBERGLASS FROM MAILING TUBE Trak 6

Library file: DATA:NBS_REVE.L
Library name: NBS MASS SPECTRAL DATABASE

		CAS #	Library Index #	Match Quality
1:	2-Butanone, 4-butoxy-3-methyl- (9CI)	54340942	8731	9260
2:	3-Buten-2-one, 3-methyl- (8CI9CI)	814788	509	9140
3:	3-Penten-2-one, 3,4-dimethyl- (8CI9CI)	684946	2106	9011
4:	2-Butanone, 4-hydroxy-3-(hydroxymethyl)-	6868979	4429	9008
5:	Cyclopenta[c]furo[3',2':4,5]furo[2,3-h][	55446270	29503	8949
6:	Ethanone, 1-cyclopropyl- (9CI)	765435	507	8890
7:	Ethanone, 1-(7-oxabicyclo[4.1.0]hept-1-y	15121014	5563	8881
8:	2-Pentanethiol, 2-methyl- (8CI9CI)	1633972	2830	8839
9:	Propane, 2-methyl- (8CI9CI)	75285	98	8779
10:	Heptane, 4-azido- (8CI9CI)	27126223	5730	8779

RETRIEVE
Which match (1 to 10):

Y: Set of 4 MS
X: Scan 418 (7.690 min) of KP

LIBRARY SEARCH RESULTS

Scan 818 (14.882 min) of KPHS45.D
GRAY VINYL COATED FIBERGLASS FROM MAILING TUBE Trak 7

Library file: DATA:NBS_REVE.L
Library name: NBS MASS SPECTRAL DATABASE

		CAS #	Library Index #	Match Quality
1:	Acetamide, N-[2-[3,4-dihydroxy-.alpha.-[	28177120	38099	9334
2:	Acetic acid, silver(1+) salt (8CI9CI)	563633	10151	9092
3:	Butanoic acid, 3-hydroxy- (9CI)	300856	1553	8942
4:	2-Butanone, 3-hydroxy- (8CI9CI)	513860	729	8832
5:	Propanoic acid, 2-(aminooxy)- (9CI)	2786223	1631	8779
6:	Compactinervine, diacetate (ester) (8CI)	2111855	35159	8725
7:	2-Propanone, 1-methoxy- (8CI9CI)	5878193	737	8702
8:	Butanoic acid, 3-hydroxy-, ethyl ester,	35608641	4434	8660
9:	2-Pentanol, 3-chloro-4-methyl-, (R*,S*)-	74685486	4917	8614
10:	Propane, 1-(1-methylethoxy)- (9CI)	627087	1490	8591

RETRIEVE
Which match (1 to 10):

Y: #1553 Butanoic acid, 3-hyd
X: Scan 818 (14.882 min) of K

E.I.R. EXHIBIT 11
MFR Sandport
DATE 6-15-93 INSPECTOR [illegible]

PHIFER WIRE PRODUCTS, INC.
P O BOX 1700 • TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA 35403-1700 U.S.A.

CHARLES E. MORGAN
Executive Vice President and Corporate Counsel

February 23, 1993

Via Express Mail

Dear

Enclosed is a copy of a complete list of all ingredients that were used by Phifer Wire Products in manufacturing the insect screening that was originally installed in your home. In the "INGREDIENT" column, I have listed the name (either the brand name or generic name) for each of the ingredients. The middle column gives a brief description of the ingredient or, in some cases, simply a generic chemical name for the brand name that appears in the left hand column. In the "SUPPLIER" column, I have tried to provide the names, addresses and phone numbers of the suppliers of these various ingredients in case anyone wanted to obtain further information about the ingredient.

I have provided this information to the various toxicologists who have studied this product and the quality of the air surrounding the product. I believe the ingredient list should be considered together with the toxicologists' reports, especially the Clayton Environmental report which we expect to receive soon. Some of the ingredients listed may be toxic if swallowed or inhaled, but may remain harmlessly contained while the product is in normal use.

I hope the enclosed information will be helpful to you and your physicians in diagnosing and treating your health problems.

Sincerely yours,

PHIFER WIRE PRODUCTS, INC.

Charles Morgan

Charles Morgan

CM:jh

Enclosure

257

The following is a list of all ingredients used in the manufacture of PhiferGlass® silver-gray pvc-coated fiberglass insect screening manufactured between January 1, 1988 and July 1, 1989

INGREDIENT	DESCRIPTION/COMPOSITION	SUPPLIER
Continuous filament fiberglass	fibrous glass consisting of silicon oxides, aluminum calcium, boron & magnesium	PPG Industries, Inc. One PPG Place Pittsburgh, PA 15272 (304)843-1300
Jayflex DINP	Diisononyl Phthalate (benzenedicarboxylic acid)	Exxon Chemical Americas (713)870-8000
Drapex® 4.4	Octyl epoxy tallate	Witco Argus Division 633 Court St. Brooklyn, NY 11231-2193 (718)858-5678
Therm-Chek® 6223	Calcium cadmium zinc stablizer in aliphatic solvent 216-641-8580 OR 1-800-321-9946	Ferro Corp. Bedford Chemical Division 7050 Krick Road Walton Hills, OH 44146-4494
Polypeg® E-400	Polyethylene glycol ester	Uniroyal Chemical Co., Inc. Middlebury, CT 06749 (203)573-3303
Aluminum Paste	Pigment containing aluminum flake and aromatic solvents	Silberline Mfg. Co., Inc. Tamaqua, PA 18252 (717)668-6050
Black Paste	Carbon black pigment and DINP plasticizer Smyrna, GA 30082 (404)333-8356	Toncee, Inc. 1500 Wilson Way
Thermoguard S	Antimony trioxide	Atochem P. O. Box 1104 Rahway, NJ 07065 (201)499-2403
Oxy 654-H PVC Homopolymer	Ethene, Chloro-Homopolymer	Occidental Chemical Armand Hammer Blvd. Pollstown, PA 19464 (716)278-7021
GEON Resin 123A PVC Homopolymer	Ethene, Chloro-homopolymer poly-vinyl chloride	B.F. Goodrich 6100 Oak Tree Blvd. Cleveland, OH 44131 (216)447-7601

258

INGREDIENT	DESCRIPTION/COMPOSITION	SUPPLIER
GEON Resin 213 PVC Homopolymer	Ethene, Chloro-homopolymer poly-vinyl chloride	B.F. Goodrich 6100 Oak Tree Blvd. Cleveland, OH 44131 (216)447-7601
Silicone Fluid L-45/50	Polydimethylsiloxane	Union Carbide P. O. Box 38002 South Charleston, WV 25303
Kerosine	Petroleum hydrocarbon	B.P. Oil, Inc. Gulf Products Division Midland Bldg. Cleveland, OH 44115

EXHIBIT 12
MFR. Suntrup
DATE 6-15-93 INSPECTOR [illegible]

Health Effects

Mr & Mrs Sunby 860-2709
Mrs Avilez 940-0156
Mr & Mrs Riha 974-4001
Mr & Mrs Gary Siener 497-6012
Mrs Gertrude Kamuda 970-2012
Mr & Mrs Joe Golarz 313/391-1675 (Mrs Golarz is a good source of information, she has names of others with health effects)
Mr & Mrs James Brown 867-8457
Mr & Mrs Tom King 391-9106
Mr Barry Goldstiene 313/350-8700 (lawyer)
Mrs. Fulerton 313/681-8585
Ms. Kathy Matz 263-3444(producer Channel 3 News, Kathy might provide some names)
Ms. Fawler 230-5862 (Health Dept.)

260

Mr. & Mrs. James R. Brown
5445 East Helton Lane
Scottsdale, AZ 85254

E.I.R. EXHIBIT 13
MFR Suntrol
DATE 6-15-93 INSPECTOR JLC

December 23, 1992

Mr. Richard Blake
Vice President
Suntrol Window Products, Inc.
3767 East Broadway Road #6
Phoenix, AZ 85040

Dear Mr. Blake:

I want to sincerely thank you for taking the trouble to inform home owners of the problems with our sunscreens. I was surprised to hear about the problems with the screens and am very concerned over the health implications.

My husband and I pruchased our home last year and moved in in January 1992. We have since both suffered severe health problems. I, for unknown reasons, had a severe case of pneumonia this spring (after sleeping directly in front of open windows). Although the pneumonia has cleared up, I have continued to have problems with lack of energy. My hsuband too has had his share of health problems. He's been suffering with a severe cough that numerous doctors have been unable to diagnose. Amazingly, since the replacement of the screens, Jim's cough has improved tremendously.

Again, I appreciate your efforts. The seriousness of the situation is of great concern to us. If you have further information regarding the improperly treated sunscreens, please notify me immediately.

Sincerely,

Mary Brown

Mary A. Brown

9536 South Ash Avenue
Tempe, AZ 85284
May 5, 1993

Phifer Wire Products, Inc.
4400 Kauloosa Avenue
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35401-7042

Dear Sir:

We moved into our residence during November 1989. Soon after our move, Mrs. Newman has experienced dizziness, stomach problems, neasea, sinus inflammations and headaches, sneezing, congestion over the last few years, in addition to other items. She has obtained medical aid for these "attacks" but unfortunately nothing has been able to help her.

Recently we became aware of a smell from our screening which seems to make her worse when she comes near them. During December 1989, we had obtained sunscreens from SUNTROL WINDOW PRODUCTS for our residence. We understand that this screening has been linked to some of these disorders. SUNTROL has indicated to us that your company is the manufacturer of our screens.

Because of these problems we wish to have these screens replaced. We have reason to believe that they are a contributing factor in Mrs. Newman's medical problems. I would appreciate it very much if you could answer this letter before May is over. Time is of the essence because the hot summer months are upon us, a time when the windows will be open and the smell from the screens will pervade the house.

If there are any questions about the above or if you wish to reach us, our number is 602-961-1772. Thank you so much for your consideration. It is much appreciated.

Yours very sincerely,

Milton Newman

Milton Newman

Mer Edwards —
a copy for your records. Many
thanks for your aid. Really appreciated.
Milt Newman 262

Al Linn
11223 N. 109th Place
Scottsdale, Arizona 85259
(602) 860-9414

November 10, 1992

Mr. John Edwards
Suntrol Window Products
3767 E. Broadway
Phoenix, Arizona

Dear Mr. Edwards,

This is in regards to the change of material in the sunscreens at the Emerald Scottsdale complex in Scottsdale, Arizona. It was noted that the reason for the change was due to defective sunscreen material.

Please note that my vertical blinds have been faded along with some furniture. It has also been noted that there was a strange odor that existed.

Please respond as to how I should handle the damage.

Yours truly

Al Linn

Al Linn

263

Nov. 11, 92

Estes Homes
Mesa, Arizona

Attention: John Luke

Mr. Luke:

As discussed with the service rep. in your office this morning, my husband and myself recently (June 92) purchased an Estes home in the Alta Mesa subdivision.

During routine window and screen cleaning, I gently cleaned our sunscreens manufactured by Suntrol Inc. with Ivory soap and warm water. While in the process I realized that the dark brown paint on the outside of the screen was washing off and leaving exposed the silver screen material underneath, which needless to say, does not block out any sun. Not only was the paint washing off, but there was a horrible odor coming from the screens, which I understand is toxic!

Upon further investigation of this frustrating matter, I discussed the screen problem with my neighbors and discovered that they have had the same problem with their screens and would also like something done to remedy this situation.

Not only are the screens in this neighborhood unsightly, but they also do not serve the purpose that was intended by having them installed as they do not block the sun out of our homes.

The screens are under warranty by Suntrol Inc. for five years from the time of installation and in good faith we spent our hard earned money to purchase their product. These homes are only four years old. Myself, as well as my neighbors, insist that Suntrol Inc. stand behind their warranty and replace the defective screens as soon as possible.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Respectfully,

Laura Nielson

Laura Nielson
5223 E. Hannibal
Mesa, Az 85205

264

Marjorie P. Stout
1055 S. Scallop Drive
Gilbert, Arizona 85234
(602) 497-0849
September 15, 1992

John Edwards
SUNTROL
3767 E. Broadway
Phoenix, Arizona 85040

Dear Mr. Edwards;

My husband and I purchased a new home from UDC in the Bayview II subdivision in the spring of 1988. One of the options which we chose to purchase was the addition of bronze sunscreens provided by your company.

Since 1988, your personnel have been to my home a minimum of four (4) times to replace screens which have changed from the bronze color to that of black. I do appreciate the consideration and responsiveness of your personnel, who have always been extremely courteous, although I do regret having to deal with them on such a continuous basis.

What I do not understand is why your company continues to replace my sunscreens, which were sold to me with a five year guarantee, with the same inferior product which is obviously defective. I was quite willing to accept the initial explanation of a batch of sunscreen in which the formulation was in error, thereby causing the sunscreens to turn color through exposure to the sun. However, after having all of my screens replaced TWICE within the last four years and now to have some of these screens showing signs of changing also, my patience has evaporated. I already paid for these screens when I purchased the house, yet I feel I am paying for them again in the time off work I am required to spend in order to be available for your workmen to be at my home. Within the last four years, I have had to lose a minimum of four days wages due to the inferior product which your company is providing. It is immaterial to me to have the warrantee extended each time my screens are replaced. My time is also valuable. I do not believe you would care to receive a bill for this time, however, should you decide to continue using an obviously proven inferior product, I will be forced to not only send your company the bill, but I will resort to small claims court to receive compensation. Also, unless we can come to an immediate agreement, my next action will be to contact the Better Business Bureau.

265

Knowing that I am not the only customer who has these bronze colored sunscreens on their home that have turned black (after all, I do live in a UDC subdivision which sells them as an option and therefore I have the advantage of also observing my neighbors' sunscreens), I am sure that you are fully cognizant of the problem. The screens do not uniformly turn black, but at first become splotchy and extremely unsightly and then gradually totally black. Also, all of the sunscreens do not turn color simultaneously, so instead of having a house which looks well kept, I end up with a home with a very tacky appearing exterior due solely to the inferior product you are providing.

I would also like to add that since I live in an area where new homes are still being constructed, I have had numerous people inquire as to my opinion of having sunscreens on the home. Although sunscreens are, in my opinion, one of the most beneficial options a builder offers in terms of comfort of the home, I can no longer recommend purchasing the sunscreens through UDC as long as your company insists on providing such an inferior product.

Please contact me at your earliest convenience so that we may resolve this matter once and for all.

Sincerely,

Marjorie P. Stout

Marjorie P. Stout

266

a bad odor, but I never heard of any possible physical side effects until I spoke with Carol Chase on October 21, 1991.

Immediately upon learning of this potential hazard, we hired Dr. Meeks to analyze the material and the odors. After intensive research, Dr. Meeks determined that the odor had only an irritant effect and no chronic or long lasting effects. His report is consistent with my phone conversation with Mrs. Chase, in which she told me the symptoms cleared up as soon as the window screens were removed.

This company has no history of making dangerous or harmful products and no experience with liability claims. I have recently spoken with the President and with the C.E.O., who has held that position since the company was founded forty years ago, and they confirmed that neither the company nor any of its insurance carriers has ever paid a personal injury products liability claim. Please feel free to confirm Phifer's record with the "Index System" or with any of our carriers. We have been insured by The Home since 12/31/88, by Liberty Mutual for the three years prior to that and by Cigna prior to 1985. In fact, except for Mr. Chase's letter of April 6, 1991, Phifer Wire has never even received a claim or demand for money damage to compensate for personal injury.

I hope this information will be helpful to you in adjusting this claim. If you need additional information about what happened and when, please give me a call.

Sincerely yours,

PHIFER WIRE PRODUCTS, INC.

Charles Morgan

Charles Morgan

CM:jh

cc: Mr. Walter Gary
Pritchett-Moore, Inc.

267