Expert Consensus on Using Mineral Silicate-Based Masonry Paint on the Exterior Granite of the Eisenhower Executive Office Building (EEOB)

Not Confidential and Not Subject to FRCP 408

March 5, 2026

Purpose of This Inquiry

President Trump has asserted that there exists a "magic paint with silicate" that, if applied to the exterior granite of the Eisenhower Executive Office Building (EEOB), would:

- Strengthen the stone
- Keep water out
- Prevent staining
- Be easy to apply
- Rarely require repainting

The President and his team offered to provide product specifications to Plaintiffs for review but have not yet done so.

Based on publicly available product descriptions, industry practice, and preliminary expert interviews, the President appears to be referring to mineral silicate–based masonry paint systems, such as those manufactured by companies including KEIM and Romabio.

In preparation for Plaintiffs' original complaint and subsequent pleadings, Plaintiffs identified twenty-five leading experts in architectural conservation, masonry, and building science who are willing to provide testimony to the Court. These experts include individuals who have overseen major restoration projects involving mineral silicate paints on some of the United States' most prominent stone buildings, including the White House and the U.S. Capitol. Several have also visited overseas manufacturing facilities of mineral silicate paint producers to receive training in the appropriate use of these materials.

To evaluate the President's claims regarding the properties and performance of such paints, Plaintiffs posed a set of non-leading questions to these experts. The experts were asked to respond independently and were not informed of the responses provided by other experts.

The purpose of this inquiry is to clarify whether the properties attributed to such paint systems are consistent with established conservation practice and building-science principles.

The questions and consensus answers are set forth below. Notably, the consensus conclusions are unanimous: no expert provided a response that contradicted any essential conclusion reflected in the consensus answers.

……..

Questions and Consensus Answers

Question 1
As a threshold matter, are mineral silicate paints appropriate for use on granite, like the exterior stone of the EEOB?

Consensus Answer
No. Mineral silicate paints are not suited for use on granite.

Explanation
Mineral silicate paints are designed to *chemically* bond with stone that contains calcium carbonate, such as limestone, sandstone, or marble—materials common in many historic federal buildings. Granite does not contain calcium carbonate. Therefore, these paints do not chemically bond to granite in the manner necessary to activate their powers to strengthen and protect underlying stone. Also, given the smooth surface of granite, applying such paint would require using an initial layer of primer or bonding agent as well as significant surface abrasion.

Question 2
Will the use of primers or another bonding agent on granite to adhere mineral silicate paint affect the benefits of the paint system?

Consensus Answer:
Yes. Using primers in this context undermines each of the primary advantages of mineral silicate paints.

Explanation:
To adhere to granite, mineral silicate paints would require an acrylic or similar bonding primer. Just as the absence of calcium carbonate in granite blocks chemical bonding between paint and stone, so does the barrier layer of a primer. Therefore, the paint system cannot function as a true mineral silicate coating, while increasing financial costs and requiring permanent damage to the granite.

Question 3
Would applying mineral silicate paint require sanding, abrasion, or other surface treatments that permanently alter the granite?

Consensus Answer:
Yes. Surface abrasion or other invasive preparation would be required, which abrasion is impossible to reverse.

Explanation:
Because granite is relatively smooth and non-absorbent, every surface of the EEOB granite would need to be sanded, scarified, etched, or otherwise abraded to allow any

paint system to adhere for any meaningful period. Abrasion methods include sandblasting or applying acid. Lacking calcium carbonate, granite is particularly resistant to abrasion, so such efforts would need to be powerfully applied. These steps permanently alter the stone's surface and appearance.

Question 4
Would mineral silicate paint strengthen the granite or meaningfully protect it from deterioration?

Consensus Answer:
No. While these paints can be highly effective systems to protect and protect certain other types of stone, they do not strengthen granite or improve its structural durability.

Explanation:
Experts do not identify any mechanism by which mineral silicate paint increases the strength of granite. At best, it acts only as a surface coating, like any other paint. Such paint does not repair internal flaws, prevent cracking, or enhance the inherent durability of granite. When mineral silicate paint is applied to a naturally porous calcium carbonate stone, it may increase the stone's durability by filling in pores in the surface. Silicate is a consolidant, but it does not work on granite.

Question 5
Would mineral silicate paint prevent water from reaching and being trapped against the surface of the stone?

Consensus Answer:
No. Painting granite does not prevent water infiltration.

Explanation:
Water infiltration is driven by failings at joints, sealants, flashing, and mortar, and building movement—not by the exposed face of granite blocks. Mineral silicate paint coatings are breathable, letting in air and moisture. These paints neither stop water getting to granite surfaces nor address the underlying sources of moisture. Trapped moisture, which freezes and thaws, cracks and otherwise degrades the surface and strength of the granite.

Question 6
Would mineral silicate paint prevent staining by iron or minerals leaching from beneath the paint to the surface or pollutants from smog and rain on the outside of the paint?

Consensus Answer:
No. Staining will still occur and is likely to be much more visible on paint than on the existing granite surface.

Explanation:
Mineral silicate paint coatings are breathable. Leaching and iron staining can pass through breathable coatings. Smog and dirt contained in rain will hit the surface of the

paint just as they would granite. Stains on a gray granite surface will become noticeable after extended periods of time. Stains on a white painted surface will be much more visible as soon as the staining occurs.

Question 7
If mineral silicate paint were later removed from a granite surface, would removal itself cause permanent damage to the granite beyond any damage caused to enable the paint to adhere during application?

Consensus Answer:
Yes. Removal would cause additional permanent damage.

Explanation:
Any bonding primers or adhered coatings would be difficult to impossible to remove without additional scarring or surface loss. It would require mechanical or chemical methods that further damage the stone. The stone where the paint is removed may be hazy, filmy, or duller in appearance. In addition, it will not be possible to remove all the paint, especially from intricate elements of the granite façade such as joints, recesses, and carved ornamented areas.

Question 8
How cost-effective would it be to use mineral silicate paint on the EEOB versus cleaning the granite?

Consensus Answer:
It would be incredibly costly and very wasteful.

Explanation:

- Paint costs: Mineral silicate paints like KEIM GRANITAL[1], including the primer that would be required for EEOB, cost around four times as much as conventional masonry paints. Since the properties of mineral silicate paints would function only as normal paint does on granite, this cost premium is not justified by additional function.
- Abrading costs: The materials and labor required to scarify the surface of the granite will be exceptional because of the size and intricate variations in the architectural elements of the building.
- Skilled labor costs: Manufacturers like KEIM require that the teams applying these products have specialized training and experience, which elevates labor costs.
- Maintenance costs: The EEOB will need repainting more frequently than every ten years. It may need cleaning even more frequently to keep the white paint from looking dingy and discolored. Historically, the building has been cleaned approximately every 20 years. While it could stand to receive more frequent cleaning, adding new painting maintenance and increasing the amount of cleaning required for a white building will escalate maintenance costs exponentially.

- Scaffolding costs: The more frequent use of significant volumes of scaffolding, given the size of the building and the more intensive time requirements of painting and maintaining painting as compared to cleaning, will significantly increase costs for both the scaffolding and the costs of worker screening to maintain security.
- Perpetuity: Given the inability to reverse permanent harm to the granite once paint is applied, repainting will be required in perpetuity, exacerbating the increased costs detailed above.

Question 9
Why are the chimneys of the EEOB currently painted white if painting EEOB granite is inappropriate?

Consensus Answer:
They chimneys are cast iron, not granite.

Explanation:
It is generally appropriate from both maintenance and historic preservation perspectives to paint iron exterior surfaces of historic stone buildings. That is why the chimneys are painted and why ornamental ironwork and fencing may also be maintained with paint.

Question 10
From a historic preservation and regulatory standpoint, is changing the color of the EEOB's granite appropriate?

Consensus Answer:
No. Changing the color would be historically inaccurate and inappropriate.

Explanation:
Altering the appearance of historic granite fundamentally changes the building's character and material authenticity, regardless of the type of paint used. Additionally, changing the building's color is not an alteration that meets an exceptional need for the federal government, so it is not a change that is justified under appropriations and environmental review guidance. Improving the appearance of the historical materials through cleaning and lighting may be appropriate but painting effects an actual color change that is ahistorical. This is especially true for a National Historic Landmark that acquired the designation because of its original appearance.

Question 11
Are there other types of concerns about painting the EEOB with mineral silicate paint?

Consensus Answer A:
Yes. Painting the EEOB will increase national security concerns.

Explanation:

Painting, cleaning the paint, and repainting paint will require scaffolding on parts of the building much more frequently and for longer duration than scaffolding for just cleaning the existing granite. In addition to the scaffolding being unsightly and diminishing the hypothesized visual benefit of a painted building, it will increase security vulnerabilities of the building. Workers can be screened for security risks (at significant expense), as is done when repainting the US Capitol, but the greater number and frequency of people so close to the White House is an additional risk.

Consensus Answer B:
Yes. Painting the EEOB will introduce a visual imbalance that diminished the uniqueness of the White House and may lead to the unnecessary painting of the Treasury building.

Explanation:
The White House is bright white. The EEOB and Treasury building which flank the White House are not. If the EEOB is painted any color, but especially bright white, the striking visual uniqueness of the White House itself will become diluted. Further, the unpainted Treasury building will stand out at creating visual imbalance. Painting the Treasury building to achieve a uniform bright white appearance would also be highly costly, unnecessary, and damaging to the building's structural and historical integrity.

……

Plain-Language Summary of Expert Consensus

After asking leading experts whether mineral silicate paint could strengthen the EEOB's granite, keep water out, prevent stains, and require little maintenance, the consensus is clear:

- Granite is not the type of stone for which mineral silicate paints are designed as it lacks calcium carbonate with which the paint chemically bonds.
- These paints do not strengthen granite or protect it from deterioration.
- Application will require extensive and intensive abrasion creating permanent damage.
- Primers needed for adhesion undermine the claimed benefits of the paint system.
- Painting does not stop water infiltration or prevent staining.
- Stains and moisture problems will still occur—and be more visible against white paint.
- Fully removing the paint later would be impossible without significant and permanent damage to the stone.
- Repainting and cleaning the paint will require more frequent maintenance than cleaning the unpainted granite surface.
- The costs of painting, cleaning, and repainting the paint will be exponentially higher than cleaning the unpainted granite surface more regularly and investing in additional lower-cost improvements to appearance like architectural lighting and window treatments.
- Painting will increase national security risks because of the greater volume, frequency, and length of stay of people working near the White House.
- Changing the granite's color would be historically inappropriate.

# # #