PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

ATT-203

Bell Laboratories

subject:

date: September 25, 1978

from: W. J. Schreibeis

Mr. J. M. Mystick:

This is in response to your memorandum of September 20th and the attached TWX received from AT&T. Comments on the specific items are as follows:

Item A: Problems have been experienced with various OSHA standards for use of chemicals. Some proposed standards are months or years before finally resolved leaving the administrator with two different standards, one in effect and a proposed stringent one pending. Standards developed for specific industries do spill over into other areas with uniquely different problems. Thus the arsenic standard aimed at smelting operations isn't readily adopted to a research laboratory.

Item B: The wisdom of requiring chest x-rays as part of physical exams for employees exposed to certain materials, such as asbestos, is questionable because they represent a possible health hazard. Some of the standards for carcinogens cause considerable fear and panic in employees having minor insignificant exposures. Some of the carcinogen standards tend to close out technology development caused by the stringent requirements.

Item C: Some state plans exceed Federal OSHA. In New Jersey there has been a crusade to identify and rigidly control suspected carcinogens without adequate justification.

Item D: Partial success was obtained by the Bell System when Mr. George M. Wilkening obtained a policy letter from Dr. Morton Corn regarding requirements for physicals for employee exposure to asbestos. A clear definition of exposure level triggering physicals resulted.

Item E: Industry must be activated in early formative policy stages. Cut down on paper work, reporting and record keeping.

Item F: The use of 1977 could be very misleading in overall cost.

MH-7885-WJS-cls

W. J. Schreibeis