



INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

To: I. C. Klimas

Date: February 3, 1978

From: W. R. Harris

Location: 19 North

Subject: VDCM Work practices

C O N F I D E N T I A L

I am not quite sure I understand what is meant by this memo of January 30, 1978 relative to VDCM work practices.

As I have previously indicated, our system of checks and balances can only operate if our Environmental, Technical, Planning and Development people all feel that they have complete access to all of our facilities, and complete freedom to criticize us in our performance. We may have production problems or other limitations that cause us not to meet the deadlines that they would like to have us meet, but that is our problem, and not theirs.

I want to be sure that we don't get ourselves in a position where we feel that we have two opposing forces in any of these areas. All of our efforts are guided toward improving PPG's profit position and we want to be sure that we remember that in all of our discussions and our memos.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'W. R. Harris'.

W. R. Harris

rs

cc: / Z. G. Bell, Jr.
F. C. Dehn
H. C. Twiehaus



INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

To: I. Klimas

Date: January 30, 1978

From: Z. G. Bell, Jr.

Location: 10 West

Subject: VDCM Workpractices
Mr. R. Lynch Comments

I responded to you concerning Mr. R. Lynch's comments on the implementation of The Chemical's Group VDCM Workpractices at Lake Charles. When Phil Snyder and I were in Lake Charles in October, Phil went through the VDCM area to audit the compliance with these new workpractices. The deficiencies Phil noted were discussed briefly with Mr. J. Farst upon our exit interview.

As background information, when we review a program at the plant we think we do a thorough evaluation and not superficial. In addition to a review of the workpractice, item by item, we do a walk through to observe that what has been told us by management is being followed in the work area. Any discrepancies are noted. We also talk to the foreman and workers to ascertain their understanding of the required procedures. Often there are differences noted, misunderstandings, misinterpretations and in some instances total unawareness that a workpractice exists.

I do not mean to imply that the plant has not or is not taking action to implement the workpractices as reported by Mr. Lynch. The discrepancies we note are those seen on our visit which may be present only during our review, however, some are of such a nature that one is lead to believe they will continue to persist beyond our visit.

I believe it is our responsibility to highlight our observations and discuss these with plant management to get them resolved and to keep Pittsburgh management advised of our findings and the plant's progress.

Zeb G. Bell, Jr.

ZB/mec

cc: F. C. Dehn
H. C. Twiehaus
P. J. Snyder
W. R. Harris

SL 073649