#7(a)

U.S. Department of Labor

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

550 Eagan Street - Room 206
Charleston, West Virginia 25301
Reply to the Attention of:
(304) 347-5937

June 20, 1984

RECEIVED
JUN 21 1984
SAFETY DEPT.

Mr. Charles P. Maxwell
Safety Director, Technical Center
Union Carbide Corporation
P.O. Box 8361
South Charleston, West Virginia 25303

Dear Mr. Maxwell:

During a recent inspection at the Sistersville, West Virginia plant, our compliance officer requested that OSHA 200 forms be provided for his review. Since the forms were maintained in Charleston, it was several days before this review took place. An OSHA 200 entry for May 21, 1981 indicated that some employees had been diagnosed with "pneumoconiosis" and no further definitive etiology was noted. Upon further investigation, our compliance officer found that the OSHA 101 forms which correlated to the OSHA 200 entries had "pneumoconiosis" again listed as the diagnosis; the individual medical records, however, have "asbestosis" listed under diagnosis.

Our Regional Tech Support Group was contacted regarding the adequacy of your recordkeeping and we were informed that "pneumoconiosis" is correct when recording an OSHA 200 entry, but that the OSHA 101 associated with that entry must reflect the final diagnosis of the physician and in this case that determination was "asbestosis."

We would recommend then that future OSHA 101 entries or worker's compensation form entries reflect the definitive diagnosis of a medical doctor.

Sincerely,

Perry D. Jones
Area Director

BB

Please file in asbestos file

Thanks
CM

cc: T. L. Collins
L. R. Noble
M. L. Mills
P. L. Graham

(7)

U.S. Department of Labor

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

550 Eagan Street - Room 206
Charleston, West Virginia 25301
Reply to the Attention of:
(304) 347-5937

June 20, 1984

RECEIVED
JUN 21 1984
SAFETY DEPT.

Mr. Charles P. Maxwell
Safety Director, Technical Center
Union Carbide Corporation
P.O. Box 8361
South Charleston, West Virginia 25303

Dear Mr. Maxwell:

During a recent inspection at the Sistersville, West Virginia plant, our compliance officer requested that OSHA 200 forms be provided for his review. Since the forms were maintained in Charleston, it was several days before this review took place. An OSHA 200 entry for May 21, 1981 indicated that some employees had been diagnosed with "pneumoconiosis" and no further definitive etiology was noted. Upon further investigation, our compliance officer found that the OSHA 101 forms which correlated to the OSHA 200 entries had "pneumoconiosis" again listed as the diagnosis; the individual medical records, however, have "asbestosis" listed under diagnosis.

Our Regional Tech Support Group was contacted regarding the adequacy of your recordkeeping and we were informed that "pneumoconiosis" is correct when recording an OSHA 200 entry, but that the OSHA 101 associated with that entry must reflect the final diagnosis of the physician and in this case that determination was "asbestosis."

We would recommend then that future OSHA 101 entries or worker's compensation form entries reflect the definitive diagnosis of a medical doctor.

Sincerely,

Perry D. Jones
Area Director