PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

K-2013

June 17, 1958

Re: O.D. 104737
O.D. 105561
Leonard G. Eaton

Medical Department
Industrial Commission of Ohio
Columbus, Ohio

Gentlemen:

On April 4, 1958, Mr. Lester M. Merritt, of this Division visited the Kimball Glass Company, 711 Southwood Ave., Columbus, Ohio, to check conditions under which the above named claimant had worked.

Prior to his death, Mr. Merritt had no opportunity to write a letter on this visit. According to his notes and telephone communication with the company the claimant worked for them from January 29, 1953 to January 17, 1958 and is still on the payroll pending his return to work. His job was the buffing of television tube faces with a cork wheel, using pumice as a buffing agent. The operation was wet. An X-ray diffraction of the pumice made by the company indicated that the pumice contains less than 0.1% free silica. Excessive dust in this area would have interfered with production. It is believed that the claimant had no exposure to dust containing free silica of industrial hygiene significance.

Very truly yours,

DeWitt Huffman
Industrial Hygiene Engineer

DDH:ES:JP

76

June 17, 1958

Medical Department
Industrial Commission of Ohio
Columbus, Ohio

Re: O. D. 104737
O. D. 105561
Leonard O. Eaton

Gentlemen:

On April 4, 1958, Mr. Lester M. Merritt, of this Division visited the K'ble Glass Company, 711 Southwood, Columbus, Ohio, to check conditions under which the above named claimant had worked.

Prior to his death, Mr. Merritt had no opportunity to write a letter on this visit. According to his notes and telephone communication with the company, the claimant worked for this company from January 29, 1953 to January 17, 1958 and is still on the payroll of the company pending his return to work. His job was the buffing of television tube faces with a cork wheel using pumice as a buffing agent. The operation was wet. An X-ray defraction of the pumice made by the company indicated that the pumice contains less than 0.1% free silica. Excessive dust in this area would have interfered with production. It is believed that the claimant had no exposure to dust containing free silica of industrial hygiene significance.

Very truly yours,

DeWitt Huffman
Industrial Hygiene Engineer

DH:ec

74