



E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & COMPANY

WILMINGTON, DELAWARE 19898

INDUSTRIAL CHEMICALS DEPARTMENT

J. C. MUELLER
 W. H. Kelso
 L. D. Greenberg
 R. S. Wangelin
 T. T. Chase
 C. C. Quarles
 R. E. Jackson, Sabine Plant
 N. R. Wallner, Houston Plant
 G. A. Cato, Belle Plant

August 8, 1973

1. copy from file
 2. copy for OSH
 3. C.F.

A. W. BEASLEY, AUGUSTA PLANT
 C. E. WATKINS, BEAUMONT PLANT
 H. A. ROSCOE, BURNSIDE PLANT
 R. J. MC AULIFFE, CLEVELAND PLANT
 H. S. BOYLE, DELAWARE RIVER PLANT
 V. G. KOPPIN, EAST CHICAGO PLANT
 W. F. BRINT, FORT HILL PLANT
 E. C. BELL, FORTVILLE PLANT
 R. D. TURNER, GRASSELLI PLANT
 R. P. ALLEN, HEALING SPRINGS PLANT
 A. SINICKSON, JAMES RIVER PLANT
 D. A. DUNCAN, MARATHON PLANT
 W. E. ELTING, MEMPHIS PLANT
 J. M. LOETHER, NIAGARA FALLS PLANT
 H. D. MASCH, PHILADELPHIA PLANT
 S. HYDE, PINEVILLE PLANT
 R. W. BAYRER, REPAUNO PLANT
 L. A. BIDEZ, TOLEDO PLANT
 G. E. NEWBORN, WILLOW BANK PLANT
 R. J. ROUSH, WURLAND PLANT

PLAINTIFF'S
 EXHIBIT

DUP-126

OSHA ITEMS

Attached are several items of interest in connection with OSHA: (1) Excerpts from the minutes of the latest Departmental Coordinators Meeting. (2) A copy of a revised form intended for reporting on OSHA or NIOSH visits to S & F. Please review and send me any comments you might have. (3) A chronology of events with respect to a Repauno OSHA visit.

W. H. MC COY 8/8

W. H. MC COY

WMM:lab
 Attach.

DUP 1000077

EXCERPTS FROM MINUTES OF DEPARTMENTAL OSHA COORDINATORS MEETING

7/31/73

NIOSH - Contract Contacts

*John
D. Hill*
If our units are contacted by a contractor holding a NIOSH contract to prepare a criteria document, we should cooperate if we have an interest in the subject. Such contacts should be handled as if the contractor were NIOSH. If, however, the contractor desires to visit a Du Pont site to take readings, etc., we are not legally obligated to permit this. If we have an interest, we should cooperate; however, it is suggested that site management be given an opportunity to view the NIOSH contract in either of the above cases. Copies (2) of any material given to a NIOSH contractor should be forwarded to the Safety & Fire Protection Division. Our Division will forward one copy to NIOSH.

Houston OSHA Inspection

A complaint to OSHA on the part of the Engineering Department Construction Division contractor's employee prompted several visits to the Site. The OSHA compliance officer made his contacts with plant management instead of the Resident Field Project Manager. All departments are urged to follow proper communication channels and, in this matter, the compliance officer should have been referred to the Field Project Manager. On this inspection, the compliance officer requested that he be permitted to tape his conversation with employees. Good judgment should be exercised when this request is made. It is conceivable that a compliance officer would use a tape recorder to record his observations; however, unless good judgment indicated otherwise, we should not permit on-plant taping of Du Pont employees.

Form 103

Paragraph V(2) of this form requires entering the principal products manufactured and the approximate percentage of the annual value of such products. It has been normal plant practice to merely indicate, for example, organic chemicals--100%. The Beaumont Plant was recently requested for a more detailed breakdown. The Plant complied as follows:

Elastomer Chemicals	55%
Industrial Chemicals	40%
Organic Chemicals	5%

This answer was accepted and the lesson learned if a similar request is received by another site, it is not necessary to get very detailed.

DUP 1000078

Status of Noise Standard

The DOL Noise Committee continues to meet. Current indication is that the 90 dBA will remain as the standard until the Sataloff Study is complete.

DUP 1000079

REPAUNO OSHA VISIT AND FOLLOW-UP

CHRONOLOGY

May 29 & 30 - Repauno Plant visited by Walter E. Wilson, Federal Compliance Officer, in response to a complaint filed by the Union "Safety and Health Officer".

Wilson expressed concern about following:

- 1) Failure to require respirators for asbestos insulation removal work.
- 2) Failure to use blotter on portable air grinder.
- 3) Adequacy of DMT oxidizer barricade design for protection of workers in bays adjacent to operating bays.
- 4) Possible excessive noise exposures in some plant areas.
- 5) Possible dust exposures in some plant areas.
- 6) Failure to use shields to protect passersby and adjacent workers from welding arc flash in boiler shop.

June 4 - Meeting at Repauno to prepare strategy for supplying information on areas of concern.

June 11 - Plant received letter from Area Director requesting additional data as follows:

- Design basis for DMT barricades.
- Medical records of Pete Miskofsky (employee interviewed by compliance officer).

Reply requested by June 15..

DUP 1000080

- June 13 - C. E. Baker and A. C. Matteson from Plant staff visited Wilson in his office in Trenton, New Jersey, to discuss the following items:
- Plant policy of using safety glasses to protect against welders arc flash injury to those near welding work.
 - Plant asbestos monitoring program.
 - DMT barricade design.
 - Medical records for Miskofsky.
- June 14 - Reply to Area Director mailed.
- June 19 - Meeting of Legal, Safety & Fire Protection, Engineering, and Industrial Chemicals to discuss information to be provided on DMT barricade design.
- June 20 - C. E. Baker called Area Director and learned:
- Wilson was no longer involved.
 - OSHA accepted our approach on asbestos monitoring but would want to take some asbestos dust samples.
 - A tentative citation on DMT barricades had been sent to area solicitor for legal opinion.
 - A citation will be issued on failure to provide welding screens or appropriate goggles to protect against welders flash.
- June 28 - Letter on DMT barricade design sent to Area Director.
- July 2 - Industrial Hygienist Rufolo and Compliance Officer Moore visited Plant to make dust and noise measurements.

DUP 1000081

- July 11 - Notice of proposed penalty for citations received by Plant. Plant called Area Director to learn nature of citations. They were told:
- Citations were in the mail.
 - DMT barricade matter would be dropped.
- July 12 - Plant received citations for three alleged violations:
- 1) Failure to provide welding screens or shields to protect workers adjacent to welding areas.
 - 2) Failure to provide blotter or other compressible material between wheel and flange on air grinder.
 - 3) Failure to give affected employees reasonable opportunity to observe monitoring and see records of asbestos surveys.
- July 17 - Meeting of Employee Relations, Legal, Engineering, and Industrial Chemicals Department personnel to discuss strategy on welding screen citation.
- July 17 - Industrial Hygienist returned to Plant to sample at those operations which were shut down during his July 2 visit.
- July 19 - Letter indicating action on citations 2 and 3 sent to Area Director.
- July 23 - Meeting of Legal, Safety & Fire Protection, and Industrial Chemicals Department personnel held to review strategy on welding screen citation.
- July 23 - Notice of Contest and request for informal conference sent. Copies attached.
- July 27 - Telephone call from Barden, Assistant Regional Administrator, to DeRiemer advised us the citation on welding screens would be vacated.

DUP 1000082

- July 27 - Letter sent to Area Director withdrawing notice of contest. Copy attached.
- July 30 - Plant received amended citation vacating item on welding screens.

STATUS

The only open item at this date is the disposition of dust sample taken in Nitrite and Diamond areas. Indication is that no violation exists and no action is needed.

DUP 1000083

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE INSPECTION

1. Cooperative attitude is important.
2. Work informally with OSHA personnel whenever possible. Phone conversations and visits were very beneficial.
3. Higher organization levels in OSHA were more willing to reason and interpret the standards.

7/31/73

DUP 1000084

REPORT ON OSHA-HEW VISIT

1. Date of Visit _____ Time _____
2. Employment Unit (Name plant, laboratory, warehouse, construction)

3. OSHA region in which your unit is located _____
(City) _____ (Region No _____)
Name(s) and Title(s) of Visitor(s): _____

4. Was the visitor(s) from OSHA _____
NIOSH _____, FEDERAL _____, STATE _____
5. What prompted the Inspection? _____

If a complaint, were you given written copy? _____ Was it necessary to request copy? _____ Note: Attach copy.

Had the complaint been discussed with management at your location before being filed? _____ No _____ Yes. Remarks _____

6. Was advance notice given? _____
7. Duration of visit _____
8. What was inspected? _____

What measurements were made (e.g., air sampling for toxic vapors, noise, etc.)? _____

9. What violations were alleged? _____

10. Were citations issued? _____ Note: Attach copy
11. Citations which might warrant contesting _____

12. Were penalties assessed? _____ Note: Attach
13. How was the initial contact handled?
- a. Officer first appeared at _____
(Guardhouse, Main Office, etc.)
- b. Asked to see _____
- c. Presented credentials _____ voluntarily _____ upon request.
- d. Did your unit have an established protocol for this eventual:

- e. Miscellaneous remarks about ease or difficulty in handling initial
contact. _____

14. Did officer talk with Safety Supervisor, Work's Engineer, Company
Physician, or comparable people about overall safety and health
of installation either before or after inspection? (Give brief summary)

15. Did officer request to see any of the Company safety and health
records or records of occupational hazard measurements (e.g., to
vapors, dusts, noise, etc.)? _____ NO _____ YES. Remarks _____

16. What other materials did he ask for and receive? _____

17. What representative(s) of employees accompanied officer on inspection
(Union Steward, complainee, etc.) _____

How was employee representative determined? _____

DUP 1000086

18. Names and titles of Company representative(s) who accompanied officer on inspection. _____
19. Were questions directed to employee representative(s) and Company representative(s) alike in presence of one another? NO Y
Give some examples of what you consider to be most leading questions. _____

20. Were photographs deemed necessary? _____ Who took them? _____

21. Comment on closing conference. _____

22. Do you have any general comments to make in way of a summary? _____

Signed _____ Unit He

DUP 1000087

Date 2/20/74

DISTRIBUTION LIST
OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY & HEALTH INFORMATION

TO:	C. S. Reburn D. G. Cushing W. O. Jewett J. R. Pailthorp A. F. Myers P. B. Vernon H. L. Lawrence R. H. Walsh R. A. Kurtz J. S. Hickman R. A. Hammond H. E. Serenbetz P. E. Dobbs W. H. Ayscue R. Pariser	H. Jungk - Chambers S. W. McCune - Chestnut Run D. E. Andersen - Exp. Sta. G. L. Chaikin - Beaumont H. P. Child - Chambers W. J. Cartledge - Louisville J. N. Montgomery - Pontchartrain G. Doukas - Beaumont J. B. Robinson - Pontchartrain B. C. Anderson - Chambers W. K. Witsiepe - Louisville H. L. Dey - Maydown <u>E. E. Embs - Beaumont</u> A. M. McConnell - Louisville B. T. LaMaster - Pontchartrain
-----	---	---

FROM: M. K. Richards

Attached is a copy of OSHA inspections at Company locations.



DUP 1000088

SAFETY AND HEALTH INSPECTIONS
COMPLAINT

November 23, 1971 - Houston Construction Site

OSHA inspectors appeared as result of complaint by former construction employee. Inspectors were very complimentary of conditions and had no violations to cite.

December 1, 1971 - Beaumont Construction

Visited by OSHA Compliance Officer as result of a complaint by employee of contractor at this location. Complaint was not recognized as justified and no citation was issued.

April, 1972 - Cape Fear Plant

Result of employee complaint on lifting, OSHA Compliance Officer visited plant. No citation.

June, 1972 - Houston Plant

OSHA inspection by Compliance Officer as result of complaint by employee of electrical contractor on site. Very satisfied with our procedures and stated employee had no basis for his complaint.

September 11 & 12, 1972 - Beaumont Works

Inspected by OSHA Compliance Officer as result of two complaints by a Natkin employee (Natkin is a contractor employed by Engineering Dept. Construction Div. on plant site). No citations.

September 29, 1972 - Cleveland IC Plant

Visited by OSHA Compliance Officer as result of employee complaint, and Ribbon Mixer in Zinc Chloride Department was inspected. No citation issued. Violation - must await results of air sample taken. Officer said he did not think the complaint was justified and thought the results of the sample taken would so indicate.

November 3, 1972 - Repauno Plant

Inspection was made as result of employee complaint. No violations. No citation.

February 23, 1973 - Repauno Plant

OSHA inspection by State Industrial Hygienist because of a widow's claim that her husband died from occupational exposure at the plant.

April 12, 1973 - Niagara Works

OSHA Officer appeared as result of employee complaint.

May 29, 1973 - Repauno Plant

Plant inspection by OSHA Inspector as result of employee complaint. Three citations.

DUP 1000089

COMPLAINT

June 5, 1973 - Houston Plant

Employee of electrical contractor alleged discrimination when terminated for refusal to work in shutdown plant area. Union upheld term. OSHA Inspector visited plant and discussed with Steward - No problems expected.

June 19, 1973 - Edge Moor Plant

Plant visited by OSHA Inspector as result of complaint from Edge Moor Employees Union. Five alleged violations. No penalties.

Sept. 6, 1973 - Antioch Works

OSHA Inspector visited plant as result of alleged lead intoxication of contractor's employee. No violations or citations pending results of analysis.

Sept. 13, 1973 - Tucker F & F Plant

OSHA Compliance Officer visited plant as result of a complaint.

Oct. 4, 1973 - Newport Pigments Plant

OSHA Compliance Officer visited plant as result of complaint of former employee. No violations. No citations.

Sept. 20, 1973 - Seaford Nylon Plant

Visited by OSHA Inspector as result of employee complaint regarding noise exposure. No citations, No penalties.

DUP 1000090

SAFETY AND HEALTH INSPECTIONS
CONTRACTORS, HEALTH SURVEYS, STATE INSPECTIONS

February, 1972 - Trail Ridge Plant

Inspected by Department of Interior - Metallic & Non-Metallic Safety Act. Violation "Welding operations were not shielded". Protective screen to be put around shop welding spot agreed upon and citation eliminated.

May, 1972 - Edge Moor Plant

Inspected by State of Delaware, Department of Labor, as result of employee complaint on Pigments Department's packing and PKT operations. No citation.

July, 1972 - Healing Springs Plant

Routine annual safety inspection by State Department of Labor. No citations.

October 5, 1972 - Belle Plant

Inspection was made by Safety Inspectors from West Virginia Labor Department as result of an employee complaint about scaffolds. Scaffolds that were inspected were found to be safe.

October 6, 1972 - Wurtland Plant

Routine inspection by State Inspector. Violation - hook on chain fall used for raising bagged chemicals pallet had a malfunctioning safety latch. Will be cited in Officer's written report. No penalty.

May 2, 1973 - Florida Plant (Trail Ridge and Highland)

Inspected by Department of Interior. No problems seemed to be present. Report will be forwarded later.

March 27, 1973 - Kinston Construction

OSHA inspection made by North Carolina Department of Labor on Daniels Construction, Kinston.

Aug. 22, 1973 - Carney's Point Works

Visited by State Inspector as result of "rumor". Unable to determine source. No violations. No citations.

DUP 1000091

SAFETY AND HEALTH INSPECTIONS
CONTRACTORS, HEALTH SURVEYS, STATE INSPECTIONS

November 2, 1973 - Monrovia Plant

Routine inspection by California Division of Industrial Safety
Compliance Unit. Seven violations. No penalties.

December 26 & 27, 1973 - Carney's Point Works

Routine annual inspection by New Jersey Department of Labor Safety
Inspectors. No violations. No citations.

DUP 1000092

SAFETY AND HEALTH INSPECTIONS
ROUTINE INSPECTIONS

June, 1971 - Chambers Works "Freon" Area

Inspection was evidently a training activity on the part of the Compliance Officer who had just finished a training program. No citations.

August, 1972 - Clanton Film Plant

Visited by OSHA inspector who asked to see barge unloading facilities in connection with his responsibility for inspection of Maritime Operations. No unloading was being accomplished at time of visit, so no inspection was made.

November 1, 1972 - Clinton Film Plant

Routine OSHA inspection by Federal Compliance Officer. Citation of a minor character resulted in a penalty of \$50. Paid by plant without comment.

January 25, 1973 - Fayetteville Works

OSHA inspector from North Carolina Department of Labor made a routine inspection. No violations. No citation.

March 28, 1973 - Endo

OSHA inspection. Some citations primarily related to improper guarding of drives. \$100 fine - paid by Endo.

May 9, 1973 - Moberly Plant

OSHA routine inspection - no citations.

May 21, 1973 - Fairfield Plant

Plant visited by Senior Factory Inspector, Dept. of Labor, State of Connecticut, unannounced for an annual inspection. His primary interest was to inspect the Plant under State Statutes. Three items found to be in violation and a few minor infractions. To be reinspected in 60 days.

June 13, 1973 - Pompton Lakes Works

Plant visited by Safety Officer from Defense Supply Agency to conduct a safety audit. No recommendations made.

June 12, 1973 - Clearfield Plant (Berg Electronics)

Compliance Officer visited plant on a scheduled inspection. No citations issued.

DUP 1000093

SAFETY AND HEALTH INSPECTIONS
ROUTINE

July 3, 1973 - Chicago F & F Plant

Routine OSHA inspection. No violations. No citations.

August 14, 1973 - Du Pont Works

Compliance Officer indicated it was a "get acquainted" visit to check our wharf. Five citations but Compliance Officer did not think there would be any penalties.

September 13, 1973 - Brevard Photo Products Plant

Routine OSHA Inspection.

September 17, 1973 - Findlay, Ohio (Remington) Plant

Routine inspection by OSHA Inspector. No serious violations. Three other violations, proposed penalty \$100.

September 25, 1973 - Johnsonville Plant

OSHA Inspector was directed by his area supervisor to inspect plant. Primarily sanitation and health facilities. Made some noise level readings. No violations. No penalties.

October 2-3, 1973 - Bridgeport, Conn. (Remington) Plant

Routine inspection by OSHA Inspector. No violations. No penalties.

October 3, 1973 - Cleveland ICD Plant

A NIOSH Representative made a scheduled one-day visit to the plant to obtain data on personnel exposure to chemicals and other hazards in business and manufacturing facilities. He indicated approval of plant's medical program and noise control program.

October 29-30, 1973 - Cape Fear Plant

Inspected by two North Carolina Department of Labor representatives as result of random selection. Two violations. No penalties.

November 28, 1973 - Biwabik Works

Routine inspection by State of Minnesota Department of Labor. Two violations. No penalties.

DUP 1000094

SAFETY AND HEALTH INSPECTIONS
INCIDENT OR SERIOUS INJURY

November, 1971 - Grasselli Plant

Result of serious injury to an employee. OSHA inspectors appeared at plant but decided to leave inspection to state men who were already present. No citations.

March, 1972 - Newport Plant

Inspected because of death of an employee in February, 1972, resulting from a broken leg in December, 1971. (OSHA Compliance Officer) No citations.

May, 1972 - Savannah River Plant

Inspected by OSHA Compliance Officer as result of a fatality. No citations.

November 29, 1972 - Spruance Fibers Plant

Inspection resulted because of fatality of contractor employee. No citation.

January 23, 1973 - Savannah River Plant

OSHA Compliance Officer made inspection of plant as result of fatality on 1/11/73. No violations found. No citation.

October 18, 19, & 30, 1973 - Chambers Works

OSHA inspection made because of explosion on 10/17/73 which resulted in one fatality. No violations. No citations.

DUP 1000095