

March 5, 1973

Legal Section
Industrial Commission of Ohio
Ohio Departments Building
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Attention: Robert L. Robbins
Room 104

Re: O.D. 9743-22
Mr. Charles Dickess

Gentlemen:

On February 22, 1973, a visit was made to the plant of the North American Refractories Company at Ironton, Ohio to check conditions under which the claimant had worked.

The company manufactures firebrick and refractories.

According to company records, the claimant's experience is as follows:

Started work:	April 24, 1934	Last day:	Currently employed with North American Refractories, Inc.
---------------	----------------	-----------	---

The claimant throughout his career of some 38 years with the subject employer served as a drypan operator. A drypan is a mechanical device which simply breaks down large lumps of clay or brick into a much smaller workable size. This operation is usually a very dusty one.

The drypan at North American Refractories Ironton Plant is located outdoors underneath an overhang attached to the north end of the plant. At the time of this visit the drypan was down so no dust counts were taken. Presently there is an exhaust system built into the drypan, which according to personnel who work in this area, has greatly improved the level of dust concentration in the immediate vicinity. Furthermore, materials are presently conveyed to the drypan by a conveyor system which eliminates the need for an individual to manually feed material into the drypan and be exposed to the considerable dust that is raised when the material is dumped into the drypan. The claimant worked for years at this job before the improvements of the exhaust system and conveyor loading of material were incorporated and consequently was exposed to more dust than he presently is. Since the drypan is essentially

located outdoors it is exposed to random air currents. It is claimed, however, that the effect of the air currents in reducing the dust concentration is insignificant. The company does provide dust respirators but does not make it mandatory that they be worn.

The claimant was given a pre-employment physical examination which did not include a chest x-ray. No chest x-rays were required or given the claimant subsequent to his employment.

It is concluded that this claimant by virtue of the fact that for most of his adult life he has been employed by the subject employer and that the greater portion of this employment has been as a drypan operator has had considerable exposure to occupational dusts containing free silica. It is also probable that this exposure contributed in a significant way to his present physical disability.

Very truly yours,

Joseph M. Paeso, P.E.
Industrial Hygiene Engineer

JMP:jp