PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

CC-Mr. H. A. Brown
CC-Mr. B. D. Lovick
CC-Mr. R. A. Kulberg
CC-Mr. Joe Baker, Seattle Office
CC-Dr. Blazek, Medical Director

December 16, 1969

Mr. Peter Kostic, Safety Administrator
W. R. Grace & Co
Industrial Chemicals Group
62 Whittemore Ave.
Cambridge, Massachusetts - 02140

Dear Peter:

Radiological Interpretation of X-ray
Annual Follow-Up
Zonolite/ Libby

Let us turn back momentarily to our Conference in Libby with Mr. Frank Rupp. We were all in accord that a problem exposure existed. We were assured that no facilities were planned which would provide adequate dust control to greatly relieve the occupation disease exposure. In the interim, we were told that transfers within the organization would be arranged for persons found to be suffering from pneumoconiosis. We were gratified to know that an x-ray program would be started to include pre-employment chest x-rays and periodic follow-up.

Medical authorities have recommended at least semi-annual chest x-rays and we have accepted annual repeat x-ray examination, more by influence of precedent than appreciative necessity. Medical authorities have not changed their recommendations for semi-annual chest x-rays. The latest radiological reports cannot be accepted as optimistically as previous reports, but even if we were to accept that only one of the sixty examined showed changes since the previous x-ray, that one is significant.

Whether we consider that one person as you or I or whoever he may be, we are thinking of him as 100%. Percentage, therefore, doesn't mean anything when you have a positive finding of occupational disease. We are past the stage of preventative engineering and must acknowledge the necessity for positive engineering controls.

Certainly, when an x-ray picture shows a change for the worse, that person must be told and that person must be gotten out of the environment which is aggravating his condition. Failure to do so is not humane and is in direct violation of Federal law.

We have never questioned but what the best approach to the overall

problem is dust control. You know I admire your program for monitoring the the work place air, and your plans for applying engineering controls found necessary. I trust that in seeking your goal of less than 12 fibers longer than five microns per CC, you will also seek a total dust count not to exceed 5,000,000 particles, per cubic foot of air.

Making the wearing of respiratory protection mandatory in the dry mill is understood. There are other areas such as the River Dock which creates similar exposures and where wearing of this approved respiratory protection is essential, for health.

I do not question but what our opinions continue to be parallel and realizing that Mr. Frank Rupp is no longer with the organization may in some way explain our temporary differences of opinion in the handling of pneumoconiosis victim. We even questioned at the time the practicality of such transfers, but at no time did we question the necessity of taking the person with noticeable lung changes out of the dust laden environment. In accepting this responsibility, we must strive even harder to accomplish our goal of dust control.

Please advise if you feel we can be of assistance from this office.

Very truly yours,

L. E. Park
Engineering Analyst
Loss Control Department

5

12-22-69

Deskside of
PETER KOSTIC

To: Harry Brown:

02146515

I'd like to discuss this with you, first chance.

RECEIVED
DEC 22 1969
CONSTRUCTION PRODUCTS DIVISION
H. A. B.

10001059