FILE NAME: Quigley (QUIG)

DATE: 1973 Mar 8

DOC#: QUIG026

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Internal Report

PFIZER INC.
CORPORATE SAFETY REPORT

SUBJECT: On-Site Review of Old Bridge, New Jersey Facilities

BY: E. K. Hamilton
DATE: March 8, 1973

SUMMARY:

Upon Divisional request an OSHA type inspection of the Quigley plant at Old Bridge, New Jersey was made. A progressive safety program was found and no serious discrepancies. Incomplete machine guarding was the major problem. Potential health hazards (noise and dust) were resolved through dialogue with the State. Housekeeping was good, considering the nature of materials handled. Establishing written procedures for each operation is suggested as a strong assist to safety.

DISCUSSION:

Visit was made at the request of Mr. D. R. Thacker on March 1, 1973. Opening interview was held mostly with Mr. J. F. Major, Plant Manager but partly with Mr. L. Dreyling, Quigley Technical Vice President, in overall charge of the installation. Mr. Major supervises plant operation while Mr. Dreyling is also responsible for the laboratory.

Forms OSHA 1 and 1B were adequately filled out at the interview (Attachment 1 and 2). All required accident records and poster requirements were in order and the safety and health program evaluation was progressive, exhibiting desirable detail for a plant of this size. Table 1 (Attachment 3) gives a list of commendable plus factors found at the plant. Two noteworthy aspects of the safety program are to be noted in the practice of assigning penalties for infractions and in the electric sign, clearly visible from the highway, giving the days since a lost time accident.

Four days previously the plant had been inspected by the State. The inspector, who under the New Jersey State Plan, would also be the OSHA inspector, cleared the operation except for six violations. He visited the plant on the next day just to make sure of his original conclusion. Abatement of all citations was either started or well underway at the time of the present visit.

No further imminent danger, or even serious, discrepancies were observed. General lack of effective guard was however observed in almost all roller mill and pulverizing machinery. Either existing guards were open railings, mesh was much too large, or coverage was insufficient. Table 2 (Attachment 4) lists these discrepancies. Otherwise it was noted that in the plant area most main exit signs were not illuminated and exit access signs were needed in places. Fire extinguisher mounting was often too high or non existant.

Serious health discrepancies were not observed, except as already noted by the State with regard to excessive noise levels. It is planned to eliminate the problem by a two year state approved program. Except for asbestos, toxic materials

were not observed. A nuisance dust problem appeared possible, but a State survey has shown no unacceptable levels. Even so, approved dust respirators were common and an effective respirator maintenance program meeting 1910 standards is in effect. A hard hat area program looked desirable and the suggestion was quickley accepted by management. The asbestos threat should be controlled by existing respirator program since the product is to be phased out shortly.

The plant consisted of several one story (some 40 to 60 ft. high) essentially open buildings of non combustible construction, except for roofs in some cases. The office building was furnished with wood paneling over gypsum board. No sprinklers were used throughout the plant. Materials were moved from trucks and box cars to production areas by fork lifts and pallets. Three small and one large front end loaders were also used. At least some trucks were rented. Trailer trucks were unloaded with tractor in place for safety. Railroad car wheels were suitably provided with stops. Dockboards were steel and especially purchased for the corporation.

CONCLUSIONS:

Review of the Table II will show that most discrepancies fall into three groups: machine guarding, fire extinguisher irregularities and exit sign deficiencies. None can be termed especially serious but abatement procedures should not be delayed. To this end, a status column has been included on the table together with a descriptive key. Every two months this column should be updated and a copy of the revision sent to Corporate Safety until all items are resolved.

In addition to correction of specific discrepancies written operating procedures for each job incorporating safety information and directions are recommended. The latest Safety Program Evaluation Report (SPER) should be reviewed and revised in the light of both this report and the State review.

E. K. Hamilton

Distribution:

Messrs. L. Dreyling
J. Major
A. Osti/File: Old Bridge Visits
D. Thacker
D. Vines

ATTACHMENT 1

11/15/71

Old Plum Poster
V(VII-13) AUTH EMPLOYEE REPS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Occupational Safety and Health Administration

SAFETY AND HEALTH REPORT

1. CSHO NO.	2. REPORT NO.
3. AREA	4. REGION

5. STATE	6. CITY	7. EMPLOYER	8. INSPECTION DATE	9. SECONDARY COVERAGE				
				PCA	SCA	CSA	MAR	OTHER

10. NAME OF EMPLOYER, TYPE OF LEGAL ENTITY, AND ADDRESS OF PRINCIPAL OFFICE: Quigley Sub. of Pfizer Inc.

11. TELEPHONE: 201-257-1227

12. STREET OR BUILDING (Place of Performance): Main Street

13. ZIP CODE: 08857

14. CITY: Old Bridge

15. STATE: N. J.

16. COUNTY AND CODE:

17. TYPE OF BUSINESS: Manufacturer

20. CLASSIFIED CONTRACTS: ☐ YES ☒ NO

21. SIC:

22. MAIN PLANT ☐ BRANCH PLANT ☐ ONLY PLANT ☒ in U. S.

23. TYPE: INITIAL X FOLLOWUP

24. COMPLAINT: YES NO X

25. INSPECTION BY: K. Hamilton

NUMBER EMPLOYED	18. ALL SHIFTS	19. LARGEST SHIFT
MALE	120	90
FEMALE	4	
TOTAL	124*	

*Approximate

26. MANAGEMENT OFFICIALS CONTACTED	TITLE	27. EMPLOYEE INSPECTION REPRESENTATIVE(S)	TITLE
L. Dreyling	Tech. V.P.	None	
J. Major	Plt. Mgr.		
28. MANAGEMENT INSPECTION REPRESENTATIVE(S)		29. OTHER EMPLOYEES CONTACTED (If no management employee representative)	
J. Major			
		J. Kloc	
30. CLOSING CONFERENCE CONTACTS (Use the OSHA-1C (or equiv.)) E. Witkowski	Personnel Mgr.	B. Thompson	
Plus Above		E. Antone	

31. (A) DESCRIPTION OF WORKSITE
(1) CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS OR TYPE OF WORK AREA (Including size)

Various non combustible - some wood roofs
All one story

32. (2) TYPE OF FIRE PROTECTION

Fire hoses to city water hydrants
Auxilliary hydrant from river
Portable extinguishers

33. (3) DESCRIPTION OF PROCESSES (Raw materials, major processes, and products, etc.)

Mixing and forming of mineral materials to produce products applicable to furnace to prolong their life or for insulation.

34. (B) SECONDARY COVERAGE-LIST FEDERAL CONTACT NUMBER, AND PREFIX (Details in OSHA-1C)

35. (C) DID YOU OBSERVE AN INJURY OR HEALTH HAZARD NOT COVERED BY A STANDARD? ☐ YES ☐ NO
IF "YES," SUBMIT AN OSHA-9 FORM.

36. (D) (1) WAS ADVANCE NOTICE OF INSPECTION GIVEN? ☒ YES ☐ NO TO WHOM? J. Major WHEN?
(2) IN YOUR JUDGMENT DID THE ADVANCE NOTICE ADVERSELY AFFECT THE INSPECTION? ☐ YES ☒ NO
IF "YES," EXPLAIN ON REVERSE OF THIS FORM.

37. (E) (1) DOES EMPLOYER MAINTAIN INJURY AND ILLNESS RECORDS AS REQUIRED? ☒ YES ☐ NO

38. (2) WERE FORMS AND INSTRUCTIONS PROVIDED? ☐ YES ☒ NO

39. (3) DOES EMPLOYER COMPLY WITH THE POSTING REQUIREMENTS? ☒ YES ☐ NO
IF "NO," LIST AS A VIOLATION ON OSHA-1A.

TIME INVESTED - TO NEAREST HOUR

59. PREPARATION	61. TRAVEL		62. CONFERENCE	63. INSPECTION	64. REPORT PREPARATION	65. TOTAL

66. CSHO'S SIGNATURE DATE

67. AREA DIRECTOR'S SIGNATURE DATE

GPO 916-169

Form OSHA-1
AUG. 1971

09 0784

ATTACHMENT 2

11/15/71

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Occupational Safety and Health Administration

1. CSHO NO.	2. Disp. NO.
3. AREA	4. REGION

OSHA-1B X = No

SAFETY AND HEALTH PROGRAM EVALUATION

PROGRAMS	YES
5 SAFETY PROGRAM	✓
Safety Staff	
Full Time	
Part Time	
Other Duties	
NUMBER ON STAFF 0	
6 SAFETY COMMITTEES	YES
Executive	
Labor-Management	
Supervisory	
Employee Note 1	✓
Meetings	
Other (explain):	
7 TRAINING	YES
Training Staff X	
Type Programing	
Supervisory	
Employee	
On the Job Note 2	✓
Formal	
Other (explain):	

PROGRAMS	YES
8 MEDICAL	
Pre-Employment Examination	✓
Placement	
Hazardous Occupation	
Periodic Note 3	✓
Followup	
Annual Examination	
Sight Conservation	✓
Hearing Conservation	✓
First Aid Note 4	✓
Doctor	
(1) Full Time	
Nurse	
(2) Full Time	
9 PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT	YES
Foot Protection Note 5	✓
Eye/Face Protection Note 6	✓
Head Protection Note 7	✓
Respiratory Protection Note 8	✓
Hand/Skin Protection Note 9	✓
Safety Belts	
Water Hazards	
(1) Life Vests	
(2) Life Rings	
Rescue	
Ear Protection Note 10	✓

PROGRAMS	YES
10 ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION (Injury)	
Supervisor	✓
Committee	
(1) Labor-Management	✓
(2) Employee-Management	
Analysis N	✓
Corrective Action O	✓
Followup T	✓
Enforcement E 11	✓
Accident Investigation (No Injury)	
11 INCENTIVE AWARDS	YES
Supervisory	
Employee	
Other (explain):	
12 PUBLICITY-PROMOTION	YES
House Organ	
Rules and Standards	
Posters	✓
Bulletin Boards Note 12	
Rally-Meetings	
13 MANAGEMENT INTEREST	YES
Good	✓
Lacking	
Cooperative	
Injury Rate	
Costs (Injury)	

Remarks:

Notes:

1. At monthly labor/management meeting.
2. No written operating procedures - will draft.
3. Two years for moving jobs. Will arrange 2 years for all; one year where needed (on suggestion that all exposed to particulates be examined.)
4. Johnson & Johnson standard kit; not selected by M. D.
5. Safety shoes subsidized: $5.00 for first pair; $12.00 for next pair in same year; boots supplied where needed.
6. Supply goggles where needed; no glasses supplied.

(continued on next page)

09 0785

7. In selected locations on voluntary basis; not required anyplace. Upon suggestion will now designate hard hat areas.

8. Approved disposable 3M supplied. Also approved Wilson replaceable filter type. Have disinfecting and care policy. Units for each individual only.

9. Two types of gloves supplied; also skin cleanser.

10. Approved Wilson earmuff supplied. State has approved 2 year period to achieve abatement. Complete sound level survey made.

11. All factors are analysed by committee and penalties are assessed where indicated; time off or obnoxious job.

12. Large electric sign visible to public shows days worked without lost time accident.

TABLE 1

PLUS FACTORS

Fire Protection

1. Two nearby fire companies
2. City water pressure hydrants
3. Auxilliary hydrant from river for pumpers
4. Fire brigade
5. Fire drills
6. Fire alarm system for plant.

Safety

1. Respirator program - 1 man supervisor
2. Hearing conservation program - ear muffs now with 2 year engineering plan.
3. Strong safety shoe policy with substantial subsidy.
4. Electric sign signifying days lost time.
5. Supervisor safety committee
6. Effective switch lockout procedure.

General

1. Fiberglas drapes
2. Wood paneling over gypsum board
3. Lab eye wash fountain.

TABLE II - DISCREPANCIES

ITEM	SEVERITY	LOCATION	DISCREPANCY	COMMENT AND SUGGESTED ABATEMENT	STATUS	REFERENCE
1	3	Buildings 1, 2, 3-Roller Mills, Pulverizers, Dryers	Incompletely guarded drive belts.	Need additional guarding or smaller mesh of existing guard.		219(e)(1) and (3)
2	3	Same as item 1	Imcompletely guarded sprockets and chains.	Complete guards		219(f)
3	3	Packers	Pinch points on packers	Guard where feasible		212(a)(1)
4	4	Packers	No voltage indication on electrical panels	Post		309
5	4	Packers	No purpose indicated on electrical panels	Post		NEC 110-22
6	3	Building 2	Wood step ladder defective	Replace		24(d)
7	3	Magnesite storage	Drive rollers of roller belt conveyor not guarded below 7 ft.	Guard		212(a)(1)
8	3	Same as item 7	No hard hat requirement	No one is admitted to building during conveyor operation but stray stone may fall later. Hard hat areas should be established in general.		132

SEVERITY KEY: 1 - Imminent danger
2 - Serious
3 - Non-serious
4 - De Minimis

STATUS KEY: 1 - Completed - list date
2 - Inprogress - list estimated completion date.
3 - In abeyance
4 - Nonconcurrence
5 - Cancelled..

* All references are from 29 CFR 1910., except when otherwise specified.
NEC - National Electrical Code.

09 0788

ITEM	SEVERITY	LOCATION	DISCREPANCY	COMMENT AND SUGGESTED ABATEMENT	STATUS	REFERENCE
9	4	General Storage Building	Fire extinguishers too high	Remount		157(a)(6)
9a	3	Same as item 9	No prohibition of smoking posted.	Post		177(g)
10	3	Same as Item 9	Blocked fire extinguisher	Remount - blocked temporarily		157(a)(2)
11	3	Same as Item 9	Large area stacked with paper bags containing mineral; no aisles for access to bags in fire	Form aisles		177(a)(10
12	4	Same as item 9	Gas meter shutoff not marked	Indicate location with a readily visible sign.		Good Practice
13	3	Same as Item 9	Two kinds of fire extinguishers adjacent and no distinguishing marking	Indicate individual use		157(a)(4)
14	4	Panel Room	Plate off spare heater allows access to unguarded sprocket and chain.	Replace plate		219(f)(3)
15	3	Panel Room	Rotating blade mixer has no means of preventing operation with cover open.	Provide electrical interlock		263(e)(1)(viii) an. (f)(3)
16	3	Carpenter Shop	Circular table saw unguarded.	Restore and revise (if needed) guard.		213(c)(3)
17	3	Same as Item 16	Hand saw unguarded.	Guard		213(i)(1)
18	3	Same as Item 16	Fire extinguisher too high	Remount		157(a)(6)
19	4	Machine Shop	Drill press unguarded.	Guard		213(l)(1) and (2)

09 0789

ITEM	SEVERITY	LOCATION	DISCREPANCY	COMMENT AND SUGGESTED ABATEMENT	STATUS	REFERENCE
20	3	Same as Item 19	Insufficient fraction of welders' clothes fire retardant or wool	Use wool or treat cotton		252(e)(3)
21	3	Same as Item 19	Oxygen stored with acetylene	Must be separated by 20 Ft.		252(a)(2)(iv)(c)
22	3	Same as Item 19	Fire extinguisher blocked	Clear		157(a)(2)
23	3	Same as Item 19	Horizontal hand saw unguarded	Guard		213(i)(1)
24	4	Propane Storage	No nearby fire extinguisher	Supply 8BC (10 lb. CO_2 or equivalent) needed.		110(g)(7)
25	4	Office	Ungrounded water cooler	Ground		NEC 250-45d
26	3	Office	Dead end to boiler room needs sign.	Post		37(q)(2)
27	4	Office	Unmounted fire extinguishers	Mount		157(a)(5)
28	4	Laboratory	No type A extinguishers	Supply		37(b)
29	3	All	All exits must have reliable illumination.	Supply		37(q)(6)
30	3	All	Exit access signs needed.	Post		37(q)(5)
31	3	All	No hazardous operations or welding permits used.	System devised by other Pfizer plant be used or "tailor made" one be developed.		106(h)(7)(ii)(a)
32	4	General	Separate lockers for work and street clothes not used for asbestos workers.	Only advisable until asbestos is phased out; special clothing and laundering also required.		93(a)(4)(i

09 0790

PFIZER INC.
CORPORATE SAFETY REPORT

SUBJECT: On-Site Review of Old Bridge, New Jersey Facilities

BY: E. K. Hamilton
DATE: March 8, 1973

SUMMARY:

Upon Divisional request an OSHA type inspection of the Quigley plant at Old Bridge, New Jersey was made. A progressive safety program was found and no serious discrepancies. Incomplete machine guarding was the major problem. Potential health hazards (noise and dust) were resolved through dialogue with the State. Housekeeping was good, considering the nature of materials handled. Establishing written procedures for each operation is suggested as a strong assist to safety.

DISCUSSION:

Visit was made at the request of Mr. D. R. Thacker on March 1, 1973. Opening interview was held mostly with Mr. J. F. Major, Plant Manager but partly with Mr. L. Dreyling, Quigley Technical Vice President, in overall charge of the installation. Mr. Major supervises plant operation while Mr. Dreyling is also responsible for the laboratory.

Forms OSHA 1 and 1B were adequately filled out at the interview (Attachment 1 and 2). All required accident records and poster requirements were in order and the safety and health program evaluation was progressive, exhibiting desirable detail for a plant of this size. Table 1 (Attachment 3) gives a list of commendable plus factors found at the plant. Two noteworthy aspects of the safety program are to be noted in the practice of assigning penalties for infractions and in the electric sign, clearly visible from the highway, giving the days since a lost time accident.

Four days previously the plant had been inspected by the State. The inspector, who under the New Jersey State Plan, would also be the OSHA inspector, cleared the operation except for six violations. He visited the plant on the next day just to make sure of his original conclusion. Abatement of all citations was either started or well underway at the time of the present visit.

No further imminent danger, or even serious, discrepancies were observed. General lack of effective guard was however observed in almost all roller mill and pulverizing machinery. Either existing guards were open railings, mesh was much too large, or coverage was insufficient. Table 2 (Attachment 4) lists these discrepancies. Otherwise it was noted that in the plant area most main exit signs were not illuminated and exit access signs were needed in places. Fire extinguisher mounting was often too high or non existant.

Serious health discrepancies were not observed, except as already noted by the State with regard to excessive noise levels. It is planned to eliminate the problem by a two year state approved program. Except for asbestos, toxic materials

were not observed. A nuisance dust problem appeared possible, but a State survey has shown no unacceptable levels. Even so, approved dust respirators were common and an effective respirator maintenance program meeting 1910 standards is in effect. A hard hat area program looked desirable and the suggestion was quickley accepted by management. The asbestos threat should be controlled by existing respirator program since the product is to be phased out shortly.

The plant consisted of several one story (some 40 to 60 ft. high) essentially open buildings of non combustible construction, except for roofs in some cases. The office building was furnished with wood paneling over gypsum board. No sprinklers were used throughout the plant. Materials were moved from trucks and box cars to production areas by fork lifts and pallets. Three small and one large front end loaders were also used. At least some trucks were rented. Trailer trucks were unloaded with tractor in place for safety. Railroad car wheels were suitably provided with stops. Dockboards were steel and especially purchased for the corporation.

CONCLUSIONS:

Review of the Table II will show that most discrepancies fall into three groups: machine guarding, fire extinguisher irregularities and exit sign deficiencies. None can be termed especially serious but abatement procedures should not be delayed. To this end, a status column has been included on the table together with a descriptive key. Every two months this column should be updated and a copy of the revision sent to Corporate Safety until all items are resolved.

In addition to correction of specific discrepancies written operating procedures for each job incorporating safety information and directions are recommended. The latest Safety Program Evaluation Report (SPER) should be reviewed and revised in the light of both this report and the State review.

E. K. Hamilton

Distribution:

Messrs. L. Dreyling
J. Major
A. Osti/File: Old Bridge Visits
D. Thacker
D. Vines