709399

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT WRG-551

Tom Egan

July 23, 1970

William J. Bourke

State of Illinois, Construction Safety Inspection Unit Meeting

Tom Feit
John MacEachern

I attended a meeting called by the State of Illinois Construction Safety Inspection Unit, 160 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60601, Room 1300. I was invited to attend by J. Munroe McNulty of McNulty Bros. Plastering. The meeting was conducted by Mr. Edward Stevenson, Supervisor of the Unit, (& Mr. Willans and Mr. Schultz, Inspectors). The meeting was called to set up regulations for job safety in the spraying of fireproofing. I am obtaining a copy of the minutes of the meeting, and will send them to you as soon as possible.

They (the State) want to use the regulations set up by New York City and follow them to the "T". One gentleman representing a sprayed fiber manufacturer (I believe Asbestospray) pointed out that New York has amended their law in regard to containers used to dispose of waste. New York will allow plastic bags to be used.

I then addressed the group, as a representative of Zonolite Division, as a manufacturer of cementitious material, explained our wet process, and how we trap and lock our asbestos into our product. I was attempting to get our product excluded from these regulations. I was not doing too good a job when a representative of (I believe) U. S. Spray-on stood up and said cementitious material was being treated equal to asbestos fibers in New York, and also told the group that one of our applicators was arrested in Philadelphia--that put the icing on the cake. I wanted to kick him out the window. We were put into the bunch.

Mr. John A. Boland, Business Representative of the Journeymen Plasterers Union Local #5, 5961 W. Madison Street, Chicago, Illinois 60644, then got up and asked the Commission how far they intended to go in their regulations and supervising. He explained that for 100 years their members when spraying Portland Cement had been putting asbestos into the mix to bind the material, and does this mean they would now have to comply with all these regulations? This opened up the Safety Commission to where they said they would have to look at each application, and they might have to extend this to other areas and products not containing asbestos. They want to start enforcing these rules August 1st, but realize jobs are started or have been bid and accepted, and they may have to make exceptions on certain aspects of the clean up regulations. The Commission was under the impression that these new regulations would not be costly, but Mr. Boland contended they could be quite costly money wise per job, might influence the change of design of a building, and then his men would suffer from lack of work. The Commission then said that they are a compassionate group and would not force hardships on the general contractor and applicators who would tighten up their jobs

voluntarily. (They later told Calio and McNulty on the side that they had good job supervision and were paying for the bad applicators).

Two plastering contractors got up and condemned other products which are on the market and use little or no asbestos and still dirty up the job and contaminate the atmosphere, which got the discussion back to whether an asbestos-free materi: would be excluded from these regulations. A gentleman named Nielsen from Turner Construction Company, a large general contractor, then got up and said the problem could be solved by using an asbestos-free material, and who in the room had such a material. The Cafco man got up quite modestly and said he had such a material.

I then got up again and gave our story of how we and other manufacturers (some probably present in this room) were working extremely hard to remove asbestos from our formula, and it is just a matter of time when this will be accomplished. The Commission indicated that they still would be policing jobs to correct instances of job abuse on dusting. I think they will be just looking for dust in general, and not specifically asbestos, which I doubt if any of them could identify readily.

In one part of the meeting they talked about labeling of our product. The Commission contends under their rules and regulations (note enclosure) we should have our bags labeled that they contain asbestos. They say asbestos is toxic, and therefore, should be labeled. I had to admit to my knowledge we did not so label our product as to contents. Can they force us to do this? I did not pursue this as I was getting out of my field of knowledge. They did not push this too hard and I dropped it, but I would like your comments on the subject.

The meeting broke up with the Commission saying they were glad we attended, thanked us for our comments, and that was it.

After the meeting I went up and reintroduced myself to the Supervisor, Edward (Scotty) Stevenson, as being from the same old neighborhood in Chicago. He remembered me, and told me not to worry, as he would help me in case of any trouble we may develop.

The way it was left is that Calio starts up on I.B.M. again now that the cement finishers strike is over. McNulty should be able to use Mono-Kote on Gateway with no problems, as his contract was signed before these regulations came to light. We will just play it by ear.

Bill Bourke

WJB/dn

Enc.