

December 31, 1964

Mr. George Mondrot
General Supervisor
Compensation and Pension
U. S. Steel Corporation
912 Salt Springs Road
Youngstown, Ohio 44509

Dear Mr. Mondrot:

Enclosed is a copy of a letter to the Bureau of Workmen's Compensation in reference to U.S. 364-22 Joseph Schinfeld.

If this Division can be of further service to you at any time, please let us know.

Very truly yours,

DeWitt Huffman
Assistant Chief
Engineering and Hygiene

DH:dd
Enclosure

December 31, 1964

Bureau of Workmen's Compensation
Ohio Department Building
Columbus, Ohio

Attention: Paul J. Dragan, Referee
Room 410-8

Re: O.D. 7863-22
Joseph Schofield

Gentlemen:

On November 6, 1964 a visit was made to the United States Steel Corporation, Youngstown, Ohio, to check conditions under which the above named claimant had worked. The company manufactures steel in the open hearth, which is the department in question, and iron in the blast furnaces.

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

May 1909	- 12/24/09	Time Keeper
5/4/10	- 9/5/12	Boosmer Weighman
9/1/13	- 3/23/16	Mason (1)
3/23/16	- 9/26/16	Bricklayer (1)
6/30/17	- 3/29/20	Bricklayer (1)
8/1/33	- 7/15/48	Bricklayer (1)
7/15/48	- 8/1/52	Assistant General Turn Foreman Masonry Department (2)
8/1/52	- 6/7/56	General Turn Foreman Masonry Department (2)

(Apparently when he changed from a mason to a bricklayer, that is just a change in name and not a change in duties.)

(1) Indicates exposure to silica, probably from 2 to 10 million particles per cubic foot of air.

(2) Indicates questionable exposure to dust containing free silica.

The company has 15 open hearths, 14 of which were operating at the time of this visit. One was down for repairs but no masonry work was being done at the time. They will do the masonry rebuild on this hearth in about 2 weeks. There was no opportunity to take a representative dust count or counts, but the area in which the masonry department worked was visited. It is probable that an industrial hygiene engineer from the U. S. Steel Corporation will visit this plant in two weeks and take representative dust counts. He may submit them in connection with this claim. However, it will be very much like sampling the open area around the plant.

Re: O.D. 7863-22
Joseph Schofield

-3-

December 31, 1964

In the early days silica brick were handled on roller conveyors and other conveyers; they were put in baskets or pans and carried to the place where the work was done. After they were taken to the site at which they were laid, they were chipped or cut and the bricklayer had exposure to dust containing free silica. This would be representative of the claimant's exposure up to 1948.

After 1948 the company started handling bricks on pallets and they reduced the percentage of silica brick that they used. The exposure to bricklayers and laborers was greatly reduced. In addition, the claimant was a general foreman and he did not handle brick. He has only questionable exposure to silica dust of industrial hygiene significance after 1948. This is the period referred to by footnote (2).

The dust that the claimant would have breathed if he worked with silica bricks would have been above 50% free silica. It is estimated that he worked with silica brick approximately 15% of his time. The remainder of the time he worked with fire clay brick and the silica content of the dust from this brick would have been in the neighborhood of 10 or 20% free silica. It should also be mentioned that about 25% of his time he worked on blast furnaces and only fire clay brick is used on blast furnaces.

Very truly yours,

Delitt Haffner
Assistant Chief
Engineering and Hygiene

DE:dd