

FROM CLIFF WATSON

TO EXECUTIVE SAFETY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

SAFETY COORDINATOR

Distribution:

Mr. R. G. Kuerner
Mr. O. L. Royer
Mr. C. L. Green
Mr. F. A. Sharkey
Mr. F. J. Mabry
Mr. W. W. Browne
Mr. E. E. Burns
Dr. M. F. Jones
Mr. W. R. Tatum
Mr. Rockne Schaffer - PC&N
Mr. R. P. Allen

PLAINTIFF'S
EXHIBIT
AL-853

July 22, 1975

RE: MINUTES OF EXECUTIVE SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING - JULY 10, 1975

The meeting was called to order by Chairman R. P. Allen at 10:05 A. M. The meeting was turned over to Art Gerhart from du Pont Management Services.

Mr. Gerhart explained the du Pont proposal (a copy of which was given to each member). Mr. Gerhart explained that an effective safety program can reduce costs tremendously. He used the du Pont experience to show that significant reductions can begin immediately but a continued effort is needed to sustain long term results. The costs and contract were discussed as well as being outlined in Page # 6 of the Summary.

Mr. Gerhart explained that the on-site consultants are experienced safety professionals who are graduate engineers. Each of the consultants has had experience in the central Safety & Fire Office.

Mr. Hood asked Mr. Gerhart how long du Pont has been in the consulting business. Mr. Gerhart explained that the Management Services group was formed about five years ago and that they have been consulting for approximately four years.

Dr. Jones stated that du Pont facilities are designed and constructed in a safe manner. What can du Pont do in a facility where safety engineering has not taken place? Mr. Gerhart pointed out that 95% of all accidents in du Pont are caused by people and that other company figures are between 70 and 85%.

Mr. Royer asked if du Pont calculated their accident statistics according to ASA Standards. Mr. Gerhart noted that they were based on ANSI Z16.1.

Dr. Jones commented that he felt our \$14,000/lost time accident figure is high. This is the number used by "Doc" Watson and quoted by du Pont on Page 2 of the Summary. Mr. Gerhart stated that du Pont figures are about \$10,000/lost time accident, but that Texas Workman's Compensation costs are going to rise rapidly as pointed out in a Wall Street Journal article dated February 25, 1974.

ALCOA0001458



83-3875-09000-002 #11
Category Code
SF-4583 (REV 11-68)

Re: Minutes Of Executive Safety Committee Meeting - July 10, 1975 (2)

Mr. Tatum mentioned that some plants have a few people who make a practice of filing on every injury. Mr. Gerhart explained that this happens in other companies as well. He expounded again on the Management Services program. Du Pont will make five visits to talk to management and labor; visit the site; and study the established work practices and rules. The du Pont procedure is to work from the basics up to the specifics of work practices. He further explained that during the second visit, a Safety Action Plan would be written and this would be the basic document for the program.

Mr. Kuerner asked about the cost of the STOP program. Mr. Gerhart said that the materials cost \$19. per student, and that should be less than the Management Services cost. Mr. Tatum asked if the proposed program would use STOP and Mr. Gerhart explained that it would not use the STOP program.

Mr. Browne asked if the program would work in a plant that has design problems since the program deals mainly with people and attitudes. Mr. Gerhart said that the program would have a greater impact on Alcoa than on a du Pont plant where many problems had been corrected by engineering.

Mr. Hood asked what portion of the program brings about the changes. Mr. Gerhart replied that no one aspect can account for significant results, but that it takes the entire program to achieve the desired results. He stressed that the involvement of management and the line organization is critical. The line organization must become the "Safety Department."

Mr. Royer asked if there were any problems concerning union acceptance of the program. Mr. Gerhart said that one plant on the Gulf Coast had a bad union problem. He felt that the final decision on safety programs must rest with the management and should not be delegated to joint committees.

Mr. Kuerner asked if Murphy Oil Company was continuing to show progress in their safety program. Mr. Gerhart said that they have continued to improve and have worked over two years without a disabling injury.

Mr. Kuerner asked how the effectiveness of the program was measured. Mr. Gerhart pointed out that each part of the program is designed to accomplish a given goal, and that the effectiveness is measured by the results or achievements. Mr. Gerhart also stated that source information will be provided for materials that need to be written or developed.

Mr. Tatum asked how much time must be devoted by the management to carry through the program. Mr. Gerhart stated that more time than is now given will be required at first, but that the amount of time will decrease as the program advances to lower levels of management.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Gerhart who was involved in the work shop sessions. Mr. Gerhart stated that all of the managers would be involved now;

Re: Minutes Of Executive Safety Committee Meeting - July 10, 1975 (3)

lower levels would be involved later. The workshop sessions vary in length from one or two hours to a whole day.

Mr. Neeley related discussions he has had with Victoria employees. He states that the impact is very strong and that during any conversation with du Pont employees, the subject or topic always leads to comments of the company's safety awareness.

Mr. Carlson feels that a man with materials handling experience would be better than a man who is primarily familiar with chemical processes. Mr. Gerhart said that du Pont has people with experience in material handling and they have done work for a flooring company, a plastics handling company, and an elastomer producer who has gone from the "bad boy" of the industry to the leader. He further states that the safety program deals with people not necessarily facilities. Mr. Neeley asked if du Pont has anyone with experience in steel or aluminum production.

Mr. Gerhart asked if there were any more questions. No questions were asked and he was excused from the meeting along with Mr. Neeley.

The meeting then turned to a discussion of the program. Mr. Browne felt that du Pont isn't in it strictly for the money. Mr. Kuerner added that he felt the program would be more expensive. Mr. Royer stated that the program would require a lot of visibility.

Mr. Browne asked if we know what Pittsburgh is proposing. Mr. Kuerner stated that he did not know. He added that even cutting the \$14,000/LTA to \$7,000/LTA and then reducing our lost time accidents by half would result in a savings greater than the direct program purchase price. He again mentioned that he needs better accident cost data from Personnel. Mr. Browne felt that the total cost of the project would be a "guestimate" of \$200,000. Mr. Kuerner added that we might spend that much ourselves and achieve very little.

Mr. Hood feels that a new safety program would be helpful but that it must be a serious effort. Dr. Jones stated that he felt "Doc" Watson should attend some of the planning meetings.

Mr. Allen feels that Mr. Hood is correct. Management needs to pay more attention to safety problems. Mr. Kuerner stated that a consultant might put their finger on the intangibles that we can't find. Mr. Browne agreed and added that we could not find a better consultant than someone who has done this type of work in a plant environment.

Mr. Kuerner referred to a meeting he had the day before the Committee meeting in which an eye problem was brought up. A man was restricted and then taken off restriction for a vision problem. The union and labor looks at this as having little regard for the safety of our employees. Dr. Jones added that this man had a cataract operation and that his peripheral vision was good after correction; thus the restriction was lifted.

ALCOA0001460

Re: Minutes Of Executive Safety Committee Meeting - July 10, 1975 (4)

Mr. Allen noted that the attitude needs changing. Mr. Kuerner agreed. Mr. Allen further explained that more people are required to perform satisfactorily.

Mr. Sharkey states that Point Comfort has made progress and that we can develop a program ourselves. He added that du Pont is in the consulting business for the money.

Mr. Kuerner stated that a du Pont program could be the catalyst. Mr. Tatum asked if the program is aimed at the right people.

Mr. Sharkey stated that any program must have the full cooperation of the Operations Manager. Mr. Kuerner countered that he has placed no roadblocks in the path of a good safety program. He added that our efficiency is lost in the zeal to get our work force down. He again stated that he has put pressure on but it may not have been clear enough. Mr. Sharkey asked if he "dedicated" an hour a day to safety. Mr. Kuerner stated that he was closer to one hour than one-half hour per day.

Mr. Royer mentioned that so far our approach has been a plant facilities approach. Mr. Browne added that we have spent quite a lot of money on facilities. Mr. Sharkey stated that during yesterday's inspection, he got the feeling that we need to designate a person who will be responsible for safety and housekeeping in certain plant areas.

Mr. Browne feels that the du Pont program cost is small compared to consulting fees he is familiar with in Tennessee.

Mr. Allen referred to the handout that he presented last week. Mr. Browne states that we need some type of training program. Mr. Kuerner agreed, adding that a good program is needed to show the people what type of things to look for.

Mr. Allen referred to a program mentioned in a letter written by "Doc" Watson that was developed by Dr. Enninger. It is a type of home study course that teaches safety. He will ask for further information.

Mr. Browne presented his "ten point Point Comfort Safety Program" of which a copy is attached.

Mr. Carlson presented Mr. Mabry's "Pilot Safety Program."

Mr. Carlson referred to proposal # 9 about equipment. Mr. Browne stated that equipment, particularly platforms is a major expense item. Mr. Kuerner felt that we would have to come to grasp with our problems and if it included hiring 6 training foremen as Mr. Mabry suggested, we would have to do it. Mr. Sharkey brought up two more points that had not been discussed. 1. Plant maps should be drawn up and area responsibilities defined and 2. Each manager should spend a dedicated amount of time to safety. Mr. Kuerner agreed, saying that he could extend his day if necessary to include his hour of dedication.

Re: Minutes Of Executive Safety Committee Meeting - July 10, 1975 (5)

Mr. Tatum added a point from his program that would utilize a speaker system in various rooms and a program could be broadcast during lunch breaks.

Mr. Kuerner asked what the response was to "Doc" Watson's letter concerning the Point Comfort program. Mr. Browne referred to it as an accumulation of bovine feces. Others echoed the remark stating that this was indicative of communications between "Doc" and Point Comfort.

Mr. Sharkey feels that with the necessary help, he can develop an active program that would achieve our goals.

Dr. Jones returned to the meeting with an X-ray in his hand. He commented that this was indicative of our problem - dumb mistakes. A foreman had broken his thumb with a piece of angle iron while beating a valve with the angle.

Mr. Kuerner feels that our Managers' Safety and Housekeeping Inspection makes us more visible and is a good vehicle for the safety effort. He then asked Mr. Carlson what the supervisors felt their job was concerning safety.

Mr. Carlson stated that he felt the safety program is mostly talk. He also felt that we could not formulate our own safety program and carry it out. He emphasized that Terry Bonds is an important part of the program.

Reference was made about a foreman who said that the safety program wasn't worth disciplining a rule violator. Mr. Watson explained that this is the feeling of many of the foremen. We don't discipline our violators, consequently any action can't stick. Mr. Royer countered by saying that we have successfully disciplined violators. None have been in the recent past, however.

Mr. Royer further stated that several years ago, the safety program was functioning. Mr. Kuerner stated that we haven't publicized our achievements and we haven't given Terry Bonds much to hang his hat on. He pointed out, also, that with the tremendous turnover in people, continuity is a problem.

Mr. Royer asked if the role of the supervisor was too big. Dr. Jones pointed out that some shifts don't have foremen.

Mr. Allen presented his ten point Safety Program.

Mr. Tatum stated that we should contact some of the plants who have used the du Pont program to get their reaction. Mr. Browne states that once we buy a program, its' effectiveness will depend on how committed we are to its' functioning. Mr. Allen feels that we need extensive training courses to teach the employees of the hazards. Mr. Brown says that du Pont already has this type of program. All they would have to do is "pull it out of their pocket."

ALCOA0001462

Re: Minutes Of Executive Safety Committee Meeting - July 10, 1975 (6)

Mr. Sharkey made his final statement a commitment that he would go all out for either a du Pont program or an Alcoa program, but 100% cooperation is needed. Mr. Carlson echoed this, stating he was in favor of buying the du Pont program. Mr. Minter drew an analogy to voice his opinion for the du Pont program. He said that if you're sick, you go to a doctor. A few glances toward Dr. Jones concluded comments as the meeting adjourned.

CLIFF WATSON

CCW:mms

ALCOA0001463

11-2-77

W.W.B

POINT COMFORT SAFETY PROGRAM

Considerations & Suggestions

1. Purchase and utilize proven existing program. To reduce possibility of losing major program ingredient, we should strictly adhere to program. Do not modify program to meet Alcoa's organization and procedures but rather change Alcoa to meet program.
2. Works Manager personally advise all employees including union officials of Company commitment and fact that safety results will be considered in everyone's performance appraisal. Obtain commitment from union if possible.
3. Establish staff of well qualified personnel whose total purpose is to administer the program. They would report directly to the Works Manager and have no other function.
4. Schedule for program implementation and obtaining intermediate goals should be sufficient to allow for a thorough step-by-step approach. (Example is DuPont requiring 16 years to obtain major results from their program.) Do not use broad brush approach with idea of obtaining accelerated results.
5. Training should be by full time (outside if necessary) instructors who are well qualified in both the craft and safety aspects of the section which they are teaching. Training should include both classroom and field instruction.
6. Concentration of training should be directed at supervisors, foremen, and hourly personnel. Do not rely on supervisors and foremen to do initial training of hourly personnel.
7. Establish intermediate goals (injuries/Xmanhours) for each department and for entire plant. Department foreman and supervisors should participate in determining these goals and at that time it would be re-emphasized that they will be held responsible for reaching and maintaining same. Guidelines should be established to assure Plant uniformity of department goals. First goals should be relatively easy to obtain to stimulate interest.
8. Establish procedure for reporting safety violations and monitoring results. All safety violation reports should state violation and action taken. Reports would be logged through program administration group and forwarded to the immediate supervisor. Review quarterly with immediate supervisor through entire organization chain all violations issued against and by his area of responsibility and results in achieving goals.
9. On a uniform basis and by means of established well understood steps, such as counseling, reprimand, and demotion or dismissal of repetitive violators and those not achieving results, should be dealt with. Action must be uniform and positive.
10. Expenditures should be concentrated on training employees to observe and eliminate unsafe acts of people. Expenditures for platforms, etc. should be minimal since in most cases these in fact represent convenience or work expediting installations. In other words, make it known that people should use their ingenuity to find alternate methods to perform the task safely and that company is willing to stand any loss in productivity until economics are such to justify the installation of a platform, etc.

July 10, 1975

11. If we expect supervisors to devote approximately 15% of their work day to safety, we should, in those areas where these people are already being fully utilized, take positive action, such as reduction or reassignment of job duties, to provide him with this time. Otherwise safety or job results will suffer.

5.1 Safety Programs.

- 1). Commit top management to \$100,000/yr expenditure for six training foremen in the Alumina & Chemical Plant.
- 2). Prepare safety instructions for each department, detailing each job.
- 3). Instruct each ^{hourly} person in each job he is qualified to fill.
- 4). Audit each ^{hourly} person's safety performance and discuss it with the person.
- 5). Give more help in materials and preparation for hourly safety meetings - hold safety meeting twice per month for hourly personnel.
- 6). Budget additional capital expenditures for plant improvements such as roads and replacement of temporary facilities, for better housekeeping.
- 7). Advertise safety to promote safety.
- 8). Develop a simple computer ^{program} to calculate safe man hours worked and broadcast on the P.A. system each shift.
- 9). Devise an inter-departmental safety program with awards.
- 10). Assign safety responsibility to hourly workers.

1. Safety Commitment - policy statement i.e...safety is going to be number one. If we can't afford to do it safely, we can't afford to do it. OR no task or job we do, no matter how large or how small, is so important or insignificant that we can afford to do it in an unsafe manner. OR safety is economically the right thing to do AND it is also the right thing to do.
2. Through meeting with every level of management starting at the top, explain what is expected of each person and who has the responsibility for safety.
3. Arrange for schools for all levels of management from the top down i.e..
 - Safety
 - Hazard Recognition
 - OSHA
 - Job Safety Analysis
 - Work Simplification
4. Start a program where each department has a safety committee to review each accident and have the injured person and the foreman present. Ask them why, how come, and what they can do to keep from having a repeat accident.
5. Improve morale. ESPERIT DE CORPS
6. Make people accountable for tools and equipment
7. Engineering Safety
8. Safety Inspections
9. Committees
10. Audits and Re-evaluations

1. Discontinue reports (i.e. Foreman Report DC-43R-71, DC-106D-72.
2. Write a policy statement.
3. Begin one week/month safety training by safety or qualified instructor (in place of Departmental Safety Meetings).
4. Lower the requirement for departmental awards to one year - establish a fund of \$1. per employee for each year and use this as a fund for awards.
5. Establish safety department responsibilities within the department (outline the safety department personnel functions and responsibilities.)
6. Get the inspections down to foreman level, also establish specific inspections - looking for deteriorated metal, etc.
7. Issue PPE to individuals. Re-issue only with the return of old equipment.
8. Establish a safety course in apprentice training.
9. Have an equipment manager assigned to safety. Care for respirators, masks, scaffolds, etc.
10. Write operating manuals. Safety must be written in. Some responsibility must be given to hourly people to perform in an acceptable manner.

CLIFF WATSON

CCW:mms