Transactions

35TH NATIONAL SAFETY CONGRESS

1947

VOLUME V

AUTOMOTIVE AND MACHINE SHOP SECTION

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL, INC.
20 NO. WACKER DRIVE · CHICAGO 6, ILL.

Automotive and Machine Shop Section

Executive Committee 1947-1948

General Chairman—J. E. MOORE, Director of Safety, Corporate Service Incorporated, Detroit, Mich.

Vice-Chairman—L. B. LOOMIS, Safety Engineer, Fisher Body—Ternstedt Division, General Motors Corporation, Detroit, Mich.

C. A. DeMONGE, Safety Director, Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Company, Detroit, Mich.

Secretary—D. L. McCULLY, Safety Supervisor, Westinghouse Air Brake Company, Wilmerding, Pa.

Program Committee

Chairman: GEO. F. NUERNBERGER, Safety Engineer, A. B. Dick Company, Chicago, Ill.

R. D. HARVEY, Safety Engineer, The Murray Corporation of America, Detroit, Michigan

C. O. ENOCHS, Safety Director, Chevrolet Flint Division of General Motors Corporation, Flint, Michigan

F. H. HUMPHRIES, Manager Safety and Claims Division, American Car and Foundry Company, New York, N. Y.

Engineering Committee

Chairman: F. W. FISKE, Safety Director, The Brewer Titchner Corporation, Cortland, New York

BARNEY J. POVOLNY, Safety Director, Detroit Diesel Engine Division, General Motors Corporation, Detroit, Michigan

WM. SMITH, Director of Safety, Ford Motor Company of Dearborn, Michigan

Membership Committee

Chairman: PAUL J. BLACK, Safety Supervisor, Westinghouse Electric Corporation, Lima, Ohio

ARTHUR E. EWING, Latrobe Electric Steel Company, Latrobe, Pa.

FRED G. YELTON, Safety Director, Delco Remy Division, General Motors Corporation, Anderson, Indiana

News Letter Committee

Chairman: PAUL F. BUNGER, Safety Director, Frigidaire Division, General Motors Corporation, Dayton, Ohio

LOUIS A. GALANTUCCI, Safety Engineer, General Electric Company, Bloomfield, N. J.

G. W. YEMM, Safety Director, Otis Elevator Company, Harrison, N. J.

Health Committee

Chairman: A. L. BROOKS, M.D., Medical Division, Fisher Body Division, General Motors Corporation, Detroit, Michigan

C. F. ENGEL, M.D., Assistant Medical Director, Westinghouse Electric Corporation, East Pittsburgh, Pa.

FRANK A. PATTY, Director of Industrial Hygiene, General Motors Corporation, Detroit, Michigan

Publicity Committee

Chairman: O. C. BOILEAU, Supervisor of Safety, Health and Retirement, R.C.A. Victor Corporation of America, Camden, N. J.

GERALD C. SQUIER, Assistant Director of Personnel, Bulldog Electric Products, Detroit, Michigan

EDWARD G. HOLTZMAN, Director of Safety and Medical Departments, Wagner Electric Corporation, St. Louis, Missouri

Statistical Committee

Chairman: H. J. JENNINGS, Safety Engineer, General Electric Company, West Lynn, Massachusetts

W. E. BROWN, JR., Safety Director, The City Auto Stamping Company, Toledo, Ohio

LOYLE DAVIS, Director of Personnel and Industrial Relations, Mueller Company, Decatur, Illinois

Off-the-Job Committee

Chairman: M. F. BIANCARDI, Safety Engineer, Health and Safety Department, Industrial Relations, Div., Allis Chalmers Company, Milwaukee, Wis.

ROBERT C. BENSON, Director of Personnel and Safety, Lansing Stamping Company, Lansing, Michigan

E. CLARK WOODWARD, Director of Safety, A-O Smith Corporation, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Poster Committee

Chairman: CARL PETERSON, Safety Supervisor, Plymouth Motors Division of Chrysler Corporation, Detroit, Michigan

CARLTON R. REID, Safety Engineer, Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company, Springfield, Massachusetts

HAROLD M. ERICKSON, Director of Safety, Nash Motors, Kenosha, Wis.

Members-at-Large—*J. W. YOUNG, International Harvester Co., Chicago, Ill.; *O. F. LEHMAN, Chrysler Corp., Detroit, Mich.; *W. A. BECHILL, Chrysler Corp., Detroit, Mich.; *J. C. BOWER, 1021 Mifflin Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa.; *M. A. CLARK, 5537 Devonshire Road, Grosse Pointe, Mich.; *H. B. DUFFUS, Westinghouse Electric Corp., East Pittsburgh, Pa.; *HOYT L. FRACHER, Detroit Steel Products Co., Detroit, Mich.; *G. A. KUECHENMEISTER, Dominion Forge & Stamping Co., Walkerville, Ont., Canada; *M. J. McCARTHY, Fisher Body Detroit Div., General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.; *ROBERT A. SHAW, Detroit Diesel Engine Div., General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.; LT. COMDR. PAUL S. STRECKER; *R. F. THALNER, Buick Motor Div., General Motors Corp., Flint, Mich.; *V. I. TROTTER; *C. E. WOOLIEVER, A. O. Smith Corp., Milwaukee, Wis.

Staff Representative—ARTHUR S. KELLY, National Safety Council, Chicago, Ill.

*Indicates Past General Chairman

MONDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

October 6, 1947

Presiding: DR. A. L. BROOKS, Medical Director, Fisher Body Division, General Motors Corporation

Recognition and Control of Fume and Dust Exposure

By V. J. CASTROP

Research Laboratories Division, General Motors Corporation

Illness which can be attributed to the occupation may occur in the automotive and allied industries. While occupational disease cases are much fewer in number than those resulting from accidental injury, there still remains the need for vigilance in maintaining a healthful working environment. The responsibility for employee health is delegated by management to the medical director with the safety director charged with matters pertaining to safety. For the smooth functioning of either department it is necessary that these individuals work in close harmony with each other.

A safety engineer who is capable of recognizing conditions which may be detrimental to the health of the employee is an excellent teammate for the doctor in any employee health maintenance program. The safety engineer need not be capable of actually sampling air in the environment or designing a ventilation system for the control of toxic materials. He should, however, have knowledge of the materials which have been proved harmful, should be fairly well informed of how these materials may be used safely, have some understanding of basic control measures which are normally recommended when such materials are used.

The intention is not to present a highly technical discussion of fume and dust exposures or detailed information, regarding ventilation systems, as such matters are of interest to the professional industrial hygienists and of comparatively little value to safety engineers. This discussion will be limited to the more basic principles of industrial hygiene as they relate to fume and dust exposures, to indicate what control measures are available or used to protect the employee's health, and, to call to your attention operations and materials which are commonly used in the automotive and allied industries, at the same time indicating the generally accepted opinion as to their effect on health.

Many conditions are corrected or improved because of reasons other than their effect upon the health of the employees. Better products, better employee relationship, reduction in maintenance of equipment may be cited as justification for management's decisions for such correction or improvement.

Generally speaking there are two means of entrance of toxic compounds into the human body under industrial conditions, namely, by ingestion or via the respiratory tract through the inhalation of fumes, dusts, mists or gases. Ingestion is of importance if toxic materials which have a systemic effect are used and adequate washing facilities are not provided, or, where the employees are slovenly in their personal habits. Inhalation is considered the most important portal of entry of fumes or dusts and the particle size, therefore, becomes significant in evaluating an exposure. The particles which cause the physiological changes are those which are small enough to remain suspended in the air and not those which immediately fall to the floor. Flying particles, which are of concern to a safety man and for which he advocates the use of goggles, are not of hygienic significance since they are not of respirable size. To judge the seriousness of an exposure by the quantity of detritus adjacent to an operation is often misleading. This is especially true where mechanical ventilation has been provided which will remove the fine material but is inadequate to trap or convey the larger particles.

In evaluating an exposure it is necessary to consider the toxicity of the material, the duration of the exposure, the average concentration of the contaminant with special attention being paid to those operations which produce high concentrations at some phase of an operating cycle, and the measures which have been provided to control the exposure.

Medical records of the individuals subjected to the exposure may be of value if the examinations are thorough and frequent and not of a cursory type. It must be remembered that occupational diseases are slow in development and in some instances lasting in effect. Slow changes may not be detected and the mere fact that cases have not occurred is no definite assurance that exposures to known toxic materials may be ignored.

The determination of the concentration of the toxic material in the air is important in evaluating the exposure. Tests of this type are not only indicative of the degree of contamination but in some instances which operation is the major offender.

The apparatus used in collecting the contaminant and the method used in estimating the amount present in the atmosphere vary with the type of material. Tests of this type are specialized in nature and are beset with many pitfalls which can lead to very erroneous results and conclusions if done by other than experienced personnel.

In a discussion pertaining to toxic materials it is generally necessary to quote permissible concentrations or as it is sometimes expressed – maximum allowable concentrations—permissible limits, or threshold limits. These terms are used extensively by industrial hygienists to indicate concentrations of a substance in the air which are considered compatible with good health. The limit usually applies to exposures of eight hours duration for a prolonged period.

The limits are, for the most part, advisory standards or bench marks which are practical to meet. In general, these limits are derived from three types of evidence all of which have value and limitations.

1. Animals have been exposed at different concentrations and the effects noted.
2. A few experiments have been made on human subjects for short periods of time.
3. Safe limits have been arrived at by measuring the concentrations of substance in the workroom air and correlating this information with results of medical examinations of workmen.

There is no magic connected with these limits and the mere fact that they are exceeded does not necessarily mean that someone will definitely become ill, but there is a good probability that someone will suffer ill effects if the limit is greatly exceeded for a considerable period. There remains much to be learned regarding the toxicity of many substances used in industry, and it is hoped that with more research and study that the answers will be found.

So much for the general picture. Now let's take a look at some specific operations.

Welding—Welding processes most commonly used can be divided into three types, arc, gas, and resistance. The safety measures pertaining to clothing, goggles, and helmets are of common knowledge and therefore, shall not be considered in this discussion.

Arc welding when performed on uncoated steel does not produce a condition which is considered harmful to the welder provided it is accomplished in a comparatively large open area. The fumes which result from welding consist essentially of the oxides of iron and oxides of metals which may comprise the steel or coating of the welding rod. Some investigators have found characteristic markings on chest x-rays of men who have welded under severe conditions for long periods of time. These markings are presumably due to the deposition of iron fumes within the lungs, but it has not been demonstrated that such fumes have caused physical impairment.

A frequently suggested limit for welding fume is 15 milligrams of iron oxide per cubic meter of air. Concentrations of this magnitude existing in the workroom would materially reduce visibility and thereby become a nuisance or an unsafe condition requiring correction.

Welding within confined areas such as tanks, inside machinery or equipment, or in small rooms presents a condition which can be of concern. The concentration of fume is materially higher under these conditions as there is little opportunity for dilution by natural air currents normally present in a large shop. Nitrogen oxides formed by the electric arc when inhaled in sufficient quantities causes fluids to form in the lung—edema—with the resultant failure of the respiratory system. While welding in large open areas these toxic gases are normally not present in sufficient quantities to cause harmful effects. However, when welding is done in confined areas, the nitrogen oxides may reach a concentration which will be harmful.

Gas welding generally is not productive of harmful fumes. There are, however, in brazing two potentially harmful exposures. While boric acid or borates generally are used in grinding of nontoxic metals which are free of sand is generally considered a nuisance and is not harmful per se. Despite this fact some state laws require griding operation to be ventilated. This requirement has probably been a hold over from the days when sandstone wheels were prevalent and also to prevent the creation of a nuisance condition. Grinding wheels in use in industry have artificial abrasives such as aluminum oxide or silicon carbide. Emery, which is a natural product composed of essentially aluminum and the magnetic oxide of iron, may also be used. A permissible limit of 50 million particles per cubic foot of air for aluminum oxide and silicon carbide was recently accepted by the members of the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists. Such a limit is liberal and concentrations of such magnitude are normally not encountered.

When lead, silica, or some similar toxic material comes in contact with the grinding wheel the exposure to the abrasive matter may be ignored and the exposure evaluated on the basis of the toxic material. If this latter material is controlled the nuisance will also be eliminated.

Ventilation systems for grinding wheels have been fairly well standardized and generally are satisfactory to prevent a nuisance. Hoods should enclose the wheel as completely as is practicable. Air volumes should be provided which are sufficient to cause an inward flow into the hood when using the smallest wheel. This is especially true where toxic materials are involved.

Wet Grinding—Baffles, hoods, and guards are generally located near wet grinding wheels to prevent dispersion of the liquid used as a coolant. These devices are usually sufficient to control the dust if it is nontoxic in nature. If the dust liberated is toxic, mechanical exhaust ventilation may be required.

Buffing and polishing—The buffing compound applied to wheels used for buffing and polishing vary in composition. Waxes and various types of abrasive are the major components. These materials plus lint and fibers from the wheel are the essential ingredients of the airborne dust. The toxicity is dependent upon the type of abrasive. Generally ventilation is provided so as to improve housekeeping and reduce the number of complaints and not because of the hazard to health.

Machining—Smoke from oily parts is the prevailing source of air contamination at machining operations. Illness has not been attributed to this type of exposure. As is the case with most fumes and dusts of the nuisance variety little is known as to what effect such materials have on already existing physical abnormalities.

Machining operations on steel produce large chips or turnings; consequently, dust is not a problem. Operations involving the machining of high lead alloys have been studied, and significant quantities of airborne lead have not been demonstrated.

Graphite which becomes airborne during the machining of cast iron is not considered to be physiologically significant, and therefore is classified as a nuisance dust. Frequently management considers it advisable to provide ventilation for the machines which are productive of the most dust, as graphite on the clothing and person and surrounding machinery is conducive to many complaints. Ventilation systems for the machining, drilling, and so forth, of cast iron should include hoods located as near the cutters or drills as is practicable. Many of these hoods are in use on production machinery and are doing an excellent job of dust control.

Abrasive Cleaning—Since silica is recognized as the most harmful of mineral dusts, an adequate ventilation system is normally provided at the time of installation of commercially built sand blast equipment. Continuous usage and lack of maintenance result in a breakdown of adequate control. Visible escape of dust is the best evidence that this has occurred and it is advisable to correct such a condition without undue delay.

Employees who are stationed in blast rooms are dependent upon personal respiratory equipment. It is of utmost importance that such devices are of a type which will provide the necessary protection. Devices of this type are of the supplied-air variety, and it is necessary that the air provided be free of harmful contaminants. The air compressors should be located in an area free of contamination otherwise the contaminant will be transmitted to the helmet and the breathing zone of the worker.

Normally, ventilation within the room is provided so as to improve visibility and to help prevent the escape of dust to the surrounding areas not to reduce the concentration of silica dust to a safe level.

Tumblast or rotating table type of sand blast units should be provided with sufficient ventilation to prevent the escape of silica dust. Leakage due to excessive wear should be remedied.

Small sand blast cabinets, where the operator controls the blast nozzles from outside the cabinet, frequently have faulty seals around the doors or the rubber gauntlets are loose or torn. The dust which escapes from the cabinet through these openings is in close proximity to the breathing zone of the employee and in many instances exceeds the permissible limit for silica. This leakage should be corrected and the men should not be required to use respirators.

If the articles being blasted are free of silica or other toxic material, the dust resulting from grit or shot blasting is classified in the nuisance category. It follows that the maintenance of ventilating systems for grit blasting, although desirable, is not always so necessary as for sand blasting.

The use of steel grit or shot in blasting rooms produce excessively high concentrations of dust within the enclosure. It is therefore, necessary to protect the worker within the room. The remarks included in the section devoted to sand blasting rooms are therefore, pertinent when considering rooms in which steel grit or shot are used as the abrasive.

Vapor blasting, a variation of sand blasting, is of comparatively recent development. This procedure involves the use of fine silica and water under pressure. The silica used in vapor blast units varies in size and may even be as small as 1250 mesh (approximately 10 microns). It is generally believed that airborne silica particles below 5 microns are most significant in causing silicosis. It then follows that operations involving the use of silica abrasive whose initial particle size approaches that order of magnitude are more hazardous, and require continual vigilance in maintaining good control. It is, therefore, essential that the vapor blast cabinets be maintained so that leakage of mist does not occur. Good housekeeping is also essential as spillage of the sand and water sludge upon the floor will create a source for dust dissemination when the water evaporates. Likewise, containers of the dried sludge should not be allowed to stand in the factory where they can be influenced by air currents of high velocity.

Practically all industrial plants have operations which involve the use of leading base bearing metal or solder. Babbitt bearing metal containing approximately 75 per cent lead has been encountered. The composition of solder metal is variable and dependent upon the purpose for which it is used, with ordinary soft solder containing a comparatively high percentage of lead.

Assuming that the babbitt or solder in use is one containing a significant amount of lead, the question then arises as to whether or not the employees working with this material will become ill. The answer to such a question could be given by a qualified industrial hygienist after he had seen the operation and considered such factors as the temperature to which the metal is heated, the method of removing excess solder, the length of exposure, and the effectiveness of the control measures provided.

It is a well known fact that lead causes illness if absorbed in excessive amounts, and therefore operations wherein lead is used have received considerable attention and study. Out of this experience certain practices are known to produce excessive exposure, whereas other practices have been proved not to be harmful. It is generally conceded that excessive concentrations do not result from operations where solder is applied by means of an electric soldering iron. This is probably due to the small amounts of solder used and the comparatively low heat of the metal. When an iron is used which is heated in a small gas fired furnace, the exposure may be of greater consequence. Solder which remains on the iron coming into contact with the flame or heat is vulnerable for volatilization. Small amounts of solder drop from the iron onto the hot floor of the furnace where it is readily volatilized or oxidized. The oxidized material may become airborne due to disturbances created by the flame or by removing or placing the soldering iron in the furnace. Frequently industrial hygienists recommend that ventilation be provided for heating units of this type thereby removing lead fumes and dust from the environment. This is particularly true in small rooms or where many units are in use.

The atmospheric contamination occasioned by the use of either gas or electrically heated pots containing solder is dependent on a number of factors. With higher temperatures more volatilization will occur and the greater will be the exposure. With the higher temperature the metal is more readily oxidized to produce a dross consisting of a high percentage of lead oxide. The dross may provide a protective coating to reduce the volatilization of the lead; however, disturbance of this coating will create an exposure. As a safeguard against excessive contamination, pots containing solder or babbitt are usually ventilated. Wherever possible it is advisable to enclose the pot as completely as possible and provide sufficient air volume to overcome the thermal effects of the molten metal. Attempts have been made to use natural draft ventilation systems to control these fumes and in those instances where the ducts were not of sufficient diameter the system was inadequate. A preferable method is the use of mechanical systems.

The removal of excess solder with power driven tools, such as grinding wheels, discs, or wire wheels, creates airborne dust which may contaminate large areas of the factory if the operation is extensive. Diligent use of abrasive cloth will also result in excessive concentrations of lead dust. Filing, however, is not productive of small particles and is preferred over the use of power driven tools. If filing is not practicable or feasible it will be necessary to provide some type of mechanical ventilation system for the solder removal operations involving the use of power tools. Since the permissible limit generally accepted for lead is 1.5 milligrams per 10 cubic meters of air (355 cubic feet) it will be necessary to have an effective system to provide adequate control. Engineers experienced in designing ventilation systems to control toxic materials should be consulted, otherwise a costly system might be erected and later discovered to be entirely ineffective. Frequently solder removal operations require the use of portable tools on large objects and a local exhaust system would not be effective, as is the case in the fabrication of automobile bodies. General contamination of the factory with lead dust has been eliminated by enclosing the entire operation in a large booth and exhausting a sufficient quantity of air from the enclosure to insure a constant inward flow of air from the factory into the booth. Under these circumstances no practical amount of air could be removed from the booth to reduce the lead concentration to a safe level, and therefore it is necessary that the men working therein be provided with adequate personal protective devices.

Heat Treating—High temperatures are a frequent source of complaint from employees in heat treat departments but such conditions and their control are not within the subject matter under discussion.

Fumes disseminated from cyanide pots are often associated with cyanides used as fumigants or as the lethal agent in death chambers and supervision as well as the employee becomes apprehensive. Fumes from such a source are irritating and because of this property should be adequately ventilated. The irritant nature of the fume is caused by alkali formed upon decomposition of the cyanide.

Molten lead is sometimes used as a hardening medium for metals. Frequently charcoal or some similar material is placed on the surface of the metal to conserve heat and prevent oxidation. A covering of this type reduces the volatilization of lead while the bath is quiescent, but has no effect while the bath is in use. Adequate ventilation should therefore be provided for baths of this type. As complete an enclosure as is practical for the operation being performed is advisable with air quantities dependent upon the open areas in the hood. To prevent contamination resulting from volatilization of lead accumulating in the combustion chambers the products of combustion from gas fired lead pots should be vented to the outdoors and not be allowed to dissipate into the workroom.

Iron Foundries—The principal ingredients of foundry dusts are silica, sea coal, clays, and parting compounds. The predominant material will be dependent upon which phase of the foundry operation is being studied and what operation is being performed. The control of dust is the major problem, whereas fume is of secondary importance.

A discussion of all the aspects of the industrial hygiene problems in such plants would require a separate treatise. For the present discussion it should be sufficient to state that all obvious sources of dust dispersion should be reduced to a minimum by adequate localized exhaust systems. In a mechanized foundry such places would be sand conditioning and mixing equipment, tumbling mills, shakeouts, core removal and knockout stations, transfer points of dry sand, abrasive blasting operations, and all grinding operations performed on castings containing appreciable quantities of sand.

Maintenance of ventilation equipment is a major item in foundries because of the abrasive action of the dust. It is imperative that a good program be maintained so as to keep the equipment functioning at maximum efficiency.

Because of the heat associated with large scale foundry activities it is a common sight to see pedestal fans or air cooling ducts directed in such a manner as to create cross drafts which interfere with the efficient removal of the dust dispersion. Better discretion in the placement of these fans or ducts will go far in reducing dust concentrations in the areas where they are used.

After the obvious has been corrected, it is advisable that a survey of the foundry be made by an industrial hygienist so that an accurate evaluation of the exposure may be obtained.

Respiratory Protective Devices — As has been stated, the atmospheric concentration of dust and fume and other materials may be reduced to a safe level by adequate exhaust ventilation. In some cases it is possible to correct the condition by substituting a less toxic material. If these measures are not practical respiratory protective devices may be used. They may also prove valuable in giving protection during an emergency or to provide protection for intermittent exposures or to supplement other methods of control. They should, however, not be considered as the desirable means of controlling a health hazard.

Experience has shown that frequently protective devices have been issued which do not provide adequate protection. Upon inquiry information was generally offered that the safety engineer was not too well informed as to what should have been provided.

The U. S. Bureau of Mines at their experimental station in Pittsburgh tests equipment of this type and studies the protection offered to the wearer. If the device is satisfactory in performance, they issue an approval number to the manufacturer which appears on the device as well as the container in which it is received from the manufacturers. The approval granted by the Bureau also stipulates that type of materials for which it is approved.

It has become general practice in the field of industrial hygiene to recommend the use of only those respirators which have been approved by the Bureau. Safety engineers should likewise insist that such devices be procured and acquaint themselves with the type of protection afforded by each device and thereby provide adequate control for the individual wearing the equipment. Some engineers prefer to stock only that type of respirator which will protect against the more harmful dusts or fumes, since a respirator of this type will also give adequate protection for materials of lower toxicity. The advantage of such a procedure has merit as it reduces the types of devices needed in stock and likewise insures the correct device for the more serious exposures.

Metal Cleaning

By THOMAS MOONEY
Med-Fac Industrial Hygiene Laboratories

The complete finishing of metals by electroplating may include:

1. Cleaning by abrasives.
2. Polishing the base metals.
3. Cleaning with solvents.
4. Cleaning with alkaline solutions.
5. Cleaning with acids often referred to as "Pickling."
6. Metal deposition or electroplating.
7. Buffing the deposits.
8. Lacquering the finished product.

In abrasive cleaning, sand or steel shot is used under pressure. The potential health hazards in this type of cleaning are exposure to dust of a high free silica (SiO_2) content caused by the sand and also to metallic dusts where metals capable of producing toxic dusts are cleaned by shot and sand blasting. Steel shot blasting is a much less severe health hazard than sand blasting; consequently, steel shot abrasive cleaning methods should be used wherever possible.

The maximum allowable concentrations (M.A.C.) for free silica are five million parti-