PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT
tabbies
AL-771

FROM THOMAS B. BONNEY

PITTSBURGH OFFICE

TO

1978 July 28

RE: ELIMINATION OF UNNECESSARY USE OF ASBESTOS-CONTAINING MATERIALS

Over the past six years, primarily by means of Industrial Hygiene Newsletters, we have attempted to discourage the use of asbestos at all of our operating locations. We have taken this position for two reasons. First, excessive exposure to asbestos represents a real hazard. Second, compliance with the applicable OSHA standard costs us money which we would not have to spend if substitute materials were used (e.g., for air sampling, medical surveillance, disposal procedures, etc.). Although our plants have made impressive headway, it appears that our goal of eliminating unnecessary asbestos usage is not yet at hand.

As we visit our plants, we still see asbestos products being used. We suspect that for many of them there are asbestos-free, functionally acceptable alternates. Because continued use of asbestos products may result in unnecessary health hazards and concerns to our employees as well as additional costs to Alcoa to comply with specific provisions of the OSHA standard, we believe that it is in Alcoa's best interest to eliminate the use of asbestos products wherever possible. To accomplish this objective requires that first we know for what specific applications it is presently being used. Therefore, we request that you survey your location to provide us with information about your plant's use of asbestos. The attached form indicates the data that is required and can be used for submitting your survey results. We ask that you submit the results of your survey by 1978 September 01.

Upon receipt we will compile a listing of current usage throughout Alcoa. With the assistance of appropriate plant and Pittsburgh personnel, we will place each usage into one of four categories:

(1) No foreseeable employee exposures; substitutes available.

(2) No foreseeable employee exposures; no viable substitutes available.

(3) Potential employee exposures; substitutes available.

(4) Potential employee exposures; no viable substitutes available.

Following classification, with the aid of appropriate Pittsburgh and plant personnel, we will work toward a prompt and orderly replacement of all items in category "3". Jointly, we will further consider if there is merit to taking the same action for any or all of those materials in category "1".

ALCOA

This, of course, will require a determination of whether the economic consequences would justify such action. Our ultimate aim is to provide the plants with the information necessary to attain effective control over their use of asbestos. To help accomplish this, we will provide you with information about substitute materials. Eventually, we will publish a list of "approved" asbestos products and applications (i.e., those for which there are no currently viable substitutes) to offer guidance for purchasing, production, industrial hygiene, and other interested plant personnel. We ask your cooperation in collecting the information needed to make this possible.

THOMAS B. BONNEY

TBB:lmn

Attachment

Letter sent to Industrial Hygienists

Copies sent to:

M. J. Caprio, Pittsburgh 19AB
J. Z. Nelson, Pittsburgh 3WPH
N. Kloap, Arkansas Works
R. C. Hinkle, Badin Works
J. D. Breazeal, Davenport Works
H. E. Chandler, Tifton
R. K. Morrow, Massena Works
E. B. Parker, Rockdale Works
W. S. Stroud, Tennessee Works
J. A. Blessinger, Vancouver Works
G. H. Farrah, EHL, Alcoa Technical Center
W. W. Williams, Fort Meade, Fla.
J. B. Dolan, Lafayette Works
G. R. Hartnett/Albert Lee, HC Products Co., Princeville, Ill.
J. R. Archibald, Pittsburgh 7AB
P. R. Atkins, Pittsburgh 7AB
B. D. Dinman, Pittsburgh 7AB
W. B. Garyotis, Pittsburgh 2AB
R. V. Newsome, Mobile Works

ASBESTOS SURVEY

Item	Product Description[1]	Specific Application	Dept.	Dust Generated?[2] yes	no	Don't Know
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						

Note 1. List should include specifications for all asbestos products currently being purchased and used. It should not include previously installed asbestos materials that are still in place but for which non-asbestos replacements are currently being used.

Note 2. Should be answered in light of currently available information. A product will be considered capable of generating significant airborne concentrations of asbestos fibers if the measured or estimated fiber concentrations are in excess of 0.1 fiber per cc (eight-hour time-weighted average). In responding to this question, it will be necessary to consider the possibility of dust being generated not only during installation, but also during use and, where applicable, disma tling.

Letter 1978 July 28 re eliminating asbestos went to the following industrial hygienists:

D. E. Thompson, Addy, Washington
O. E. Wilkinson, Anderson County Works
J. M. Plunkett, ATC
J. F. Dey, Arkansas Works
Earl M. Morgan, Badin Works
V. Locke, Jr., Wear-Ever, Chillicothe
L. L. Grubb, Cleveland
J. V. Muncie, Corona
K. W. Williams, Davenport
S. Huey, Rea Magnet, Fort Wayne
W. D. Coker, Lafayette
L. M. Crivaro, Lancaster
R. Andrew, Lebanon
W. D. Helmick, Logans Ferry
T. V. Byerley, Marshall
G. D. Hicks, Massena
W. J. Boutreis, Mobile
R. E. Podhora, Point Comfort
J. D. Gibbs, Richmond
A. G. Clayton, Rockdale
J. C. Vergho, Tennessee
L. L. Haisch, Vancouver
D. P. Hooghkirk, Vernon
R. L. Parsons, Warrick