Marginalia recreated from Original Document

FACSIMILE, ORIGINAL ILLEGIBLE

Basic problem is the dual stds - ACGIH TLV and J-M TLV also ... (illegible)

CONFIDENTIAL

Toronto Plant N90
November 20, 1970.

Dr. T. H. Davison, Waukegan

cc:
A. B. Marchant - GHQ, N.Y.
H. M. Jackson - " "
C. L. Sheckler - " "
W. A. Young -

STANDARD PROCEDURE FOR WORK RESTRICTIONS
AND COUNSELING OF PNEUMOCONIOSIS CASES

current

Bill Young has passed along you letter, and I am quite confused by the basic recommendation that you indicate the company physician makes in such cases. As I read the procedure, the company physician recommends that the employee must not work in an area over 12 f/cc or 5mppcf unless a respirator is worn. My understanding of current policy is that no employee, whether or not he is a pneumoconiosis case or clear, should be exposed to these levels of dust. (illegible)

current company TLV 6 f/cc

When Cliff Sheckler was at the plant recently and we were discussing this subject, I get the impression from Cliff that the company physician was establishing much tighter exposure restrictions in pneumoconiosis cases. This, in turn, I interpreted as any significant amount of dust greater than 1 f/cc. — ? 6 F/CC

As you can see, the difference betwee the way we have already established this basic part of the procedure and your recommendation varies substantially. Could you please take another look at this situation and give us the benefit of your advice?

R. F. Winkworth

plant physician has advised "no dust" restrictions on PN 1-2-3 cases. This is far less than even the 6.0 f/cc limit that I suggested. C.L.S.

0304 2551

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/11797/1

CONFIDENTIAL

Toronto Plant E90
November 20, 1970.

Dr. T. H. Davison, Wadhagan

cc:
A. B. Merchant - CHO. Ny.
H. H. Jackson -
C. L. Sheehler
W. A. Young

transfers/disclosures

STANDARD PROCEDURE FOR WORK RESTRICTIONS AND ASSESSMENT OF PNEUMOCONIOSIS CASES

3/1970-71 Toronto

Bill Young has passed along your letter, and I am quite confused by the basic recommendation that you indicate the company physician adopt in such cases. As I recall the procedure, the company physician recommends that the employee must not work in an area over 12 f/cc or longer unless a respirator is worn. My understanding of current policy is that no employee, whether or not he is a pneumoconiosis case or claim, should be exposed to these levels of dust.

Chief Sheehler was at the plant recently and we were discussing this subject. I got the impression from Chief that the company physician was establishing much tighter exposure restrictions in pneumoconiosis cases. Also, I gather, 6 interpreted as any significant length of dust, greater than 6 f/cc. ? 6 F/cc

As you can see, the difference between the way we have already established and the basic part of the procedure and your recommendation varies substantially. Could you please take another look at this situation and give us the benefit of your advice?

R. F. Winkworth

Meaning of "no dust" restriction & TLV concept

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/11797/2