cc for T. P. Norris
W. C. Thurber
J. E. Walsh
KC-File
NF-File

UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION
P.O. Box 579 Niagara Falls, N.Y. 14302

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT
UC-5047

By H.B. Rhodes

Date 3/26/74

Full Name	National Gypsum Company	Interviewed	Frank Zimmerman
Address	325 Delaware Avenue Buffalo, NY		
Mfrs. of	Building Products		

OBJECTIVE

Frank Zimmerman and the writer were guests at a meeting of a safety committee of the Gypsum Association. The objective was to get their comments and impact on our draft of the proposed OSHA work standards for the field use of type joints, in plant manufacture of muds was only touched on briefly.

OBSERVATIONS

Those in attendance were:

Frank Zimmerman	Corporate Safety and Health Division, National Gypsum
Jerry Moore	Safety and Health National Gypsum, Buffalo
Herb Carlson	Manager, Technical Services, Gypsum Association
James Cornell	Safety Director, U. S. Gypsum
Ken Freeman	U. S. Gypsum
Tom Chambers	Grand Rapids Gypsum

Jack Shull of National Gypsum who is chariman of the Gypsum Association Technical Committee was also in and out of the meeting several times.

The background and basis for the revised regulations was presented to the Association Committee. The type of dust levels that occurred in their Denver tests and in several other tests (including ours) were discussed in detail. They had selected their test conditions to represent the worst conditions on the assumption that the fiber counts would be low. They could then use the data as a basis for not labelling products etc.

The general concensus was that fiber counts could range from around one to up towards ten depending on the type of compound (general purpose or topping) being sanding, the skill with which base mud job had been done, i.e. how much had to be removed, and atmospheric conditions. It was also recognized that if asbestos were not even present, they had serious silica and nuisance dust problems.

With this somewhat dubious situation on sanding as backgroung the proposed work practices were reviewed in detail. There was general agreement that they are technically feasible but there was real concern for their econimic impact and whether they could be policed in the field. No further suggestions on other practices were made. The "wetting" of dry-mix in the field also continues to be a particulary difficult proplem with no real attractive alternative offered.

The handling of asbestos from the rail car and in the plant was discussed for a short time. U. S. Gypsum stated that they consider that car unloading is the most serious plant dust problem they now face. National Gypsum and Grand Rapids Gypsum were in agreement. I mentioned our moves towards boy and pallet shrink wrapping. J/M has talked about the same thing but has not been willing to make any trial shipments.

The gypsum companies are also in agreement that they are going to have to install some sort of automatic boy handling facilities or a very good hood system. Jim Cornell (U. S. G.) claimed he has never seen a boy opener that worked well and even with excellent hood facilities it was going to be hard to stay below two fibers.

ADDES NOTES

I talked a ltttle with Tom (Red) Chambers of Grand Rapids Gypsum in Kansas City. They seem to be quite large and he controls the formulations. He did not know Tom Norris but did mention an Amsco man who he understood was our distributor. A call there by Tom P. Norris is suggested.

Typed 3/29/74
cam

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/19546/2