

Exhibit - U.S. Attorney General letter 2003

Joseph Myers to Attorney General John Ashcroft

Page 1

March 7, 2003

147 Heather Drive
Butler, PA 16001
March 7, 2003

Office of Attorney General
U. S. Department of Justice
Honorable John Ashcroft
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Overview: A recent fatality at AK Steel Corporation's Butler Works (PA) substantiates workers' recent complaints of AK Steel's OSHA violations, as well as violations of criminal and civil law, and exposes the company's policy of employee intimidation and terrorization.

Enclosures: Documents numbered 1 through 44, and lettered A through I. Correspondence to and from several OSHA officials regarding alleged OSHA violations at the Butler Works. Various documents which substantiate AK's policies and practices toward employees.

Dear Honorable John Ashcroft:

Like foreign terrorists who threaten American freedoms, certain domestic terrorists – in the form of unethical corporate executives – threaten the safety, the livelihood, and even the lives of American workers.

One such company, AK Steel Corporation – headquartered in Middletown, Ohio – terrorizes and threatens its most valuable asset, its steelworkers in Butler, Pennsylvania. Most recently, AK Steel's policies and mismanagement resulted in the death of a steelworker. Keith Eckenrode was recently killed because of corporate intimidation, ineptitude and mismanagement, leaving his widow with 3 fatherless young children.

I am contacting the Department of Justice at the highest level because a complete and thorough investigation of the AK Steel Butler Works is desperately needed.

I wrote to the Department of Justice on 11-29-01 regarding the above allegations. The DOJ replied to my letter on 5-15-02, stating that the issues I presented did not provide sufficient details or evidence to warrant action by your office.

The purpose of this letter is to provide further details and evidence to warrant attention and a subsequent investigation by the Department of Justice.

Enclosed please find documentation to prove my allegations of AK Steel's violations of the U.S. Code, Title 18: conspiracy against rights (section 241), extortion (section 3559), and terrorism (section 3077), as well as alleged violations of civil law and Constitutional rights.

Only the Department of Justice Can Intercede

You and your Department are the only entities capable of investigating this corporate terrorist – AK Steel. OSHA seems incapable of dealing adequately and thoroughly with this corporation, to protect AK's workforce. The Department of Justice must intervene – and include law enforcement agencies when applicable – in this dire situation on behalf of thousands of men and women terrorized by this corporation.

March 7, 2003

Please consider carefully the documents and claims made in this letter – because the livelihood and, indeed, the lives of thousands of AK employees are at stake. Thus far OSHA has, over the course of many years, failed to protect the safety and rights of AK employees.

Death of an AK Steelworker

On October 29, 2002 Mr. Keith Eckenrode, a production worker, was killed at the Butler AK Steel plant while performing his job. AK Steel failed to provide a safe work environment for Eckenrode because the company utilizes a less effective lockout procedure for production workers than for maintenance workers.

Maintenance workers, when working in or around equipment, lock and tag out the power sources and bleed off air and hydraulics, while production workers, like Eckenrode, are NOT instructed how to do that same procedure (to bleed off air and hydraulics) in order to protect themselves. If air and hydraulic lines are not bled off they remain pressurized, and a malfunction can cause them to become activated. AK provides no such instruction to production workers.

Eckenrode died of massive crushing injuries to his torso when he was pinned within the exit end of the coiler unit of the Processing Department #2 Aisle, Weld and Trim Line. [This unit trims and re-coils steel coils up to 5-foot diameter, using a 5-foot long tension arm which maintains tension on the coil as it is being re-coiled.] While doing a clean up process assigned by a supervisor, Eckenrode was fatally crushed under the tension arm when an electrical failure caused either the air or the hydraulics to activate the tension arm under pressure, crushing him beneath it.

Additionally, there are allegations that the electrical failure (a coil short out) was caused by an inferior coil, which contributed to Eckenrode's death. Approximately a year ago AK replaced an electrical coil, allegedly with an inferior coil that was not rated properly for the application. When maintenance electricians installed the replacement coil, a properly rated coil was not available at that time. AK management allegedly instructed electricians to use an improperly rated coil, to get the unit quickly back in production. (The steelworker(s) with firsthand knowledge of this allegation will testify to authorities, if guaranteed protection from termination by AK Steel.)

As evidenced by Eckenrode's death, AK Steel's separate lock out / tag out procedures, one for maintenance and one for production, is woefully inadequate to protect the safety of its steelworkers. If AK supervisors had instructed Keith Eckenrode (and other production employees) the proper and SAFE way to bleed off air and hydraulic lines, he would be alive today. Note: Eckenrode was no stranger to this equipment. His assigned job had been on this unit, and he worked on this equipment on a regular basis. Eckenrode complied with company policy – and it killed him.

Contact information for the legal counsel for Keith Eckenrode's widow, Cheryl: TuckerArensburg Law Firm, attorney Chris Cahillane, 1500 One PPG Place, Pittsburgh, PA 15220-5401, 412-594-5552.

Employees Fear AK Steel

As I explained to Robert Szymanski (OSHA's Pittsburgh Area Director), OSHA will not get an accurate and/or an exhaustive investigation for many reasons. First, because AK employees (many that I know personally) refuse to talk to OSHA regarding all the issues addressed in this letter, as well as many others – some of which I may not be aware. Employees fear the loss of their jobs if they report anything to OSHA. Many employees I know say they will testify to law enforcement agencies at the federal level – such as the FBI – but not to OSHA. AK employees fear retaliation in the form of discharge, and they fear that OSHA will be unable to protect them from AK's retaliation. My case [explained later in this letter] is an example of this. I tried to file a complaint with OSHA on several dangerous issues; then OSHA claimed at that time that my concerns did not fall under their

jurisdiction. AK subsequently fired me, and OSHA could do nothing to protect me. AK made an example of me for other employees; when employees speak out, they are terminated.

AK Steel Allegedly Thwarts OSHA

Second, it seems that AK Steel continually thwarts OSHA's efforts to perform its duties. Allegations abound that AK managers may have tampered with the crime scene and crucial evidence following Eckenrode's death and prior to OSHA's arrival on the scene. An AK foreman who was supervising on the night of Eckenrode's death, allegedly reported to OSHA that Eckenrode had not been directed to enter the coiler area that night. However, it is common practice that AK employees who are given orders to clean up an area are expected to clean everywhere – unless specifically directed otherwise. AK managers, it seems, are reporting half-truths to OSHA.

Not surprisingly, in addition to stonewalling OSHA, AK is allegedly attempting to thwart Eckenrode's widow's civil case against AK. I recently spoke with Eckenrode's widow, Cheryl, who informed me that her attorneys requested to visit and inspect the site of Eckenrode's death. AK complied with that request, but remained less than cooperative. On the day of the attorneys' visit, AK supervisors allegedly scheduled off most of Eckenrode's co-workers who could have reported firsthand knowledge of the facts surrounding his death. Cheryl said it was evident that the few steelworkers available to the attorneys that day seemed clearly intimidated and extremely hesitant to speak openly and freely about the tragedy.

Evidence will show that AK Steel's so-called "safety program" primarily uses intimidation by retaliation. AK Steel showed this in my case, as I attempted whistle blowing to OSHA and to other agencies – and was subsequently discharged by AK Steel.

AK's "Oppressive Management Style" and Employee Intimidation

AK Steel intimidates employees to the extent that they fear reporting any accident or injury – even the most minor because, according to the Butler Armco Independent Union, "a suspension is sure to follow." [Refer to Document # 34, BAIU weekly newsletter dated 11-6-02.] Interestingly, that is probably the only reason AK's OSHA recordables are low right now.

It's not because AK is a sterling example of industrial safety, but only because AK terrorizes its employees so that they avoid seeking medical treatment [at the plant hospital] to avoid reporting workplace injuries. Unfortunately, this only creates the façade of a safe work environment.

In addition to suspending hundreds of steelworkers, AK has fired scores of employees in the past few years as a result of what would normally be considered "minor" injuries or safety policy infractions. According to that BAIU newsletter, AK Steel has fired 59 workers, and suspended 224 (at the Butler plant), since taking over Armco Steel in late 1999. [By my computation, that averages one firing every 19 days and one suspension every 5 days – an obscene statistic in even the most ruthless companies.]

Following Keith Eckenrode's death, AK Steel's CEO Richard Wardrop penned a letter to all employees expressing his "prayers and sympathies" to Eckenrode's family and friends. Despite Wardrop's knowledge that AK steelworkers were grieving the loss of their co-worker and friend, Wardrop found it necessary to reiterate in a sympathy letter his impossibly unattainable mandate for "zero injuries." As evidenced thus far, his policy is only possible when employees cannot report injuries – for fear of retaliatory discharge. [Refer to Document # 35.]

AK uses a progressive discipline system whereby employees are given verbal and written warnings, then suspensions, and then are discharged. This policy is abused, however, because AK seems to collect recorded violations on every employee, in case a termination becomes necessary in the future.

March 7, 2003

[Refer to Document # 34.] Plus, under AK's system, the progression of discipline continues from the first offense, even if it was as simple as an unbuttoned shirtsleeve. [Refer to Document #44, *Butler Eagle*, 11-8-02.] If employees, like me for example, try to expose corruption, mismanagement, and genuine safety violations within the company, AK will discharge them, using past history and "safety violations" against them. In my case, however, *I actually followed company policy before my discharge.* (My story follows later.)

"Quotas" for Management

Moreover, AK Steel uses a quota system (documented in writing) for its turn foremen, whereby they must document, at a minimum, one unsafe act and one unsafe condition on a weekly basis. [Refer to Document # 17, "Avoid Verbal Orders 5-22-01."] As an example to other managers, nine salaried supervisors were fired recently for NOT furnishing their weekly quotas of so-called "safety violations." [Refer to Document #44.] Upon request, I can provide names of those fired managers. Additionally, scores of management personnel are quitting or taking early retirement because of the interminable pressure to slink around the plant, ratting out subordinates, co-workers, and friends for trivial and petty "safety" infractions, while knowing that upper management ignores or institutes genuine safety violations. [See the "My Story" section of this letter, which details AK's practice that forces employees to continue operating damaged mobile cranes.]

Examples of Firings and Suspensions

Some examples of alleged firings, suspensions, and warnings given to hourly employees for minor and absurdly ridiculous infractions [Refer to Document # 17, page 2, and Document # 44]:

- One worker was fired for using a faulty piece of equipment that he previously reported as faulty, but the company refused to take out of service. (AK's rationale for his termination: allegedly, company officials "could not find" the worker's report of the faulty equipment.)
- Several workers have been fired for walking through overhead doors and not using a man door.
- One employee was given a 3-day suspension for wearing his wedding ring before even starting his shift.
- An employee was written up for walking with his hands in his pockets.
- Another employee was written up for writing a measurement on a tablet while walking.
- Employees were written up for having shoe laces untied or cuffs and shirts partially unbuttoned.
- Perhaps the most ridiculous of all: one employee was written up for "sweating too much" and not drinking enough water. Apparently AK management is omniscient and can sense when employees are not optimally hydrated.

Injured employees, fearing termination, are literally finishing their shifts and leaving the plant with serious injuries – a fractured leg, in one case – so that they do not have to report their injuries as work-related. Employees seek treatment at local health care facilities, but not at the plant hospital.

Insurance Fraud?

Fearing termination for being injured on the job, AK employees seek treatment at Butler Memorial Hospital, for example, and are forced to lie about their work-related injuries. AK workers, when asked by hospital personnel if they were injured at work, must falsify their treatment records and insurance claims, saying they were injured at home, at play, etc. AK's health insurance carrier, Highmark SelectBlue, pays the injury claims – instead of AK's workmen's compensation carrier. [AK Steel's employee health insurance carrier is: Highmark Blue Cross Blue Shield, an Independent Licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association. AK Steel's Group # 04127114, Network Code 365, BC Plan 363, BS Plan 865. Member Service/Benefit questions: 1-800-241-5704. Member Claims contact address: Highmark Blue Cross Blue Shield, P.O. Box 3355, Pittsburgh, PA 15230-3355.]

AK's Motivations?

Most likely, the primary reasoning behind AK's current policies is monetary; AK has realized decreased workmen's compensation claims. Certainly these statistics, no matter how they jeopardize the well being of its workforce, make AK Steel appear more fiscally sound during its current negotiations to acquire National Steel Corporation. Moreover, in the event of a future sale of AK Steel, these statistics will prove appealing to a potential buyer.

The secondary motivation for AK's ongoing terrorization and intimidation of employees is so that AK can garner safety awards from OSHA, which of course leads to their exemption from random inspections. [See OSHA's web site at www.osha.gov/oshprogs/vpp/benefits.html, which explains these exemptions.]

AK Management Style Causes Mental Anguish

According to one local doctor, "hundreds" of AK employees [his word] are being treated at area mental health facilities for emotional and psychological illnesses and breakdowns directly caused by AK's oppressive management policies and terrorization of its workforce. This particular doctor is treating a personal friend of mine for these problems at an area psychiatric facility, and he explained the unprecedented numbers of AK employees being treated for mental stress and anguish. (My friend has agreed to testify to a law enforcement agency on this matter, if asked.)

Department of Justice officials should inquire of local health care facilities to investigate the extent to which AK employees are being terrorized psychologically, mentally, and emotionally. [Names of some patients willing to testify can be furnished at your request or that of law enforcement agencies that can protect the workers against termination.]

AK Steel subsequently forced this friend (mentioned above) back to work – against doctor's orders. First AK suspended this worker's Sick and Accident Health benefits, which completely eliminated income. Then AK allegedly threatened to terminate him if he did not return to work immediately. Interestingly, he is taking several prescriptions for his ailments, yet has been forced to return to work – while under the influence of these medications – at his own personal risk and at the risk of others. AK Steel is causing an unsafe work environment in this instance.

AK's Ruthless Reputation

Following the acquisition of the former Armco Steel, AK Steel has allegedly earned a heinous reputation throughout the tri-state area for its ruthless management practices. Local companies – like AK's suppliers, customers, vendors, and neighbors – allegedly are aware of AK's abusive, retaliatory, and intimidating policies toward its employees. Allegedly, one local company eagerly hires AK's discharged employees.

Even Irwin J. Dean, Jr., the arbitrator who ruled against me in my hearing [mentioned later in this letter], recognized what he called "oppressive management style" in a recent award to another steelworker at the Butler AK plant. [Refer to Document # 34.]

AK's CEO Wardrop Opposes Workers' Causes

Wardrop has been under investigation by the Ohio Elections Commission for his part in violating campaign-financing laws in 2000. Wardrop and a committee of several other CEOs are alleged to have solicited funds to spearhead a "smear campaign" against Ohio Supreme Court Justice Alice Robie Resnick during the election of 2000. Justice Resnick, who had "joined with three other justices [on the Ohio Supreme Court] to generally support workers' causes," won the election despite the alleged efforts by Richard Wardrop and the others to remove this justice who has fought for workers' rights. [Refer to Document # 45, "Enemies of Labor Under Investigation," Nov/Dec 2000, page 2.]

AK Steelworkers Desperately Need Help

AK steelworkers know the reputation of CEO Wardrop, and they have experienced his wrath. AK employees know that an agency like OSHA cannot – and will not – protect them against retaliation from AK Steel. In Szymanski's words, OSHA "cannot put a gun to their heads to make them talk." He admitted to me that OSHA has definite limitations in the scope of its authority. OSHA has lost all credibility with the AK hourly workforce because of all the incidents outlined here, plus many others. Many employees have told me they will speak with law enforcement agencies, but not with OSHA, about the obstruction of justice, terrorization, and abuse that has taken place and is taking place. For instance, in the death of Keith Eckenrode, at least one steelworker has told me personally that he will not testify to OSHA about key facts in the incident because he fears discharge. He will, however, testify to a law enforcement agency.

Ironically, AK steelworkers cannot turn to AK's Director of Corporate Safety, *Mr. Jim Stanley*, who is the *former Deputy Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor*. None of the issues, crises, and tragedies mentioned here should have occurred with someone of Mr. Stanley's caliber as AK's Director of Corporate Safety.

Interestingly, the Department of Labor recently appointed Mr. Stanley to the National Advisory Committee on Occupational Safety and Health (NACOSH). [Refer to http://aksteel.com/news/press_release.asp?doc_id=301] Perhaps, if the Department of Labor had been made aware of the horrific conditions within Stanley's company, he may not have been appointed to an advisory position such as this.

Mr. Bob Carroll of the Pittsburgh OSHA office told me that, after reading the information I've sent to OSHA, and learning that AK's Director of Corporate Safety is Jim Stanley, the Pittsburgh OSHA office is eager to have the FBI involved in an investigation at AK Steel for two reasons.

- First, the FBI would provide a more thorough investigation. OSHA has acknowledged that its scope of authority is limited, and that AK seems to be untouchable.
- Second, the FBI's involvement would protect Pittsburgh area OSHA officers from legal liability in the event of criminal prosecution and civil liability of AK Steel.

Pittsburgh area OSHA director Robert Szymanski admitted, "we have not investigated a plant like the Butler AK Steel plant," inferring that AK Steel knows how to manipulate the system, circumventing OSHA law, labor law, and criminal and civil law.

Since OSHA is not empowered to investigate and penalize AK Steel for its practices, policies, and alleged violations of law, the Department of Justice must intervene.

My Story

I am a former steelworker with 17 years of service at the AK Steel Butler Works, formerly known as Armco Steel. *Prior to AK's acquisition of the facility, I had a satisfactory employment record with Armco.*

In 2000 and 2001, while I was working in the Transportation / Trucks Department as a heavy equipment operator and truck driver, my supervisor (Ed Tasse) gave me verbal orders to operate defective mobile cranes and to drive overloaded and unsecured tractor-trailers – both of which are in violation of company policy. [Refer Document # 40, my letter to Robert Szymanski (of OSHA), dated 11-29-02 that details all the policies that AK verbally ordered me to violate.]

At that time, I attempted to file a complaint with OSHA regarding my allegations that AK Steel forced (and still forces) the Transportation Department to operate defective mobile cranes and to

drive overloaded and unsecured tractor-trailers throughout the plant. I spoke with OSHA representative Jim Cannell, who told me his superiors claimed that my issues did not fall under OSHA jurisdiction.

On numerous occasions throughout 2000, I reported two defective mobile cranes to my supervisor, Tassey, and questioned my legal liability for operating defective equipment as well as the overloaded and unsecured tractor-trailers. Tassey, in response, refused to have the cranes repaired and refused to give me written indemnification in the event of an incident.

Then I contacted the PA Attorney General's office to inquire of my legal liability. Mr. David DeVries advised me that if I knowingly operated any defective equipment I would assume criminal and civil liability in the event of a catastrophe.

Tassey and AK management ignored my reports of defective cranes for approximately a year. AK eventually fixed one crane, but the other crane was never repaired until after I was discharged on Friday, March 23, 2001. The following Monday, AK allegedly brought in a manufacturer's technician to repair the defective crane.

During most of 2000 when I repeatedly attempted to report the defectives cranes and resolve the overloaded truck / unsecured load issues with management, I was involved in a safety infraction, with at least six other workers. In this incident, we had been installing a pump near railroad tracks when we failed to follow General Safety Order # 3 (GSO-0035-3). This GSO gives the safe procedures to be followed when performing work on or in the general vicinity of plant railroads and railroad equipment. According to the GSO, we called the Yardmaster for permission to work near the tracks, but we forgot the other two GSO provisions to install a de-railer and fluorescent cones. While I completely understood being disciplined for neglecting the cone and de-rail procedure, I questioned the reason that I was the only member of that entire crew to have received a 3-day suspension without pay for the infraction. [Refer to Document # 6, letter of suspension.]

It is my belief that I was singled for discipline in this incident because I had previously been very vocal in reporting the defective cranes and pushing for resolution of the overloaded truck / unsecured load issues over the previous months. In fact, I questioned my supervisor (Ed Tassey) about the reasons that I was the only one to receive a suspension. He claimed to have asked his superiors the same question. They told him that's the way it was going to be. End of story. [His approximate words.]

Unfortunately, incidents of using defective and out-of-service equipment are ongoing at AK Steel. Just a few months ago, AK management ordered a worker (a personal friend of mine) to remove a repair tag from an out-of-service mobile crane, perform a job with the defective crane, and then replace the repair tag. Of course this practice is against company policy, but it occurs nonetheless. [See Document # 4, "Armco's Safety and Security Handbook," section entitled Mobile Crane Operation #7, page 71.] Note: Documents # 4 and # 33 are the same Security Handbooks, except for page numbering. The Armco Handbook was in effect while I was employed there. AK subsequently printed their version (in June 2002) – using primarily identical wording as in the Armco version – except for pagination differences.

In March 2001, AK Steel discharged me for refusing to drive grossly overloaded and unsecured tractor-trailers throughout the mill. AK's written policy clearly mandates that "Operators shall operate their vehicles in strict conformance with all the provisions of the State Motor Code, both inside and outside the plant..." [Refer to Document # 1, "SHSP-0035-28." Emphasis mine.] My supervisor gave me a verbal order to drive grossly overloaded and unsecured tractor-trailers inside the

March 7, 2003

plant, clearly against AK's written company policy. I feared for my safety and that of my fellow steelworkers, in addition to being held criminally and civilly liable in the event of a catastrophe. Additionally, Armco's Safety and Security Handbook [refer to Document # 4, page 6] acknowledges that the company's written rules are "supplementary to applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations. In the event of differences, the higher standard of safety shall apply." *In this case, the PA Motor Vehicle Code is the higher standard of safety.*

The main reason AK's in-plant transport methods are unsafe is because the in-plant road up to the Hilltop processing facility has an unusually severe grade with a 90° bend in the road. In transporting up or down that hill with an overloaded and unsecured trailer, a tractor power loss could cause the combination tractor-trailer to freewheel, possibly jack-knifing, overturning, and losing the load, with coils rolling down the hill. Certainly this could result in death or injury to the driver, or anyone in the vicinity – not just AK personnel, but outsiders as well. [Refer to Document # 26, the tractor manufacturer's warnings against overloading the trucks.]

AK Steel's primary defense for using overloaded trucks is because they are on private property (and AK claims that PA State Motor Vehicle Code does not apply to them). While AK does maintain a guarded entrance, AK employees are not the only persons who readily enter the AK plant. Vendors, outside contractors, sales people, and the food service and uniform rental suppliers enter daily – and even the general public can enter the plant at any time to purchase slag from Heckett Slag, whose building is located within the gates on AK property.

Also in question is an accurate definition for private property. This seemed to be a gray area because, after contacting the PA Attorney General, the PA State Police, and OSHA, each authority gave me a different answer as to the definition. Another consideration is the fact that AK Steel receives PA state funding for its in-plant railroad crossings, which brings into question a true private property status.

AK's repeated argument for not securing loads (with chains or straps) is because "electrical steel grade coils are susceptible to product damage from load binding." [Refer to Document # 38, a quote from Jerry Hesidenz, Director of Safety and Risk Management.]

However, AK neglects to mention that these same exact coils are later trucked out of the plant with chains or strap bindings. [Refer to Document # 40.] According to one AK metallurgical engineer, there is no structural or chemical difference in product composition at the end stage than when it is hauled in-plant.

If AK Steel believes that their unwritten policy of hauling overloaded and unsecured tractor-trailers is genuinely a safe practice, then they should include this in their written documentation, their Safety, Health, and Security Handbook and the Safety and Health Standard Procedures (SHSP-0035-28), in order to protect their operators. [Refer to Documents # 33 and # 1.] As it stands, AK Steel verbally orders drivers to haul overloaded and unsecured trucks, violating their written policy. In the event of any accident, AK has documentation to legally protect the company. In the process, the operator shall then be shown to have violated the company's written policies in hauling overloaded, unsecured trucks, also violating their PA Commercial Driver's License. [Interestingly, now there is sworn testimony (during my arbitration hearing) in which AK officials repeatedly admit to the unwritten policy of forcing drivers to haul grossly overloaded and unsecured tractor-trailers.]

Propensity for Tractor-Trailer Incidents

Mine is a valid concern because there is a propensity for vehicle mishaps like this. Before and since my termination, there have been several hazardous incidents involving both secured and unsecured loads shifting and/or rolling off the trailers, both inside and outside the plant. [Refer to Document # 40: Details of these incidents involving drivers named Dave Masartis, Rick Morando, Dan Reddick,

March 7, 2003

and Gary Namesnik are outlined in my letter to Robert Szymanski, dated 11-29-02.] [Also refer to Document # 21, which explains Masartis' suspension.] Additionally, a driver named John Zelerino was hauling a tractor-trailer down the Hilltop road on the 90° bend when the trailer unhitched from the tractor, and freewheeled down the hill and into a field.

For your reference: these steel coils weigh between 4,000 and 50,000+ pounds each. The overloaded trucks can weigh more than 130,000+ pounds, yet are only licensed at 73,280 pounds, according to PA State Motor Vehicle Code. *AK Steel's verbal orders to the Transportation Department are for its drivers to haul loads that are approximately twice the legal load limits.* [Refer to Document # 27, which details AK's licensing of the tractors at 73,280 lbs. with the Commonwealth of PA Department of Transportation.]

Interestingly, Arbitrator Irwin J. Dean, Jr., who ruled against me in my arbitration hearing in 2001 and upheld charges of insubordination (though I clearly obeyed AK's written policy), recently returned an award in favor of another Grievant who clearly violated work rules on an unrelated issue. Dean's award to the other grievant stated, "Although the Grievant clearly violated work rules with which he was familiar, the record strongly suggests that the Grievant's misconduct was provoked in substantial part by the supervisor's oppressive management style." [Refer to Document # 34.]

Unlike the other grievant, I was clearly observing AK's written policies, yet was fired and was subsequently ruled against in arbitration. *Prior to my discharge, my supervisor subjected me to the same "oppressive management style" and gave me an order in violation of company policy.*

In refusing to operate defective mobile cranes and to drive overloaded and unsecured tractor-trailers, I tried to protect myself from legal liability and was terminated for doing so. However, there was a prior case in which AK workers attempted to protect themselves from legal liability and were permitted to do so.

Two of AK's Truck Department mechanics, Ralph Geibel and Roger Stoner, who are PA-certified inspectors, refused to pass the inspection of three trailers severely damaged by excessive and repeated overloading. According to their PA certification, these 2 employees knew that if they had passed trailers that were defective they could have been held criminally and civilly liable in the event of an incident involving the trailers. These 2 workers were neither discharged nor reprimanded in any way for legally protecting themselves. I was not afforded the same protection.

The main reason I sought to protect myself by implicitly following AK's written policy is because of a prior truck incident that happened to me in June 1998, under Armco's management. During an in-plant haul, the truck I was driving rolled over when the unsecured load (a pinion gear) shifted during transport. Management, former Truck Supervisor, Rick Bofinger, gave me a verbal and written warning for not securing the load, saying that "continued behavior of this nature may lead to more severe disciplinary action, up to and including discharge." [Refer to Document # 3.] After AK Steel's takeover in 1999, and their implementation of a "zero-tolerance policy," it seemed I had no choice but to secure all loads – or face discharge because of the previous written warning I had received for not securing a load. AK Steel subsequently fired me for requesting to secure loads and for refusing to haul grossly overloaded trucks.

Interestingly, the day before my discharge, AK submitted a Daily Safety Contact sheet for all truck drivers to sign – to verify they had read the Contact. The Contact, dated 3-22-01, contained only two directives: "**Contact #1: Do not overload trucks, haul within legal load limits. Contact # 2: Secure all loads on all vehicles.**" [Refer to Document # 12.] After reading this Daily Safety Contact, I was more convinced that I needed to follow AK's written directives implicitly. AK Steel fired me for doing so.

Ineffective Union

Following the arbitration hearing, my grievance was denied on 11-30-01. My union, the Butler Armco Independent Union (BAIU), has refused my request to file an appeal in Federal Court. (Refer to Document #30.) A Union officer, Secretary Hank Leyland, told me that the Union does not file appeals in Federal Court on any discharge case. This should be the decision of the grievant, not that of the Union officers. Prior to my arbitration former Union president, Carl Nanni, sent a letter asking me to be present and to "cooperate with your Union in the presentation of evidence and arguments on your behalf at that time and place." [Refer to Document # 18.] Likewise, the Union should "cooperate" with me, honor my request for a Federal appeal on the Arbitration decision, and truly protect the rank and file members.

My understanding is that the arbitration process was established so the court system would not be flooded with labor disputes, and that is reasonable. However, I did not receive a fair and thorough arbitration – and now the Union refuses to file an appeal on my behalf in Federal Court. Labor law does not supercede U.S. Code, Constitutional Rights, or criminal and civil law.

A "Company-Owned" Union?

The Butler Armco Independent Union is ineffective against a ruthless company like AK Steel because the company "owns" the union, so to speak:

- ✓ The Union Hall is owned by AK Steel, on AK Steel property, within the plant gates.
- ✓ All the officers are on the AK Steel payroll, paid overtime wages without working overtime, and are paid holiday wages without being forced to work any holidays.
- ✓ The Officers are not paid by the Union general fund, as is the case with most unions.

Early in the week of my discharge I sought help from my Union because, in observing AK's tactics, I knew that my discharge was imminent. AK management had told me that I could not resort to "self help" prior to my discharge and during the subsequent arbitration. Yet, Union president Carl Nanni hesitated to offer assistance in any way prior to my discharge because he feared that AK would fire an officer as an intimidation tactic and an example to the rank and file because of upcoming contract negotiations. If Union officers were paid by the Union out of the general fund, then the officers would have no fear of retaliatory discharge from AK. As it stands, the BAIU is impotent against a company like AK Steel.

The Union Misrepresented Me Before

On February 25, 1998 I filed a Grievance (BU-98-024) with my Union regarding a daylight truck position that I should have been awarded because of my seniority and contractual rights. I spoke with then-Grievance Chairman Jack Lewis to discuss the validity of my complaint and grievance. Based on the facts, he assured me that I had a valid grievance. In fact, his reassurance was "I won't file a grievance unless I can back it by the Contract." Lewis wrote the grievance and contacted me for a signature. Within 2 months, I went to the Union office to check on the status of my grievance, only to discover that the Union had subsequently withdrawn this grievance – without my knowledge or consent.

Jack Lewis, one of two officers who had signed my grievance withdrawal, claimed that Paul Kelly (then-Union President) had made a deal with the company to award the daylight truck position to a woman with less seniority. When asked why he would rescind a valid grievance that he personally filed, Lewis claimed, "We as officers have the right to override the Contract at any given time." The woman, Nancy Mills-Marzullo, had threatened to file a complaint with the EEOC if she was not awarded the bid. In effect, my Union concluded that violating my contractual rights would be less difficult for them than dealing with an EEOC violation.

Because of the Union's actions and misrepresentations of me in this case, I became suspicious of the Union's fair representation of my interests, and its ability to challenge AK's continual disrespect for our Union's contractual agreement.

Possible Collusion Between the Union and AK Steel

During a grievance procedure at AK Steel, the usual and customary process is: Step I (Investigatory Meeting), then Step II (Works Management Meeting), followed by Step III, which is the final meeting to attempt a resolution before an arbitration hearing is scheduled. Then (and only then) a Grievance Record is signed and dated.

However, in my case the Company and the Union had both signed a Grievance Record [Document # 19, dated 6-1-01] five days before my Step III Hearing was held (on 6-6-01) and before a ruling was made (on 6-19-01). *In other words, both parties knew that my Grievance would be denied at my Step III Hearing – before the Hearing had occurred.* Before the Step III Hearing was held, both the Union and the Company had already begun preparations for an Arbitration Hearing. This substantiates my allegations of collusion between the Company and the Union, to deny me my contractual rights.

Additionally, in all three Steps, AK used portions of Document # 4 to substantiate their allegations of insubordination – yet did not mention the portions that would exonerate me. The Union failed to present Document # 1 and the portions of Document # 4 that would have clearly exonerated me. Because both parties withheld the same documents or portions thereof, this may also indicate collusion between the Union and the Company.

Union Counsel During Arbitration Hearing

Following my Arbitration ruling, I did a line-by-line review of my arbitration transcript. I believe that Mr. Jack Murtagh (the Union's legal counsel), in neglecting to address certain issues and in refusing to convince the Union to file a Federal appeal on my behalf, may not have followed several of the PA Rules of Professional Conduct. [Refer to <http://www.pacode.com/secure/data/204/chapter81/s81.4.html>.]

In the Arbitration, AK Counsel James Haggerty cross-examined me regarding AK's Safety and Health Standard Procedure [SHSP-0035-28, Document # 1], which outlines AK policy for drivers to abide by State Motor Code regarding overloading and securing loads, saying "You didn't even know it existed?" [Document # 23, page 160, line 4.]

At that time, Murtagh declined to recross me, and he failed to introduce the concept that the burden of ensuring that I had known about it rested with the company. Refer to Document #1, page 5, section 2.11, which states, "Annually, all employees who operate mobile equipment/vehicles must review this SHSP... [and other documents], and the section covering vehicles and mobile equipment in the Safety and Security Handbook." It is AK's policy to use employee signatures to verify employee awareness and company notification of policy. If AK's sole defense of this SHSP was that I never knew about it, Murtagh could have recrossed to mention AK's neglect to ensure that employees had reviewed the SHSP. This SHSP requires drivers to "operate their vehicles in strict conformance with all provisions of the State Motor Code, both inside and outside the plant." [Refer to Document # 1, page 4, section 2.9.]

In his opening statement, AK Counsel Haggerty referred to my case as one of "classic insubordination" [Document # 23, page 16, line 11]. Yet, Mr. Murtagh did not later counter that I was not insubordinate, because I followed the Armco Safety and Security Handbook's mandate for

operators to “operate Company or personal vehicles on company property or on local, state or federal highways for business purposes must comply with all State and Federal regulations, training, and license requirements.” [Document # 4, page 68, “Operation of Vehicle and Mobile Equipment.”] Also, the Handbook provides that the company’s written rules are “supplementary to applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations. In the event of differences, the higher standard of safety shall apply.” In this case, the PA Motor Vehicle Code is the higher standard of safety. [Refer to Document # 4, page 6.]

In the Grievance Record [Document # 19, page 3, number 7(f)], the Union submitted the Armco Safety and Security Handbook [Document # 4] pages 76, 77, 78, and 79, which discuss insubordination, but the Union neglected to submit page 68, which details AK’s requirements for drivers to comply with state and federal regulations, both on and off company property. The Union also should have introduced page 71 [number 7], which details operator of mobile cranes to inspect each crane before use and to report and correct all deficiencies prior to use.

These omissions and Murtagh’s subsequent refusal to file a Federal appeal substantiate my allegations that Murtagh may have violated the PA Professional Rules of Conduct. Specifically he may have violated Rule 1.1 Competence, for not exhibiting thorough introduction of all pertinent defenses. As well, he may have violated Rule 1.3 Diligence, for not insisting that the Union file a Federal appeal on my behalf. Rule 1.3 Diligence explains that, “A lawyer should pursue a matter on behalf of a client despite opposition, obstruction or personal inconvenience to the lawyer, and may take whatever lawful and ethical measures are required to vindicate a client’s cause or endeavor.” The Union, in effect, became an opposition and obstruction to Mr. Murtagh because of AK Steel’s intimidation of the Union and threat of discharge of officers. Because Murtagh is retained by the Union, he failed to overcome the Union’s influence and opposition to file a Federal appeal of my Arbitration.

AK Causes Asbestos Exposure

During the summer of 2001, AK maintenance workers were given a job assignment in the Silicon Maintenance Department. Upon starting the job, a worker found what appeared to be asbestos, and notified the supervisor. The supervisor allegedly concurred but ordered the workers to perform the assignment anyway, saying AK Steel would test the material. However, the material was never tested until after completion of the job, when asbestos was confirmed as expected.

Workers filed a complaint with OSHA, but AK only received a citation not a fine. Later, Mr. Szymanski explained that OSHA could only give a citation for the incident because OSHA had not been present at the time to do an air-borne contamination test of asbestos exposure. After the fact, the level of asbestos exposure to which AK employees were subjected could not be determined. I questioned Mr. Szymanski, saying that since asbestos is known to be a federally regulated carcinogen, the job site should have been shut down immediately for clean up and removal by a certified asbestos removal team using stringent procedures. AK Steel failed to comply with federal mandates, yet OSHA did not fine them or forward the incident to proper authorities for criminal prosecution.

Locomotive Operator Killed

Approximately 8-10 years ago, steelworker Don Huff was operating a radio-controlled locomotive by himself as directed by the company at the Butler plant. He became trapped, his skull was crushed between two railroad cars at the couplers – and some time passed before his co-workers knew he was killed. OSHA investigated, yet made no procedure changes to force (then) Armco Steel to add more personnel to make that job safer.

One person remotely operating an entire locomotive is unthinkable, yet AK Steel continues this practice – even after an employee’s death. Operating a locomotive with only one person (a job formerly done by 4 – 5 employees) just to save money – is unconscionable. Injuries and equipment

March 7, 2003

damage using the one-man system has amounted to much more than the cost of the salaries eliminated.

AK Workers Allegedly Exposed to Toxic Substance Now Have Leukemia

In the past few days I was informed of an alleged toxic substance exposure in the Melt Shop department. Several steelworkers there have been diagnosed with leukemia, allegedly due to exposure to a substance used in department equipment. Allegedly, OSHA has done subsequent air contamination testing – but only under AK Steel's permitted time constraints. Allegedly, AK Steel changed air filters and did a general clean-up prior to OSHA's arrival on the scene. Once again, it seems AK is thwarting an accurate and thorough investigation by OSHA.

More Exposure Cases

Former AK steelworker, Phillip Vavro, (a personal friend) was chemically poisoned by a neurological toxin several years ago at the Butler AK Steel plant. Vavro is seriously ill, has had short-term memory loss, and neurological injuries. He has been in litigation for several years, despite the testimony of professionals who have helped to substantiate his case, and he has had to fight for his disability pension.

Another man, Robert Wells, (my neighbor), was employed by an AK-contracted company, hired to do a job at the AK Steel Butler plant. Wells was working on acid lines and, while performing the job, he was burned on both arms by the acid. Wells is now permanently disfigured and may have permanent nerve damage. Allegedly, AK Steel had the proper acid suits – but did not supply a suit to Wells because of the cost of cleaning it after use. Wells' civil case is pending. It is unknown to me if OSHA did an investigation of this incident.

AK Receives an Award?

In November 2001 while AK uses terrorist tactics and possibly violates numerous laws, risking the lives and health of its steelworkers, OSHA awarded Butler AK Steel the "VPP Star Designation Award," which exempts AK from random OSHA inspections. [See OSHA's web site at www.osha.gov/oshprogs/vpp/benefits.html.] OSHA knew of the aforementioned issues (and many more), yet it gave the VPP Award to AK regardless. What a tragedy – and a gross misconduct of the OSHA mission statement.

"The mission of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) is to save lives, prevent injuries and to protect the health of America's workers."

It is impossible to believe that OSHA has in any way followed its mission statement after the travesties that have taken place at the AK Steel plant in Butler, PA.

Ironically, while AK bullies and terrorizes its workforce, its Chairman and CEO Richard Wardrop, Jr., enjoys commendations and appointments. Recently he was appointed to the Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations (ACTPN), which gives "policy advice on matters concerning objectives and bargaining positions on trade agreements." Wardrop has been recognized by industry publications and a national newsmagazine for having received numerous awards for safety and performance. [Refer to http://aksteel.com/events/event_detail.asp?e=45.] In 2000 Wardrop was selected by the National Safety Council to receive its first "Green Cross for Safety" Medallion while AK Steel and its contractors were assessed nearly \$100,000 in fines by OSHA for many health and safety violations at its Mansfield (OH) plant. [Refer to Document # 47.]

Unfortunately, Wardrop's recognition has been purchased by the blood, sweat, tears, anguish, and deaths of AK steelworkers.

Repeated Pleas to OSHA for Help

In November 2002 I called OSHA again, this time regarding my issues plus those pertaining to Keith Eckenrode's death. A man named Mr. Frank Leibrick stated that my complaints and issues did fall under OSHA jurisdiction, unfortunately it was then 1-½ years after the fact, and a formal complaint could not be filed because I was no longer an AK employee. Mr. Leibrick filed a non-formal complaint for me on 11-6-02. However, it should have been a formal complaint filed in 2000 or 2001 while I was employed at the Butler AK Steel plant.

After Leibrick filed my complaint with OSHA, his boss, Robert Szymanski (OSHA Area Director), took over the case. Szymanski contacted AK Steel to investigate my allegations. [Refer to Document # 37.]

AK Steel's representative, Jerry Hesidenz (Director – Safety and Risk Management), responded to OSHA with a letter detailing how the company allegedly “corrected” the violations. [Refer to Document # 38.]

OSHA's Robert Szymanski then wrote me, saying that AK took “the necessary steps to correct the hazardous conditions.” Szymanski invited me to respond and rebut Hesidenz's claims of AK's resolutions of the hazards. [Refer to Document #39.]

Following Szymanski's request, I responded to OSHA on 11-29-02, and gave a rebuttal of Hesidenz's letter claiming AK supposedly resolved the hazards in my complaint. In fact, Butler AK Steel has not corrected the hazardous conditions, as erroneously stated by Hesidenz. His letter only explained to OSHA why AK drivers are ordered to haul overloaded trucks with unsecured loads. Hesidenz clearly detailed the exact transport methods that have been used for years and, indeed, that are still being utilized. [Refer to Document # 40.]

Nothing has changed at the AK Steel plant. AK drivers are still forced to haul overloaded trucks with unsecured loads throughout the plant, jeopardizing their personal safety and that of their co-workers and the public within the plant. AK's continuing practices of unsafe hauling can be substantiated by repeated testimony of company officials in my arbitration hearing. [Refer to Document # 23, the verbatim record of my arbitration hearing.]

During a subsequent phone conversation with Szymanski, he questioned the scope of OSHA jurisdiction and asked me to request in writing a written explanation from OSHA regarding why the overloaded and unsecured trucks issue supposedly did not fall under OSHA jurisdiction. [Refer to Document #41.]

OSHA Verifies My Complaints

OSHA's Philadelphia office responded to me in a letter from Assistant Regional Administrator Mr. Kenneth W. Gerecke, dated 1-16-03. In it, OSHA verifies in writing that the issues involving overloaded and unsecured tractor-trailers does, indeed, fall under OSHA jurisdiction. Moreover, Gerecke says, the “condition of the roadways in the plant must be appropriate for the safe operation of the equipment, and the loads must be adequately secured.” [Refer to Document # 42.]

In that letter, Gerecke referred me to Mr. John McFee (a staff member) for further questions. In a later phone conversation, Mr. McFee said he had no explanation as to why OSHA did not file a complaint on my behalf while I was still employed at AK Steel.

Repeated Pleas to AK for Help

Before my discharge, my attorney and I sent letters to AK CEO Richard Wardrop [refer to Documents # 9 and 11] to inform him of my complaints and several other issues, but to no avail. I

also contacted Dr. Bonnie Hill, a member of the AK Steel Board of Directors, on 9-18-01, to inform her of the many issues, and she refused to become involved.

I contacted Ms. Brenda Harmon, Vice President of AK's Human Resources, on 4-9-01 to file a complaint, and she referred me to Mr. Rick Winter, head of Butler AK's Human Relations. I contacted Mr. Winter on 4-12-01 to file a complaint about the issues addressed in Document #11, as well as all the other documents. Mr. Winter called me at home on 4-19-01 to inform me he did not feel I had any claims.

Later in my arbitration hearing, Bill Gonce (AK's Industrial Relations Manager) was asked if AK Steel had received letters from my attorney and from me, and he stated that they had. When asked if AK had responded to those letters, he stated that the AK legal department informed him there was no need to respond to my inquiries and concerns. According to this information, I believe AK Steel had intended to discharge me.

Local Official Cannot or Will Not Intervene

After my discharge, I wrote to Butler County (PA) District Attorney Tim McCune, apprising him of the numerous incidents of gross negligence and the hazardous conditions at AK Steel Butler Works. [Refer to Document #28.] I also sent him Document #11 and the Union brief from my Arbitration hearing.

McCune's response was that, in his opinion, the PA Vehicle Code restrictions did not apply to AK Steel's in-plant hauling practices. Furthermore, in a subsequent telephone conversation with me, he not only refused to help but he stated that "unless there's a fatality, I'm not coming in there."

Since his phone conversation with me, there has been a fatality at AK Steel, and, to my knowledge, D.A. McCune has yet to investigate AK's responsibility in Eckenrode's death.

Corporate Criminal?

In recent news, it is shameful to see how corporations like Enron, WorldCom, and others can destroy employees' and investors' financial well being. Thankfully President George W. Bush, in his recent State of the Union Address [1-28-03], has promised corporate reform to "insist on integrity in American business...holding corporate criminals to account."

AK Steel – while not robbing shareholders – is a corporate criminal for allegedly terrorizing, intimidating and abusing employees, extorting jobs, manipulating the system to circumvent OSHA law, labor law, criminal and civil law, Constitutional rights, and the U.S. Code – all while polishing its PR façade.

The Butler plant, when formerly owned by Armco Steel, was one of the best steel-producing plants in the U.S. and quite possibly the best in the world – for decades. The Butler plant allegedly carried the entire corporation for a time. Under AK Steel's alleged mismanagement, however, the Butler Works is now operating at a loss for the first time in decades. In 1999, in fact, the entire corporation saw a \$264.3 million loss, resulting in the lowest stock prices in four years. [Refer to Document # 48.]

While AK Steel's profits were "down by 42 percent," AK's CEO, Richard Wardrop's salary "increased by more than 100 percent." [Refer to Document # 49, *Dayton Business Journal*, 6-26-00, page 2.] Wardrop enjoys an annual salary of \$8.8 million [Document # 44], while running our corporation into the ground. In fact, Forbes.com recently ranked Wardrop in the top five worst-value CEOs in corporate America, when comparing CEO salaries with company loss/profit – or, ranking "the best boss for the buck." [Refer to Document # 50, *Forbes.com*, 4-26-01, www.forbes.com/2001/04/26/ceoindex.html.]

AK Steel has the power to destroy employees' livelihood, conspire against them, and extort jobs. It happened to me – after I refused to follow a verbal order that violated company policy and PA Motor Vehicle Code, as well as violating common sense and good judgment. AK Steel made an example of me.

Steelworker Keith Eckenrode's death is additional proof that AK Steel fails to provide a genuinely safe work environment, and uses dangerous and questionable policies and procedures, despite what their corporate PR department claims.

According to PA Attorney General Mike Fisher, "There is no more important function of the government than the *protection of the people's rights and property against those who have no respect for the law nor for the security of others.*" [www.attorneygeneral.gov/around/mission.cfm, quote posted 1-21-97. Emphasis mine.]

It is obvious to all of AK Steel's present and former employees that AK Steel has no respect for the law – and less respect for its human resources. The only way AK Steel will change its policies and tactics is if a law enforcement agency and the subsequent prosecution forces them to do so.

Other agencies and entities seem inadequate or ill equipped to face this corporate nemesis. AK Steel's CEO Wardrop, in fact, disregarded ten United States Congressmen from Ohio, when they asked to meet with him to discuss AK's impact on the community following AK's 3-year lockout of its Mansfield (OH) plant employees. [Refer to Document # 46, page 2.]

Thank you for your prudent consideration to this letter. Thousands of steelworkers – and thousands of their spouses and children – are counting on you and the Department of Justice for a fair and thorough investigation of all these matters. *Not only is it a matter of livelihood, but it is also a matter of life or death* for AK Steel employees still working at the Butler plant.

You and your Department, and law enforcement agencies are the only forces capable of taming this unchecked, seemingly untouchable corporate terrorist, AK Steel. The Department of Justice has a responsibility to intervene in this dire situation on behalf of the tens of thousands of men and women terrorized by this corporation and its CEO.

Please give us some hope for investigation and resolution of these policies and practices, and alleged violations. Remember that each death, injury, suspension, and firing not only impacts employees, but also wives, husbands, children, and loved ones.

My wife and I, and our 2 teenage daughters have been robbed of my livelihood and a portion of my retirement. AK Steel has altered my children's futures forever, while thousands of AK steelworkers and their families live in fear for their futures.

They are counting on you. **We are all counting on you.**

Sincerely and gratefully,

Joseph Myers
724-482-4726

CC:

- **Honorable George W. Bush:** President, United States of America
- **Honorable Elaine Chao:** Secretary, Department of Labor
- **Tom Ridge:** Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security
- **Robert Mueller, III:** Director, FBI
- **Benigno G. Reyna:** Director, U.S. Marshals
- **John A. Boehner:** Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce, U.S. House of Representatives
- **Ed Rendell:** PA Governor
- **Mike Fisher:** PA Attorney General
- **Arlen Specter:** U.S. Senate (PA)
- **Rick Santorum:** U.S. Senate (PA)
- **Phil English:** U.S. House of Representatives (PA District 3)
- **Mary Jo White:** PA State Senate (21st District)
- **Guy A. Travaglio:** PA State House of Representatives (11th District)
- **Alan McMillan:** President, National Safety Council
- **Pennsylvania Governor's Award for Safety Excellence Committee**
- **National and Local Media:** television and print

"All that is necessary for the triumph of evil, is that good men do nothing." – Thomas Jefferson

Enclosures

Documents are listed in chronological order, based on date of origination or of a related incident or fact.

Document # 1

Safety and Health Standard Procedure (SHSP-0035-28), origination date 7-19-71, updated July 2001, entitled *Qualifications for Operators of Mobile Equipment*, which details AK Steel's requirements and procedures required for mobile equipment operators.

Document # 2

Grievance BU-98-024, dated 2-25-98, which I filed with my Union, on an unrelated issue (a daylight job bid). The Union, without my knowledge or consent, subsequently withdrew this grievance. Because of the Union's actions on my behalf in this case, I became suspicious of the Union's fair representation of my interests, and its ability to challenge AK's continual disrespect for our Union's contractual agreement.

Document # 3

This is the warning I received for not securing a load inside the plant on July 9, 1998. This incident made me wary of the need to follow AK's written policies in order to protect myself from discharge. (After this incident, AK threatened me with disciplinary action, up to and including discharge, for not following written policy. AK later discharged me for following written policy.)

Document # 4

This is Armco's Safety and Security Handbook (publication date March 1999) in force at the time of my employment. It is essentially the same as the AK Steel version (issued June 2002) except for pagination. Note underlined portions. [Compare Document # 33, *AK Steel Butler Works Safety, Health, and Security Handbook*, included for your reference only.]

Document # 5

An advisory notice to drivers regarding vehicle and registered combined weights, which had been posted on 7-12-99 in the tractors. This emphasized AK's requirement for employees to follow AK written policy.

Document #6

A suspension letter for me, dated 7-28-00, for not following AK's written policy regarding a safety violation of General Safety Order # 3, in which I forgot to use proper safety equipment during an unrelated incident. This document shows AK Steel's propensity to suspend and discharge workers for not following AK's written policies. [Compare this with Document #3, 7-9-98, another verbal/written warning to me. Both documents threatened disciplinary action up to and including discharge, and they instilled in me the necessity to follow AK's written policy implicitly. AK subsequently fired me for attempting to follow company policy on the overloaded and unsecured truck issue.]

Document #7

Handwritten minutes (taken by Union rep Greg Loverick) from an investigatory meeting (on 12-15-00) held by my supervisor, Ed Tassey, to inform me that I should haul overloaded trucks with unsecured loads. I asked if I would be fired for not doing so, and Tassey claimed he was not saying that. However, his quote was "Unless road conditions are unfavorable, your requirement is to haul six [coils]." Six coils is clearly over the weight limits according to PA State Motor Vehicle Code. Three months later Tassey did, in fact, fire me for refusing to haul overloaded trucks and unsecured loads.

Document # 8

AK Steel document, dated 1-31-01, sent to all employees from Brenda Harmon, the Vice-President of Human Resources at the corporate level. After receiving this company-wide notice regarding EEO, Harassment, and Telecommunications Policies, I thought perhaps the Corporate Human Resources

Department might be able to assist me after my discharge. I subsequently contacted Ms. Harmon, who referred me to Rick Winter, Butler AK Human Resources.

Document # 9

Letter dated 3-1-01 from my former attorney, Dennis M. Moskal, to AK officials, seeking clarification, documentation, and indemnification for the me regarding AK's requirement to operate overloaded and unsecured tractor-trailers, contrary to AK's written policies and possibly in violation of PA State Motor Vehicle Code. Moskal also mentioned the fact that AK receives state funding for all of its in-plant railroad crossings, which calls in to question the 'private property' status.

Document # 10

AK Steel's Job Safety and Health Analysis dated 2-2-01, which is an analysis of hauling coils intra-plant. This document contradicts Armco's Safety and Health Handbook [Document # 4], as well as SHSP-0035-28 [Document # 1] and Daily Safety Contact dated 3-22-01 [Document # 12]. Reference Document # 4, page 6, which negates this Analysis.

Document # 11

Letter dated 3-21-01 from me to numerous AK Steel officials, describing dangerous safety infractions and double standards within the company, as well as my concerns about my own criminal and civil liability while being ordered to operate the overloaded, unsecured trucks and the defective mobile cranes.

Document # 12

This document was the safety contact given to all drivers on 3-22-01, the day before my discharge. This clearly mandates that operators shall "not overload trucks, haul within legal load limits, and secure all loads on all vehicles."

Document # 13

AK's letter of suspension with intent to discharge, dated 4-5-01. This letter is referred to in my arbitration hearing, as Company Exhibit #1. This letter contains Ed Tasse's claims that I was insubordinate on 3-22-01 and 3-23-01, yet under oath Tasse testified that I was not insubordinate on 3-22-01. This shows AK's inconsistencies and half-truths.

Document # 14

AK's letter, dated 4-10-01, in response to my Works Management meeting, after my discharge. This letter uses passages from the Armco Safety and Security Handbook [Document # 4] to substantiate AK's claims of my insubordination, yet it does not address the issue that my supervisor's verbal orders violate this Handbook, page 68, under Operation of Vehicles and Mobile Equipment.

Document # 15

Grievance # BU-01-118, dated 4-12-01, that the Union filed on my behalf, following my discharge.

Document # 16

Letter, dated 5-19-01, that I sent to former Union President Carl Nami, requesting a videographer and my wife to be present as a witness during the Step III Hearing. I wanted a more accurate account of the meeting because the Company, during the Step I and Step II Hearings, had made false allegations, and they denied my request to use my personal recorder during the meetings. At those meetings, the Union provided only longhand notes, which are not verbatim accounts of the meetings. I wanted an accurate transcript of this meeting that was of utmost importance to my employment and my future. AK Steel denied my requests and refused to give me a written explanation for their denial. [Refer to Document # 18.]

Document # 17

"Avoid Verbal Orders" dated 5-22-01. This document explains AK's quota requirement for managers to document at least 1 unsafe act and 1 unsafe condition weekly, in each section. Page 2 lists some, not all, of these violations.

Document # 18

Letter, dated 5-29-01, from the Union president asking for my cooperation with the Union at my Step III Hearing prior to my Arbitration hearing. Likewise, the Union should "cooperate" with me, honor my request for a Federal appeal on the Arbitration decision, and truly protect the rank and file members. This letter also states AK's denial of my request in Document # 16. The Union's request for my "cooperation" most likely references their recollection of my dissatisfaction with the Union's previous misrepresentation of me on a Grievance that the Union withdrew without my knowledge or consent. [Refer to Document # 2.]

Document # 19

Grievance Record # BU-01-118 (dated 6-1-01) for my upcoming Arbitration Hearing. This document generated by both the Union and AK Steel details the charges, allegations, and documentation filed by both parties to be used as Exhibits during the Arbitration Hearing. The Union neglected to include portions of several documents that would have exonerated me. [Documents # 1, 4, and 12.]

Document # 20

Letter, dated 6-19-01, sent by Bill Gonce, Manager, AK Industrial Relations, regarding his denial of my grievance at the Step III Hearing. Significant point: Note the dates of Documents # 19 and # 20. Gonce's ruling [Document # 20] on my Step III hearing occurred after the company and the Union signed and dated my Grievance Record [Document # 19]. In other words, the Company and the Union had already signed and dated the Grievance Record (on 6-1-01) five days before my Step III Hearing occurred. Allegedly Gonce had pre-determined that my Step III Hearing would be denied before the meeting was held. This substantiates my allegations of collusion between the Company and the Union, to deny me my contractual rights.

Document # 21

This document, dated 6-21-01, is the suspension letter to Dave Masartis. Reference the underlined portions. Masartis was suspended for not stabilizing a load, although the company repeatedly testified in my arbitration hearing that hauling unsecured is their "safe" and accepted way of hauling. In this document, they claimed that Masartis should have "taken steps" to ensure that the load was stationary. However, if AK had followed their own written policies [Documents # 1, 4, 12] and allowed him to chain or strap the load, his coil would not have shifted and rolled out of the truck well.

Document # 22

This document, dated 8-13-01, is a list of additional items added as documentation subsequent to the Grievance Record completion.

Document # 23

Verbatim record of the Arbitration hearing (final transcript submitted 8-20-01), in its entirety, including the Arbitrator's ruling. With the transcript I have included my list of points and issues that I believe are incomplete and/or inaccurate, and led to a denial of my grievance. These points should prove my allegations of collusion between the Union and AK Steel and/or misrepresentation to deny me my contractual rights. Furthermore, it is my belief that Arbitrator Dean denied my grievance without ruling on the complete facts in this case.

Document # 24

A drawing and specifications of the new CRNO trailer, Union Exhibit # 8. This is referred to in the Arbitration Hearing transcript.

Document # 25

A drawing and specifications of the new Hilltop trailer, Union Exhibit # 9. This is referred to in the Arbitration Hearing transcript.

Document # 26

This document is the operator's manual for the tractors involved. Reference page 2, which warns of the risks in exceeding the manufacturer's recommendations for gross vehicle and combination weight: "...overloading can cause component failure resulting in property damage, personal injury or death." AK Steel continuously disregards the tractor manufacturer's weight recommendations when ordering drivers to haul loads in excess of 100,000 pounds.

Document # 27

This document [also Union Exhibit 11 from my arbitration hearing] verifies that the trailers are licensed at 73,280 pounds with the Commonwealth of PA Department of Transportation.

Document # 28

This is a letter, dated 11-29-01, I wrote to Butler County (PA), District Attorney Tim McCune, advising him of the gross negligence and hazardous conditions at AK Steel Butler Works. I also sent him Documents #11 and the Union brief from my Arbitration hearing. [See also Document # 31, his reply to my letter and refusal for help.]

Document # 29

Arbitrator Irwin Dean's "Opinion and Award," dated 11-30-01, after my Arbitration Hearing. Dean ruled against me and upheld my discharge from AK Steel. It is my opinion that Arbitrator Dean did not rule on the merits of my case.

Document # 30

Letter from my Union (BAIU), dated 12-12-01, in response to my request to file an appeal of the arbitration decision in Federal Court on my behalf.

Document # 31

Butler County (PA), District Attorney Tim McCune's written reply, dated 12-19-01, to my letter and plea for help at Butler AK Steel [see Document #28]. In his opinion, the PA Vehicle Code restrictions did not apply to AK Steel's in-plant hauling practices. Furthermore, in a telephone conversation with me, he not only refused to help but he stated that "unless there's a fatality, I'm not coming in there [AK Steel]." Since his phone conversation with me, there has been a fatality at AK Steel (Keith Eckenrode) and, to my knowledge, D.A. McCune has yet to investigate AK's responsibility in Eckenrode's death.

Document # 32

Letter, dated 1-10-02, from the PA Department of Transportation in response to my letter dated 11-29-01 [Document # 28], regarding my concerns about the overloaded trucks and unsecured hauling at AK Steel.

Document # 33

AK Steel Butler Works Safety, Health, and Security Handbook, copies of supporting pages.
- Publication date June 2002. [See Document #4.]

Document # 34

Union Newsletter, dated 9-11-02, referencing Arbitrator Irwin Dean (who had ruled against me despite my efforts to comply with company policy). In this case, Dean overturned the discharge of another steelworker (who clearly violated work rules), because Dean acknowledged that the worker's "misconduct was provoked in substantial part by the supervisor's oppressive management style."

Document # 35

Letter dated 11-1-02 from AK Steel CEO Richard Wardrop, addressing Keith Eckenrode's death. Note the final paragraph, which reiterates Wardrop's impossibly unattainable mandate for "zero injuries."

Document # 36

Butler Armco Independent Union newsletter, dated 11-6-02, which addresses the Union's complaints of AK's management style, including harassment, intimidation, coercion, and threats. The letter addresses the unprecedented numbers of firings and suspensions, it references Keith Eckenrode's death the week prior, and the letter calls for a public Union rally on 11-11-02 in Diamond Park in Butler, PA.

Document # 37

Letter dated 11-6-02 sent to me from the Pittsburgh OSHA office, regarding filing my non-formal complaint against AK Steel (which should have been a formal complaint during the time of my employment with AK).

Document # 38

AK Steel response letter (from Jerry Hesidenz) to the Pittsburgh OSHA office (Area Director, Robert Szymanski) dated 11-12-02 regarding the allegations in my non-formal complaint against AK Steel. [See also Document #40, my rebuttal of Hesidenz's letter to OSHA.]

Document # 39

OSHA's letter from Robert Szymanski to me, dated 11-18-02, inviting me to respond and rebut Hesidenz's claims of AK's resolutions of the hazards for which I filed a complaint with OSHA.

Document # 40

My response letter to OSHA's Robert Szymanski, dated 11-29-02, regarding my rebuttal of Hesidenz's letter claiming AK's supposed 'resolutions' of the hazards in my complaint.

Document # 41

Letter dated 12-9-02, from me to Mr. Szymanski, regarding my rebuttal of Hesidenz's claims of resolution of the hazards at AK. During a subsequent phone conversation with Szymanski, he questioned the scope of OSHA jurisdiction and asked me to request in writing a written explanation from OSHA regarding why the overloaded and unsecured truck issues supposedly did not fall under OSHA jurisdiction.

Document # 42

Written explanation from the Philadelphia OSHA office, dated 1-16-03, in response to Document # 41. In this, OSHA verifies in writing that the issues involving overloaded and unsecured tractor-trailers does, indeed, fall under OSHA jurisdiction. Moreover, the "condition of the roadways in the plant must be appropriate for the safe operation of the equipment, and the loads must be adequately secured."

Document # 43

My letter to Elaine Chao, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor, dated 2-22-03. My letter to her is similar to the letter to the Department of Justice. I wrote to her, requesting her intervention regarding OSHA inadequacies, since the D.O.L. oversees OSHA. After receiving little satisfaction and assistance from OSHA, it seemed I needed to appeal to a higher authority.

Document # 44

Newspaper article, Butler Eagle, Butler, PA, dated 11-8-02, which details the Union's complaints against AK Steel. Among the complaints: AK's 'management style,' numerous firings and suspensions; steelworkers' fears about reporting injuries; extreme stress and mental anguish of

working at AK; profit losses and spending; and the call for the Union to be treated with "respect and dignity." The article calls for Union solidarity and attendance at a public Union rally held 11-11-02.

Document # 45

Article found on the web site of the United Steelworkers of America (USWA), which represents AK steelworkers at its Mansfield (OH) plant. This article details allegations of AK Steel CEO Richard Wardrop's involvement in a committee investigated by the Ohio Elections Committee for soliciting funds to initiate a smear campaign against Ohio Supreme Court Justice Alice Robie Resnick during a recent election. Justice Resnick is well known as a supporter of workers' rights. [<http://www.uswa.org/steelabor/novdec00/aksmear.htm>.]

Document # 46

Article found on the United Steelworkers of America (USWA) web site. Page 2 details AK Steel CEO Wardrop "arrogantly 'snubbing' the ten U.S. congressmen from Ohio who requested a meeting with him" regarding the community impact of AK's 3-year long employee lockout at its Mansfield (OH) plant. [<http://www.uswa.org/news/armco/ak050800.html>.]

Document # 47

Article found on the USWA web site which tells of AK's CEO Wardrop receiving the first "Green Cross for Safety" Medallion, despite substantial OSHA violations and fines totaling nearly \$100,000. The article also mentions that the Department of Justice filed suit against AK for violating air and water pollution standards in Ohio. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ordered AK to provide safe drinking water to the community of Zelienople (PA) following AK's discharge of nitrates into Connoquenessing Creek at the Butler facility. [<http://www.uswa.org/press/aksteel071400.html>.]

Document # 48

Article on the USWA web site (1-26-00) which details AK's substantially conflicting reports to shareholders, saying that the company set new records with shipments to appliance and automotive customers. Yet, in 1999, AK realized a \$264.3 million profit loss, resulting in the lowest stock price in 4 years. [<http://www.uswa.org/news/armco/aksteel012600.html>.]

Document # 49

Article in the Dayton Business Journal (6-23-00), which discusses exorbitant CEO pay scales, and specifically mentions AK Steel CEO Richard Wardrop, whose salary increased by more than 100 % while AK's profit was down by 42%. [<http://dayton.bizjournals.com/dayton/stories/2000/06/26/story1.html>.]

Document # 50

An article from *Forbes.com*, called "Heroes or Zeros? Best Value Bosses," (4-26-01) which compares CEO salaries with the profitability of their respective companies. This details, in effect, the "best boss for the buck." Not surprisingly, AK Steel CEO Richard Wardrop was ranked #5 on the "worst value" list of CEOs. [<http://forbes.com/2001/04/26/ceindex.html>.]

Explanation for Enclosures A through I

Enclosures A through I are contracts and communications to and from my former attorney, Joseph H. Chivers, Esq., and they explain my dissatisfaction with his representation and subsequent negotiations with AK Steel on my behalf. It seems that Mr. Chivers may have compromised my case against AK Steel. I intend to seek damages for his part in mishandling my case against AK Steel.

At our first meeting, the consultation, I made it very clear to Mr. Chivers that I would not settle for anything less than my accrued wages, pension, benefits, etc. At no time did I ever state anything otherwise.

After we signed the *Power of Attorney with Agreement for Retainer and Contingent Fee*, [see Document A], Mr. Chivers began negotiations with AK attorney Mr. John P. O'Connor, an "intervention" as he called it. After some time Chivers called to say that Mr. O'Connor, in a phone conversation on 10-2-01, said that reinstatement was out of the question and that we should submit a demand letter. He asked me to send a letter with my demands. I sent a list of my demands to Chivers, via fax and certified mail on 10-4-01. [Refer to Document B.]

Chivers and I had a few subsequent phone conversations after he received my demand letter. He discouraged some of my demands (which indicated he clearly understood what my demands were), but I said that, as the client, it was my prerogative to include all of those demands.

Then on 10-19-01, he sent to Mr. O'Connor a letter with demands to which I never agreed. [Refer to Document C.]

According to Chivers' document I signed to retain his services in intervention, *The Power of Attorney with Agreement for Retainer and Contingent Fee*, [Document A], it states in the first paragraph:

"It is understood, however, that my attorney will not enter into any agreement to settle or otherwise compromise this matter without my expressed approval."

Chivers clearly presented a demand on my behalf that did not represent my demands in negotiations with AK Steel, and he may have compromised my case in doing so without my expressed approval.

On 10-22-01, after receiving a copy of the demand letter Chivers sent to O'Connor, I immediately called Chivers, saying that he had misrepresented me. He asked me what demands I wanted – and I said I wanted the demands we had talked about all along – exactly what I included in my detailed letter of 10-4-01, that he requested.

It was at this point that he claimed ignorance of my demand letter, that his paralegal had misplaced it, etc. – although I knew he clearly understood my demands, because he initially balked at them, saying I would never receive them.

I told Chivers that I wanted him to rescind his previous demand letter to O'Connor, and send the demands that I clearly outlined in my detailed letter of 10-4-01.

His revised demand letter dated 10-23-01 to Mr. O'Connor stated that he wanted to "convey additional demands on [my] behalf for settlement of this matter." Once again he misrepresented me. The second letter should not have been to add demands, but to rescind the previous demand letter, because it clearly did not represent the demands I wanted conveyed to AK Steel.

In his letter of 10-25-01, Mr. O' Conner acknowledged receipt of both demand letters from Chivers, and stated that AK rejected all the demands. [Document E.]

During one of our phone conversations he mentioned that he had had a prior relationship with Mr. O'Connor, a work-related association, or the like. Since learning of his admitted past relationship with O'Connor, I have noticed what seemed like a loss of his passion for my case, and I had hoped that his prior relationship with O'Connor had not created a conflict of interest in my case.

After lengthy consideration, I concluded that it was not in my best interest to have Mr. Chivers file a lawsuit and represent me in litigation against AK Steel. It became obvious that our rapport had diminished, and my confidence in him waned. Chivers' actions in negotiations with AK attorney O'Connor on my behalf clearly did not represent my interests, and may have compromised my case.

Additionally, Mr. Chivers' actions may have violated the PA Professional Rules of Conduct. [Refer to <http://www.pacode.com/secure/data/204/chapter81/s81.4.html>.]

Specifically, he did not abide by Rule 1.2, Scope of Representation, which states: "A lawyer shall abide by a client's decisions concerning the objectives of representation" and "... The client has ultimate authority to determine the purposes to be served by legal representation...." In negotiations with AK Steel, Mr. Chivers did not convey my original demands.

Neither did he abide by Rule 1.3, Diligence, which states: "A lawyer's workload should be controlled so that each matter can be handled adequately." During one telephone conversation, Mr. Chivers claimed he was too busy to review several documents pertinent to my case, and he argued that "I do not have time to go through all the documents you sent me." Perhaps if Chivers had knowledge of and conveyed to AK Steel all of the defenses and issues for which I had documentation, his negotiations on my behalf would have been successful.

I am currently in the process of retaining a new attorney at this time.