

INTER-OFFICE MEMO **TENNECO CHEMICALS, INC.**

TO M.W. Williams AT Piscataway DATE January 22, 1971
 FROM H.B. Carr AT Burlington COPY TO E.J. Hourihan
 F.W. Kanzler
 SUBJECT Notes From Safety Council MVC Meeting ✓File

Reference: MWW Note of 1/6/71

The following is the status of areas noted as requiring attention in my attached report of 8/19/70:

1. Recommended switching of compressors between the Homopolymer and Copolymer Plants has not been completed. The reason is that the engineering problems are quite involved-as we have been told. The plant has instituted some procedures which have proven successful and these are:
 - a. Copolymer is now using a recycle system whereby when they are not stripping, they recirculate the headspace of the recovered monomer storage tank. This has been successful in minimizing air from being sucked into the system.
 - b. In Plastisol, the compressors are shut down if the time between stripping cycles is three or more hours. This action was based on a recommendation by F.W. Kanzler and has minimized air entrance into the compressor.
3. The scrubbing approach for VCM has been given attention; initially by J.J. Zullo and now by M.E. Wagshul. The approach has not been a direct scrubbing technique but instead an improvement in the phenol addition control. Mel is investigating a means for providing continuous phenol addition at key process points. This program is active but the timing is uncertain.
5. While improvement has been noted in removing air from compressors, we are a long way from the Safety Council's comment that any air constitutes a hazard. Reductions accomplished thus far have been: Copolymer (5 to 1-3%), Dispersion (7 to ca. 2%) and Homopolymer (continuing at the ca. 0.2% level). The plant is leaning more on information provided by E.J. Hourihan's and R.D. Richard's Wacker visit in which the Germans stated that levels less than 3% are not hazardous. We do not agree with this conclusion and feel that this area requires more attention.
6. We would like a reply from Engineering on the Safety Council's statement that several companies use intrinsically safe two-way portable radios in their plants. It has been clearly stated time and again that equipment in our plant must be Class I, Group D, Division I. Our question really is: Is

Page 2

this for all equipment?

HBC

H.B. Carr

Attachment.

HBC/jt