

INTER-OFFICE MEMO

TENNECO CHEMICALS, INC.

TO T.T. Zuhl AT Piscataway DATE October 16, 1975
FROM P. Scheiner AT Burlington COPY TO H. Winters
SUBJECT Piscataway Sprinkler Line Modification ☒ File

The sprinkler line running along the north side of the Paint Colorant Plant was modified to install a plug in a dead leg running to the plant. This was necessitated by a leaky shut-off valve in the line that permitted water to seep under the Paint Colorant Plant.

The sprinkler contractor, working for General Contractor L.C. Bowers, disclaimed any blame for not installing a cap as required on his approved drawing. The sprinkler contractor was told that a cap was installed by the demolition contractor, F. Wilhelms and Company. The foreman for Wilhelms claimed he installed the cap although his contract drawing did not require that he do so. Over one year later it is discovered that the cap was never installed.

In retrospect, the true story can be pieced together as follows:

1. F. Wilhelms cuts old sprinkler line and does not cap line. This is consistent with his contract drawing since the line was to be extended and reused as a riser.
2. Factory Mutual requests that Colonial Sprinkler, the sprinkler contractor, relocate the proposed new riser on the north end of the building. This calls for the old line to be discontinued and capped off.
3. L.C. Bowers inquires of foreman for Wilhelms whether the line has been capped off. They are informed verbally that it has.

From the above, it can be stated that Wilhelms performed his work in accordance with his construction contract. L.C. Bowers and Colonial Sprinkler both acted in good faith but were misled by verbal information. Tenneco should assume responsibility for the above since as job supervisors, we are responsible for communication between contractors.


P. Scheiner

PS/jst

COLORITE 011057