

CELANESE CHEMICAL COMPANY
TECHNICAL CENTER
Corpus Christi, Texas

PLAINTIFF'S
EXHIBIT
CEL-733

To: Mr. L. W. Hartman/

From: R. L. Stannard

RLS-38-74

July 31, 1974

After investigating several methods of compliance with OSHA, pertaining to our breathing air, I would like to make a recommendation for a work order to finalize this problem.

The way our systems are designed, the breathing air header comes from our plant air line in 5 different locations. Each of these locations could be isolated from the present system with a minimum of piping. Once this isolation is done, it would just be a matter of another source of breathing air tied in.

The most inexpensive and easiest method of supplying this air would be to use bottled air, designed in Banks where more air might be needed. We can purchase breathing air bottles (300 cu. ft.) for approximately \$160.00 each. I think we would need 12 of these bottles. Two for Building 130, ~~two~~ for the high pressure lab, two for the acrylates areas, ~~two~~ for Building 149 and two spares. The regulators, connecting piping, labor, etc. would probably run the cost of this work order up to about \$2,500.00.

The advantages of this system would be:

1. Assurance of uncontaminated air.
2. Inexpensive change over as compared to other methods.
3. No maintenance of compressors, etc.
4. No possibility of pressure back up from process to contaminate lines.
5. No CO monitor required.

Disadvantages are:

1. Bottles would require at least monthly pressure inspection.
2. Limited supply of air. Spare bottles would help this situation. In most cases, 4 masks could be used from 2 bottles approximately 3 hours. This should be sufficient for our needs.
3. Usage of air would have to be reported so in-between inspections could be performed.

If there is anything else I can do to get this kicked off, please let me know.

DS:bk


Dick Stannard

cc: R. W. James

008719