File

Safety Considerations JJW

CONFIDENTIAL

RECEIVED
FEB 15 1973
C. C. I.

TRANSMITTAL MEMORANDUM

January 22, 1973

TO: Mr. W. R. van der Hoeven (2)
Texas City Plant

COPY TO:
Mr. J. A Burton - N. Y.
Mr. H. D. Coombs - 514
Mr. G. H. Daniels - 511
Mr. B. M. Fonville - 511
Dr. D. J. Foster - 511
Mr. R. E. Graebert - 514
Mr. D. R. Hutchinson (4) - 515
Mr. D. R. Reem/Mr. J.F. Schultz - 515
Mr. M. E. Sutherland - 511
Mr. C. O. Tanona/Mr. J.J. Walker - 51
Mr. R. L. Yelton - 515

TRANSMITTAL ONLY:

Mr. R. C. Glock - 526
Mr. G. F. Hanna - 312
Mr. F. P. Provenzano - 515

SUBJECT: Final Report - Normal Paraffins Unit
Major Hazard Survey
Texas City, Texas

Attached is the final report of the Major Hazard Survey for the Linear Alcohols Unit at Texas City. A total of 14 major concerns are included in this report. A list of all concerns has been sent to Mr. D. R. Hutchinson, the Unit Department Head. The concerns listed in this report should be treated as confidential.

According to the Major Hazard Survey Procedure, plant personnel should develop an action plan within 60 days after issuance of this report. The survey team members should receive a copy of the action plan and subsequent progress reports.

If you have any questions on the report, please contact me or one of the other members of the survey team.

A. L. Barefoot

A. L. Barefoot, Team Coordinator
D. A. Gaugler - 511
V. R. Ryder - 312
R. A. Loke - 515

ALB:gr
Attachment

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT
UC-4038

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-4038: A. L. Barefoot to W. R. van der Hoeven Transmitting the Final Major Hazard S...
ACL Doc 18658 · Page 1 of 4
Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/18658/1

UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION

CHEMICALS & PLASTICS

PROCESS AND OPERATING SAFETY REVIEW

NORMAL PARAFFINS UNIT - TEXAS CITY PLANT

R. A. Loke	- Representing R & D
D. H. Gaugler	- Representing Process Safety and Fire Protection
J. R. Ryder	- Representing Engineering
A. L. Barefoot	- Coordinating and Representing Production

BROWNSVILLE PLANT
BROWNSVILLE, TEXAS

UCC 022256

but the question arises, at what point will he decide to turn in an alarm (should he be unable to extinguish it). The potential problem of crying "wolf" too often is obvious; but by the same token, we feel that a record of all fires must be maintained and that a procedure be worked out whereby the fire department will be notified. Fire department and operating personnel should be educated to accomplish this end.

OSHA IMPLICATIONS

1. Entrances to caged ladders at elevated levels in the process structure are not provided with spring-loaded gates.
2. Racks and chains are not provided for pressurized cylinders throughout the unit.
3. Insulators were observed not wearing proper respiratory equipment when applying asbestos (?) insulation.
4. Safety showers and eye bath stations are in need of repair and painting.
5. Spring-loaded valves are not used for drum-emptying operations.
6. Scaffolding equipment is substandard.
7. Many hoses were observed to be in need of replacement.
8. It was reported that on occasions samples have been stored in the same refrigerator used by the operators for keeping their lunches.
9. Standard Operating Procedures are not up to date and are incomplete.
10. The sewer vent pipe in the control building is corroded and could permit hazardous fumes to enter the building.
11. Many utility drops were not labeled.
12. Rotating equipment guards not adequate on some pieces of equipment.
13. Obstructions were noted around the northeast hose house.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-4038: A. L. Barefoot to W. R. van der Hoeven Transmitting the Final Major Hazard S... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 18658 · Page 3 of 4 asbestosclaims.law/library/18658/3

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/18658/4