

API Ballot Summary Sheet

10/21/2005

Ballot: 38-05: 653-195, Alignment of Vertical Welds for door sheets

AMS ID: 727

Start Date: 8/26/05

Closing Date: 10/7/05

Associate: Gordon Robertson

Coordinator: Gordon Robertson

Proposal:

<u>Voter</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Vote Results</u>			
			<u>Affirmative</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Did Not Vote</u>
134629	Nelson Acosta	HMT Inspection	Yes		X	
131617	Joel Andreani	Equity Engineering Group, Inc., The	No	X		
38921	Robert Annett	Alyeska Pipeline	No	X		
73074	Ronald Bailey	American Tank & Vessel, Inc.	No	X		
136219	Mark Baker	Baker Consulting Group, Inc.	Yes	X		
142888	Chris Bashor	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	No	X		
134681	Ernie Blanchard	MOSAIC	No	X		
109375	Jerry Boldra	SBC Global	Yes	X		
22200	Dan Boley	DJA Inspection Services	No	X		
134782	Steve Caruthers	Tank Consultants, Inc.	No	X		
154212	Gary Cavey	Conservatek Industries, Inc.	No	X		
7127	Earl Crochet	Kinder Morgan	No	X		
150217	Jody Day	Lide Industries, Inc.	No			X
142685	Domingo de Para	ExxonMobil	No			X
133403	Jeffrey DeArmond	BP p.l.c. Whiting Refinery	No	X		
146748	Terry Delong	Terasen Pipelines (USA) Inc.	No	X		
135965	Kenneth Erdmann	Matrix Service Company	Yes	X		
105011	David Flight	Dow Chemical Company	No	X		
134870	Laurence Foster	Marathon Ashland Petroleum LLC	No	X		
134880	John Fumbanks	Pond and Company Inc.	No			X
115033	Alan Geis	Colonial Pipeline Company	No	X		
83689	Ty Hagen	Hagen Engineering International, Inc.	No	X		
136619	Robert Hendrix	Eastman Chemical Co	No	X		
70596	Marty Herlevic	James Machine Works, Inc.	No		X	
93133	Randy Kissell	TGB Partnership	Yes	X		
81918	Manfred Lengsfeld		No	X		
135014	John Lieb	Tank Industry Consultants, Inc.	Yes		X	

API Ballot Summary Sheet

10/21/2005

Ballot: 38-05: 653-195, Alignment of Vertical Welds for door sheets

AMS ID: 727

Start Date: 8/26/05

Closing Date: 10/7/05

Associate: Gordon Robertson

Coordinator: Gordon Robertson

Proposal:

136274	Thomas Lorentz	AEC Engineering, Inc.	No	X		
135072	Francis Maitland	Quense LLC	No			X
113545	James McBride	Petrex, Inc.	Yes	X		
139045	Craig Meier	ConocoPhillips	No			X
137255	Carl Mikkola	Enbridge Energy Partners, L.P.	No	X		
131185	Douglas Miller	Chicago Bridge & Iron Company(CB&I)	Yes		X	
69609	Bhana Mistry	TIW Steel Platework	Yes	X		
83736	John Mooney		Yes	X		
92212	George Morovich	TEMCOR	No			X
136286	Philip Myers	Chevron Corporation	Yes	X		
132210	David Nasab	Kellogg Brown & Root	No	X		
82544	John Oleyar	HMT, Inc.	Yes	X		
5193	Richard Pinegar	Cargill Inc.	No			X
102412	Roy Ralph	Petro-Canada	No			X
135169	Michael Richardson	International Paper	Yes	X		
73744	Bruce Roberts		Yes	X		
101360	Marilyn Shores	Sunoco Logistics	Yes		X	
126019	Larry Speaks	Mass Technology Corporation	No	X		
134314	Tearle Taylor	Flint Hills Resources	No	X		
134325	Donald Thain	Shell Global Solutions (US) Inc.	Yes		X	
145034	Leith Watkins	Explorer Pipeline Company	No	X		
145896	Alan Watson	A.R. Watson, USA	Yes	X		
132209	Richard Whipple	Fluor, Inc.	Yes	X		

API Ballot Summary Sheet

10/21/2005

Ballot: 38-05: 653-195, Alignment of Vertical Welds for door sheets

AMS ID: 727

Start Date: 8/26/05

Closing Date: 10/7/05

Associate: Gordon Robertson

Coordinator: Gordon Robertson

Proposal:

	<u>Affirmative</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Did Not Vote</u>
Balloting Totals:	36	5	2	7

Total Responses:	43			
Total Ballots:	50			
Response Rate :	72%	Must be > 50%		
Approval Rate:	88%	Must be > 67%		
Consensus:	YES			

API Ballot Summary Sheet

10/21/2005

Ballot: 38-05: 653-195, Alignment of Vertical Welds for door sheets

AMS ID: 727

Start Date: 8/26/05

Closing Date: 10/7/05

Associate: Gordon Robertson

Coordinator: Gordon Robertson

Proposal:

API Template for Ballot Comments and Resolution

Ballot ID: 727	Date: November 3, 2005	Document: 38-05-653-195
----------------	------------------------	--------------------------------

#	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Voter/ Commenter	Company	Section No. (e.g. 3.1)	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed Change	Comment Resolution
1	Bruce Roberts			Technical	The proposed wording may confuse some readers, as the references to 9.2 are too broad.	Replace the 3 references to 9.2 to just refer to 9.2.1 through 9.2.3, if that is really the intent.	
2	Philip Myers	Chevron Corporation		Technical	These are my substantive comments: 1. 9.2.4.1.2 refers to material requirements of 9.2.4.1.2.1 which I believe is incorrect. 2. I think you may need some water stops to prevent faulty welds in the old corner welds from leaking where the door sheet intersects the old welds.		
3	John Oleyar	HMT, Inc.		Technical	Some thought should be given to a cautionary statement addressing the effect of heat from welding on a riveted tank seam and the requirement to seal weld a distance beyond the replacement section along the riveted seam in a low heat manner.		
4	Marilyn Shores	Sunoco Logistics		Technical	John Lieb spoke at one of our meetings about the need for modifications to door sheets, i.e. rounded corners and other warnings. Those items need to be incorporated here. Also, the numbering system has gotten carried away, so this item needs to be formatted differently.	I will be glad to assist in a revised proposal.	
5	Bhana Mistry	TIW Steel Platework		Technical	This is an affirmative comment: API-653 deals with repair and alterations of tanks built under 12-C and API-650. Both of these std. deals with welded tanks only. Is it appropriate to deal with rivetted tanks in API-653? Descrptions for several different cases is good but some what difficult to follow. Some type of figure to go with description will be very useful.		
6	Alan Watson	A.R. Watson, USA		Editorial	Use metric units		

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 6 are compulsory.

API *electronic balloting commenting template/version 2002-12*

API Template for Ballot Comments and Resolution

Ballot ID: 727	Date: November 3, 2005	Document: 38-05-653-195
----------------	------------------------	--------------------------------

#	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Voter/ Commenter	Company	Section No. (e.g. 3.1)	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed Change	Comment Resolution
7	Douglas Miller	Chicago Bridge & Iron Company(CB&I)	3.10	Editorial	Proposed definition says a door sheet is an OPENING while all of new section 9.2.4 uses "door sheet" to refer to the PLATES that fill the opening.	Suggested definition: "Door Sheet: A plate or plates that are cut from an existing tank shell to create a temporary access opening and which are subsequently reinstalled or replaced."	
8	John Lieb	Tank Industry Consultants, Inc.	9.2.4	Technical	The general section on door sheets should address the alternative of providing an access opening through the roof of the tank. Door sheets can be problematic, especially on large diameter tanks. It is often less costly to remove one or more sections of roof plate for access of equipment if the tank does not have shell fittings large enough.	Add to 9.2.4: "Consideration should be given to temporarily removing a section of roof plate to provide access for equipment and materials rather than removing shell plate."	
9	John Lieb	Tank Industry Consultants, Inc.	9.2.4.1.2.2.1 & 9.2.4.1.2.2	Technical	The full fillet weld prescribed in this section should be on both sides of the shell plate.	Add the phrase "on both sides of the shell plate" after "full fillet weld"	
10	James McBride	Petrex, Inc.	9.2.4.1.2.2.2	Other	The wording seems confusing.	Reword the first sentence as follows: The upper section of replacement shell plate shall be either 24" longer or shorter than the lower section such that the vertical seams of the upper section offset the vertical seams of the lower section by 12".	
11	John Mooney		9.2.4.1.3.2	Editorial	"it shall cross" should be revised to "it crosses"		
12	James McBride	Petrex, Inc.	9.2.4.1.3.2	Editorial	In the first sentence, replace shall with shell. Also, reword sentence for clarity.	Reword as follows: "If new shell plate material is utilized for the door sheet and it crosses existing weld seams, the replacement section must ..."	
13	John Lieb	Tank Industry Consultants, Inc.	9.2.4.1.3.2	Editorial	"Shell" is misspelled as "shall".		
14	James McBride	Petrex, Inc.	9.2.4.1.3.2.2	Other	The first sentence needs to be changed for clarity.	Reword as follows: The upper section shall be either 24" longer or shorter than the lower section such that the vertical seams of the upper section offset the vertical seams of the lower section by 12".	

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 6 are compulsory.

API electronic balloting commenting template/version 2002-12

API Template for Ballot Comments and Resolution

Ballot ID: 727	Date: November 3, 2005	Document: 38-05-653-195
----------------	------------------------	--------------------------------

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
#	Voter/ Commenter	Company	Section No. (e.g. 3.1)	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed Change	Comment Resolution
15	Kenneth Erdmann	Matrix Service Company	9.2.4.1.3.2.3	Technical	Change existing weld to existing rivet. Also, throughout the ballot the horizontal full fillet weld should specify both sides.		
16	Mark Baker	Baker Consulting Group, Inc.	9.2.4.1.3.2.4	Other	Suggest that the sentence reading "Therefore sealing of rivites and rivet seams by means near the door sheet welds is required." to "Therefore sealing of rivites and rivet seams by means near the door sheet welds may be required."		
17	James McBride	Petrex, Inc.	9.2.4.1.3.2.4	Editorial	Reword the last sentence. Replace is required with will be required	Reword as follows: Therefore sealing of rivits and rivit seams by some means near the door sheet will be required.	
18	Randy Kissell	TGB Partnership	9.2.4.2	Editorial	9.2.4.1 Door Sheet Installation Utilizing Removed Shell Plate should be 9.2.4.2.		

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 6 are compulsory.

API electronic balloting commenting template/version 2002-12

API Template for Ballot Comments and Resolution

Ballot ID: 727	Date: November 3, 2005	Document: 38-05-653-195
----------------	------------------------	--------------------------------

#	(1) Voter/ Commenter	(2) Company	(3) Section No. (e.g. 3.1)	(4) Type of comment	(5) Comment (justification for change)	(6) Proposed Change	(7) Comment Resolution
19	Douglas Miller	Chicago Bridge & Iron Company(CB&I)	9.2.4.2.1	Technical	<p>Negative Comment: I disagree with the proposed rule that the vertical seams need to be offset when the doorsheet extends from one course into another and the removed doorsheet is reinstalled. The offset is required in new construction (API 650 3.1.5.2.b) and it is good practice in that context since plate for each course is installed individually. But a tall doorsheet cut from an existing shell where the two shell plates removed remain one assembly is different. A better detail and better workmanship will result when the vertical seams have no offset for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fit up of one continuous vert will be smoother than separate fitups for each course. 2. Because of smoother fitup there will be less distortion and less residual stress. 2. There will be no stops or starts in the vertical welding where it intersects horz seams. 3. There will be no starts or stops in partial length horizontal seams at top of first shell course as is required with offsets. 	We should state that when a doorsheet extends from one course into another and the removed doorsheet material remains in a single piece and is subsequently reinstalled, then no offset is required in the vertical seams where they cross a horizontal seam.	
20	Donald Thain	Shell Global Solutions (US) Inc.	9.2.4.2.1	Technical	This section conflicts with 9.2.4.1.1. and Figure 9-1. Vertical seams are allowed to align if new plate is used, but not if existing plate reused?		

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 6 are compulsory.

API *electronic balloting commenting template/version 2002-12*

API Template for Ballot Comments and Resolution

Ballot ID: 727	Date: November 3, 2005	Document: 38-05-653-195
----------------	------------------------	--------------------------------

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
#	Voter/ Commenter	Company	Section No. (e.g. 3.1)	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed Change	Comment Resolution
21	Nelson Acosta	HMT Inspection	9.2.4.2.2 & 9.2.4.2.3	Technical	I can see no technical justification for the inclusion of the last sentence in either of these proposed added paragraphs where reinstallation of the original plate section is not permitted if the door sheet extends beyond any vertical or horizontal seam. This restriction will impose unnecessary hardships on owner / users due to schedule restrictions and replacement details using only welded replacement plates. This restriction should be deleted from both proposed paragraphs.		
22	Randy Kissell	TGB Partnership	all	Editorial	Don't use more than 4 numbers to designate a section; instead, use (a), (b), (c), etc., and then (1), (2), (3), etc. for subsections. Institute a standard policy on this if we haven't already.		
23	Michael Richardson	International Paper	General	Technical			
24	Michael Richardson	International Paper	General	Technical	Would it not be advisable to include a statement about radiusing the corners of the door sheet plate where the sheet does not extend to the horizontal weld seam. I know that common sense implies this, but.		

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 6 are compulsory.

API electronic balloting commenting template/version 2002-12

API Template for Ballot Comments and Resolution

Ballot ID: 727	Date: November 3, 2005	Document: 38-05-653-195
----------------	------------------------	-------------------------

#	(1) Voter/ Commenter	(2) Company	(3) Section No. (e.g. 3.1)	(4) Type of comment	(5) Comment (justification for change)	(6) Proposed Change	(7) Comment Resolution
25	Jerry Boldra	SBC Global	Proposed Agenda Item 653- 195	Technical	<p>COMMENT</p> <p>My vote is "affirmative with comments". I have one technical question and several editorial comments. My "editorial" comments are strong comments which lead to the conclusion that the item needs to be rewritten.</p> <p>TECHNICAL QUESTION: For a door sheet that extends up into the second course, does our collective experience support the 12 inch off-set for the vertical seams of the first and second course? It seems like a lot of extra work to cut the door sheet with offsets, re-weld the door sheet with the offsets and do the additional NDE testing. Is there a history of problems with aligned vertical welds in door sheets? Contractor & owner experience and welding engineering judgment should be solicited to justify this proposed 12 inch offset. So, my "technical question" is I'd like to hear from the group about their experience and their opinions about the need for a 12 inch offset between the first and second course?</p> <p>EDITORIAL COMMENTS:</p> <p>The agenda item needs to be re-written to be simpler, more concise and easier to understand. The current form contains:</p> <p>(a) DUPLICATED PARAGRAPHS numbered:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">9.2.4.1.2.1 and 9.2.4.1.3.1</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">9.2.4.1.2.2.2 and 9.2.4.1.3.2.2</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">9.2.4.1.2.2.1 and 9.2.4.1.3.2.1</p> <p>(b) UNNECESSARY REDUNCANCY: The words "... with complete penetration and complete fusion." are written four times in the proposed agenda item. In addition, this phrase is already covered in API 653, paragraphs 9.2.3.1 and 11.1.1.</p> <p>(c) TOO COMPLEX: The phrase "... must satisfy the sections x.x.x.x.x thru x.x.x.x.x" is written four times in the proposed item. This format make the</p>	<p>It is customary and considered a requirement to provide suggested text when a criticism is offered. I support this concept, custom and spirit of cooperation. However, I don't believe it applies in this case. If a re-write were a simple matter of a few words or sentences, I would be happy to provide suggested text, as I have in the past. A proper re-write of this item will require more than an hour of editing. The concept of "completed staff work" is to provide a complete and well-written work product . . . which is ready for sub-committee processing. In other words, it is the author's responsibility to provide a concise, clear well written proposal. The author should not leave it to his peers to provide a well-written proposal, therefore the author should rework this item and resubmit it for ballot.</p>	

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 6 are compulsory.

API electronic balloting commenting template/version 2002-12

API Template for Ballot Comments and Resolution

Ballot ID: 727	Date: November 3, 2005	Document: 38-05-653-195
----------------	------------------------	-------------------------

#	(1) Voter/ Commenter	(2) Company	(3) Section No. (e.g. 3.1)	(4) Type of comment	(5) Comment (justification for change)	(6) Proposed Change	(7) Comment Resolution
26	Jerry Boldra	SBC Global	Proposed Agenda Item 653-195	Technical	<p>My vote is "affirmative with comments". I have one technical question and several editorial comments. My "editorial" comments are strong comments which lead to the conclusion that the item needs to be rewritten.</p> <p>TECHNICAL QUESTION: For a door sheet that extends up into the second course, does our collective experience support the 12 inch off-set for the vertical seams of the first and second course? It seems like a lot of extra work to cut the door sheet with offsets, re-weld the door sheet with the offsets and do the additional NDE testing. Is there a history of problems with aligned vertical welds in door sheets? Contractor & owner experience and welding engineering judgment should be solicited to justify this proposed 12 inch offset. So, my "technical question" is I'd like to hear from the group about their experience and their opinions about the need for a 12 inch offset between the first and second course?</p> <p>EDITORIAL COMMENTS:</p> <p>The agenda item needs to be re-written to be simpler, more concise and easier to understand. The current form contains:</p> <p>(a) DUPLICATED PARAGRAPHS numbered:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">9.2.4.1.2.1 and 9.2.4.1.3.1</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">9.2.4.1.2.2.2 and 9.2.4.1.3.2.2</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">9.2.4.1.2.2.1 and 9.2.4.1.3.2.1</p> <p>(b) UNNECESSARY REDUNCANCY: The words ". . . with complete penetration and complete fusion." are written four times in the proposed agenda item. In addition, this phrase is already covered in API 653, paragraphs 9.2.3.1 and 11.1.1.</p> <p>(c) TOO COMPLEX: The phrase ". . . . must satisfy the sections x.x.x.x thru</p>	<p>It is customary and considered a requirement to provide suggested text when a criticism is offered. I support this concept, custom and spirit of cooperation. However, I don't believe it applies in this case. If a re-write were a simple matter of a few words or sentences, I would be happy to provide suggested text, as I have in the past. The entire item needs to be rewritten and it will require more than an hour of editing. The concept of "completed staff work" is to provide a complete and well-written work product . . . which is ready for sub-committee processing. In other words, it is the author's responsibility to provide a concise, clear well written proposal. The author should not leave it to his peers to provide a well-written proposal, therefore the author should rework this item and resubmit it for ballot.</p>	

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 6 are compulsory.
API electronic balloting commenting template/version 2002-12

API Template for Ballot Comments and Resolution

Ballot ID: 727	Date: November 3, 2005	Document: 38-05-653-195
----------------	------------------------	--------------------------------

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
#	Voter/ Commenter	Company	Section No. (e.g. 3.1)	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed Change	Comment Resolution
27	Richard Whipple	Fluor, Inc.	Proposed Change: Notes	Editorial	The addition of 3.10 Door Sheets will necessitate that all the other definition numbers after 3.10 will increase one digit. Will this cause any cross-referencing problems?		
28	Douglas Miller	Chicago Bridge & Iron Company(CB&I)	Source and Background and 9.2.4.2.1	Technical	I think we were mistaken in our reply to inquiry 653-I-10/03 which is the source of this agenda item. We said at that time that 653 section 9.2.2.2 requires offsets. But this is not correct. The 12" dimension addressed in 9.2.2.2 is not an offset.		
29	Douglas Miller	Chicago Bridge & Iron Company(CB&I)	Throughout	Technical	The new rules that cover door sheets in lap welded and riveted tanks also have good application to replacement shell plates that are not door sheets. However since these rules are being placed into a new "door sheet" section, it looks like they can only be used for door sheets. This ought not be.	The reorganization suggested in previous comment will solve this problem too.	
30	Douglas Miller	Chicago Bridge & Iron Company(CB&I)	Throughout	Editorial	The section numbering is very cumbersome. Seven digits are too many, especially when there is extensive cross referencing between the sections.	I suggest the new information be reorganized by adding rules as needed to existing sections 9.2.2 and 9.2.3. I believe that a simpler structure will result. Also it will be shorter since I think a lot of the current repetition can be eliminated.	

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 6 are compulsory.

API electronic balloting commenting template/version 2002-12