

API Ballot Summary Sheet

3/22/2005

Ballot: 21-05: 653-153, 653 Allowable Stress for Appendix M Tanks

AMS ID: 623

Start Date: 1/24/05

Closing Date: 3/14/05

Associate: Roland Goodman

Coordinator: Valeen Young

Proposal:

Vote Results

<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	Yes	X		
38921	Robert Annett	Alyeska Pipeline	No			X
73074	Ronald Bailey	American Tank & Vessel, Inc.	No	X		
136219	Mark Baker	Baker Consulting Group, Inc.	No	X		
142888	Chris Bashor	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	No	X		
134681	Ernie Blanchard	IMC-Phosphates	No	X		
109375	Jerry Boldra		No			X
22200	Dan Boley	DJA Inspection Services	No	X		
134782	Steve Caruthers	Tank Consultants, Inc.	No	X		
7127	Earl Crochet	Kinder Morgan	No	X		
142685	Domingo de Para	ExxonMobil	Yes	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	No	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	Voridian Engineering & Construction	No	X		
70596	Marty Herlevic	James Machine Works, Inc.	No	X		
93133	Randy Kissell	TGB Partnership	No	X		
81918	Manfred Lengsfeld		No			X
135014	John Lieb	Tank Industry Consultants, Inc.	No	X		
136274	Thomas Lorentz	AEC Engineering, Inc.	Yes	X		
135072	Francis Maitland	Quense LLC	No	X		

API Ballot Summary Sheet

3/22/2005

Ballot: 21-05: 653-153, 653 Allowable Stress for Appendix M Tanks

AMS ID: 623

Start Date: 1/24/05

Closing Date: 3/14/05

Associate: Roland Goodman

Coordinator: Valeen Young

Proposal:

78399	David Martin	Conservatek Industries, Inc.	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)	No	X		
69609	Bhana Mistry	TIW Steel Platework	No	X		
83736	John Mooney		No	X		
92212	George Morovich	TEMCOR	No	X		
136286	Philip Myers	ChevronTexaco Corporation	Yes	X		
132210	David Nasab	Kellogg Brown & Root	No	X		
82544	John Oleyar	HMT, Inc.	No			X
5193	Richard Pinegar	Cargill Inc.	No	X		
102412	Roy Ralph	Petro-Canada	No			X
135169	Michael Richardson	International Paper	No	X		
73744	Bruce Roberts		Yes	X		
101360	Marilyn Shores	Sunoco Logistics	No			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.	No			X
145034	Leith Watkins	Explorer Pipeline Company	Yes	X		
145896	Alan Watson	A.R. Watson, USA	No	X		
132209	Richard Whipple	Fluor, Inc.	No			X

API Ballot Summary Sheet

3/22/2005

Ballot: 21-05: 653-153, 653 Allowable Stress for Appendix M Tanks

AMS ID: 623

Start Date: 1/24/05

Closing Date: 3/14/05

Associate: Roland Goodman

Coordinator: Valeen Young

Proposal:

	<u>Affirmative</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Did Not Vote</u>
Balloting Totals:	37	1	0	11

Total Responses:	38	
Total Ballots:	49	
Response Rate :	76%	Must be > 50%
Approval Rate:	97%	Must be > 67%
Consensus:	YES	

API Template for Ballot Comments and Resolution

Ballot ID: 623	Date: March 23, 2005	Document: Ballot 21-05: 653-153
----------------	----------------------	--

#	(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
1	Bruce Roberts			Technical	Change B to 2 in paragraph B of 4.3.10.1. (Editorial)		
2	Philip Myers	ChevronTexaco Corporation		Technical	My comment is that Y in proposed 4.3.10.1 (A.2) be based on 30000 psi at ambient temperature and that it be reduced for the proposed new design temperature in accordance with the yield strength reduction factors in appendix M. Also, I think that there needs to be a section that address consideration of the thermal expansion of the various tank components and connection details such as rafter. NDE requirements should be included as well.		
3	Steven Adolphsen	Morse Construction Group, Inc.	4.3.10	Editorial	In 4.3.10.1.B, the phrase "... the additional analysis of B above is required." Does not seem to read well.	I suggest replacing these words with " an additional analysis is required".	
4	Larry Hiner	Chicago Bridge & Iron Company(CB&I)	4.3.10.1	Technical	4.3.10.1 part A. 1 - last sentence. Affrmative comment - Y is never known until a factor is applied to the yield strength.	Change "When value of Y is not known," to "When the material minimum yield strength is not known,"	
5	Larry Hiner	Chicago Bridge & Iron Company(CB&I)	4.3.10.1	Technical	4.3.10.1 part B second sentence. Affirmative comment - The reference to "B" is incorrect. Also use maximum design temperature.	Change "B" to "2" and change "operating" to "design"	
6	Thomas Lorentz	AEC Engineering, Inc.	4.3.10.1	Editorial	A clarification is suggested on the reference noted in the second sentence of proposed paragraph B, under 4.3.10.1:	B. . . . If the tank diameter exceeds 100 feet, and the tank was not constructed with a butt welded annular ring, the additional analysis of API Standard 650, Appendix M.4.2 is required. In addition . . .	
7	Domingo de Para	ExxonMobil	4.3.10.1 B	Technical	The reference to the butt welded annular ring should point to sub paragraph A2 instead of B		

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: 623	Date: March 23, 2005	Document: Ballot 21-05: 653-153
----------------	----------------------	--

#	(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
8	Larry Hiner	Chicago Bridge & Iron Company(CB&I)	4.3.10.1 part B	Technical	4.3.10.1 part B. Affirmative comment - It would be prudent to perform some additional NDE in the critical zone when the tank exceeds 100 feet diameter and was not constructed with a butt welded annular ring. Suggest a full visual inspection and possibly an MT or PT of the inside corner weld.		
9	James McBride	Petrex, Inc.	4.3.10.1.B	Technical	Second part of B. concerning tanks exceeding 100 feet in diameter references additional analysis per B. above. I am not so sure that this is the right reference. Do you mean to reference 4.3.10.1.A.2? That would make more sense to me.	Change the reference from "B" to 4.3.10.1.A.2.	
10	Joel Andreani	Equity Engineering Group, Inc., The	4.3.10.1.B.	Technical	There is no "B" above. Beleive this should read "2" of 4.3.10.1 (A)		
11	Larry Hiner	Chicago Bridge & Iron Company(CB&I)	4.3.10.2	Technical	4.3.10.2 a Affirmative comment - The second sentence could be misinterpreted. interpreted.	Change the word "this" to "this (API 653)"	
12	Domingo de Para	ExxonMobil	4.3.10.2	Technical	I think we need to make reference to foundation investigation if we are going to consider changing a tank to hot service.		
13	Steven Adolphsen	Morse Construction Group, Inc.	4.3.10.2	Editorial	In 4.3.10.2.a, it reads "The allowable shell stresses of this Standard shall not be used". I do not see (or missed) an explanation of why this 'dead end' statement has been added. Shouldn't we offer rules on what allowables to use?	none	

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: 623	Date: March 23, 2005	Document: Ballot 21-05: 653-153
----------------	----------------------	--

#	(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
14	Leith Watkins	Explorer Pipeline Company	653 new Section 4.3.10	Editorial	I had difficulty understanding the opening paragraph 4.3.10. I couldn't tell whether the provisions were for how tanks would be evaluated or the circumstances calling for evaluation.	rewrite paragraph 4.3.10 for clarity: "Tanks of welded construction that operate at temperatures exceeding 200F but less than 500F shall be evaluated for suitability of service. The requirements of this section are based in part on the requirements of API Standard 650, Appendix M, and pertain to tanks not originally constructed according to API 650 Appendix M and for continued service of tanks constructed according to API 650 Appendix M."	
15	Nelson Acosta	HMT Inspection	M.4.3.10.1.A.2 / M.4.3.10.1.B / M.4.3.10.2	Technical	Suggest revised wording as below to clarify the intent for the reader. Also, it would probably be appropriate in 4.3.10.2 to be more specific about the "requirements of this standard" that are intended to apply to this situation (as further reference for the user rather than leaving it as a comment only.	M.4.3.10.1.A.2 If the bottom plate material in the critical zone has been reduced in thickness beyond the provisions of the original tank bottom corrosion allowance, if any, or reduced below nominal thickness where no corrosion allowance is applicable, the shell-to-bottom M.4.3.10.1.B Correct reference in 2nd sentence to "the additional analysis of A above is required." M.4.3.10.2 The shell-to-bottom joint shall be evaluated for fatigue conditions. In addition, the adequacy of the bottom plate material in the critical zone shall be based upon the requirements of this standard.	

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

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