

API Ballot Summary Sheet

3/23/2005

Ballot: 22-05: 653-162, Examination Length of Repair Welds

AMS ID: 624

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		
138021	Moraya Al-Gahtani	Saudi Aramco	No	X		
79326	Gregory Alvarado	Equity Engineering Group, Inc., The	No	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.	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		
135851	David Bryan	Marathon Ashland Petroleum, LLC	No	X		
130397	Jerry Burke	GE Panametrics	No			X
134782	Steve Caruthers	Tank Consultants, Inc.	No	X		
7127	Earl Crochet	Kinder Morgan	No	X		
132217	Dwayne Davis	Stone & Webster, 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		
133429	Robert Dolejs	UOP LLC	No	X		
128480	Wayne Elliott	Elliott Services, Inc.	No	X		
135965	Kenneth Erdmann	Matrix Service Company	No	X		
128483	Robert Ferrell	The National Board of Boiler & Pressure	No	X		
133207	John Fiore	FTS, Inc.	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

API Ballot Summary Sheet

3/23/2005

Ballot: 22-05: 653-162, Examination Length of Repair Welds

AMS ID: 624

Start Date: 1/24/05

Closing Date: 3/14/05

Associate: Roland Goodman

Coordinator: Valeen Young

Proposal:

133538	Frank Furillo	ExxonMobil Corp.	No					X
115033	Alan Geis	Colonial Pipeline Company	No	X				
84365	Mark Geisenhoff	Flint Hills Resources, LP	No	X				
83689	Ty Hagen	Hagen Engineering International, Inc.	No	X				
133668	Gary Heath	All Tech Inspection	No	X				
136619	Robert Hendrix	Voridian Engineering & Construction	No	X				
70596	Marty Herlevic	James Machine Works, Inc.	No	X				
91812	Peter Hunt	Shell Chemical Company	Yes			X		
89501	N. Jones	Pro-Inspect Inc.	No					X
93133	Randy Kissell	TGB Partnership	Yes		X			
26542	Morris Kline	HMT Inspection	No			X		
135705	Owen Konski	Syncrude Canada Ltd.	No	X				
75330	Dennis Layman	BP p.l.c.	No	X				
81918	Manfred Lengsfeld		No					X
135014	John Lieb	Tank Industry Consultants, Inc.	Yes	X				
136274	Thomas Lorentz	AEC Engineering, Inc.	No					X
128476	John Ludman	DuPont Engineering Technology	Yes	X				
135072	Francis Maitland	Quense LLC	No	X				
78399	David Martin	Conservatek Industries, Inc.	No	X				
113545	James McBride	Petrex, Inc.	No	X				
138401	John McMillan	Mechanical Integrity Inc.	No	X				
139443	James McVay	Tesoro Petroleum	No	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				
114038	Ron Miller	Physical Acoustics Corporation	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		

API Ballot Summary Sheet

3/23/2005

Ballot: 22-05: 653-162, Examination Length of Repair Welds

AMS ID: 624

Start Date: 1/24/05

Closing Date: 3/14/05

Associate: Roland Goodman

Coordinator: Valeen Young

Proposal:

140695	Richard Nichols	Roddey Engineering Services, Inc.	No	X	
139601	John O'Brien	Innovative Research Consultants	No		X
82544	John Oleyar	HMT, Inc.	No		X
82270	Robert Pechacek	General Electric Inspection Services	No	X	
5193	Richard Pinegar	Cargill Inc.	No	X	
102412	Roy Ralph	Petro-Canada	No		X
10929	John Reynolds	Shell Global Solutions (US) Inc.	Yes		X
135169	Michael Richardson	International Paper	Yes	X	
102879	James Riley	ChevronTexaco Energy Technology Cor	No	X	
73744	Bruce Roberts		No	X	
102884	Joe Don Sanders	Lyondell Citgo Refinery	No		X
77480	Clinton Schulz	Citgo Refining & Chemical Co.	No		X
138135	Michael Shallis	Longview Inspection, Inc.	No	X	
101360	Marilyn Shores	Sunoco Logistics	No	X	
145484	Ryan Sitton	Berwanger, Inc.	No		X
132992	Robert Smallwood	DNV USA	No	X	
78185	Kelly Smith	ConocoPhillips	Yes	X	
126019	Larry Speaks	Mass Technology Corporation	No	X	
73144	Kenneth Tam		No	X	
134314	Tearle Taylor	Flint Hills Resources	No	X	
134325	Donald Thain	Shell Global Solutions (US) Inc.	No		X
137459	Roland Valdes	Inspection Solutions, LLC	No		X
145034	Leith Watkins	Explorer Pipeline Company	Yes		X
145896	Alan Watson	A.R. Watson, USA	No	X	
134558	John Watson	The Dow Chemical Company	No	X	
135619	Steven Wells	Capstone Engineering Services, Inc.	No	X	
132209	Richard Whipple	Fluor, Inc.	No		X

API Ballot Summary Sheet

3/23/2005

Ballot: 22-05: 653-162, Examination Length of Repair Welds

AMS ID: 624

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:	57	4	3	21

Total Responses:	64			
Total Ballots:	85			
Response Rate :	67%	Must be > 50%		
Approval Rate:	93%	Must be > 67%		
Consensus:	YES			

API Template for Ballot Comments and Resolution

Ballot ID: 624	Date: March 23, 2005	Document: Ballot 22-05: 653-162
----------------	----------------------	--

#	(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	Philip Myers	ChevronTexaco Corporation		Technical	I have the same comment as last time, which was not addressed. I do not think that an additional agenda item is needed as described by this item because paragraph 12.2.2 fully addresses this issue and the criteria of judging the existing weld by the original standard of construction. I recommend dropping item.		
2	Peter Hunt	Shell Chemical Company		Technical	Don't know what I'm balloting.		
3	John Lieb	Tank Industry Consultants, Inc.	12.1.3.2	Technical	"Tank construction contractor" could be interpreted to mean the original tank erector.	Change "tank construction contractor" to "tank repair contractor".	
4	Randy Kissell	TGB Partnership	12.1.3.2	Technical	I'm confused by the proposed wording. Is this what you mean? Radiographic or ultrasonic examination shall be used for a)the full length of completed repairs of butt-welds and b)a distance of 3t or 3 in., whichever is greater, of existing welds from the intersection of repaired welds with existing welds. The report shall indicate the examination zone. Indications shall be evaluated using the criteria in 12.2.2. The repair of any defects outside the examination zone will be by contractual agreement between the owner-operator and the tank construction contractor.		
5	Kelly Smith	ConocoPhillips	12.1.3.2	Technical	Delete the last sentence, "The repair of any defects.....". It does not belong here and should be covered in the contract between the owner-operator and the tank contractor. BW-RC		

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: 624	Date: March 23, 2005	Document: Ballot 22-05: 653-162
----------------	----------------------	--

#	(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
6	John Reynolds	Shell Global Solutions (US) Inc.	12.1.3.2	Technical	<p>"Section 12.2.2 gives evaluation criteria" Change gives to provides.</p> <p>"The repair of any defects observed, that are not in or caused by the repair weld, will be handled by contractual agreement between the owner-operator and the tank construction contractor." "Defects" by ASNT definition are unacceptable rejects. Also, who will be contractually involved in the handling of such flaws is not as important as how they are evaluated, which should be by the appropriate level of FFS.</p>	<p>Second to last sentence should read "Section 12.2.2 provides evaluation criteria"</p> <p>Change "defects" to "flaws" in last sentence, and add FFS evaluation as shown here: "The repair of any flaws observed, that are not in or caused by the repair weld, should be subject to the appropriate fitness-for-service evaluation and will be handled by contractual agreement between the owner-operator and the tank construction contractor."</p>	
7	Douglas Miller	Chicago Bridge & Iron Company(CB&I)	12.1.3.2	Editorial	<p>The phrase "limits of required EVALUATION" in the fourth sentence is a reference back to the second sentence where it says "the EXAMINATION shall continue ... 3t or 3inches" The terms should be consistent in these two sentences. The third sentence use "evaluation" which is correct at that location.</p>	<p>In fourth sentence change the word "evaluation" to "examination."</p>	
8	Nelson Acosta	HMT Inspection	12.1.3.2	Editorial	<p>In the 3rd sentence, add the word "detected" between "or" and "by ultrasonic methods". In the 6th (last) sentence, replace the term "construction" with the term "repair" so that the end of the sentence reads "tank repair contractor".</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: 624	Date: March 23, 2005	Document: Ballot 22-05: 653-162
----------------	----------------------	--

#	(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
9	Leith Watkins	Explorer Pipeline Company	653, Section 12.1.3.2	Technical	The last sentence is out of the scope of API 653 and appears to be written to cover legal issues.	Delete the last sentence and rewrite the added language for clarity: "Completed repairs of butt welds shall be examined over their full length by radiographic or ultrasonic methods. The examination shall continue into the previous existing weld a minimum length of 3 times the wall thickness or 3 inches, which ever is greater. All indications on the radiographic film or ultrasonics shall be evaluated according to the criteria of Section 12.2.2. The radiographic film and report shall indicate the area of the repair weld plus the examined section of the existing weld."	
10	Michael Richardson	International Paper	General	Technical	Three inches does not seem adequate to me based on my experience. I would suggest six inches be the additional examination length. This would be similar to a tracer shot with RT.		
11	John Ludman	DuPont Engineering Technology	Last Sentence in Paragraph 12.1.3.2	Technical	The last sentence should be dropped. The last sentence adds no technical value and is vague.		
12	John Ludman	DuPont Engineering Technology	Last Sentence in paragraph 12.1.3.2	Technical	The last sentence adds no technical value and is vague.	Drop the last sentence	

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

API electronic balloting commenting template/version 2002-12