

24 November 1951

MEMORANDUM TO: General Walsh

SUBJECT: Haines to Fairbanks POL Line

1. Because of the current critical materials situation, it was decided to review the situation as regards pipe for the subject line to gain indications as to whether:

- a. Welded pipe is suitable, in lieu of seamless pipe.
- b. Welded pipe is more readily available than seamless.
- c. Prospective bidders consider the project can be completed to operable condition if pipe is delivered at the mill at a rate of 7,000 tons per month beginning in April 1952 and completing in September 1952, as indicated by NPA for seamless pipe.

2. On 20 November 1951, I talked with Mr. Poorman, Engineering Division, Office, Chief of Engineers. He agreed it was wise to review the matter, stated Office, Chief of Engineers had originally favored welded pipe, and stated he would have his people make a review.

3. On 20th and again 21st November 1951, I talked with Mr. Bachemin, one of the principals of Fluor Corporation, the Architect-Engineer firm on the project. He stated they were specifying API 5L pipe for the job, line pipe, seamless or welded, 0.20% carbon. He stated he had no objection to welded pipe, in fact considered it entirely suitable, cheaper, and possibly in better supply since only three producers make seamless, whereas a large number of mills produce welded pipe. He said the electric fusion weld should be required since electric arc welding produces an inside bead which cannot be trimmed. Mr. Bachemin further stated welded pipe made from plate was within closer wall thickness tolerance than seamless. He further stated a combination of the two types of pipe would be entirely suitable. Mr. Bachemin described the 8" products line between Salt Lake City and Pasco, Washington, owned and operated by Salt Lake Pipeline Company, a subsidiary of Standard Oil of California. He said this line was built of a wide variety of pipe, including submerged arc welded pipe, that it operated 1700 psi; had a wall thickness of 1/4", and working stresses of to 65% of yield stress. For any further desired information on this line he suggested we call Mr. C.V. Baxter, Vice-President, Salt Lake Pipeline Company, Salt Lake City.

4. I talked with Mr. Ray Hamilton, Bechtel Corporation, San Francisco, concerning the possibility of completing the project next construction

24 November 1951

season. He stated the pipe delivery schedule would make it very tight, but probably could make it under normal seasonal weather. He said they had laid pipeline in Minnesota in weather as cold as -15°F. On this job, he suggested four spreads plus equipment for river and lake crossings. Mr. Roy Price, of Engineers Ltd. Pacific Pipeline Company, Oakland, California, was less optimistic about completing next year with proposed delivery schedule, stating any delay encountered would run the work over into 1953.

5. Supply Division has not yet completed a check on the relative availability of the two types of pipe. It is recommended that this office, supplemented by Office, Chief of Engineers Supply Division if desired, complete this check in order to enable us to reach a quick decision on procurement when funds and authority are received.

FOR THE DIVISION ENGINEER:

H. E. HELMBOLDT
Lt. Col., Corps of Engineers
Special Assistant

cc: Supply Division