

TO Mr. H. P. Leyendecker	SUBJECT EXXON LEXINGTON Newport News Shipyard Period Evaluation - 1978	
FROM Wm. A. Ingham, Jr.	DATE October 24, 1978	FILE NO

1. Yard repair period started off at a slow pace due to workload in yard at the time. Vessel arrived in yard 8/24/78, sailed 9/29/78. Elapsed time, 37 days. I feel the vessel could have gone through the yard period in 32 days, except for the following facts:

a. Yard workload through most of the yard period left us short on labor and key crafts, especially on the second shift. The shops were crowded, especially machine shop and pipe shop. Some time was lost because of various key personnel (yard) being on and off the vessel for periods of time, due to other work and/or vacation, etc.

2. ~~Some time was lost due to Labor Day weekend.~~

3. USCG and ABS were overloaded with work and short of personnel.

4. Lost time due to threat of hurricane and procedures which had to be taken as a precaution.

5. The estimators furnished us on this vessel as well as the GETTYSBURG were trainees who received little or no guidance. I complained many times to Mr. Via, and although I got assurances that something would be done, the situation did not, and has not improved. Supplements were held up for weeks. I have still not received supplement #10 on the LEXINGTON. The performance on the part of the yard estimating department was poor, to indifferent, to incompetent, to say the least.

6. Boilers

Some (33) superheater handhole plates stowed in a barrel in the boiler disappeared. The fault lies with the shipyard. Someone at some time saw a partially filled barrel, dumped trash material into it. The barrel was then offloaded and a complete search of the yard could not locate these handhole plates. I borrowed a like amount from the EXXON HUNTINGTON at Norfolk Shipyard and ordered replacements for that vessel. ~~This cost us (3) days boilers.~~ It was necessary to renew (60) superheater tubes in the starboard boiler. In my opinion this was an operational problem. The tubes involved were all in lowest of (3) passes. The dog bones were in tact, but the tubes involved were heavily waved. Additionally, same boiler inner wind box casing in way of air registers were found buckled and warped. The wave in tubes caused them to be in contact. This required renewal. In my opinion, I feel the boiler was fired off at one or more times with superheater vents closed. Precluding superheater circulation and thus damage to tubes. Except for waved condition, tubes were good. I can't prove this. I offer it as a possible causative action. Boilers, (23) screen tubes required replacement in port boiler. All air heater tubes in good condition. No replacements required. I have found it difficult in many yard periods to convince shipboard

personnel of the importance and expedience of restarting the plant at the earliest possible time, in the best interest of completing the yard period. Testing, proving, the benefit of ship's engineers. I know this is expedient. Some disagree and then complain of lack of time to prove all equipment. I feel my opinion is correct and relevant.

7. Clean up of vessel much improved over GETTYSBURG. Still could be improved.
8. At instigation of our Marine Department, some noticeable improvements: budgeted available manhours, inhouse surveillance of over staffing, riggers, especially coordinators whose function is to expedite our work through shops.
9. Overall, the money spent for the job done was well spent. This class vessel is a "good" ship. I base this conclusion on the current reality of constantly decreasing production versus manpower to do a given job. Craft attitude, craft supervision, and declining perspective on the overall picture. I resent the pricing of items by unqualified estimators, or by qualified estimators who are spread too thin and can't give the job the time required. I resent the shipyard indifference to cost responsibility and cost control.
10. Our problems: again, in my opinion, our vessels should arrive in the yard with permanent captain, chief mate, chief engineer, and 1st asst. engineer. The advantages of this procedure are obvious. In 80% of the yard periods, this is not the case. Three different chief mates, two 1st asst. engineers on the LEXINGTON alone, similar circumstances on the GETTYSBURG.
11. Furnishing material for shipyard repairs, modifications, etc. Performance is poor. Promises, yes. Delivery, no. Examples: Butterworth heater shell, dishwasher, food warmers, cafeteria salad display unit, Mark 16 radar, sewage modification parts, etc. Refer, if you will, to my recommendations submitted a year ago to how this problem could be solved. I see no saving or profit in cutting paperwork that delays progress of yard repairs on "need to know basis" i.e. delivery sheets, "4 cartons", "2 boxes", no details as to content, further, no waybill, delivery data, etc. We save \$1000.00 on deleting one form and increase the cost of yard repairs by paper efficiency by \$1000.00 X 20 or 30. Communication as to supply parts, especially and predominately on betterment items is a major cause of delay in completion of the yard period. Revisions on betterment items follow through on approval of same, lack of essential supplier supervision during critical periods of installation, failure to follow through on preplanning and approval by regulatory bodies is evident.
12. Changes in officer personnel during yard period, three chief mates, two 1st. asst. engineers.

WAI: bt

c: Mr. H. J. Borgen	Mr. L. A. Hanft	Mr. J. A. Tompkins
Mr. A. T. Fellows	Mr. R. H. Osmer	Mr. E. J. Worrel, Jr.