

Letters to the Editor

Pipeline Position Misunderstood

Dear Editor:

Recent conversations with civic leaders strongly indicate that the positions of the Port Commission and Chamber of Commerce Port Development Committee on the Whittier Pipeline are not understood.

The formal action of both groups opposing the pipeline was based solely on the economics of NOT military necessity. Civilian groups do not necessarily know all of the facts and therefore are in no position to question the military requirements.

If they convince Congress that the pipeline is required to efficiently carry out their missions, we have absolutely no objection. However, the economics which effects the Port revenues and the purse of every taxpayer is seriously questioned.

A year ago when the ALCOM Staff negotiated its reduced rates for POL coming across our dock, their legal officer stated that if the pipeline was built the military would have no need for a dock in this area. More recently their Port Liaison Officer could not give a cut and dried answer as to whether the pipeline would effect the through-put at the Port other than using it for the limited supply of locally produced jet fuel.

The pipeline under consideration since 1942, was delayed in 1965 after Congressional Hearings. The Congressional Record states, "The Whittier POL Pipeline was deferred for another year on the basis that conferees agreed that this project required more study."

I trust this study will amend certain statements made at this hearing such as "the Port of Anchorage cannot be used for military planning purposes from about mid October to mid April", and "...the five (5) to seven (7) month period when Cook Inlet, the only seaport route to Anchorage is free of ice."

This was certainly disproved in 1964 by Sea-Land's highly successful weekly year-round service to Anchorage without delays or damage in the worst ice conditions in the Weather Bureau's recorded history and the presence of tankers in the Port in this month of December.

The \$3 million cost of the pipeline is

questioned mainly because the record states the "existing rights of way is available for the route of the pipeline." This is not true as putting mixed product petroleum pipelines in a railroad tunnel (which in this instance also carries electric power lines) is prohibited by every known reference and is therefore unacceptable to the Alaska Railroad. This would necessitate putting the pipeline over the mountains, additional lift pumps, and extra maintenance and operating crews which were not considered in the cost estimates at the Hearing.

Regarding a statement at the Hearings, "I don't think there is any way of completely guaranteeing we can use the railroad all the time to the capacity required", the Alaska Railroad strongly refutes this, saying 200 tank cars are presently available and could easily transport over 16,000 barrels per day from Whittier to Anchorage if necessary.

As written by the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense on April 27, 1965, "on a ten year basis the cost of delivery by pipeline is most economical. The alternative of delivery by tanker to Anchorage during the open season and by tanker to Whittier in the closed (winter) season and by rail from Whittier to Elmendorf is slightly higher in cost". Since this date the Alaska Railroad has drastically reduced its tender for hauling military POL products on this route. Further, both the Alaska Railroad and the Port will give even lower prices to the military if the quantities increase as forecast, thus possibly indicating the pipeline is not more economical.

Our main desire is to clarify the existing record of mis-statement and to ensure that the Congress determines which method of providing petroleum products is truly the most economical. We are also pointing out that the Municipal Terminals of the Port of Anchorage require the financial backing of the military if it is to continue its growth for the military as well as civilian use in the area.

Very truly yours,
Anchorage Port Commission
Wallace E. Martens, Chairman



PLUMMETING TEMPERATURES added to the picturesque qualities of Cook Inlet by filling it with chunks and pieces of ice, but not enough to slow the S. S. Anchorage from getting to its berth at the Port of Anchorage

dock. In picture above the Anchorage appears to be locked securely to the dock while waiting for crews to unload her cargo.

(Daily News photo)

Sea-Land Gets Huge New Crane

SEATTLE — Looming up on the Port of Seattle's Pier 5 is a brand new giant of a crane — 20 stories high and almost a city block wide. This huge traveling container crane will be used exclusively by Sea-Land Service, Inc., for its highway van and containership operation which serves the Seattle-Portland-California run and the Seattle-Alaska route.

The specially built high-speed crane was constructed by Pacific Coast Engineering Co., Alameda, Calif., and cost approximately \$685,000 installed. The port leases it to Sea-Land where it is used to load and unload 35 and 40-foot highway vans of up to 27½ tons and up to 40 vans per hour.

With the boom up, the new crane is 206 feet high (almost 153 feet tall when the boom is extended over the ship), and 217 feet wide, with boom extended. At the track base, the crane is 51 feet wide and rests on 12 double trucks electrically driven by a trolley system—electric wires suspended from stanchions 16 feet above the ground.

The crane runs on rails the full length of Sea-Land's two berths at Pier 5—about 1,200 feet.

Until the new crane went into operation Tuesday on the S.S. Anchorage, Sea-Land used a 40-ton whirley crane which could handle about ten vans per hour, compared with the new crane's 40 per hour maximum rate.

Sea-Land's two custom-designed container ships on the Alaskan run are the Seattle and the Anchorage which carry up to 294 fully loaded vans, plus loose-stow cargo. Sea-Land serves Alaska, the Pacific Coast, Atlantic Coast and Puerto Rico with its large fleet of ships, thousands of trailer-truck rigs, and a network of sea-and-land terminals.

Port Moves To Construct New Facility

The Anchorage Port Commission will seek federal funds for planning and building a marine repair facility at the Port of Anchorage.

The commission last night unanimously approved seeking a Community Facilities planning grant and Economic Development matching funds for the estimated \$1.5 to \$2 million facility.

No specific figure was set for the planning grant which would be used for engineering and feasibility studies.

CITY matching funds could come from bond issues, according to A. E. Harned, port director.

Harned suggested that lease payments from users would result in "little or no port funds" being required to pay off the bonding.

The marine repair facility would be a part of the port's industrial park and, as such, it would not be required that revenues be turned over for payment of the original port construction bonds.

HARNED reminded the commission that an estimated \$350,000 in repair and dry-dock work was generated in the area last year.

This information was presented earlier to the commission by Robert Logan, marine insurance adjuster.

The commission instructed Harned to prepare the applications for consideration by the Anchorage City Council.

Oil Tanker Safety Is Questioned

Lt. Col. James Shaver, military liaison to the Anchorage Port Commission, has questioned the safety of bringing standard type oil tankers into Anchorage during the winter.

Shaver made his comments during the course of Monday's commission meeting.

NOTING that Wally Martens, commission chairman, had cited the ability of Sea-Land's vessels to negotiate Cook Inlet in winter, Shaver said these accomplishments, although praiseworthy, "do not disprove anything that has been said concerning use of standard equipped tankers of both the Military Sea Transport Service and suppliers."

The Anchorage port is considered safe for tankers from about mid-April to mid-October, Shaver said. Mid-March to mid-April and mid-October to mid-November are considered "marginal," he said.

He said the military's planning "must provide assurance of accomplishment that is vital to military missions."



BUGGED OR NOT some phones in Anchorage are just plain hard to use. Out on the city dock a swirling wind packed the booth solid with snow and today dock-

ers had to chop a path to the instrument and provide a little knee room. Steve-dore Van Brunt said it was a cold way to find out his line was busy.

(Daily News photo)

Port Director Sees No Bond Payment Problems

The Port of Anchorage will meet its Feb. 15 construction bond payment of \$100,000 without difficulty, according to Port Director A. E. Harned.

After years of scratching for the twice-yearly payments, the port now is on firmer financial footing.

A year-end summary of port activities show that 192 cargo handled during the year added up to 922,207 tons with 675,052 tons representing petroleum products, according to the port's year-end report.

Last year's port revenues totaled \$728,763. This is up over the \$715,450 anticipated revenue incorporated into last year's port budget.



FIRE DRILL FOR PORT EMPLOYEES

City of Anchorage port offices have just been moved to a new upstairs location in the port terminal building and as part of the move employees went through a fire drill. Shown on the fire escape ladder is Mrs. Ronald Wojtaszek, clerk stenographer. Looking on is Capt. A. E. Harned, port director.