326-68-588
Box #67
FOLDER: MATLS - 5 URANIUM
#83 1953

3.1 NY00

Files
THRU: F. M. Belmore

January 30, 1953

G. E. Dunlap, Chief, Metallurgical Development Branch, Production Division

URANIUM METAL FOR DEVELOPMENT WORK

SYMBOL: PM:GED:smh

MATERIALS 5 Ur

We have run out of uranium for development work at Bridgeport Brass Company, Metals & Controls Corporation, and Superior Steel Corporation, and this is creating an unfavorable situation wherein we are unable to press them for active progress because they have nothing to work with.

We have since November requested certain items of uranium metal, namely in our letters November 25 to Production Planning and Scheduling Branch, our teletype of November 26 to C. L. Karl, our letter of December 15 to George Bate, and our letter of January 2 to George Bate. To date, none of this metal has been received. We realize that there is a shortage of uranium but by the same token, this condition is permitting us to perform an experimental rolling at Fernald. As of January 29, the ingot metal had not yet been shipped from St. Louis for this experimental work.

There have been occasions on which the Sylvania pilot plant ran very close to the limit of their stock of scrap slug material for hydriding. We would appreciate every effort possible to remedy this situation so that adequate supplies of ingot metal, process slab and plate and slug material could be received ahead of time.

We have two very urgent programs, one being the flat plate development, and the other, hollow slugs which involve the above contractors. We have fortunately received no definitive orders for any quantity of material but also we have been unable to get ahead of the demand, which we feel sure will develop very soon.

Sylvania recently requested a large inventory of ingot metal approximating 104 tons to be supplied them through December 1953. We have gone over this with Production Planning and Scheduling Branch and decided that 150 slugs per day production considered at 80% efficiency, Sylvania should not require more than 52 tons of ingots for this period. Perhaps this will alleviate the situation somewhat for our metallurgical development allotment.

cc: G. Bate, Production Div.
R. J. Smith, Jr., Production Div.

The ingots were shipped to AH&F by MCW on Friday, January 29, with Mr. Cook of the Traffic Branch expediting shipment.

In summation, the above record appears to indicate that the greatest portion of lost time was due to a lack of firm specifications and requirements on the part of the MDB.

B. Material for Superior Steel and for Metals and Control

On November 25, we received the following request:

1. Six slabs 1" x 5" x 65" minimum with 72" length preferable to be shipped to Station COL for Superior Steel.

2. Three slabs .5" x 6" x .20" and three slabs .25" x 6" x 120" to be shipped to Metals and Control.

On November 26, a teletype was sent to Fernald requesting this material and a copy of their Production Order, dated the same day on National Lead, was subsequently received by this office.

Fernald in subsequent telephone conversations requested that the following be determined:

1. Would as-rolled edges be acceptable?
2. What thickness tolerances would be acceptable?
3. Is New York in position to transship this material, each of the larger slabs for Superior Steel being 220 lbs. each?

The above Fernald questions were discussed with MDB. In the meantime, we requested Fernald not to proceed until answers could be obtained to their questions.

On December 15, we received a memo from MDB revising quantity and dimensions of the material for Superior Steel from that above to 12 slabs each 2.5" thick by 8" wide by 100" long, with hot-rolled finish. (Each slab approximately 1350 pounds each.)

During the period of December 15 to January 2, Don Maggin, in Jim Siwik's absence requested clarification on the following:

1. Tolerances
2. Blooming practice
3. Revised shipping address so that New York Station COL would not have to transship.

Note: Apparently both groups (PPS and MDB) missed the point that these slabs could not be cast to the weight required by present casting practices.

On December 13, we received a Sylvania request dated December 8, requesting 6,000 pounds of reject slugs for delivery by approximately January 8, with the additional request that reject slugs be segregated into groups with not less than three slugs to a group from each different ingot.

Arrangements for segregation were not completed with Fernald until December 31, at which time Sylvania agreed to take one ton of unsegregated material immediately and the remaining two tons segregated as slugs as accumulated. Initial shipment of unsegregated material was made on January 9, and the remaining segregated material was shipped on January 29.

In summation, it is believed that past delays have been caused by working on a hand-to-mouth basis. It is believed that placing the requirements on a calendar year uniform shipment basis should alleviate this situation. It should be noted that there are approximately 12 tons of large ingots in stock at Bayside which was delivered during the Summer of 1952 that have not been used owing to lack of hydriding equipment suitable for such large pieces.

General Comment: The Production Planning and Scheduling Branch will continue to make every effort in supplying material for Metallurgical Development Branch requests, on time; however, we appreciate that the above delays have been attributable in the most part to normal changing requirements encountered in any development program.

CC: O. E. Dunlap, Metal. Develop. Br., Production

FEBRUARY 6 1953