

# Areas of Interest

- PCP Retention
- Environmental Conditions
  - 50% Relative Humidity
  - Monitoring 12 hrs prior to
- Training & Certification
- Moderate Flash Rust
- Paint Storage
- Reduce Required Reports
- Touch-up Issues (New and Disturbed)
- Proposed Change Form
- Elim 3.8.1 (CAP sheet) since info will be in CQATK

# Document Improvement

- NSI 009-32
- Problem & Rationale
  - Document too Complicated, need to simplify
- Proposed Change
  - Allow Replace Sections 1.1 through 4.11 with:

**See Ship, Paint Same**

# PCP Retention

- Tables 1-5, surface preparation, Para 3.1.4
- Problem & Rationale
  - Most surface ship shipyards abrasive blast and apply an inorganic zinc pre-construction primer to steel plates and shapes before starting fabrication. This primer provides good protection from corrosion during the construction period and is often in very good condition at the time when the final paint system is scheduled to be applied. Yet NSI 009-32 requires that this pre-construction primer be completely removed by abrasive blasting, thereby increasing preservation costs. Current demonstration at ADD.
- Proposed Change
  - Allow the PCP to remain if the PCP is applied “properly,” OQE exists, and is compatible with the coating system it should be allowed to remain. Not to apply to nuc areas.

# 50% Relative Humidity

- Notes to Tables 1 through 5, Note 26.
- Problem & Rationale
  - Maintain the relative humidity in the tank or void space at a maximum of 50 percent from the start of surface preparation to cure of the topcoat. This issue is considered one of the most expensive requirements in NSI 009-32 to meet. Most Navy contractors do not have dehumidification units as standard capabilities in their blast and paint facilities. Paint manufacturers' product data sheets typically require that relative humidity be no greater than 85 percent, which can frequently be met with either no extra controls or by just heating the space to lower the relative humidity. IMO PSPC requirement is 85%.
- Proposed Change
  - Relax the requirement for 50% RH to read “in accordance with manufacturer’s recommendation or 85%.” This does not apply to pot water & feedwater tanks.

# Monitoring Environmental Conditions 12 hrs prior to Coating Application

- Paragraph 3.10.1.1
- Problem & Rationale
  - Monitoring is redundant waste. Surface prep requirements invoked by 009-32 ensure surface prep condition meet specification at the time of coating application.
- Proposed Change
  - Replace the words “from 12 hours prior to” with “from surface preparation (G)-point acceptance” in paragraph 3.10.1.1

# Take readings to validate operation of environmental recorders

- Paragraph 3.10.1.2
- Problem & Rationale
  - Current requirement is to take and document manual readings at 12 hour intervals and at (G) points to verify that operation of data loggers. A recent NSRP study showed that this requirement added unnecessary cost (quantify from report – attach appropriate pages). Confirmation at each (G)-point should be adequate to confirm operation.
- Proposed Change
  - Delete the words “once every 12 hours and”

# Training & Certification

- Paragraph 3.9.1
- Problem & Rationale
  - Training provided by outside agencies may be redundant to equivalent SY training programs. It also may not be the most economical for all shipyards.
- Proposed Change
  - Allow in-house SY training and certification programs for coatings inspectors with NAVSEA approval letter.

# Training & Certification

- Paragraph 3.9.2
- Problem & Rationale
  - NSI requires QP-1 for critical coated surfaces. QP-1 is an ISO-formatted program. It is therefore redundant to ISO programs maintained by some SYs.
- Proposed Change
  - Allow ISO certification as an alternate to QP-1.

# Moderate Flash Rust

- Paragraph 3.10.5.1 and Tables
- Problem & Rationale
  - Remediation of moderate flash rust in areas prepared with open UHPWJ equipment is costly and does not appear to offer a significant benefit in either service life or risk reduction.
- Proposed Change
- Allow moderate flash rusting on water jetted surfaces in place of a maximum of light flash rusting.

# Paint Storage

- Paragraph 3.1.13
- Problem & Rationale
  - Current requirement to document and maintain restrictive storage conditions is cumbersome and costly for many contractors
- Proposed Change
  - As an alternative, allow the contractor to measure core temperature of paint during mixing. Temperature should be within the present requirements.

# Paint Storage

- Paragraph 3.1.13.1 & 2
- Problem & Rationale
  - Current requirement is for non-skid material is more restrictive than paint. Current requirement may be for storage conditions more restrictive than the manufacturer recommends.
- Proposed Change
  - Revise paragraph 3.1.13.1 to read “For paint and nonskid storage, meet the storage requirements of their NAVSEA-approved F-718.”
  - Eliminate 3.1.13.2.

# Touch-up Issues (New and Disturbed)

- Paragraph 3.6.2.1
- Problem & Rationale
  - The requirement of surface profile (3.10.6), conductivity (3.10.7), and DFT readings (3.10.10.1) for touch-up areas is costly and time consuming for very small areas.
- Proposed Change
  - Delete these requirements for touch-up.

# Touch-up Issues (New and Disturbed)

- Paragraph 3.6.2.1
- Problem & Rationale
  - The requirements of 3.6.2.1 are restrictive and add significant cost to task items requiring accomplishing activities to meet those task requirements in Paragraph and subparagraphs of 3.10.
  - Task item specifies New & Disturbed in a void space (which has not been fully preserved in approximately 15 years, but is scheduled for full represervation within one year). Surface prep and painting of an area less than a total of 2 sqft needs to consider the value added and the invoking 009-32 requirements of paragraph 3.6.2.1 and the cost driver escalating ship repair cost associated in this requirement.
- Proposed Change
  - Provide SUPERVISOR the option of relaxing requirements of paragraph 3.6.2.1 when specifying requirements in task items. Cost drivers and trade off comparisons need to be fully considered when specifying requirements. (Quality of work request)

# Proposed Change Form

- SSRAC Steering Committee
- Problem & Rationale
  - A data-driven method for proposing and reviewing changes to all Standard Items be developed that has better definition of potential costs and savings. Have that rationale on the proposal at time of submission.
- Proposed Change
  - Use attached, revised form with ROI and cycle time reduction

# Elim 3.8.1 (CAP sheet) since info will be in CQATK

- Paragraph 3.8.1
- Problem & Rationale
  - CAP sheet submittal is not necessary as all information will be entered into CQATK.
- Proposed Change
  - Eliminate 3.8.1

# Action Items

- Distribute this presentation to draft review team - Steve
- Prepare Drafts for distribution to attendees – Pete, Steve, Judie, Jeff, Phil NLT 25APR08
- Distribute drafts to panel – Steve NLT 28 APR
- Receive feedback from panel – NLT 5MAY
- Conference call as required - TBD
- Incorporate comments into drafts – 15MAY08
- Submit final proposals Due 30 May 2008