

LEAD INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION

882 MADISON AVENUE

NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

August 17, 1961

SUBJECT: BUREAU OF SHIPS'
QUALITY CONTROL
REGULATIONS

To Members of the Lead Pigments Technical Committee:

Attached please find a copy of a letter dated August 4 from Mr. J. B. Keyes, The Bunker Hill Co., Oakland 7, Calif.

I will appreciate having your comments as to your company's experience with the new Bureau of Ships' quality control regulations and whether or not you deem it necessary for the Association to take an active stand in opposing the present requirements.

Please direct your reply to me so that I can summarize it for later distribution to the Committee.

I will also place this subject on the agenda for the next meeting for further discussion, if necessary.

Sincerely yours,

D. M. Burtina

David M. Burtina

THE BURGER HILL COMPANY
1336-16th Street, Oakland 7, California

August 4, 1961

AIR MAIL

Mr. David M. Borcia
Lead Industries Association
292 Madison Avenue
New York 17, N. Y.

Dear Dave:

In conjunction with the Bureau of Ships new regulations issued last January, regarding quality control of the paints which they purchase from the paint manufacturing industry, we and this industry are being confronted by demands for raw material control which could be unduly expensive. We are bringing this to your attention at Ed Elmore's suggestion to determine whether or not it be feasible for us as an industry association to take some action along with the National Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Association.

To review; the Bureau of Ships issued this new set of demands last January. Very briefly this regulation outlined that any manufacturer producing anything for the Navy must have in his files the detailed laboratory tests conducted on the particular lot of raw material, and which covered all specification requirements demanded for that particular raw material, regardless of how small an amount might be used in the ultimate finished product. Production of the finished product could not even be started until all the raw material lots involved in the finished product was available and with full detailed test data, in the files of the producer.

The National Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Association objected to this, and through a series of conferences both back East and out here had this regulation relaxed as of last April to the extent that whatever tests the raw material supplier conducted as a control in his own plant would be considered sufficient. However, in actual application the inspectors are demanding more than this, going back to the original thesis that the full specification requirements demanded of a raw material be available. The paint industry is resisting this and we believe we should give them whatever assistance possible.

As an example we are supplying White Lead Carbonate which meets Federal Specification TT-W-251c. The TT-W-251c full laboratory test requirements are run occasionally and have always been met in full when the plant control tests are also okay. The control tests regularly run on each lot are: % CO₂, oil absorption and color.

TT-W-251c requires in addition determination of % total Pb, determination of % insoluble impurities and % moisture. Our estimate in the laboratory costs required is, that our regular controls average \$15.00 per determination, whereas the full TT-W-251c determination would cost \$25.00. Does the balance of our industry find that similar conditions exist and what would their thinking be? We would appreciate knowing other companies' reaction.

With best regards,

THE BURGER HILL COMPANY
Pacific Division

J. B. Haynes
Technical Sales Engineer

JBR/km
cc: K. E. Elmore