



MINUTES
of the
GOVERNMENT TECHNICAL & RESEARCH COMMITTEE MEETING
Marine Session
NATIONAL INSULATION MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION
Washington, D. C. May 21, 1963

The meeting was called to order by Bert Tower with the following in attendance:

C. J. Hendrickson	M. H. Detrick Company
W. P. Sinclair	Pittsburgh Corning Corp.
Ray Foote	Maritime Commission
John Ford	Coast Guard
Harold Browning	Bureau of Ships - Code 709
V. L. Miller	Pittsburgh Corning Corp.
A. L. Munkres	Bureau of Ships - Code 648
A. E. Kincaid	Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp.
J. H. Chilcote	Bureau of Ships - Code 634C4
Bert Tower	Johns-Manville Sales Corp.
John Sams	Gustin-Bacon Mfg. Company

Maritime Basic Specifications For Cargo Ship Construction - Final Draft
2/27/63, Revised Draft 3/15/63 - Section 75 - Discussed as follows:
with possible revisions as shown -

NOTE: Comments by those identified - otherwise consider as general consensus.

R. Foote: Specification with possible changes will be used by design agents as a guide for cargo vessels which might include say 12 passengers or so and exclusive of tankers. Any requirements in excess of these specifications will be paid by owners - Maritime subsidizes 50 - 55% for Construction only -

Carl Cooney wrote these specifications after reviewing all previous and present specifications and also endeavored to project ahead.

The Maritime Commission requests from NIMA and from the individual manufacturers (with copies to NIMA) their comments. These comments should include full explanations

and reasoning. Comments without full clarification will not assist the Maritime Commission in evaluation - for the Maritime expects some 5000 comments.

The deadline date for replies is June 9, 1963. It is suggested that the manufacturers respond as soon as possible and that

Jack Barnhart write the Maritime Commission requesting an extension of time for NIMA and the manufacturers to reply. The following is the direction of the responses:

U. S. Department of Commerce
Maritime Commission
Attn: L. C. Hoffman
Chief Division of Engineering
Office of Ship Construction
Washington 25, D. C.

Show on Subject Matter in Letter
"Basic Specifications for Cargo Ship
Construction - Section 75"

It is further suggested that Jack Barnhart also mention in his letter to the Maritime Commission that NIMA anticipated the presence of Maritime personnel to discuss Section 12 Basic Specifications, Air Conditioning, Heating and Ventilation. That it was to Government and Industry regret that no one was present from Maritime to discuss this important specification.

RE: SECTION 75

Par. 1 line 10 Delete word "Insulation"
line 11 Change to read surface temperature of pipe may vary
line 26 Comments requested on temperatures
line 33 Delete word "Diesel" and change to "Engine"
line 35 Delete word "Diesel" and change to "Engine"

Par. 2 - It was suggested that lines 9, 10 and 11 be rewritten

NOTE: Maritime thickness generally thicker than Navy.

The 125° temperature referred to is the temperature of the pipe, not the lagging.

Par. 2 line 28 Comments requested
line 35 Delete "or Fibrous Glass"
line 36 Clarify 350° F - question 370°F?

- Par. 2 Page 3 line 5 Delete "or Fibrous Glass"
 Page 3 line 6 Clarify 999° F Temp - two types

NOTE: It was suggested that Federal Specifications be used whenever possible in lieu of Military Specs. Question if there should be a new Section for 1000° or above.

- Par. 4 Insulating Cements - Comments requested

NOTE: HH-I-00500 is being revised - Comments regarding including in this spec.

- Par. 4 Maritime is endeavoring to develop costs on piping on a R & D project. It was stated the economic thickness manual only refers to flat surfaces.

- Par. 4 - Table A - line 12 Consider inserting Fibrous Glass - All manufacturers are requested to review and comment on thickness and sizes.

The Table A Note should also pertain to Table A-1

- Par. 7 - Table B - line 24 & 25 Suggest rewrite to include 85% magnesia and to also include "in accordance with manufacturers recommendations" deleting "as approved"

- Par. 8 line 8 It was suggested that this cover single and double layer expansions. Clarification is requested as to what constitutes an "approved expansion joint"

- Par. 8 Clarify where single and where double used.

- Par. 13 - Lagging - line 8 Suggest include the one coat type of Insulating & Finishing Cement.

- 75 - 12 Table D A review of this Table is requested as it was felt it was not consistent.

NOTE: Metal lagging is not being used in practically all areas

Re: Section 12 - It is requested that a future meeting be arranged by the Chairman possibly the later part of June and to write John Brackett of Maritime.

Comments are requested on 1) Heated Tube Test, 2) What is a Fire Test and 3) Should the test be for materials applied?

The morning was primarily spent discussing Section 75. There was little time to Discuss Section 12.

In conclusion was desire to remind the members that they are to respond to the Maritime directly re Section 75, sending copy to NIMA.

Respectfully submitted

C. J. Hendrickson