

Cross Reference:

Application Techniques
Trade Sales General

CC:

Mr. J. W. Iliff, Lab.
Mr. C. R. E. Merkle, Lab.
Mr. S. W. Quisenberry, Wilm. D-8034
Mr. O. R. Volk, Lab.

RETURN TO MARSHALL LABORATORY LIBRARY

Philadelphia Laboratory
July 29, 1949

MEMORANDUM REPORT NO. M-261:

REFERENCE COPY "INDEXED"
NOT FOR CIRCULATION AP 15'53

FIELD TRIAL OF PRESSURE TYPE ROLLER-COATERS

This test was conducted in a bathroom about 5' x 7' and all four walls were roller-coated. We used 670-760 Interior Semi-Gloss tinted green with 33-875.

Application:

It took about twice as long to roller-coat as it did to brush this room, using the 8" Paintrite Roller (Barnes-Grosse Co., Glendale, Calif.) with the Flo-Matic pressure tank (Rubberst Co., Newark, N. J.). The paint splatters off the roller more so than from a brush so that your hands are covered with tiny specks of paint. The floor in places and the bathtub were covered with this fine spray. It thus required more time in cleaning up after the job was completed. In this room all corners and edging around doors, windows and surbases required cutting in with a brush before roller-coating. The painter virtually worked with a brush in one hand and the roller-coater in the other. In a large room with long unbroken walls it might be possible to make better time but in this test it took more strokes with a roller-coater, over a particular area, to get a good job than it would with a brush. This method is far superior to the "pan" type roller-coater. The same results were obtained with the 4" Paintrite Roller (Barnes-Grosse Co., Glendale, Calif.) only with much slower application.

Finish:

This method gives a "pinhead-stipple" finish.

Conclusion:

From this test it is apparent that the brush is still superior to these roller-coaters, as used by a professional painter. Results might be somewhat different in the hands of an amateur or inexperienced painter.

PHILADELPHIA LABORATORY

J. D. Reid
J. D. REID

JDR:pp