

L42 Surveillance Panel Meeting

Detroit, MI

5-9-2006

Attendees:

C. Koglin
D. Bartlett
D. Lind
B. Koehler
D. Smith
R. Burrow
H. Chambers
J. Gropp
C. Schenkenberger
B. Sullivan
P. Kampe

Section 3

Panel would like a definition of contact pattern. Find a document for reference purposes: AGMA, etc Gleason?

Section 6.13.1

Panel is concerned that Table 1 in Section 6.13.1 has RECOMMENDED replacement parts. If the parts are recommended then the concern is that it doesn't stop anybody from using other, not listed parts. The panel feels this is what happened in the past and would like the Task Force to come up with a critical equipment parts list. The labs communicated that they struggled with this part because it becomes difficult to prove part numbers as they are not stamped on the parts themselves, but usually on the packaging they arrive in. The task force felt the engine, transmission, flywheel, clutch, and throttle body were all important. They will review and try to come up with a solution to the panels concern.

Section 8-Preparation of Apparatus

Edit 8.2.1 Panel would like to add what coast side contact patterns are acceptable.

Record coast side pattern as received. Recommended coast side pattern should be L2F+1, L2F0, L2F-1, L3+1, L3F0, and L3F-1.

Edit 8.2.3 Record backlash as received by manufacturer. If manufacturer data is not available, record backlash at four equally spaced locations. The readings shall be between .004 and .009in.

A1.1

Under note 3 re-word to the following.

The maximum rise above the starting temperature during the shock sequence is to be 15°, or the test is considered non-interpretable.

Section 9.2 Test stand calibration

Issue: There seems to be a disconnect between the acceptable LTMS bands vs. what LRI will accept. Chairman is not 100% sure if this is true, but there is no documentation related to the LRI rule. Currently labs will run a reference sequence (3 passing, 1 failing). Assume the first 3 passing oils come out as follows:

1. 30% score
2. 32% score
3. 28% score

Even though these results are within the LTMS bands, the LRI might not accept the 32% result. Therefore, a lab will typically choose to run another passing oil. This would then allow the lab to choose 3 of the 4

results to present to LRI. Bill Sullivan has referred to this as “cherry picking” the data. The process described above is the same in the current L42 procedure.

Action Item: Chairman to check with Keith Purnell at PRI about LRI documentation. If no documentation exists, then a request to LRI will be made to provide documentation.

The issue was tabled, but there was much discussion on if the LRI bands and LTMS acceptance bands should be the same. Should the acceptance bands be different for each gear batch or be kept the same, and allow the labs to adjust to torque to fit in those bands?

Action item: Don Lind to setup working group consisting of Bill Sullivan, Frank Farber, Don Lind, Cory Koglin & lab reps to discuss options on control targets.

Lunch 12:30

Re-adjourn 1:15

L42 chairman reminded the SP that we already adopted the current “L42-1” driveline into the STP 512A document and the SP would be doing the industry a service if we adopted the L42-1-Draft 17 dated February 29, 2006 version as the accepted version.

Motion (Burrow, 2nd Koehler):

Adopt Draft 17 (February 28, 2006) as the document to run L42 tests, replacing the current STP512A, including report forms and data dictionary. Labs request TMC implement report forms and data dictionary prior to 5-16-2006. Tests can be started as of 5-9-2006, but not reported until report forms and data dictionary are implemented. L42-1 will need to be removed from procedure and replaced with L42.

For-6

Against-0

Abstain-0

Motion passes

Motion to adjourn(Bartlett/Sullivan) 1:45

History behind Draft 17:

Draft 17 was originally made to become the L42-1 procedure. The procedure was going to specify torque targets for Shock 1 and 2 for every axle batch approved, therefore; eliminating the need for a lab to adjust torque levels in order to achieve proper score level. The labs ran a 32 test matrix on the 604/637 gear batch. The labs targeted a shock 1 coast torque of -83lb-ft and a shock 2 torque of -335lb-ft. The results can be found in the L42 meeting minutes for the April 2006 SP. The result of the matrix did not provide the outcome desired (If the labs run to the same shock 1&2 coast side torque, then the EOT scoring level should be the same). The data was inconclusive as to what exactly caused the differences, but the TF reviewed the data extensively and did not find any one reason. The procedure and report form changes are a drastic improvement over the STP 512A procedure. Therefore the SP felt the need to adopt draft 17 along with the report forms and data dictionary.