

**L42 Surveillance Panel Meeting minutes
PRI Apollo Room, Warrendale, PA
September 6th, 2006**

Attendees:

Cory Koglin
Don Bell
Don Bartlett
Chris Schenkenberger
Jerry Gropp
Brian Koehler
Don Lind
Dale Smith
Bill Sullivan
Salvatore Rea
Robert Burrow

Agenda

Call to Order/Membership review

Timeline/review

2006 Industry Hardware Order Update

- New driveside gear design
- Pilot batch matrix review

Rating workshop

- Bright burnish gearsets

New/Open issues

Adjournment

2006 industry hardware order

The chairman presented the Task force's recommendation on how to proceed with the pilot batch of gears .

Goal: Determine if new drive side gear design has any effect on test performance. Discover any large build errors that could affect test performance.

Desired Outcome: Give Dana the go ahead to make production run of 959 axles.

- Dial stands to Target 22% Pinion score at all labs
- Tests maybe run on a Referenced or unreferenced test stand
- Parc has volunteered to run axles first in order to find "appetite" of axle batch (conditioning and shock torques)
- Parc will share stand setup data to other labs in order to provide a starting point
- Labs will then target 22% pinion score and adjust stand from Parcs recommendations if needed

- Once labs feel stand is on target to deliver 22% score-Run 4 pass oils; 1 discriminating oil

Motion to approve gear batch matrix suggestion as prescribed (presented by C. Koglin "L42 2006 Pilot gearbatch matrix suggestion")—Dale Smith

Second—Bill Sullivan

Discussion—question was asked if all labs should reference the stands before this matrix

--would burn up a lot of axles

--would waste resources to reference before running matrix

Decision-Labs do not have to reference the L42 stands before running matrix, but must have instrumentation calibrated within guidelines of specification.

Vote: 6-0-0 passed unanimously

Rater workshop review

Bright burnish/scoring issue status (proposed to include bright burnish in scoring value):

- 2 gearsets with bright burnish sent from Afton to rater workshop in July, but had rust
- Data shows that there is still a wide range of interpretation even when including bright burnish
- Discussion on effects of issue on referencing requirements and invalid/non-interpretable results
 - Option 1:* All tests other than discrimination oil, with any other distress other than scoring, the test is considered non-interpretable. Question was raised, would Harold & John accept the fail oil at LRI?
 - Option 2:* For all reference & candidate tests other than the discrimination oil, any distress present other than scoring, the test shall be considered non-interpretable.
- Discussion of whether tabling this issue now would have any adverse effects

Motion to take no action at this point, and leave it tabled unless chairman hears more issues from labs on issue

Motion to table issue by Don Bartlett, second by Dale Smith. Passed 6-0-0

Adjournment