

A. Open Meeting – Morning Session

1. Meeting was called to order by Rich Capolupo
2. Rich introduced Shawn Nedley with SSPC who provided a Marketing Update with slide presentation. Details of the presentation can be found at the website or by email to nedley@sspc.org.
 - a. One of the new marketing tools will be a new website “Search Engine” for owners and contractors looking for information about a contractor’s scope of service. Each contractor will be required to fill out a survey listing their scope of activities and capabilities and their geographical reach for working specific locations/jobs. i.e. At the present time there are no known contractors that show the capability of working in New Mexico.
 - b. Shawn emphasized the need for each contractor wishing to participate is to provide extensive details about their services. The users will go to this site and search by specifics the type of contractor (scope of a contractor’s ability) and the contractor’s ability to work in specific locations.
 - c. **Pradeep Radhakrishna, with Insipria FZE**, asked “How does SSPC currently stand in their efforts to solicit contractors and participation from an International standpoint.
 - d. Shawn indicated that SSPC is very anxious to not only expand the National awareness but are very interested in their International growth; however the program was in an “infancy” stage at this present time and only with the participation of contractors will the program continue to grow. Shawn re-emphasized that the more information a contractor provides for the website will determine how they come up in the search when an owner is looking for a contractor.
 - e. Rich emphasized that Shawn and the contractors should be working together on getting the most precise information on the search website to maximize it’s potential.
3. Rich called on Michael Damiano, SSPC for reporting on the status of the DAC and CAS.
 - a. Michael explained that in 1998 the DAC (Disciplinary Action Committee) had developed a Code of Conduct that defined a series of things that could cause disciplinary action. It was determined that there were some gaps in the code when some certified contracting firms had had fatalities and safety issues which came to light. In 2010 there was a task group of five (5) persons, headed by **Andy Moelk**, which was to develop provisions and review the DAC revisions on an ongoing basis. The task force is still active and needs two more contractors to volunteer for the group. Alex Thrasher with Vulcan Painters Inc.; Steven Zdzicra with P & S Painting; and Jackie McCuiston with Northrop Grumman volunteered.

The task force will be looking at but not limited to:

1. Relationship to EMR.
2. Serious Incidents.
3. Poor Performance.
4. Contractors terminated for cause. What were the reasons?
5. Other things related to poor performance, such as contractors over extending themselves and hiring non-qualified contractors to do the work which may be illegal.

Michael stated the DAC was outside the normal audit process.

- b. The next item addressed by Michael was the QP1 standards. The ballot on voting was about to close. If anyone wanted to vote on it they should do it soon.

Rich asked if the QP1 Revisions had been initiated? Michael replied “No”.

- c. Michael stated that QP2 has been defined and some of the requirements have been toned down and some of the insignificant issues had been taken out.

Rich asked if it was available now as an electronic document? Michael said it was still not ready but they were working on it. He said that QP2 was reorganized and simplified. It was to go into effect this year. He also stated that the audit information is on the website and is invoked by the auditors. There was more done on tweaking safety issues which were more essential, as well as emphasis on training, with procedures in place.

- d. **Tony Kavouris with Atlantic Painting** asked where the CAS program was in play and what was the time line for implementation?

Michael replied the Implementation Plan, time to go into effect, was January 1, 2012. As of January 1, 2012, there was to be one (1) CAS Level 2 Applicator on each crew (job site) of \$50,000 or higher.

Don Holle asked if that was for every type of job across the board.

Michael said no, that some were exempt and would be identified per job. He also stated That the customer has the right to waive the CAS requirement but it must be done in writing. i.e. Nuclear plants had already waived the requirement however, in fact, their requirements were even more strict.

Michael indicated that there would be cases where the experience of an individual would be considered as a contributing part of the CAS Level 2 Applicator Certification. He used the term “grandfathered in” as a way of explaining the consideration of the experience level of an individual in the process of certification.

Steve Cogswell with BAE Systems said he had some concerns regarding the requirements for certification. What were the requirements? The task force that had been established a year ago submitted their suggestions for the criteria for certification and a great deal of work had gone into this. Had any of these suggestions been included in the ballot?

Michael stated 95% was, as an answer.

Steve stated their suggestions did not include “grandfathering in”. He also stated that had submitted a change in the training hours required. Were they accepted? What were the specifics in writing?

Michael stated the standards are not that specific and he would be prepared to talk more about it in the afternoon session.

Tony stated that they wanted specifics. Would they get facts and figures in the afternoon meeting?

Michael said yes.

The conversation continued between the task force members and Michael. The members of the task force had been charged with the task of developing and submitting their recommendations for the specifications for the CAS certification.

Tony said they had submitted their report and to date had seen nothing in writing. How could a time table for implementation be determined if the certification standards had not been finalized? Where was it in writing?

Michael stated SSPC would work one-on-one with each party as they moved forward and that 2012 was to be the year of getting it going and getting it working and 2013 was to be the year of up and running.

The conversations became a debate issue and Michael indicated that SSPC would work with each and every one on initiating the plan. Michael re-emphasized that the customer has the

right to waive the CAS program but it must be in writing. He stated that the program should be embraced as a tool to improve job performance across the board.

SSPC is charged with the responsibility of improving the quality and safety. He emphasized the “Train the Trainer Program” as an example of helping contractors/companies work more effectively while helping them control the costs to do so. Companies could train as many personnel as they wished with the only other cost involved being for the Proctor to certify those trained.

The question was asked if it was to be like the C5 annual requirement?

Michael said no, as long as they maintained their current certifications.

A question was asked by **John Burcaw, of IUPAT/FTI** about “what defined a crew”?

Michael’s response was “No ground people.”

John asked what current certifications were considered?

Michael stated that it would consist of the 1st exam and then 40 hours of SSPC training. He also stated, “You are more in control of the training, and the CAS program is not applicable to ground people. Michael asked Rick Smith to explain the recent courses he had taught in Louisiana for the contractors working for BP.

Rick Smith explained briefly that the contractor that works for BP had been now required by BP to have Level 1 type certification for their job sites. The contractor had pulled highly experienced individuals from their company that had no official certification and from a program put together by SSPC, Rick had taught them what would be defined as a “refresher” course to expand their knowledge based on Level 1 certification including hands on training and proper language of terms and explanations. This consisted of a one day class (review) of the criteria followed the next day by a written exam. He stated that not only had BP adopted this requirement along with Shell, Marathon & Exxon.

Brian Gingras, IUPAT/FTI stated but wanted to clarify, that this process was not at the Level 2 certification where the participants had to not only be hands on and be able to demonstrate and explain the process of blasting and spray painting but also included the inspection of equipment, operate a compressor, Co2 monitor, calibration, demonstrate the abrasion and so on before they put the hood on to start. In other words from start to finish with the same to be said for painting.

Ernie Dunbar, MANTA Industrial asked, “Is there a difference in public or private coating?”

Michael stated, “No.”

Rich stated, “Our goal is in maintaining and improving integrity with the CAS Training program. The task force group was charged with making sure the contractor, unions and non-union people could survive the process. In going forward designed so employees don’t get left out, for example helping them through the course if they couldn’t read, or if a contractor is stumbling through the process to give him support. We are looking to make sure it’s “doable”.

Michael added that the CAS program would be discussed in greater detail at the afternoon business meeting and while the meeting is only for the Advisory Committee and their input, it is open to everyone to attend. In closing he added, “If you do nothing with CAS and wait till January 1st to realize it is being implemented you will have a problem. If we don’t have qualified work forces we will be in trouble. They need the skill and tools to keep us in the direction toward success and in the long run it will help sell the job and the product.

Rich thanked everyone for attending and reiterated the afternoon session was open to the public, but would be governed by the Advisory committee and the public was “the audience”, not the participants.

A. Closed Meeting (Open to Public) – Afternoon Session

1. Meeting called to order by Rich Capolupo. The first thing on the schedule is approval of Meeting Minutes from 2010 Meeting held in Phoenix, Arizona. Michael Damiano passed copies of the minutes around the table.
2. Prior to addressing the approval of the minutes, Michael stated that he wished to clear up the term “grandfathered in”; which he had used in the morning session.
 - a. If a contractor has someone with extensive, identifiable experience and he wishes to submit them for CAS certification, their experience/credentials would be taken into account as a part of their eligibility however everyone, regardless of credentials/experience would have to take the exam.
 - b. Steve Cogswell stated he had an issue with having to pay again for a training test.
 - c. Mike stated that CAS will include elements of C7 & C12. The bits and pieces sent through the CAS task force committee should contain all the details, problems, implementation and so on. It will be up to the committee to write up the implementation program.

He stated that Bob, Tony, Steve & Don were the task force charged with this responsibility and once it was finished it is up for review. He stated that part of this information should contain the wording that an owner can be exempted or modify the requirements but must do it formally. He asked that two additional persons should volunteer to be a part of this task force. Volunteers were Steven Zdzicra and Alex Thrasher. If an additional was needed Jackie McCuiston volunteered.

- d. Rich stated that Board of Governors had approved a timeline for implementation of the CAS program. Details of how to get there was up to the task force group based on the implementation timeline.
- e. Michael stated that with the January 1, 2012 timeline for implementation that within 10 years this program should then be fine-tuned and successful. The meat and potatoes of the program itself is to be determined by the task force committee and then given to SSPC.

A question was asked, “Will the CAS criteria be able to be modified to the contractors needs. If a contractor is strictly a Bridge contractor do they have to learn about tank and other things not pertaining to their work.
- f. Michael stated the program would not address specifics but everyone would need to have a basic general knowledge or the fundamental core of a craft person’s knowledge of specifics.
- g. Steve Cogswell stated, so there is no Level 1 requirement in the CAS.
- h. Rick Smith asked where did the requirements come from.
- i. Michael stated that the requirements were adopted and modified to the ACS2 program and SSPC Interim program and that by the long range goal of 10 years it will be better and leaner.
- j. Tony asked where were the details?
- k. Michael said anyone who wants details he will email specifics.
- l. Tony asked Rich, “So where is the package containing the details and are the details already final?” If so, when will we get to see them and comment on them? Before the summer? Time is needed in order to give people time to react.
- m. Rich asked Michael, “When will the information be sent out? When will it be done?”

- n. Michael commented that everyone should start their planning/training now in order to see how they will move forward.
- o. Rich commented that it was his understanding that the committee felt they had already provided the necessary information from their standpoint and that the Task force needed to meet with SSPC to finalize it within at least 90 days. This would allow the union guys to train.
- p. Tony stated that as far as training was concerned he noted that SSPC already had 2 classes listed on the educational format for CAS.
- q. Michael stated that contractor's should start their training, i.e. Train the Trainer, and that they should get a qualified proctor out to their places to proctor the tests. SSPC would offer proctoring.
- r. Steve Cogswell asked if that was for written and practical and how long would that take?
- s. Michael stated that 3 hours per guy would be an average and the size of the group would determine how long it would take.
- t. Steve asked how many persons made up a crew based on 1 CAS per crew? Has it been defined? Where are the details defining this? Where is the report they turned in?
- u. Rich stated that 90 days was too long for the task force and SSPC to finalize the details.
- v. Steve asked why should the task force start from scratch on something they did already. A lot of work went into the task force's report and how can a time line be approved if the details, or nuts and bolts of the criteria haven't been finalized?
- w. Michael stated the interim standard and presentation was done and was a document they could work from.
- x. Tony asked again where were the details? What part of the task forces input was and wasn't accepted?
- y. Michael stated that 2000 hours of experience and 150 hours of formal training was the accepted criteria. From there the individual went right to the exam.
- z. Tony asked, "what about the continuing education hours required?"
- aa. Steve stated no one had seen the interim draft even! Where was the document?
- bb. Michael stated that only the time line had been approved. That they took out of the draft what was need for the implementation plan.
- cc. Steve asked, "where is the task force's draft?"
- dd. Michael stated the interim standard had been developed/approved in 2008. The timeline for the implementation was approved in August 2010. The details need to be done/finalized.
- ee. Steve brought to everyone's attention that the 2010 copy of the minutes on page 7, paragraph (dd) that all the information was to have been able to be seen on the website already.
- ff. Michael stated he didn't do it, but would put the interim standard on the website along with the task forces data & specifics.
- gg. Steve asked, "was the 2008 document used as a basis for this new draft along with the task forces contribution? Where is the task forces work? Did the Board even see it?"
- hh. Michael stated, "No. Nothings been done that they were doing the recommendations now."

- ii. Rich re-emphasized that the Board of Governor's had approved the schedule only. That they were now asking for the nuts and bolts which was to be determined along with task force's work and combined with the already approved 2008 document. It would then be sent out to everyone.
- jj. Steve asked if Level 1 got taken out of the 2008 interim standard? What about the 2008 power point and what about the task force's presentation?
- kk. Tony asked, "Were the changes marked up and tweaked before they went to the Board of Governors? Are we correct then that the Task Force's information was not included?"
- ll. Michael stated the standards were not changing, the details were going to make it better, more "doable" on the job site. Some of the Task Force's suggestions were not accepted.
- mm. Tony asked what was rejected?
- nn. Michael stated they did not discount everything.
- oo. **Ralph Terillo** asked if this applied to blasting and spraying crews only. Timelines were already there and that there were standards there you couldn't change. What determines a crew?
- pp. Michael stated that if they wanted to change things they would have to make recommendations.
- qq. Steve stated, "I want to see the documentation. I want to see the parts that have been changed."
- rr. Tony stated that at this point there were only 2 recognized sources of training and that was IUPAT and SSPC. Were there any directions or contacts who were also qualified to do the training? Are there any other resources? Who else can be utilized to train.
- ss. Michael said he would have to check.
- tt. Tony stated that at the NCCR website all of theirs was done in-house.
- uu. Michael stated any outside sources would have to be qualified and approved as equal in order to be an alternate source.
- vv. Tony asked how would you go about it.
- ww. Michael stated there were standards already developed.
- xx. Tony stated that was a career in itself.
- yy. Michael asked, "Are we not preparing people for a career?"
- zz. Tony stated that it wasn't done overnight!
- a.) Steve stated again, "We're not seeing the final plan. We'd like to see it in black and white. Like to see what's been done since we're 10 months from the implementation plan.
- b.) Rich suggested the group should look at the 2008 documents.
- c.) Bob Denyse stated they had already done that.
- d.) Michael asked, "when do you want an answer regarding your recommendations?"
- e.) Tony said two weeks. February 14th.
- f.) Steve stated that **Pradeep Radhakrishna** had already been certifying to C7, 12 & 14. What are the details? Was it a waste of time on his part without recognized standards?

- g.) Michael stated he would have the information to them by February 14th.
 - h.) Rich stated, “We were under the impression that what we recommended would be heavily considered and not patronized. Some were not negotiable apparently. If they are not “doable” we should know that. The task force invested a tremendous amount of time and they worked hard at it. Everything we are talking about was covered at least once.
 - i.) Steve apologized for his outburst.
 - j.) Rich stated that yes they had beat up the CAS program pretty good.
2. Rich asked if there were any other items/issues to be addressed?
- a. Barry McCoy stated that the CAS notification form should have a yes or no “block” for checking on it.
3. Tony stated that in the information they submitted they had changed the training hours. What was the official recertification training hours now?
- a. Michael stated it was 20 hours a year.
 - b. Barry stated that the top heading of the notification form the changes had not been done.
 - c. Michael said he would take care of it.
4. Bob DeNyse stated that more and more issues on the job site are becoming a problem where the owners have a third party representative (i.e. inspector) as a go between the contractor and the owner. He said he would like SSPC to consider helping with this. When the owner and contractor are at odds and the third party gets in the middle the issues don’t get resolved in a timely manner and sometimes are not in the best interest of all parties.
- a. Dan Zeratti stated he couldn’t agree on SSPC getting involved in this. In order for SSPC to outreach to owners on this kind of issue they would need to become involved in other areas as well. Perhaps by attending the AIA conference. The designer after all is where it all starts. The owner doesn’t always know what he wants. Perhaps they could get members of AIA, WWA and the Concrete Association to be a part of SSPC services.
 - b. Bob stated that owners always side with the inspector and the contractor is stuck with the outcome. Someone unbiased, and arbiter needs to get involved.
 - c. Dan stated that yes sometimes inspectors were not qualified for some of the tasks the owners put on them.
 - d. Bob stated he thinks SSPC should set something up to be of support in this kind of situation.
 - e. Tony said that legally that might not be possible and that SSPC would have to look at the liability issues that were involved.
 - f. Bob stated a 3rd party is always involved to handle the owners lack of knowledge and is just asking SSPC to write up the guidelines.
 - g. Rich stated that inspectors do go out with the owners expecting them to do things outside their parameters and most owners are not aware of the liability issues involved when a 3rd party is involved in safety issues. Inspectors need to hold fast to staying within their parameters of knowledge.
 - h. Michael asked what Bob was looking for?
 - i. Bob asked that a committee look into this type of assistance in the form of mediation or temperance in order to help the owners.
 - j. Dan stated that there would always be contracting issues that needed to be addressed.

- k. Tom stated that was a fantasy world. Contractors have guidelines on how to reconcile issues and that States have their own guidelines to resolving issues.
 - l. Rich stated that he believes through education and other ways that you could get this accomplished. An inspector's job was to observe and document only and they should know not to step over that line.
 - m. Steve stated that QP5 was in place already and needed to be marketed more.
 - n. Rich stated that the positive way was that problems get recognized and you eliminate the small things and move forward. He also stated that a committee could be assembled to look into the issue and submit their recommendations.
 - o. Tom Nestopoulos stated that everything would be fine if the inspectors stayed within their guidelines and the owner should know what he is getting from who and what he is getting.
 - p. Bob stated that sometimes the 3rd party was writing the specifications instead of the owners and the owners need to get more involved. It would also be helpful if the inspector provided guidelines to the owner up front.
 - q. Rick Smith stated that what we have happen is Inspector's become paint cops and then we allow them to govern how we work instead.
3. Rick asked if there was anything new going on with the QP3/ASIC?
- a. Michael stated in 2011 the ASIC relating to steel fabrication would be sent out and SSPC would continue on paint. He also stated that by late fall new criteria would be given out to review.
4. Bob asked if QP1 revisions/standards had been approved?
- a. Michael said the ballots were closed and everyone would be notified. Changes would be adopted next year giving everyone the opportunity to adapt. Standard CAS, changes in safety, some areas were stepped back.
5. Michael reviewed his action items which were to respond back to the CAS task group on what had been included, what was not, and what considerations were given.
6. Rich asked for volunteers for a committee on 3rd party problems. Bob DeNyse, Nickos Kantzoglu and Rick Smith volunteered.
- a. Michael suggested they solicit a 3rd party inspector to participate.
7. Rich asked if there was anything else to be addressed. With none forthcoming he adjourned the meeting.