FEB 19 1999

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE RESERVE

16-Feb-99

MEMORANDUM FOR JIM VAN GILDER
Corrosion Technologies Corporation
P.O. Box 551625
Dallas, TX 75355-1625

FROM: Tim Tomasko
920th RQG Corrosion Control Manager
Patrick AFB, FL 32925

SUBJECT: Mil Spec for 81309E

1. It has come to my attention that the testing requirements for Mil Spec 81309E are being significantly changed from a Salt Fog or Salt Spray test to a Sulfurous Acid test demonstrated on mild steel. To meet the requirements of this new testing, your company is being forced into adding a waxy substance to your product to remain on the QPL.
2. Our unit's geographic location is equivalent to living on an aircraft carrier and with your produce, Corrosion X; we have great success controlling and preventing corrosion on our aircraft, which are constructed, of 90% aluminum not steel. Adding wax to your product would destroy the characteristics and benefits we get from your product now.
3. Mil Spec 81309E needs to remain as an Ultra Thin Film (0.5 mil or less) to remain effective. One of the main reasons we like this product, is it dose not build up like a waxy CPC (85054) and that it penetrates into areas a waxy CPC can not. Another benefit is it can easily be removed with a solvent and reapplied quickly.
4. Our unit recently (20 July – 6 August 98) underwent a Survey/inspection from the Air Force Corrosion Program Office. Team members consisted of Richard Kinzie AFRL/MLS-OLR Robins AFB GA, CMSgt Owen Jett AFRL/MLS-OLR Robins AFB GA, SMSgt Mark Foley AFRL/MLS-OLR Robins AFB GA, Gary Stevenson AFRL/MLS Wright-Patterson AFB OH, Michael Spicer AFRL/MLS Wright-Patterson AFB OH, and James Suzel Contractor, Dayton OH. Of all the bases Surveyed, Patrick AFB received the highest rating on their Corrosion Control Program: ***Outstanding***. This team noted the outstanding condition of our unit's helicopters and commented in their final report that a commercial corrosion preventive compound (Corrosion X) was being misted throughout the structure as a preventative measure with exceptional results. The team also complimented our CPC utilization.
5. I explained to the Survey team that tests done in Laboratories under controlled conditions are not the same as testing a product out in field conditions. I explained to them how I tested Corrosion X under field conditions and at present, Corrosion X meets all our needs in combating our corrosion problem. The versatility and composition of Corrosion X make it the best all around CPC on the market today for aircraft use! Since the final report of this survey, I have received calls from engineers, Corrosion Control Managers, and other military installations wanting to know how we use Corrosion X. I have, and will continue to recommend this product for corrosion prevention on aircraft.
6. If wax is added to Corrosion X, we will be forced into finding another produce that produces the same or near too benefits we received in the past from this CPC.
7. Again, Mil Spec 81309E must not have wax added to it. We can not afford to look for another product when Corrosion X meets and exceeds the needs of a good quality CPC.
8. *To add wax to this product would be a huge mistake.*

TIMOTHY J. TOMASKO, WS-10 USAFR
Corrosion Control Manager