

**Subject:** Cleveland Process Audit

**Date:** March 13, 2015

**Completed By:** Steve Busicnki

On March 13, 2015, work order CLV 55214 was ran on the CLO for Bennett. The master coil was slit to the appropriate widths for the customer. Tag DU65365 was verified prior to loading and use of the coil. The operator recorded readings that he stated were taken with the hand micrometer for gauge and calipers for widths. The material was run until the OD measurements at the re-coiler reached the customer requirement. No measurements were taken at the time the coil was split or restarted. The gauge measurements were taken again at the end of the master coil and all measurements were recorded. Thickness readings for the material were also taken from the gauger. Based in the gauge report, 99.9% of the material was within specification with an average thickness of 0.0761". The 00.1% that is outside of the gauge requirement was at the head of the coil for a length of 3 feet. These 3 feet are on the ID of the coil and is considered packaging. There is also a camber requirement of 0.00 - .12 listed. I did not notice a camber measurement being taken or being recorded on the Slitting Order or Slit Size Inspection sheet. I will follow-up with the supervisor to make him aware of camber not being checked.

On March 27, 2015, the supervisor of the slitters retrained the slitter operators to check for camber on orders where a camber measurement is listed.

# Slitting Order

Date: 3/16/15	Customer: Bennett
Work Order #: CLV55214	Date Run: Mar. 13, 2015

## Incoming Inspection Checklist

Tag #	Gauge & Width	Type	Tag Wgt.	RB	Olsen	Actual Wgt.	Width	Mic
D165365	.511 X .4775	202	14.460	48.5		14.460	97 7/8	0.005
								0.008

Cutting Instructions: 7 cuts 6.700

Slit Tolerance: $\pm .005$	Max O.D: Solid 1/4 half	Max Skid Wgt: 6,000	I.D: 20"
Gauge Range: .072 / .078	Salesman:		

### Special Instructions:

1 Cuts with some defect but okay to ship

\_\_\_\_\_ Cut Size  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Cut Weight  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Defect  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Approved By

2 Cuts Rejected

\_\_\_\_\_ Cut Size  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Cut Weight  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Tag No. or No.'s  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Reason for Reject

3 Ok to move material for shipment or to Stock

\_\_\_\_\_ Name  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Date

# Slit Size Inspection

Date: Mar. 13, 2015

Work Order: CW/55214

Size of Cuts	Beginning Width	Mics	(Paxson Only) Middle Mics	End Width	Mics
6.700	6.705		Split @ 15 5/16	6.705	
	6.704			6.704	
	6.705	.0705		6.705	.074
	6.705			6.705	
	6.704	.072		6.704	.075.5
	6.705			6.705	
	6.704			6.704	
U.S.I.					
Gov Width Test	3 @ 47 5/8	@ 10 9/16	48 5/8		

DO ANY CUTS HAVE:

Rust/Stain

Burrs

Knife Marks

OK

Initials

J.P.

# Part Spec/PO Audit Form

Cust #	1480	Customer	Bennett	Grp/Sz/Grd/Width	POC / 148 / DSB / 6.7000
Equip/Plant	CLO	Work Order #	CLV 55214	Part No.	1001
		Date	3/13/2015		
Work Order Information		Material to be Used		Actual	
	Tag #1	DU65365	Tag #2	Gauge #1	Gauge #2
	PO#	CLV 021289-001	PO#	% Gauge In Spec	% Gauge In Spec
Gauge Range	0.0720 - 0.0780	Gauge Min	Gauge Min	Low/High Gauge	Low/High Gauge
Width Range	6.695 - 6.705	Width	Width	Average	Average
Length Range	0.0000 - 0.0000			Width	Width
Rockwell	Rockwell		Rockwell	Length	Length
Tensile				Rockwell	Rockwell
Yield	A1011 HRPO				
% Elongation	Coil DS				
Chem Rqmts	Type-B				
Other Rqmts					
Camber	1 pc. 46,460 lbs.			Other	
	0.00 - .12			.1% - 3ft Beginning	
Summary					
Actions					
Final Status					

## Jemison Metals On-The-Job (OJT) Group Training Form

EMAIL completed form to HR for filing. Maintain original on location.

Continual Learning is key to Continual Improvement in the JM QMS. This Form recognizes that:

### **(Attendees):**

Print Name	Initial	Print Name	Initial
Suzanne Binner	S.B.		
Thomas Rodriguez	T.R.		

have successfully completed OJT for:

**Department:** SLITTING

**Subject:** 03/13/15 Process Audit, Camber not checked. CLV 55214

**Training Start Date:** 03/27/15

**Training Completion Date:** 03/27/15

**Signature of Trainer:** John Chandler

According to this document, the OJT for these individuals have been trained and have demonstrated sufficient competence to conduct the documented function/task without further instructions. Continued performance evaluation and observation could result in additional training being specified.