

9750000, Structural Coating Systems  
Comments from Industry Review

\*\*\*\*\*

**Jennifer Williams**  
Office of the District Secretary  
Florida Department of Transportation  
Office (850) 415-9592  
[jennifer.williams@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:jennifer.williams@dot.state.fl.us)

**Comment:**

In order to help insure compliance with this specification, Section 975-4 (Painting Strain Poles, Mast Arms and Monotube Assemblies), we recommend adding a Value Added Guarantee at Final Acceptance, or a written warranty. Also, in order to detect rust or other defects within the mast arm, we recommend requiring a video inspection just prior to Final Acceptance.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Charles E. Boyd, P.E.**  
(850) 414-4275

**Comment:**

I suggest changing the proposed name of 975-5 from “**Post Tensioning Anchorage Coatings**” back to the more generic name used in the current comparable Section 975-8 “**Elastomeric Coatings**”.

The main reason for this is these coatings may be used for purposes other than post tensioning anchorage protection as stated in 975-5.1 General: Use an elastomeric coating system to provide a waterproof barrier over post-tensioning anchorages or other areas designated in the plans.

Also, Sections 462-4 and 462-13 refer to “elastomeric coatings”, not “Post Tensioning Anchorage Coatings”.

\*\*\*\*\*

Debbie Simmons  
Business Development Manager  
Carboline Company  
678/455-5821  
[dsimmons@carboline.com](mailto:dsimmons@carboline.com)

**Comments:**

Section 975-1.4 packaging & labeling – section indicates that materials shall be shipped in containers marked with a number of items including the department QPL number. Carboline requests clarification if this number is required on each can of paint including all accompanying mixing components.

Section 975-202 performance requirements – section indicates that all coatings regardless of color shall meet the color and gloss requirements defined designated in the table under the cyclic weathering resistance testing. Per NTPEP testing, current testing by the coating suppliers for bridge projects for the various DOT’s referencing NTPEP testing has been done in accordance

with federal color number 14062 (dark green). If coating suppliers are to meet this requirement, Carboline requests a listing of the federal color standard numbers that will be referenced for upcoming bridge projects as certain colors and/or dark colors could be an issue.

Section 975-2.3.1.3 finish coat – Reference is made that the clear coat shall contain a dissipating colorant that shall be visible for a minimum of 12 hours after application and shall completely dissipate within 96 hours after application. Carboline recommends the use of a dye additive that generally dissipates within 24-72 hours. Extra thick application of the clearcoat, low light, low temperatures or high humidities will slow the rate of dissipation. Bright sun, hot and dry conditions may cause the color to dissipate much faster than normal. These factors can have an influence on the timeframe defined within this section. Carboline requests FDOT to consider these factors and alter the minimum/maximum timeframe, include a statement to allow for certain key factors or eliminate the minimum/maximum timeframes.

Section 975-2.3.3.2 and 975-2.4.3 finish coats is noted to be one coat of white polyamide epoxy coating. Carboline requests this statement be changed to also include the use of a cycloaliphatic amine epoxy.

Section 975-3 galvanized steel coating system – this section does not specify the coats for the system (e.g. primer, intermediate, finish). Carboline requests clarification on this issue.

- Carboline recommends that the implementation date for the proposed changes to FDOT section 975 be moved to 1 year from the date that the proposed changes are officially incorporated by FDOT to allow sufficient time for the coating suppliers to address panel preparation and lab testing of the proposed coatings by an independent lab (e.g. the salt fog testing requires 5000 hrs or ~ 7 months).
- Carboline recommends that the implementation date for the proposed changes to FDOT section 560 be moved to 6 months from the date that the proposed changes are officially incorporated by FDOT to allow sufficient time for product applicators/fabricators to incorporate these proposed changes into their programs.
- Carboline recommends that the section 975 spec indicates the manner in which outdoor testing will be addressed as it relates to coating approvals. Historically, a coating company would receive a conditional approval of their coating systems if the systems meet the requirements of the lab testing matrix. If the conditional approval concept applies, Carboline is requesting that FDOT define the terms of the conditional approval within the scope of the section 975 specification document.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Andrew S. Fulkerson**

800.321.7628

[afulkerson@euclidchemical.com](mailto:afulkerson@euclidchemical.com)

Comments:

975-6 Class 5 Applied Finish Coatings A) Under Accelerated Weathering you are recommending ASTM G 153 but for the Anti Graffiti Coating Spec (975-7 you are requiring AASHTO R-31, should these tests be consistent? B) I feel that Impact Resistance and Elongation criteria should be included in the Class 5 Finish Coating Specification. 975-7 Anti-Graffiti Coating A) This new Spec does not state if the requirements in 975-7.2 are for all types of anti graffiti coatings to be used or for permanent urethane based, or for sacrificial wax based. B) If the requirements are only for permanent type then they are fine as they are. If they are going to be required for wax based sacrificial types some testing requirements may be harsh or unattainable. C) Why state ASTM G 153 for Class 5 Coatings and AASHTO R 31 for Anti Graffiti Coatings.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Karen Byram**  
(850) 414-4353  
[karen.byram@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:karen.byram@dot.state.fl.us)

Comment:

The Product Evaluation has concerns as to how soon products will be available for the QPL for this specification. It is unreasonable to expect manufacturers to have product testing complete, reported and on the test deck by July 2009 unless the SMO has conducted the laboratory and field testing and has a list of products that can meet this modified specification. We suggest the specification change be delayed for implementation until January 2010 or later.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Rudy Powell**

Comment:

975-1.3. Should lab test results, test panels for outdoor testing, and wet samples be added to the list of items to be submitted for QPL approval?

\*\*\*\*\*

**Jonathan Van Hook**  
[jonathan.vanhook@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:jonathan.vanhook@dot.state.fl.us)

Comment:

Text: Section 975-2.3.3.2 states that the finish coat for the interior of a box shall be one coat of polyamide epoxy coating. There are many shades of white. Suggest providing a Federal Standard No. for the White Color.

\*\*\*\*\*