

9250000 CURING MATERIALS FOR CONCRETE
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Rudy Powell
414-4280
rudy.powell@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (9-18-13, Internal)

The Division II specifications need to be reviewed to confirm the reference to either Type I or Type II curing compound. SCO wants Type II or Type I with fugitive dye to ensure proper coverage for bridge components. Some rabbit trails need to be followed as part of this change.

Response:

Dan Scheer
414-4130

Comments: (11-15-13)

Why do we need certification submitted if product is on QPL?

925-2.2.2 Certification: *Prior to use, the Contractor shall provide to the Engineer ~~with manufacturer~~ a certification from the manufacturer of the curing compound, conforming to the requirements of Section 6 that the requirements of this Section are met. The certification shall conform to the requirements of Section 6.*

Response:

Karen Byram
414-4353

Comments: (11-21-13)

NTPEP does not 'approve' products. The specification is missing the performance values for the NTPEP testing to determine approval.

Response:

Barry Smith
414-4776
barry.smith@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (11-22-13)

1. 925-2 Criteria for QPL acceptance would be better conveyed by a chart with the requirements for specific test methods and acceptable values. ASTM C309 and the testing outlined in the NTPEP Project Work Plan have different test methods referenced for the same test, an example is the Nonvolatile Content Test, ASTM C309=ASTM D2367 v NTPEP=ASTM D1644. Criteria for QPL acceptance must be particularly specific. (Heads up, the reference in the NTPEP Project Work Plan references AASHTO M 148, this method expired in January 2005. I have contacted NTPEP about this.)

Response:

2. This spec change appears to be an effort to start accepting NTPEP testing for QPL listing. If this is correct, a closer review of the methods required by NTPEP may be needed to achieve consistency in the performance goals. NTPEP reports a value, not pass/fail data. Again, a valid reason for charted requirements.

Response:

3. 925-2.2.1 The Department does not currently require any form of accreditation for laboratories submitting independent testing for QPL submissions. Will this create a condition for NTPEP acceptance only?

Response:

4. 925-2.2.1 states that the independent testing facilities will be responsible for reporting and correcting deficiencies. Will this detail be handled as the current manufacturers QC programs overseen by the SMO or is it voluntary?

Response:

5. Concerning acceptance, if a manufacturer achieves listing on the QPL, is the certification requirement in 925-2.2.2 necessary? A standard acceptance form as found on the SMO website certifying QPL listing should be adequate, not redundant documentation that the product meets the specification's requirements. I suggest a re-write of 925-2.2 and 925-2.2.2.

Response:

Joe Mori
305-825-7144
jlmori@jmoripainting.com

Comments: (12-3-13)

Having curing compounds listed on the QPL is much needed. Particularly because most of the curing compounds currently being used do not self dissipate and are wax based. In fact most have a cautionary statement advising against its use for surfaces to be painted. Removal of wax based products and compounds that do not easily self dissipate adds undue cost and time to the project. I strongly suggest that the State only list products that are not wax based and that are proven to self dissipate within a reasonable time. The State should also consider revising the current method of field testing for curing compound as defined in section 400-15.2.6.3. This method is flawed and consistently provides for false negative results.

Response:
