9260000 EPOXY COMPOUNDS
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Rudy Powell
414-4280

Comment: (11-25-13) I am concerned with the deletion of the epoxies. Some links between specs may be broken if these are deleted. For instance, Type J links Section 353 with Section 937 and 416. I am not sure what other links may be broken. My comments are in the attached- most are formatting. My biggest concern is the deletion of the epoxies.

Let's address my concerns before going to industry review.

Response: Responder was contacted and concerns were addressed as follows: Type J products were converted to S937. The removal of Type J in this modification is timed to coincide with the publication of other links that needed modification. A team was assembled to identify all other links and verify that the necessary changes have been made to coincide with this specification publication. No Change Made.

****

Thomas
tom.b@russellengineering.com

Comment: (12-9-13) The testing required for the Type F-2 epoxy does not appear practical for any application which is not known well in advance of the need for such a repair, an accident. This group encompasses the bulk of instances from my experience. Such damage is rarely anticipated and never planned. For Projects which involve the repair and rehabilitation of concrete structures, the nature of which are not fully known at the time of Bid, the testing requirement assumes that a Supplier has the Product on hand, pre-tested, and absent shelf life concerns. This seems to be high bar indeed. I would expect significant Project delays could be experienced.

Response: Agreed, this language is too restrictive. The requirements will be changed to: "Furnish to the Engineer testing from the manufacturer of the product for each lot of material to be incorporated into the project. The test results will indicate that the material is in conformation with the specifications and will include actual values from the required tests. Obtain approval from the Engineer before incorporating material into the project." Change Made.

****

Robert Forlong
813-240-7489
robforlong@gmail.com

Comment: (12-10-13) I have a comment and recommendation for your 9260000 proposed change specifically Type K.
You propose removing all reference to "sand" which leads me to conclude that the epoxy specified shall be 1,000 - 2000 cps viscosity with no aggregate added to seal bottoms of fiberglass pile jackets. I don't believe that this is the intent. I spoke to Ivan Lasa and Richard Delorenzo by telephone yesterday and they both agreed aggregate/sand should be included. Their change intended to allow the manufacturer to recommend the sand loading and not limit or define a specific amount to be added to the mixed epoxy. Or allowing the manufacture to supply pre-proportioned units (A epoxy + B Curing agent and C Component the aggregate/sand.) Also,

defining the viscosity is not important, and should not be limited to a range of 1000-2000 cps, specifying a self leveling moisture resistant grout is most important.

Response: Agree, language added for manufacturer supplied, pre-proportioned aggregate. Specification also indicates epoxy must flow, harden and seal under water. Change Made.

****

Daniel Stickland
410-5620
daniel.strickland@dot.state.fl.us

Comment: (12-11-13)
Check the chart in section 926-1. There are several types of compounds that were removed but the lettering of each type stayed the same and will no longer be in sequential order. That may have been intentional, but just wanted to bring it to your attention.

Response: This is intentional. We do not rename epoxy types because there are other specifications and Department documents that reference epoxies by type. No Change Made.

****

Anonymous

Comment: (12-12-13)
926-2.2 First sentence - Suggest changing "Specification" to "Section"

Response: The correct word is ‘Specification”. The modifications to the QPL requirement will be stated throughout the specification and are not limited to the details in this section. No Change Made.

****

Katie Bettman
904-360-5391
katie.bettman@dot.state.fl.us

Comment: (12-30-13)
1. For Type F-2 and Type H Epoxy, the note in 926-1 states, “Accepted by project testing.” 926-5.3 and 926-6 describe the specific requirements for accepting the material on the job. These Specifications state, “…products will be accepted on the job. Furnish a report of test results from an independent laboratory on samples taken from material shipped. Ensure the test was performed within 45 days prior to shipping date of the material.” These two statements are confusing and seem to contradict each other. If the tests are taken prior to shipping the material to the project, then the manufacturer is coordinating the testing and sending the results. I would not consider this project testing. I don’t see how this differs from “Accepted by certification.” Also, it is not clear what the required frequency of testing is.

Response: Agreed, this language is too restrictive. The requirements will be changed to: “Furnish to the Engineer testing from the manufacturer of the product for each lot of material to be incorporated into the project. The test results will indicate that the material is in conformation with the specifications and will include actual values from the required tests. Obtain approval from the Engineer before incorporating material into the project.” Change Made.

2. The language of 926-10, which addresses Packaging, Labeling, and Safety, needs to be

cleaned up. The first sentence states, “All containers shall be shall show the type, mixing directions, batch numbers, manufacturer’s name, date of packaging, shelf life expiration date and quantity in pounds or gallons.” This can be corrected by removing the “shall be.” The second sentence states, “Containers with components shall clearly identified with Component A - contains epoxy resin or Component B - contains hardener.” This can be corrected by changing “identified” to “identify” and removing the “with” or adding “be” before “identified.”

Response: Agreed. Changes have been made.

****

Richard DeLorenzo

Comment: (1-13-14) By specifying only pre-packaged aggregate from the manufacturer, the gradation requirements of the filler are not required.

Response: Agreed. Changes have been made.

For the Type Q, the test method for bond strength (926-9 table) should be FM 5-587 instead of ASTM C882.

Response: Agreed. Changes have been made.

In the table in 926-1, should the double asterisk be “**Certified Test Report”. “Project testing” implies testing of samples taken from the jobsite.

Response: Agreed. Changes have been made.

For the F-2 epoxies, I thought these were going back to QPL. Either way is fine with me.

Response: These products will be accepted by certified test reports.

****