Comments: (11-9-21, Internal)
See the comment below. We still need to discuss the Contractors doing Friction Testing.

No concerns, just a question, I thought that section 900 would talk about the product, ie it says no wax. Since it has to be on the APL would this not then say no wax. Should we not eliminate item 1 and 2. Are we now requiring on site reps of the material?? I do not see where it requires it in the spec it just says Qualification of the on site rep. I think you would be hard pressed to get factory on site reps and where does it say what qualifications the rep must meet? Should table 413-2 be in the 900 section?

Still not sold on us doing the friction test? Also this spec is very prescriptive using products that they tested and being inspected by CEI’s if we put down the way they tell us to should be responsible if the friction test does not pass?
Response: Thank you for looking over the currently proposed revisions to Spec 413.

It is my understanding that the Department will be looking at this specification in greater detail for the next revision cycle. I’m primarily involved with the laboratory testing/data review for APL qualification of high molecular weight methyl methacrylate, so I have copied other individuals that may be involved to ensure your questions are considered.

Response: Thank you for looking over the currently proposed revisions to Spec 413.

Karen Byram
Karen.Byram@dot.state.fl.us
(850) 414-4353

Comments: (11-23-21, Industry)
How are APL products affected by this spec change and have they been notified by your office? This spec change was erroneously marked as not affecting the APL. Product approval requirements I left you a voice message, please contact me today.
Response:

The qualification status of the two approved products is not affected by these revisions. Several test methods specified were intended for cementitious type materials. These were changed to methods more suited for methacrylate/epoxy type materials. The existing specification limits were evaluated following both test methodologies and the existing specification limits were deemed appropriate. We did remove the limits on elongation. Elongation is important to know since bridge decks supported on steel girders have more movement than bridge decks on concrete girders and require more elongation of the repair material, however there was not a need to place limits on this parameter. In addition, the testing procedures for viscosity were clarified to reduce ambiguity and improve the comparison between producer supplied test results and FDOT verification test results. Both approved producers were sent the proposed revisions. One responded with agreement to the proposed changes and also suggested to increase the application rate of the sand from 0.6 to 1 pound per square yard. The reasoning for this was based on their field experience. The lesser initial spread rate was never sufficient, and they suggested using 1 pound per square yard would be a more realistic initial spread rate to specify.
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