

RESPONSES TO 5630000 COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

\*\*\*\*\*

Richard Newsome

COMMENTS:

The Last Sentence in Article 563-2-2 Protection of adjacent Surfaces, should read:

"Clean surfaces other than those intended to be coated until all traces of anti-graffiti coating has been removed and the surface has an acceptable appearance."

RESPONSE:

This section was intended to apply to both new construction as well as recoating with anti-graffiti coating. In the case of new construction, no coating would be present. I propose that the sentence should read:

"Clean surfaces that are to be coated as per manufacturer's recommendation."

\*\*\*\*\*

Tonii Brush

COMMENTS:

In the spec shown below the English measure is struck through and the metric left. In the other specs the metric is struck through and the English left. Is there a reason to leave the metric measure and not the English?

RESPONSE:

The intent is to use the most common form of measurement. The metric measures were selected for this specification because they are the common field measure for coatings.

\*\*\*\*\*

Chris Lovelace

COMMENTS: Remove 563.2.2, line 2, sentence that reads "Clean surfaces that are to be coated...acceptable appearance." It makes no sense in its current context.

RESPONSE:

See response to Tony Walsh.

Remove 'Moisture in Concrete...ASTM D 4263' from 563.2.3. The test is inadequate at best in real world DOT situations. Insert acceptable use of electronic moisture meters.

RESPONSE:

This section was carried over from the old specification. I do not have the information to address this issue.

Adhesion testing required under 560-15 (line 9 in 563.2.3) should be conducted before the test patch is applied as well as after coating application.

**RESPONSE:**

The concern being tested is adhesion of the anti-graffiti coating to the Class 5 coating, not the Class 5 coating to the concrete. If the Class 5 coating to the concrete is the failing layer, the anti-graffiti coating passes the test.

In 563.2.7, line 2, delete 'receiving' and insert 'that have received new' instead.

**RESPONSE:**

The surface is going to receive the coating; therefore the graffiti must be cleaned off prior to coating.

\*\*\*\*\*

Tony Walsh

**COMMENTS:**

In section 563-2.2, Protection of Adjacent Surfaces. In the second paragraph, second sentence, it reads "Clean surfaces that are to be coated, as to manufacturer's recommendation....". since this is a "protection" section, shouldn't it read "Clean surfaces that are to be protected ..."

**RESPONSE:**

This sentence is a better fit in the next section and should be moved.

\*\*\*\*\*

Jennifer Taylor

**COMMENTS:**

A majority of the Anti-Graffiti coating systems are applied over a class 5 finish coating. The manufacturer of the class 5 finish coating system should be responsible for supplying an Anti-Graffiti coating system that is compatible to their system, when a Anti-Graffiti coating system is called for in the plans. Eliminate section 563 as recommended and require the manufacturer of the Class 5 coating system to supply an Anti-Graffiti coating system meeting the requirements of sections 563 & 975-9 and include it under section 400-15.2.6 when called for in the plans.

**RESPONSE:**

It is possible that some of the Class 5 manufacturers will supply such a system. But anti-graffiti performance is not a requirement of a Class 5 coating and there is no intent to combine to the two specifications at this time.

\*\*\*\*\*

Jose Rodriguez

**COMMENTS:**

Section 563-3:

Need to clarify the meaning of "projected surface". For example, for a round column, is the area to be measured the diameter of the column times the height (projected area on a vertical plane) or the perimeter times the height (actual area)?

**RESPONSE:**

The sentence should be written as:

“The quantity to be paid for will be the surface area to be coated with anti-graffiti coating, in square feet, completed and accepted.”