

RESPONSE 2 COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

David O'Hagan

02/02/2006 03:28 PM

I have the following comments:

9320103

Why are no temperature ranges for the sealant specified in this spec either?

David C. O'Hagan, PE
State Roadway Design Engineer
FDOT Central Office
(850) 414-4283

RESPONSE: *Based on the information that I have available to me at the time of origination, accelerated testing was shown to be indicative of actual field performance. Therefore, the testing in section 931-1.3.2 has been found to be sufficient.*

Ghulam Mujtaba

File: 9320103 - Nonmetallic Accessory Materials For Concrete Pavement and Concrete Structures

Subarticle 932-1.3

1. Subarticle 932-1.4 Second paragraph: Change "his quality control test" to "quality control tests" to "his/her quality control test".

RESPONSE: *I agree with removal of the word "his".*

2. Subarticle 932-1.6- The paragraph, before last: Change "the Engineer shall check " to "the Engineer will check".

RESPONSE: *This is a specifications terminology issue. I have no opinion.*

Jeffrey A. Pouliotte

File: 9320103 - Nonmetallic Accessory Materials For Concrete Pavement and Concrete Structures

Username: Jeffrey A. Pouliotte
UserEmail: jeffrey.pouliotte@dot.state.fl.us
UserTel: 850-414-4146
Date: Tuesday, February 07, 2006
Time: 03:06:17 PM

Comments:

Specification 9320103 does not seem to have an upper (maximum) temperature limit for which this product has to perform and not become liquid, stick to tires, etc. (unless additional temperature requirements are hidden in one of the referenced ASTM Test Methods). The maximum temperature limit listed in Table 932-1.3.2 Physical Requirements appears to be 770F+30F.

RESPONSE: *That is covered in Table 932-1.3.2 Tack-free time MIL S8802*

Mike Bergin

File: 9320103 - Nonmetallic Accessory Materials For Concrete Pavement and Concrete Structures

1. There was a requirement for the silicons to meet specific test methods, but it did not indicate that the labs performing these test had to meet any specific laboratory qualifications, such as CCRL, AMRL, NELAC or NVLAP, etc. If we are going to require the producers to perform tests for acceptance then their lab should have some level of credibility.

RESPONSE: *That is a policy issue that is outside of the scope of this specification.*

2. The only other comment that I have was that 932-1.3.1, Type D, second sentence, "The material must cure by chemical reaction and not ~~be~~ by evaporation,"

RESPONSE: *I agree, that is a typo.*

Richard J. Kessler, PE, CPM
State Corrosion Engineer
Florida Department of Transportation-State Materials Office
5007 N. E. 39th Ave.
Gainesville, FL 32609
Phone: 352-955-6686
