

3501204 Cement Concrete Pavement
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Zinck, Ken

Comment: (1-5-11) Comments submitted by Tammie Andrews of D5 Orlando Operations

I have reviewed this Spec. change and I would like to offer the following.

The current Spec. states “grease one end with an approved lubricant, to prevent the concrete from bonding to the dowel.” The proposed Spec. would read, “Wait a minimum of 7 days before coating one-half of the dowel with a lubricant grease approved by the Engineer.”

As proposed, this shifts the responsibility of approval to the Engineer and does not spell out the desired results. I recommend NOT approving this Spec. change as proposed and suggest to change the Spec. to read “Wait a minimum of 7 days before coating one-half of the dowel with an approved lubricant to prevent the concrete from bonding to the dowel.”

Response: I originally had language for the lubricant referring to a military standard.... “use a lubricant meeting the requirements of mil-x-x.” This was questioned by the FHWA and viewed as overkill. The thought was that we don’t need to specifying space shuttle grease when Crisco is all that is needed. I have removed the approved language altogether and just specified a petroleum based lubricant that....

Rudy Powell

Comment: (1-10-11) There is an inorganic primer system described in 975- see 975-2.3.2. My understanding is this paint system, which would be primer only, is used when a pigmented system is not needed like in a rural area. We should have these systems listed on the QPL. 350-12.4 could still say “listed on the QPL.”

What is the Engineer going to use to approve the lubricant?

Response: As far as zinc rich primers for dowel bars, zinc rich primers should probably just be removed. Maybe somewhere in the state, someone has followed the spec and there is actually a dowel bar that has a zinc rich primer on it, and for this case we should keep the language? However, the reality is that no mfgr’s are going to use \$50/gallon paint when \$10/gallon paint meets the specification requirement. The zinc language is really unneeded, but if it is desired to keep it and point it to the QPL that is fine too. I don’t believe it will have any real impact either way. The spec was in place for many years and required a QPL zinc rich primer and I could not find a construction person that remembered one such instance.

From the State Specifications Office: The language will stay the same as sent to industry review.
