Specification Section 560
Subarticle 560-03

ORIGINATION
Date: 5-19-26
Name: Oliver Chung
Email: Oliver.Chung@dot.state.fl.us

COMMENTARY

1.Shop personnel qualifications have been covered in Materials Manual. 2.Excessive requirement: interior white paint coat of box girders were only for improved lighting. 3. Research (BEG84) Implementation: 10.2

INTERNAL COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

(Please note all comments and responses are verbatim as received. The Specifications Office does not alter typos or grammar.)

BLACK = Comment **BLUE** = Specifications Response **GREEN** = Change Made to Specification

Name: Melissa Hollis
Date: 5-27-26
COMMENT: C-Team comments regarding materials and APL have not been addressed.

RESPONSE: This comment do not appear to be related to the proposed updates, but instead represent valid proposals. As the APL office is the authority on almost all of these suggested changes, we recommend they propose their own updates so the Specification Office can reconcile all changes as they see fit.

ACTION TAKEN: N/A

Specification Section 560
Subarticle 560-6

ORIGINATION
Date: 5-19-26
Name: Oliver Chung
Email: Oliver.Chung@dot.state.fl.us

COMMENTARY

1.Shop personnel qualifications have been covered in Materials Manual. 2.Excessive requirement: interior white paint coat of box girders were only for improved lighting. 3. Research (BEG84) Implementation: 10.2

INDUSTRY COMMENTS AND RESPONSES
(Please note all comments and responses are verbatim as received. The Specifications Office does not alter typos or grammar.)
BLACK = Comment **BLUE** = Specifications Response **GREEN** = Change Made to Specification

Name: Davion Mori
Email: dmori@jmoripainting.com
Date: 6/24/26

COMMENT: With respect to the proposed change, please define “hole edge” within the section to avoid ambiguity.

Also, we would like to take this opportunity to address the approach in section 560-10.2 in general. Though organic zinc rich primers are generally expected to have superior performance over aluminum mastic long term, they are less surface tolerant and more prone to application issues in field conditions. The increased likelihood of deficiencies in application can reduce or even negate the anticipated performance benefit. These application challenges are described below and supported by industry studies and manufacturer technical bulletins which may be provided upon request.

The first challenge is organic zinc-rich primers are not typically compatible for direct application over existing coatings. As a result, repairs adjacent to sound shop-applied inorganic zinc (IOZ) cannot be properly feathered, creating a sharp demarcation line that can lead to coating failures at the transition. Aluminum mastic has demonstrated better adhesion and compatibility over cured IOZ, thereby reducing the risk of failure at coating system interfaces.

The second is surface preparation challenges. OZ primers typically require abrasive blast cleaning to a minimum SSPC-SP 6 standard for proper performance. This is significantly more time-consuming and costly in the field compared to power tool cleaning suitable for aluminum mastic. Blasting also creates containment, dust, and environmental challenges not typically encountered under 560 COATING NEW STRUCTURAL STEEL, and could therefore greatly impact the time and cost for new steel coating systems.

Based on the above, we respectfully request that FDOT reconsider the default repair approach in Section 560-10 to favor aluminum mastic as the primary repair material.

RESPONSE: The language pertaining to hole edge was proposed as part of a research project. We do not believe it is ambiguous. If you need to further discussion, please reach out to sm-metalcoattimb@dot.state.fl.us.

We believe there is substance to the comments regarding aluminum mastic repairs. However, this comment is not related to the currently proposed updates.

ACTION TAKEN: We will add the feedback on aluminum mastic repairs to our standard document update tracker and consider implementing it next cycle.