EMI INTERNATIONAL
Enviro-Mates, Inc.
Tel 850 438 4111 PO Box 12107 Pensacola, FL 32591 Toll Free 877 438 4111
www.enviromates.com or www.dustnet.com

March 10, 2003

Memo: Horton TC-1210 / TC1210 DUSTNET

Re: Letter of discovery, doc. # JN L4776, Evaluation of Coated and Uncoated Abrasive.

In this letter of discovery dated May 1991 the product Horton TC1210 was tested to determine if the use of an abrasive treated with this dust suppressant would have any adverse effect on the cohesion of coatings.

Horton TC-1210 was the label name of the dust suppressant in May 1991. Between May 1991 and November 1992 the name was changed to **TC1210 *DUSTNET*®** only for a more discernable product name to identify the use of the product. Only the name was changed, the ingredients and the formula remained the same and are still the original formula of this dust suppressant.

As you can see the results are very positive for using **TC1210 *DUSTNET*®** to control harmful, sometimes fatal dust with absolutely NO adverse effect on the cohesion of coatings to surfaces prepared for painting with abrasives treated with **TC1210 *DUSTNET*®.**

Don G Presley c.o.o.
EMI International

Member IMA-NA

HOUSTON
LOS ANGELES

PITTSBURGH

(412) 788-1300
TWX 510 697 3335
FAX (412) 788-1306

KTA-TATOR, INC.

115 Technology Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15275

PROTECTIVE COATINGS (PAINT) CONSULTANTS: Testing • Instruments • Inspection • Analytical Laboratory

May 3, 1991

SUBJECT: **Evaluation of Coated and Uncoated Abrasive**

In accordance with your letter of June 29, 1990, KTA-Tator, Inc. has performed an evaluation of coated and uncoated blasting abrasive. It is KTA's understanding that the purpose of the coating is to reduce dust generation. The purpose of the testing was to determine if the material used for coating the abrasive (Horton TC-1210) is deposited on the steel during the blast cleaning process, and further, to determine if the presence of this material on the blast cleaned steel surface will compromise the performance of subsequently applied coatings.

Physical Testing

In order to determine if blast cleaning with the treated abrasive would result in poor paint performance, a number of 4" x 6" commercial grade steel panels were blast cleaned with both the treated and untreated abrasives to achieve the SSPC-SP5 "White Metal" blast. These panels were then painted with four different generic types of coatings, allowed to cure, and then subjected to a variety of tests.

The coating types used were an alkyd, an epoxy, a vinyl, and an inorganic zinc primer. The specific coatings were as follows:

1. (Alkyd) - Sherwin Williams Kem-Kromik Universal Metal Primer.
2. (Epoxy) - Porter MCR-43 Hi-Build Primer, 4336 Gray, a polyamide epoxy.
3. (Vinyl) - Glidden Vinyl Guard 5516 White.
4. (Inorganic Zinc) - Porter Zinc-Lock Inorganic Zinc 311, a self-curing ethyl silicate coating.

The various coatings were mixed and applied in accordance with the manufacturers' instructions, using conventional spray technique.

After approximately one week of curing at laboratory ambient conditions of approximately 72°F and 50% relative humidity, the coated test panels were subjected to a number of tests. The tests consisted of adhesion (ASTM D-3359), six weeks of tap water immersion (ASTM D-1308), six weeks of salt fog testing (ASTM B-117), and ten cycles of freeze/thaw/immersion testing. Each freeze/thaw/immersion cycle consisted of approximately 7 1/2 hours at 140°F, 1/2 hour of tap water immersion, and 16 hours in a laboratory freezer.

For salt fog and immersion testing, blistering was evaluated in accordance with ASTM D-714 and overall rust by ASTM D-610. Blisters are described by their size (a "2" is the largest and an "8" is the smallest), and their frequency (Few, Medium, Medium Dense, and Dense). The rust gradings range from a 10 (no rust) to a 1 (50% rust). Rust at the scribe was evaluated subjectively.

The subsequent painting and testing of these panels failed to reveal any significant difference in paint performance between panels blast cleaned with coated abrasive versus uncoated abrasive. Therefore, although no amount of laboratory testing can duplicate the variety of actual field conditions, it would appear that the use of the Horton TC-1210 coating does not result in a significant reduction in paint performance.

Should you have any further questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Very truly yours,

KTA-TATOR, INC.

Dwight G. Weldon

Dwight G. Weldon

DGW/RNR:wc

JN L4776