



Figure 1. Diagram of paint test areas.

Table 1. Paint system designations.

| Coating System | Area A | Area B | Area C | Area D |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Surface Preparation | SSPC SP5 | SSPC SP6 | SSPC SP3 | Existing Paint |
| Location | West exposure on superstructure | East exposure on superstructure | West exposure on superstructure | Girders below level of tracks |
| System #1 Amerlock400AL/ Amerlock400AL | 1A | 1B | 1C | 1D |
| System #2 Kolorane 9500/ Kolorane 9500 | 2A | 2B | 2C | 2D |
| System #3 Steelmastic 168/ Steelmastic 168 | 3A | 3B | 3C | 3D |
| System #4 SSPC Paint 25/ TT-P-38 | 4A | 4B | 4C | 4D |
| System #5 CoE Formula 19466/ CoE Formula 19466 | 5A | 5B | 5C | 5D |
| System #6 Rustbond Sealer/ SSPC Paint 25/ TT-P-38 | 6A | 6B | 6C | 6D |

Cape Cod Railroad Bridge Final Comments on Test Systems

5 year observations were published in a technical report. 7 year observations were made prior to the coatings being removed during a repainting of the structure in 2001-2002. 7 year photographs were taken of most areas and are available on the web page for each coating. Overall, System #3 (Steelmastic 168) provided the best performance. This aluminum epoxy mastic was the only high build system which may have added to its performance. System #6 (SSPC Paint 25 / TT-P-38 applied over Rustbond Sealer) also looked very good. The sealer was found to add to the performance of the system on poorly prepared surfaces early in the test. This was the only 4 coat system tested.

The ranking of the remaining systems remained essentially the same as stated in the 5 year report. As stated in the report, some of the coatings were brushed thinner than specification requirements. This may have had a significant effect on their performance especially on edges and rivets.