

# CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

SCL #: 2005  
DateRun: 06/03/2005  
Experimenters: Jason Marshall  
ClientType: Environmental Service Firm  
ProjectNumber: Project #1  
Substrates: Wood  
PartType: Coupon  
Contaminants: Coatings  
Cleaning Methods:  
Analytical Methods: Performance Test  
Purpose: To evaluate impact resistance for various floor finishes

Experimental Procedure: The moisture content at the time of testing will influence results due to the hygroscopic nature of the base materials. Therefore, efforts must be taken to ensure that the moisture content and temperature remain constant during the evaluation period. Ideally, the sample floor should be kept at 65+/-1% relative humidity and 68+/-6 F.

During laboratory testing, conditions were slightly drier, 40% relative humidity, but the temperature was within the given temperature range ~70 F).

## Sample Preparation

The flooring material supplied was Hardwood flooring made from Red Oak. The boards were ¾" thick, 2 ¼" wide and cut into 8" sections. Some pieces of the flooring had to be sanded prior to making initial thickness readings to remove residual packing tape adhesive. With the boards cut into 8" coupons, three readings were made using a Brown & Sharpe Micrometer to measure each coupon's initial board thickness. Each reading was made to 0.001" and the three values were averaged to give a baseline thickness for the coupons. In addition to the thickness baseline, baselines were established for Gloss, Coefficient of Friction, Impact, Small Area Loads. Procedures for each baseline measurement followed the procedures to be outlined.

Following the establishment of the baselines, three coupons were coated with a supplied floor finish according to the manufacturers' specifications. The finish was applied using a 1" Pure Bristle 1500 paint brush. To ensure consistent coating application, the finish was leveled off using a 10 mils Precision Gage & Tool Co Dow Film Caster. Three coats were used for each floor finish as this was common number of coating layers suggested by the various manufacturers. Each coating layer was allowed to dry for 2 hours prior to the application of the next coat. Completed coupons were allowed to sit for a minimum period of 24 hours before performance evaluations were conducted.

## Falling-Ball Indentation

This test is designed to obtain a measure of the resistance of a flooring finish to impacts from dropped objects. Four drops were made for each coupon for a total of twelve drops per finish. Each drop was made at 6" intervals starting at 6" and ending at 72". The ball used for the drops was a 440-C stainless steel 2" diameter ball, grade 100. The dropping apparatus used is shown in Figure 2. Carbon paper was placed on the coupon surface to assist in determining where the indentation was made.

## Figure 2. Dropping Apparatus

The same Brown & Sharpe Micrometer was used to measure the indentations to the coated coupons. A plot was made of the height of drop and residual indentation and the slope of the best fit line was calculated. From the plots, the intercept of the height of drop at 72" was recorded as the index of indentation resistance. Results for each finish were compared each other.

Results: Impact depth was calculated by subtracting the average initial coating thickness from the thickness measured at the point of impact for each drop height. The initial average coating thickness was calculated from the three initial coating measurements made for each coupon.

		Coated Thickness			Drop Height											
		Middle	End 1	End 2	6	12	18	24	30	36	42	48	54	60	66	72
Cleaner	Coupon															
	2	22	7.506	7.506	7.502	7.503		7.447	7.421							
		22 Alt	6.474	6.493			6.411									
		23	7.490	7.489	7.470					7.411	7.368	7.229				
		23 Alt	6.453	6.458	6.462				6.410							
		24	7.470	7.468	7.522								7.251	7.233	7.242	7.328
3	25	7.505	7.543	7.518	7.467	7.451	7.427	7.345								
	26	7.590	7.582	7.538					7.400	7.383	7.376	7.351				

## CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

	27	7.570	7.561	7.575									7.348	7.283		7.248
	27 Alt	7.050	7.019	7.036											6.950	
4	28	7.539	7.541	7.530	7.476	7.431		7.426								
	28 Alt	6.740	6.710	6.751			6.682									
	29	7.479	7.490	7.474				7.299	7.260	7.234	7.108					
	30	7.546	7.560	7.522								7.331	7.339		7.366	
	30 Alt	6.987	6.988	6.950											6.769	
5	31	7.566	7.558	7.557	7.548	7.507		7.491								
	31 Alt	6.900	6.888	6.879			6.800	6.781								
	32	7.557	7.560	7.545				7.442	7.412		7.327					
	32 Alt	7.130	7.053	7.050						6.910						
	33	7.547	7.550	7.532								7.392	7.268	7.397		
	33 Alt	6.450	6.443	6.451												6.268

Summary Table

Product	6	12	18	24	30	36	42	48	54	60	66	72	Slope of Best Fit Line	Index of Indentation Resistance	Rank
Polyurethane Gloss	0.002	0.073	0.058	0.084	0.048	0.072	0.115	0.254	0.236	0.254	0.245	0.155	263.41	0.273	2
WB Polyurethane	0.055	0.071	0.095	0.177	0.170	0.187	0.194	0.219	0.221	0.286	0.085	0.321	217.66	0.331	3
WB Sanding Sealer	0.061	0.106	0.052	0.111	0.182	0.221	0.247	0.373	0.212	0.204	0.206	0.177	205.34	0.351	4
Aqua Deva Metro	0.012	0.053	0.089	0.069	0.112	0.142	0.168	0.227	0.151	0.275	0.146	0.180	277.07	0.260	1

Graphs for each product are shown in Figure 2.

\*Due to the construction of the floor boards and the location of the impact from the ball, additional baseline readings had to be recorded for certain areas on the coupons. These values are designated by the coupon number and Alt (alternate).

Product	Slope of Best Fit Line	Index of Resistance Indentation	Rank
Polyurethane Gloss	263.41	0.273	2
WB Polyurethane	217.66	0.331	3
WB Sander Sealer	205.34	0.351	4
Aqua Deva Metro	277.07	0.26	1

The lower the index the less the indentation the better the coating's resistance

Summary:

Conclusion:

Aqua Deva Metro had the lowest Index of Retention, followed by Capitol Polyurethane Gloss.