

# CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

SCL #: 2005  
DateRun: 09/06/2005  
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 abrasion resistance for additional floor finishes

**Experimental Procedure:** Control of Moisture Content and Temperature  
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.

**Abrasion Resistance**  
The methodology used for this experiment uses little from the ASTM standard. The 80 grit aluminum oxide was used as sandpaper, the testing went for two, 100 cycles and the Navy-type Wear Tester instrument was replaced with the BYK Gardner Abrasion Tester (Figure 1).

**Figure 1. Abrasion Tester Apparatus**  
Coupons were placed into the Abrasion tester and subjected to the 100 cycles with the 80 grit sandpaper. At the end of the first cycle, the coupons were wiped with a dry sponge to remove any dust that was generated. Three thickness measurements were made and recorded to determine the decrease in surface thickness. The coupon was then subjected to the second 100 revolutions with the sandpaper. Measurements were made in the same manner as the first set. Averages for both sets were calculated and compared to the other floor finishes.

Results:

	Initial Thickness	Overall Ave Coating
Kiilto	7.542	7.563
	7.562	
	7.584	
Kiilto w/ Pimer	7.510	7.558
	7.553	
	7.612	

Summary

## CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

Product	Coupon		Center	End 1 A	End 2 A	Average	Final Coat - Cycle 1	Ave Product	Ave Cycle 1
Kiilto	A	Cycle 1	7.508	7.513	7.572	7.531	0.011	7.550	0.012
	B		7.516	7.556	7.585	7.552	0.010		
	C		7.558	7.564	7.580	7.567	0.016		
Kiilto w/ Primer	J		7.475	7.460	7.552	7.496	0.014	7.523	0.036
	K		7.475	7.473	7.560	7.503	0.050		
	L		7.548	7.573	7.588	7.570	0.042		

Product	Coupon		Center	End 1 A	End 2 A	Average	Final Coat - Cycle 2	Cycle 2 Ave loss	Diff Cycle 1 - Cycle 2
Kiilto	A	Cycle 2	7.483	7.488	7.540	7.504	0.039	7.535	0.027
	B		7.510	7.531	7.577	7.539	0.023		
	C		7.570	7.560	7.558	7.563	0.021		
Kiilto w/ Primer	J		7.461	7.455	7.501	7.472	0.038	7.488	0.071
	K		7.460	7.451	7.480	7.464	0.089		
	L		7.515	7.537	7.528	7.527	0.085		

### Comparison to other products

Product	Finished	Cycle 1	Cycle 2
Kiilto	7.542	7.531	7.504
	7.562	7.552	7.539
	7.584	7.567	7.563
w/ Primer	7.510	7.496	7.472
	7.553	7.503	7.464
	7.612	7.570	7.527
Product		Cycle 1	Cycle 2
Polyurethane Gloss		0.033	0.029
WB Polyurethane		0.034	0.038
WB Sanding Sealer		0.034	0.047
Aqua Deva Metro		0.054	0.060
Uncoated		0.052	0.033
Hydro 202 Satin		0.035	0.046
SafeCoat Satin		0.021	0.036
SafeCoat Gloss		0.034	0.054
Kiilto		0.012	0.027
w/ Primer		0.036	0.071

Summary:

Conclusion: Kiilto with out the primer resulted in the least amount of coating thickness loss.