

SUGGESTED CONDENSED MANHOLE FRAME SEAL SPECIFICATION

(Rehab with SealGreen Internal Seal)

PART 1 GENERAL

1.01 SCOPE

This specification includes the materials and procedures required for the internal sealing of the frame-chimney joint area of all brick and block manholes and the entire chimney area of all precast manholes within the area included in this project, as shown on the attached drawings.

1.02 SUBMITTALS

The manufacturers of all manhole frame seals shall submit a notarized certification to the Engineer stating that their product meets the design life and all applicable material requirements of this specification.

PART 2 PRODUCTS

2.01 INTERNAL MANHOLE SEAL

The internal manhole seal shall be designed to prevent leakage of water into the manhole through the frame/chimney area. The seal shall remain flexible to allow for the repeated vertical and horizontal movement occurring in the frame/chimney area. The two component urethane seal shall be applied to the entire inside surface of the frame/chimney area at a thickness not less than 70 mils. Mil thickness will vary depending on climactic conditions. The material shall have a minimum elongation of 500%, Shore A hardness of 95-100, and tensile strength of 4000 psi.

- A. Acceptable Manufacturers
 - 1. Cretex Specialty Products

PART 3 EXECUTION

3.01 SURFACE PREPARATION AND SEAL INSTALLATION

The surface preparation required to apply the frame/chimney seal and the application of the material shall be in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

NOTE: A specifier is within his rights to issue a proprietary specification that names only one brand. If in the informed and professional judgment of the specifier, his client's needs will be best served by naming a particular brand, then he has the responsibility to limit his specification to one source. This practice is even acceptable on publicly funded projects. The principle of proprietary specification has found legal support in the case of Whitten Corp v. Paddock Pool Builders, Inc., a Federal District Court case from Massachusetts (376 F. Supp125). Further support came in 1975 when the U.S. Supreme Court rejected further appeal and review.