

# Field Performance Comparison

## HOLD\*BLAST vs. HoldTight 102

Conditions for comparative testing:

- Location: Sturgeon, Bakersfield, CA
- Same A-36 carbon steel for similar fabricated steel parts and equipment.
- Blast equipment: Graco EQ600 mist blaster.
- Blast media: Red Garnet, 80 grit.
- 1:50 dilution. Dilution rate as stated in the respective directions.
- Dilution with (Culligan) deionized water.
- 2 to 2.5 mil profile.
- Same blasting contractor and operators.
- Ambient conditions: Ave. temp.: 63°F; ave. humidity: 42%; ave. dew point: 35°F

### Equipment



---

### HoldTight 102



March 30 through April 1, 2015: fabricated vapor box trailer was abrasive blasted. By March 31<sup>st</sup> blasted areas with HoldTight 102 began to flash rust:





Areas that flash rusted were reblasted on April 1<sup>st</sup>. 12 hours later reblasted areas had failed again:



On April 2<sup>nd</sup>, those areas that turned after 2 vapor blastings with HoldTight102 were sanded with 80 grit paper to remove the flash rust. Hand repaired surfaces of the vapor trailer were then coated on April 3<sup>th</sup>.

---

## **HOLD\*BLAST**

On April 8<sup>th</sup>, 3 eye wash trailers were abrasive blasted with HOLD\*BLAST. On April 10<sup>th</sup>, after 36 hours:



55 hours after mist blasting with HOLD\*BLAST:





120 hours after mist blasting with HOLD\*BLAST:



On April 13<sup>th</sup>, surfaces blasted with HOLD\*BLAST were coated.