



## **AASHTO's NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION PRODUCT EVALUATION PROGRAM (NTPEP)**

**Information and Operations Guide  
Date of Last Revision: May 6, 2019**

### **Foreword**

The purpose of this guide is to provide members of the National Transportation Product Evaluation Program (NTPEP) a concise description of AASHTO, and NTPEP's role within the organization. It is also designed to explain policies and procedures that have evolved from operational experience.

This guide may be reviewed and updated periodically at the discretion of the Steering Committee. Annual review of policies and procedures may result in updates to this guide.

# Table of Contents

## **1.0 DESCRIPTION OF AASHTO, Council on Highways and Streets, and NTPEP**

- 1.1 WHAT IS AASHTO?
- 1.2 WHAT IS the Council on Highways and Streets?
- 1.3 WHAT IS NTPEP?
  - 1.3.1 NTPEP Product Evaluation Process
  - 1.3.2 NTPEP Product Testing/Assessment
  - 1.3.3 NTPEP Audit Program

## **2.0 NTPEP ORGANIZATION**

- 2.1 NTPEP STAFF
  - 2.1.1 NTPEP Program Manager
  - 2.1.2 Associate Program Manager
  - 2.1.3 NTPEP Manufacturing Auditor
  - 2.1.4 NTPEP Technical Committee Liaison
  - 2.1.5 Administrative Coordinator
  - 2.1.6 NTPEP Implementation Specialist
  - 2.1.7 NTPEP Technology Specialist

### **2.2 NTPEP Committee**

- 2.2.1 NTPEP Committee Chair
- 2.2.2 NTPEP Committee Vice-Chair
- 2.2.3 Meetings

### **2.3 Steering Committee**

- 2.3.1 NTPEP Regional Representatives
- 2.3.2 Membership
- 2.3.3 Appeals Board

### **2.4 Technical Committees**

- 2.4.1 Membership
- 2.4.2 Technical Committee Chair
- 2.4.3 Technical Committee Vice-Chair
- 2.4.4 Responsibilities of TC Officers and Members
- 2.4.5 Member Agencies
- 2.4.6 Industry Representatives
- 2.4.7 Meetings
- 2.4.8 Participation
- 2.4.9 Technical Committee Documents and Responsibilities
  - 2.4.9.1 Work Plans
  - 2.4.9.2 Product Sampling & Shipping Requirements
  - 2.4.9.3 Scheduling of Testing and Timely Release of Data
  - 2.4.9.4 Reports

- 2.4.9.5 Approval of Reports
- 2.4.9.6 Appeals
- 2.4.9.7 Responding to Inquiries

## **2.5 APEL**

- 2.5.1 APEL Task Force
  - 2.5.1.1 APEL Task Force Chair
  - 2.5.1.2 APEL Task Force Regional Representative
  - 2.5.1.3 APEL Task Force Decisions
  - 2.5.1.4 APEL Task Force Meetings
  - 2.5.1.5 Communication with the APEL Task Force and/or Testing Laboratory
  - 2.5.1.6 State Product Coordinators
- 2.5.2 APEL Website
  - 2.5.2.1 Applicability
- 2.5.3 APEL Evaluation Review Process
  - 2.5.3.1 Stage 1: Detail Product Evaluation Application Submittal and Processing
  - 2.5.3.2 Stage 2: Initial Product Evaluation Request
  - 2.5.3.3 Stage 3: Posting of Evaluation Data
  - 2.5.3.4 Stage 4: Product Certification Request

## **3.0 ANNUAL NTPEP PROGRAM MANAGEMENT**

- 3.1 Review and Assessment
- 3.2 NTPEP Annual Meeting
  - 3.2.1 NTPEP Program Report
  - 3.2.2 Resolutions
  - 3.2.3 Sponsorship
- 3.3 New Products' Categories for Evaluation and Assessment of Existing Technical Committees
- 3.4 Research Needs

## **APPENDICES AND ANNEXES**

- Appendix A: AASHTO Organizational Charts
- Appendix B: AASHTO Regions
- Appendix C: Appeals Board Process
- Appendix D: Technical Committee Scopes
- Appendix E: Established NTPEP Policies
- Appendix F: Introduction & Development of a New Product Category and Assessment of Existing TCs
- Appendix G: Standard Operating Procedure for Receiving and Distributing Research Proposals
- Appendix H: General Terms and Conditions Applicable to All Technical Committees
- Appendix I: APEL Evaluation Review Process Flowchart
- Annex I: Defining "Retest" Requirement and Recommended "Re-evaluation"
- Annex II: Manufacturer Request to Visit Field Site or Test Deck
- Annex III: NTPEP Succession Plan

## Summary of Changes

### 1.0 DESCRIPTION OF AASHTO, Council on Highways and Streets, and NTPEP

#### 1.1 WHAT IS AASHTO?

Founded in 1914, AASHTO is legally an incorporated, nonprofit, and nonpartisan association representing the member highway and transportation departments in the 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. Its purpose is to foster the development, operation, and maintenance of an integrated national transportation system. The primary work of AASHTO is technical, including developing and maintaining voluntary standards and guidelines for the design, construction, maintenance, and operation of transportation facilities.

Membership in AASHTO is agency based, meaning only government agencies can belong. AASHTO's Board of Directors adopts official positions on legislative proposals, develops official policy statements, establishes membership dues, establishes standing and special committees and subcommittees, and decides all other policy matters relating to the operation or activities of the Association, including the adoption of voluntary standards.

AASHTO's Council on Highways and Streets is the foundation for the AASHTO transportation family – AASHTO started as a highways and roads association. Today the Council on Highways and Streets provides and represents the technical expertise of AASHTO. The dedication to improving our highways' design, construction, maintenance, operations, standards, traffic devices, and materials is shown in the shared goals and activities of the Council on Highways and Streets and its subgroups. The council's extensive work includes active participation in many areas such as the development of guidelines for design, product evaluation, specification standards for construction and maintenance, security provisions, and many more.

One of the technical service programs of AASHTO is NTPEP, which is funded by voluntary contributions from member agencies. NTPEP provides a source of independent data for many products that are used nationally for construction and maintenance of our infrastructure. NTPEP also conducts audits at manufacturing facilities, which in turn provides an audit report to the AASHTO member departments. Other technical services that are sponsored by AASHTO include AASHTO re:source (formerly AMRL), the AASHTO Accreditation Program (AAP), and the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP). An organizational chart is provided in Appendix A to depict how NTPEP fits into the structure of AASHTO.

#### 1.2 What is the Council on Highways and Streets?

The Council on Highways and Street shall address issues related to highway and street planning, design, construction, operation, and maintenance, and shall provide input on related policy issues and cross-cutting/multimodal issues to the Transportation Policy Forum. The Council shall provide direction and assignments to the Committees on issues related to highways and streets. The Council will also review and approve applicable technical documents on behalf of the association, including engineering standards and guides related to all phases of project delivery, maintenance, operations, safety, and materials. The Council shall promote and encourage technology and knowledge transfer by member states, and shall make recommendations regarding needed research. The Council shall review and provide input on proposed federal regulatory mandates of national concern, and identify key policy areas for review and discussion by the Transportation Policy Forum.

### 1.3 WHAT IS NTPEP?

NTPEP was established in 1994 as a Technical Service Program which reports to the Council on Highways and Streets. The program combines the professional and physical resources of the AASHTO member departments in order to evaluate materials, products, and devices of common interest for use in highway and bridge construction. The primary goals of the program are to provide cost-effective evaluations for the state DOTs by eliminating duplication of testing and auditing by the states and duplication of effort by the manufacturers that provide products for evaluation. As a liaison to the AASHTO Committee on Materials and Pavements (COMP), NTPEP supports the highway materials functions of these committees.

#### 1.3.1 NTPEP Product Evaluation Process

The Technical Committees determine the process by which a product is evaluated by NTPEP. Products may be evaluated through testing/assessments of product samples, audits performed at the product manufacturer, or a combination of both.

#### 1.3.2 NTPEP Product Testing/Assessment

Samples of a manufacturer's products are tested and/or assessed according to the work plan. These results are posted on the NTPEP DataMine Website (<http://data.ntpep.org>) for use by the member agency. NTPEP testing/assessments do not imply *acceptance* of the product. Acceptance is the responsibility of the member agency.

#### 1.3.3 NTPEP Audit Program

Audits are performed at the product manufacturer's facility and encompass a detailed review of the quality management system, production process, and testing capabilities (NOTE: Audits are not to be considered *inspections*, which are the responsibility of the member agency). The results of the audit are posted on the NTPEP DataMine Website in the form of reports for use by the member agency.

NTPEP audits do not imply *acceptance* of the product. Acceptance is the responsibility of the member agency.

## **2.0 NTPEP ORGANIZATION**

NTPEP is comprised of the NTPEP Staff, NTPEP Committee, Steering Committee (SC) and the Technical Committees (TC).

### **2.1 NTPEP STAFF**

The NTPEP Staff consists of the NTPEP Program Manager, Associate Program Managers, NTPEP Implementation Specialist, NTPEP Technology Specialist, Manufacturing Auditors, Technical Committee Liaisons, and an Administrative Coordinator.

#### **2.1.1 NTPEP Program Manager**

The NTPEP Program Manager is responsible for the management and overall direction of the program. The manager ensures sufficient and knowledgeable staff personnel are assigned as liaisons to Technical Committees and prepares and oversees an annual operating budget for the program.

#### **2.1.2 Associate Program Manager**

In coordination with the NTPEP Program Manager, the Associate Program Manager oversees the administration and management of tasks associated with the NTPEP audit and product evaluation programs, and as needed performs duties in support of the Committee on Materials and Pavements (COMP). In overseeing the NTPEP audit and product evaluation programs, tasks include: Oversee the implementation of new programs and administer current audit and evaluation programs; Communicate with manufacturers interested in participating in NTPEP along with reviewing and accepting applications in Datamine; Administer third party laboratory contracts associated with audit and product evaluation programs; Monitor any changes in specification or work plan requirements and revise current program documentation as needed; Assist with the implementation of new DataMine website; Provide support to NTPEP technical committees as a NTPEP Liaison; Help plan and participate in the annual NTPEP meeting; Works with the Program Manager on tasks associated with overall NTPEP improvements and outreach; ; The incumbent is responsible for overseeing contractors performing NTPEP audits as needed.

#### **2.1.3 NTPEP Manufacturing Auditor**

Each NTPEP Manufacturing Auditor is responsible for conducting on-site audits of production facilities on behalf of the NTPEP Audit Program.

NTPEP Manufacturing Auditors shall, at a minimum, have completed a course of study in science, technology, or engineering, and possess a Bachelor of Science degree. They shall complete comprehensive internal training with AASHTO Staff covering the fundamentals of NTPEP, the audit program, in-depth information about the materials being audited, Datamine, and travel policies. In addition to internal training, the Auditor-in-training shall go in the field for a series (minimum of three audits/product) of observational audits, shadowing his/her trainer, followed by training audits which the trainee will conduct and be reviewed upon (the trainee will conduct a minimum of two audits/product in the presence of the trainer). At the conclusion of the training period, should he or she be deemed fully competent, the auditor will be approved to conduct audits unaccompanied.

Each Manufacturing Auditor is assigned to several Technical Committees to serve as a technical resource pertaining to the operational procedures of NTPEP. The Auditor provides assistance to the Technical Committee for interpretation and enforcement of the Technical Committee Work Plan and other aspects of the Technical Committee. The Auditor also provides valuable insight on the manufacturing and testing aspects of the products being audited. The Auditor will advise and assist the Technical Committee Chair in the balloting and approval process of any published work of the Technical Committee.

#### 2.1.4 NTPEP Technical Committee Liaison

Each Technical Committee Liaison is assigned to serve several Technical Committees as a technical resource on the operational procedures of NTPEP. The Liaison provides guidance to the Technical Committee for development and maintenance of the Technical Committee Work Plan and other work of the Technical Committee. The Liaison will advise and assist the Technical Committee Chair in the balloting and approval process of any published work of the Technical Committee.

#### 2.1.5 Administrative Coordinator

The Administrative Coordinator provides support and website maintenance for the steadily-growing NTPEP. They provide services related to invoice management. They also create and maintain contact groups within AASHTO's Membership Information Management System.

#### 2.1.6 NTPEP Implementation Specialist

The NTPEP Implementation Specialist is responsible for the implementation of new products, monitoring the sustainability of current NTPEP technical committees, and other NTPEP technical committees.

#### 2.1.7 NTPEP Technology Specialist

The NTPEP Technology Specialist is responsible for the implementation and maintenance of its website database (DataMine) along with being a NTPEP Liaison for technical committees.

## **2.2 NTPEP Committee**

The NTPEP Committee is comprised of representatives from every participating AASHTO member department, the Federal Highway Administration and industry associations (in a non-voting capacity). The committee develops NTPEP guidelines by establishing policies and operating procedures in accordance with stated program goals. The committee develops an annual test program and makes decisions and appointments to execute it. The NTPEP Committee reports to the Council on Highways and Streets.

### **2.2.1 NTPEP Committee Chair**

The Council on Highways and Streets Chair, following the official operating procedures of Council on Highways and Streets, will appoint the NTPEP Committee Chair. The Chairman is appointed to two-year terms, which is interpreted as holding office for two-calendar year periods from the effective date of appointment, and terminates at the end of the first association annual meeting after their term has lapsed. Committee chairs may be appointed to succeed themselves for another two-year term. The Committee Chair provides leadership to the NTPEP Committee by chairing the meetings and making decisions in the best interest of NTPEP. The Chair appoints technical committees, approves project work plans, reports to the Council on Highways and Streets about NTPEP activities, and represents the program as the key member department contact. The Committee Chair serves on the NTPEP Steering Committee (SC). The Committee Chair will act as chair of the SC when the Committee is convened as a Board of Appeals.

### **2.2.2 NTPEP Committee Vice-Chair**

The NTPEP Committee Vice-Chair will be determined by Committee ballot. The SC will provide the nominations for the Vice-Chair position. The Vice-Chair performs the duties of the Chair whenever the Chair is unable to perform his or her duties due to absence or incapacity. The Vice-Chair serves as Chair of the SC, except in those instances where the SC meets as the Board of Appeals. The Vice-Chair also presides over new member orientation sessions.

The NTPEP Committee Vice-Chair is appointed for a term not to exceed 6 years.

### **2.2.3 Meetings**



The NTPEP Committee will meet at least once each year at the direction of the committee chair. At that time, the NTPEP Committee and all technical committees will meet, unless a technical committee chooses to conduct a webinar prior to the meeting. This annual meeting usually takes place in April or May. The annual meeting will be rotated among the four AASHTO regions with the rotation to begin as follows:

- 2019 – Region 4 (Western)
- 2020 – Region 3 (Mid America)
- 2021– Region 1 (Northeast)
- 2022 – Region 2 (Southeast)

**NOTE:** States in each region are illustrated in Appendix B.

## **2.3 Steering Committee**

The Steering Committee (SC) is responsible for periodic review and revision of the organization, policies and procedures of the NTPEP Committee to insure that the work of NTPEP is carried out. The SC also serves as a board of appeals whenever the appeals process becomes necessary.

### **2.3.1 NTPEP Regional Representatives**

There will be one Regional Representative on the SC from each region of the Association. Each Regional Representative will be a member of the NTPEP Committee and will be elected to a four-year term by the member departments of the respective region at an annual meeting of the Committee. Regional Representatives will have staggered terms with one Representative's term beginning at the annual meeting each year. Delegates from the region electing the Representative will convene at the annual meeting to consider the nominees for Regional Representative. The candidates will have an opportunity to address the group and an electronic ballot will be cast to elect the Representative. A simple majority of the delegates from the region in attendance at the annual meeting will determine the successful candidate. Rotation for elections to the SC as Regional Representative will begin as follows:

- 2019 – Region 4 (Western)
- 2020 – Region 3 (Mid America)
- 2021– Region 1 (Northeast)
- 2022 – Region 2 (Southeast)

If a vacancy occurs between the annual meeting dates, the Committee Chair will have the authority to appoint an Interim Representative to the SC from the Region where the vacancy occurs. The Interim Representative will serve the remaining portion of the term of the elected Representative who vacated the position.

Regional Representatives may be elected to two consecutive four year terms on the SC. The second term shall be extended by the Steering Committee members. A Regional Representative appointed to fill a vacancy by the Committee Chair as

described above may be elected to an additional four year term. The elected term may be consecutive to the expiration of the appointment.

### 2.3.2 Membership

The Vice-Chair of the NTPEP Committee will chair the SC. In addition to the SC chair, the committee will include the NTPEP Committee Chair and Regional Representatives from each of the four AASHTO regions. When the SC sits as the Appeals Board, the Chair of the NTPEP Committee will chair the Board.

### 2.3.3 Appeals Board

The Appeals Board provides mediation for any disputes that arise between Manufacturers or Suppliers and the respective Technical Committee if the dispute cannot be resolved between the Manufacturer and said committee. Decisions made by this board will be considered final. Refer to Appendix C for additional details regarding the Appeals Process.

## 2.4 Technical Committees

The Technical Committee (TC) develops a project work plan and provides oversight and guidance throughout the evaluation process. The TC develops the evaluation procedures, identifies evaluation locations, and chooses the agencies, whether they be a DOT, state transportation agency, a private lab, or a consultant, to perform the evaluations.

### 2.4.1 Membership

TC membership will consist of member agency personnel, industry personnel who have an interest in the subject and background knowledge of the committee subject matter, and a representative from each laboratory that conducts evaluations for that specific technical committee. A TC may also include individuals with special expertise in the subject area who, in the opinion of the technical committee chair, NTPEP Committee Chair and the NTPEP Program Manager enhance the work of the committee. TC membership is open to all member agencies and representatives from participating companies in the relevant industry. The only members eligible to vote are the member state agency personnel. A list of the Technical Committees and their scopes is provided in Appendix D.

### 2.4.2 Technical Committee Chair

Each TC will have a chair appointed by the NTPEP Committee Chair. The TC chair will lead the TC meetings and will serve as the principal contact and spokesperson for the TC. The TC chair is responsible for the overall quality and timely delivery of work produced by the TC. No individual may serve as TC chair of more than one TC. On occasion, the Program Manager and Steering Committee have the flexibility to appoint someone until a viable Chair is identified.

### 2.4.3 Technical Committee Vice-Chair

Each TC will have a Vice-Chair appointed by the NTPEP Committee Chair. The TC Vice-Chair will lead the TC meeting in the absence of the TC Chair and will otherwise provide assistance in the operation of the TC. No individual may serve as TC Vice-Chair of more than two TCs. On occasion, the Program Manager and Steering Committee have the flexibility to appoint someone until a viable Vice-Chair is identified.

### 2.4.4 Responsibilities of TC Officers and Members

The TC Chair and Vice-Chair will know the TC's purpose, draft and prepare meeting agendas, draft TC documents, including but not limited to: Work Plans, User Guides, and Technical Memoranda, delegate TC tasks to members when appropriate, facilitate discussion during the teleconference and in-person meetings. Additionally, the TC chair and vice-chair are responsible for overseeing the release of evaluation data and audit reports and the resolution of any technical disputes that may arise.

The TC members will provide technical assistance and guidance as requested, input during discussion, and fulfill document review in a timely manner.

The TC chair, vice-chairs, and members will contribute to the effort required to accomplish committee's objectives and actively attend and participate during the teleconference and in-person meetings.

### 2.4.5 Member Agencies

The TC will strive to include at least one member from each of the four AASHTO regions and any state under contract to perform testing for the TC. If a member agency is represented by more than one person per TC, the agency will designate a single voting member for the TC.

### 2.4.6 Industry Representatives

Representatives of industry providing products evaluated by the TC may be an industry representative of the TC. Such participants serve as non-voting members. The TC chair may direct the industry representatives to designate a single representative that will provide one voice for industry concerns and issues to the TC during the annual meeting. Industry participation will be generated through cooperative agreements between AASHTO and industry associations. Each TC is only allowed to have up to two industry representatives.

### 2.4.7 Meetings

Each TC will have their session at the annual meeting, if they choose to not conduct a webinar prior to the meeting. Each TC will have a minimum of two

conference calls annually. The NTPEP Liaison will schedule and host the conference calls and the particular TC chair will moderate them.

#### 2.4.8 Participation

Attendance by all members at the annually scheduled meeting is especially important to accomplish the work of these committees. Acceptance of membership on one of these committees implies recognition of the value of its work, and a willingness and commitment to make every effort to attend these meetings. Recognizing that agency travel restrictions may prohibit attendance at annual meetings, other means of participation by the members for conference calls, document review and responding to ballots provides a valued contribution to the work of the TC.

#### 2.4.9 Technical Committee Documents and Responsibilities

Below is a brief overview of the documents and responsibilities with which TC committees are charged. Every TC will have a Work Plan that is reviewed annually. The TC will coordinate sampling, testing and audit procedures as well as ensure data is reported for their specific TC.

##### 2.4.9.1 Work Plans

When notified by the NTPEP Program Manager or Staff Liaison that proposals for emerging Technical Committees have been approved, the TC will finalize the work plan. The work plan specifies the procedure used by contracting agencies (public or private entities) to perform NTPEP product evaluations. The project work plan becomes a part of the contract between AASHTO and the contracting agency. The technical committee develops the work plan, with input from the member agencies and industry representatives on the TC. While industry may provide input, only the member agencies will be able to vote on these documents. The work plan clearly defines the product and its possible applications for highway and transportation department use.

Specific dates or other information that would force frequent revision of the document will not be included in the work plan. All referenced time schedules will be in general terms that do not require revision based on yearly calendar changes. An exception to this rule is that referenced standard test methods will contain the year if a TC is using a previous version of the AASHTO or ASTM standard (i.e. T 89-15, M 256-16, etc.) to preclude confusion over what method is specified for the NTPEP evaluation. If the TC is using the current version of the AASHTO or ASTM standard, then the year will not be referenced in the TC work plan. Every year, the TC will review referenced standard methods to determine whether or not these methods have changes.

When a work plan is updated beyond editorial revisions, there is a 3 step process to be followed for approval of the revised document.

1. The NTPEP Program Manager or Staff Liaison for the TC will review the work plan to verify the practices that are required of all work plans are included and consistent with established policies as stated in this document. Rather than restating policies that are described in this guide, work plans shall reference the appropriate section of this document. If the NTPEP staff and the TC Chair cannot resolve deviations from policy, the work plan will be referred to the SC for review and decision. The SC may determine that the deviation is appropriate. If so they will ballot a change to the affected policy with the Committee. Conversely, they may find corrections to the work plan are needed and suggest revisions to the TC Chair to bring it in conformance with existing policy. The decision of the SC will be final.
2. After comment/review, the draft work plan will be edited by the TC chair. The work plan revision will then be balloted through a meeting or electronic ballot by the entire TC. The TC will determine if comments received from balloting are technical changes or editorial changes. Negatives received will be voted on by the TC as persuasive, non-persuasive or non-related. Negatives that are found persuasive will be addressed. Any technical revisions due to comments or resolved negatives will require the work plan to be balloted a second time.
3. After the TC approves the work plan, a copy will be submitted to the NTPEP Program Manager and Staff Liaison. The NTPEP Program Manager will submit any new work plan and/or any work plan deemed by the TC Chair to have significant modifications for balloting and approval by the entire NTPEP Committee. Negatives and comments from the full Committee vote will be returned to the TC Chair for resolution as detailed in the section above. Any technical revisions due to comments or resolved negatives will require the work plan to be balloted a second time. Work plan approval is defined by electronic or voice ballot with two-thirds of the voting members responding and a majority responding affirmatively.

#### 2.4.9.2 Product Sampling & Shipping Requirements

The project work plan will stipulate that manufacturers will provide products, representative of the normal production process, in the quantities specified, at no cost to the program, and may be selected by a NTPEP representative from existing stock. The manufacturer is responsible for notifying the TC Chair regarding the location(s) of the materials to be sampled and providing the correct contact information for obtaining the samples.

Products may not be shipped to the test state or authorized testing facility until authorized by the NTPEP Liaison/TC Chair. The manufacturers will submit a completed electronic application (eAPP) to NTPEP.

Once the eAPP is accepted by the NTPEP Liaison, DataMine will email the information to the appropriate TC Chair, who will then become responsible for notifying the manufacturer that the product has been accepted for testing and providing payment instructions. When payment for the evaluation has been confirmed as received in DataMine, the TC chair or testing facility will notify the manufacturer when and where to ship the product for testing unless the TC requires the materials to be sampled in the presence of a DOT representative.

If the work plan requires the materials to be sampled at the manufacturing location in the presence of a DOT representative; the NTPEP Staff will contact the voting member of the state in which the product is to be sampled. The voting member will arrange for appropriate personnel to be present during the sampling process.

#### 2.4.9.3 Scheduling of Testing and Timely Release of Data

The AASHTO staff liaison assigned to the TC will review the work plan and the TC testing schedule. The staff liaison will periodically request schedule updates from the test state or authorized testing facility to track the progress of the product evaluation. The TC or designee will review the test reports for quality of the data contained in the report. Each work plan will contain a timeline for review and release of the test or audit information to the manufacturer.

Testing facilities failing to test and release data in a timely and satisfactory manner will have their termination of agreement contract clause enforced if the matter is not expediently resolved.

#### 2.4.9.4 Reports

Status reports, final reports, and other information required by each work plan will be produced timely and accurately, proceeding through the Quality Assurance process set forth by the committee. Reports will be generated within DataMine. Audit reports will be posted to DataMine by the NTPEP Auditors. If applicable, the test state will upload any data generated into DataMine and notify the Lead State that the data is ready for review. Following Lead State review and approval, the data is released to the manufacturer. Upon review and approval from industry, the data will then be released to the public. Release of data prior to the publication of the final report or public release of uploaded data will be in accordance with those policies stated in Appendix E.

Reports do not provide parameters or specifications for acceptance or rejection of a product. They will provide an objective evaluation and reporting of data obtained from the testing or audit that has been performed. The report may cite product compliance with the work plan requirements.

#### 2.4.9.5 Approval of Reports

The TC will approve the report. Reports will be made available electronically on the NTPEP DataMine website with an announcement provided to all participating member departments and upon request, to AASHTO committees, FHWA and the Transportation Research Board. NTPEP will utilize DataMine to electronically distribute reports/data to all manufacturers who participate in the program. The NTPEP Program Manager may also elect to provide reports to others not affiliated with AASHTO, such as cities and counties, and may establish subscription fees or other appropriate charges for such distribution.

#### 2.4.9.6 Appeals

If a manufacturer/supplier disagrees with the actual test or audit results shown in a report, the manufacturer should refer to the review process covered in Appendix E. If the disagreement cannot be resolved through the TC Chair the dispute may be referred to the Appeals Board for final decision.

When data is in the appeal process, a note will be entered into the electronic report indicating that the data is “on hold”. The appeal will not delay public release of other data in the report. Upon completion of the appeal process, data will then be reported in accordance with the policy and procedure of the technical committee for that specific product. (For details regarding the Appeals Board Process please see Appendix C)

#### 2.4.9.7 Responding to Inquiries

When the TC is presented with questions and concerns from manufacturers, testing facilities, and other sources, the TC liaison shall present the question to the Chair and Vice-Chair for their consideration on the matter. Depending on the complexity of the issue, the Chair and/or Vice-Chair may decide to handle the matter immediately, or they may consult with other members of the TC for further guidance on an issue. During the TC’s quarterly meetings, the liaison will ensure that all major inquiries are presented to the members of the TC along with any information regarding how the inquiry was resolved. Members shall be given an opportunity to discuss each item, and ask questions pertaining to the matter or the resolution of that matter.

Some inquiries and issues that are presented to the Chair and Vice-Chair may involve proprietary information. In cases where such sensitive information is involved, the Chair and/or Vice-Chair will present that information to the NTPEP Steering Committee before disseminating it to the technical committee. The NTPEP Steering Committee will then help the Chair and/or Vice-Chair determine whether the information should be held as confidential, or if it can be released to the other members of the technical committee.

When the Chair and/or the Vice-Chair determine that the TC should be involved directly with a decision on a particular inquiry, then the matter shall be deliberated upon and put to a vote. Any member of the TC may join in the deliberation, but only voting members will be allowed to vote on a resolution, however. In order to pass or reject a proposed resolution, a simple majority vote will carry the decision.

## **2.5 APEL**

The AASHTO Product Evaluation List, APEL, was created as a program for member departments to use innovative and proprietary transportation products that are in compliance with 23 CFR 635.411 (a)(2) through the exchange of state DOT product certifications, evaluations, and AASHTO-coordinated accelerated laboratory testing. The listing serves to eliminate duplication of testing by the states and duplication of effort by the manufacturers providing products for evaluation.

APEL is steered by the APEL Task Force and operates under NTPEP receiving oversight from the NTPEP Steering Committee.

### **2.5.1 APEL Task Force**

APEL is comprised of the APEL Liaison, APEL Chair, and APEL Regional Representatives.

#### **2.5.1.1 APEL Task Force Chair**

The NTPEP Chair shall appoint the APEL Chair, an agency Chief Materials Engineer. The APEL Chair provides leadership to the APEL Task Force by chairing the meetings and making decisions in the best interest of APEL. The Chair will work in unison with the Regional Representatives to make determinations on product submittals, and drafts a letter of final judgment to manufacturers. The APEL Chair serves on the NTPEP Steering Committee.

#### **2.5.1.2 APEL Task Force Regional Representative**

There will be at least one Regional Representative on the APEL Task Force from each region of the Association. The Representatives will conduct initial determinations of acceptance for product submittals, followed by a detailed review for those products which are accepted. Working with the APEL Chair, the Representatives will provide guidelines for the development of an evaluation protocol.

#### **2.5.1.3 APEL Task Force Decisions**

The APEL Task Force makes all decisions with respect to the product review process. The APEL Task Force must decide whether or not to proceed with a product evaluation based on the information listed on the product's application, and the interests of the states. Only products that fit within the scope of APEL will be given a decision to proceed. The application form is standard for all products



and is designed to capture important product information relevant to the decision by the APEL Task Force. Upon review of a product's application, the APEL Task Force will decide how to proceed based on the areas of interests important to the states. Examples of these areas include, but are not limited to, quality, practicality, cost effectiveness, environmental, sustainability, and level of interest from the states.

#### 2.5.1.4 APEL Task Force Meetings

The APEL Task Force meets at a minimum of once a month on the last Wednesday of every month via teleconference. In addition, the APEL Task Force meets in person at the annual NTPEP meeting.

#### 2.5.1.5 Communication with the APEL Task Force or Laboratory

All communication should go through the APEL liaison in order to properly document any and all information exchanged for later review by the APEL Task Force.

#### 2.5.1.6 State Product Coordinators

Data generated through a product evaluation shall be made available to the State Product Coordinators to determine whether a product may be granted provisional status on a State DOT's Qualified Product List (QPL). Should the circumstance arise that a state has previously conducted a product evaluation the manufacturer may submit a request through APEL for the State Product Coordinator to post the certification and/or report generated from the evaluation.

### 2.5.2 APEL Website

The APEL website is intended to house new and innovative products or materials, old products or materials for new applications, or products that while scientifically vetted face implementation obstacles due to lack of specifications, experience, knowledge, or guidelines among AASHTO members. In addition, products that lack acceptance due to competitive dominance of other more traditional products or materials among the AASHTO members can also be incorporated.

#### 2.5.2.1 Applicability

The APEL website is not intended for materials or products whose basic properties are under research, not ready to implement in the field, or where specifications already exist among the AASHTO members or other sources like ASTM or ACI.

### 2.5.3 APEL Evaluation Review Process

The APEL process consists of four stages all reviewed and approved by the APEL Task Force. Refer to Appendix I for flowchart of process.

1. Initial product evaluation request

2. Detailed product evaluation application submittal and processing
3. Posting of evaluation data
4. Product certification request

If a state DOT has already performed an independent review process, steps 1-3 can be skipped, enhanced, or performed again at either the APEL Task Force's request or the vendor's needs.

#### 2.5.3.1 Stage 1: Initial Product Evaluation Request

Vendor submits a request to APEL for consideration of their product or material to be evaluated for possible inclusion into the APEL listing. The APEL Liaison reviews the applications and decides if the product fails to meet the basic acceptance criteria described above. If the product doesn't meet, the vendor is notified and encouraged to follow other means more appropriate for their product. Please note that the coordinator does not decide whether to test the product or not; the coordinator makes sure the products that go in front of the APEL Task Force meet the scope of APEL.

If the product meets, the coordinator forwards the evaluation request to the APEL Task Force for review and discussion on the next scheduled teleconference. The APEL Task Force then decides if the product moves to stage 2. There are specific documents, requirements and financial obligations from the vendor at this point if a decision is made to move ahead to stage 2.

#### 2.5.3.2 Stage 2: Detail Product Evaluation Application Submittal and Processing

Once the detailed product application and fees have been received, the coordinator reviews for completeness and forwards the request to the APEL Task Force for review and discussion at the next teleconference. The APEL Task Force reviews the application and provides basic direction to the liaison if further questions or information are required, how to proceed in the evaluation of the product, basic variables of interest, laboratory to use, types and duration of tests, etc.

With all the relevant details of the test program identified, the liaison communicates with the laboratory to describe the testing guidelines and obtain a scope of work and cost estimate for testing based on the decisions of the APEL Task Force. Aside from the cost estimate, the laboratory provides a detailed breakdown as to what the test regimen entails and the cost of either individual tests or a wholesale value for the entire evaluation. The estimate of cost is given to the vendor in order to provide an opportunity to decide if proceeding with the evaluation is in their best interest. If the vendor confirms participation and payment, the laboratory is asked to proceed. The laboratory may at this point contact the vendor to acquire an appropriate number of product samples. The laboratory then conducts testing.

#### 2.5.3.3 Stage 3: Posting of Evaluation Data

When the report is received from the testing lab, the results are reviewed by the APEL Liaison for proper content and formatting, and then the report is forwarded to the vendor. The vendor then has the opportunity to decide if they wish to publish the data. If they wish to publish the data, the test report becomes available for review and use by state product coordinators.

#### 2.5.3.4 Stage 4: Product Certification Request

When a state has previously conducted testing on a vendor's product and certified it for use, the state may post their certificate as well as the resulting data at any time. If a state has not posted evaluation data, a vendor may submit a request through the APEL module to have the state product coordinator post their certificate to the site.

The APEL Task Force or state product coordinators that review this data may request additional testing or new evaluations to be completed in case the previous data/evaluation do not meet their required acceptance criteria.

### **3.0 ANNUAL NTPEP PROGRAM MANAGEMENT**

#### 3.1 Review and Assessment

Every year, the NTPEP Committee will determine program direction. The Committee will review the activity of current TCs and evaluate proposals for the formation of new TCs and products for evaluation within the NTPEP structure for the coming year.

#### 3.2 NTPEP Annual Meeting

At the annual meeting, the NTPEP Committee will review and approve a proposed annual testing program for the ensuing year, develop a budget supporting the testing to be completed and consider any resolutions brought before the committee.

##### 3.2.1 NTPEP Program Report

The NTPEP Program Manager will provide the annual budget report to the NTPEP Steering Committee each year. The budget report will show the previous fiscal years receipts and expenditures and provide an update regarding the number of products that were submitted for evaluation and the number of manufacturing processes that were audited as part of the program.

##### 3.2.2 Resolutions

The NTPEP Committee may adopt resolutions to request actions from the Council on Highways and Streets, the AASHTO Board, or other subcommittees, or to establish general policies for NTPEP. Proposed resolutions will be submitted to the Steering Committee in writing prior to, or at, the annual meeting. A resolution

must be approved, by electronic or voice ballot, by two-thirds of the voting members. The NTPEP Program Manager will record approved resolutions in the minutes and forward each to the appropriate recipient.

### 3.2.3 Sponsorship

Sponsorship dollars and in-kind contributions for NTPEP meetings, if any, are to be obtained in a manner that conforms to Section 4 of the AASHTO Bylaws, Board of Directors Operating Policy. These contributions will only be used to directly offset the cost of the opening NTPEP reception, the actual NTPEP annual meeting, including the meals served as part of the NTPEP meeting, the morning and afternoon breaks associated with the NTPEP meeting, the Technical Tour (if applicable), the NTPEP dinner, and all related activities that are published in the meeting's official agenda. With the exception of displays, hospitality suites are not desired and industry associations and companies are discouraged from sponsoring such activities.

The annual meeting can be sponsored in three ways:

#### 1) Tiered sponsorships

Approval for tiered sponsorships will be made by AASHTO and the Host State. Tiered sponsorship will be displayed at the following levels; Platinum, Gold, Silver, and Bronze. Contribution levels and manners of recognitions of sponsors will be determined by AASHTO in conjunction with the Steering Committee and Host State.

#### 2) Event sponsorships

Approval for event sponsorships will be made by AASHTO and the Host State. Event sponsorships are used to offset costs for the sponsored event. An entity sponsoring a specific event that wishes to contribute an amount larger than the cost of the event will have their contribution that exceeds the cost of the sponsored event recognized at the appropriate tiered sponsorship level. Sponsor recognition (displays, placards, etc.) at an event will be approved by AASHTO, the Host State, and the Steering Committee.

#### 3) Exhibitor Opportunities

NTPEP industry participants may choose to be an exhibitor at each Annual NTPEP Meeting. The details for the exhibitor opportunities are listed in the registration website for the Meeting.

### 3.3 New Products' Categories for Evaluation and Assessment of Existing Technical Committees

Participating states, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), or industry may submit candidate product categories for formation of new Technical Committees or addition to an existing Technical Committee. All submissions must include the expected scope of the test project accompanied by a statement of expected benefits and estimated costs. Any available documentation indicating the need of the new test project by the AASHTO members will be included. Every existing Technical Committee will undergo an annual assessment to evaluate the sustainability and value for states and participating manufacturers. The detailed procedure for submittal of a new product category and assessment of existing TCs under NTPEP is defined in Appendix F.

### 3.4 Research Needs


Members are encouraged to submit materials-related research needs for NTPEP endorsement for inclusion in NCHRP and other research programs. Research needs statements will be submitted to the appropriate TC chair prior to, or at the annual meeting for TC endorsement. Following the meeting, the TC Chair forwards endorsed statements to the NTPEP Program Manager for consideration. Product test data will be made available for research upon request and approval by the SC.

## **APPENDICES AND ANNEXES**


Appendix A:	AASHTO Organizational Charts
Appendix B:	AASHTO Regions
Appendix C:	Appeals Board Process
Appendix D:	Technical Committee Scopes
Appendix E:	Established NTPEP Policies
Appendix F:	Introduction & Development of a New Product Category and Assessment of Existing TCs
Appendix G:	Standard Operating Procedure for Receiving and Distributing Research Proposals
Appendix H:	General Terms and Conditions
Appendix I:	APEL Evaluation Review Process Flowchart
Annex I:	Defining “Retest” Requirement and Recommended “Re-evaluation”
Annex II:	Manufacturer Request to Visit Field Site or Test Deck
Annex III:	NTPEP Succession Plan

Appendix A: AASHTO Organizational Charts

# Committee Structure



## Appendix B: AASHTO Regions



### **Region 1 – Northeastern Association of State Transportation Officials (NASTO):**

Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico

### **Region 2 – Southeastern Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (SASHTO):**

Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia

### **Region 3 – Mid America Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (MAASHTO):**

Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin

### **Region 4 – Western Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (WASHTO):**

Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wyoming



## Appendix C: Appeals Board Process

The Appeals Board functions as a point of mediation for any disputes that arise between Manufacturer or Suppliers and the respective Technical Committee if the dispute cannot be resolved between the Manufacturer and said committee. The Appeals Board is comprised of the Vice Chair of the NTPEP Committee, and the Regional Representatives (one each from the four AASHTO Regions). The Appeals Board will be chaired by the Chair of the NTPEP Committee. Decisions made by this board will be considered final.

When a Manufacturer or Supplier disagrees with reporting or data generated for products that they have submitted through Technical Committee for evaluation, the steps detailed below shall be followed for resolution:

1. Provide the TC Chair a written request to review the data or consider revision to the reported values. The request must contain justification related to the specific product that has been submitted.
2. The TC Chair will review the request and make a decision regarding the validity of the request for revision to the reported values.
3. If the TC Chair determines the request to be valid, the Chair will notify the data reporting entity and request either a reevaluation of the product or a change to the data.
4. If the TC Chair does not find the request to be valid, the Chair will notify the Manufacturer that the request has been denied.
5. If the Manufacturer considers the issue unresolved after working with the TC Chair, the Manufacturer may request the matter to be taken before the Appeals Board as described above.
6. The appeal will not delay public release of other data in a report. The data in question will be reported as “on hold” while the appeal is in process.
7. The Appeals Board will convene and review the information provided by the Manufacturer and the TC Chair.
  - a. The Board may request additional information from the Manufacturer representative or the TC Chair.
  - b. The Appeals Board may request that the Manufacturer representative and the TC Chair appear before the board to discuss the issues of the appeal.
8. The Appeals Board decision regarding the issue will be considered final.

## **Appendix D: Technical Committee Scopes**

### **Technical Committees:**

#### **1. Asphalt Release Agents (ARA)**

The Asphalt Release Agents Technical Committee facilitates the laboratory evaluation of liquid based, non-solvent release agents for hot mix asphaltic concrete.

#### **2. Concrete Admixtures (CADD)**

The Concrete Admixtures Technical Committee facilitates the evaluation of liquid admixtures for modifying properties of concrete utilized in highway construction.

#### **3. Concrete Curing Compounds (CCC)**

The Concrete Curing Compounds Technical Committee facilitates the laboratory evaluation of liquid membrane-forming compounds utilized in the curing of concrete surfaces in highway construction.

#### **4. Crack Sealers and Joint Sealants (CS & JS)**

The Crack Sealer and Joint Sealant Technical Committee facilitates the laboratory and field evaluation of crack sealer and joint sealant materials. The specific products evaluated are hot poured crack sealers and hot poured and cold applied chemically cured joint sealants.

#### **5. Detectable Warning Systems (DWS)**

The Detectable Warning Systems Technical Committee facilitates the laboratory performance evaluation of these products using a simulated weathering exposure. The general product categories include Cast-in-place (wet concrete with mechanical anchors), surface applied (adhesive bonded). Surface applied single dome, and Integral (brick pavers and similar devices). The laboratory evaluation includes a battery of laboratory performance tests to evaluate the conformance of devices to Americans with Disabilities Act and Architectural Barrier Accessibility Guidelines and to predict field performance.

#### **6. Elastomeric Bridge Bearing Pads (EBB)**

The purpose of the program is to establish a list of Manufacturers and products that conform to the quality control and product testing requirements of this program. AASHTO member departments can then use this information in their quality assurance program for Manufacturer/product acceptance. This may include

utilizing this information to establish a qualified Manufacturer list, a qualified products list, or both. By participating in this program, the Manufacturer agrees to produce product that meets or exceeds the requirements in AASHTO M251 and the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Construction Specifications, Section 18 and follow the minimum quality control provisions of their Quality Program.

## **7. Epoxy and Resin Based Adhesive Bonding Systems (ERB)**

This evaluation program utilizes laboratory tests to determine properties and evaluate the performance of adhesives for concrete. This work-plan is intended to assess resin adhesive systems that are not intended for sustained load applications; for example, dowel connections in concrete pavement slab replacements, and jointing epoxies of precast segments for segmental bridges.

## **8. Erosion Control Product (ECP)**

The Erosion Control Products Technical Committee facilitates the evaluation of products which reduce the erosion of soil. The tests follow protocols originally developed under the guidance of the Erosion Control Technical Committee (ECTC). These standards developed by ECTC are now ASTM standards. The tests serve to evaluate the products effectiveness at reducing soil loss from rainfall-induced erosion on a simulated slope and soil loss from shear forces in a simulated channel. In addition, the germination test shows the products ability to enhance or impede vegetation germination and growth. Complementing these tests is a battery of index value tests documenting the physical properties of the products.

## **9. Geosynthetics (GTX & REGEO)**

The Geosynthetics Technical Committee facilitates the evaluation of geotextiles and geosynthetic reinforcement as used in applications which include subsurface drainage, separation, stabilization, temporary erosion control (e.g., silt fences), permanent erosion control, paving, geosynthetic reinforced soil walls, geosynthetic reinforced slopes, embankment base reinforcement, and pavement subgrade reinforcement. These evaluations are conducted through two independent testing programs, Geotextiles and Geosynthetic Reinforcement (GTX and REGEO).

**Geotextiles:** This evaluation is targeted to provide the test data needed to assess geotextile products in accordance with AASHTO M 288. NTPEP also requires private labelers, convertors, and prime manufacturers to be audited. During each audit, the products are sampled for testing.

**Geosynthetic Reinforcement:** This evaluation is conducted in accordance with WSDOT Standard Practice T925, which uses a number of ASTM, ISO, and other test standards as part of its evaluation protocol to assess the long-term strength and stiffness of geosynthetic reinforcement products (e.g., geogrids, geotextiles, and polymer straps), including field and laboratory evaluation of installation damage effects, laboratory creep testing, and chemical durability testing (including typical in ground chemical and moisture conditions and UV stability).

Data produced through these evaluations can also be used as input for reinforced soil structure design.

NTPEP also requires prime manufacturers of geosynthetic reinforcement products to be audited. During each audit, the products are sampled for testing.

### **10. Guardrail/Guiderail (GRL)**

The purpose of this program is to establish a list of Manufacturers and products that conform to the various requirements of the Guardrail Work Plan and who successfully pass their NTPEP audit each year. AASHTO member departments can then use this information in their quality assurance program for Manufacturer/product acceptance. This may include utilizing this information to establish a qualified Manufacturer list, a qualified products list, or both. By participating in this program, the Manufacturer agrees to produce product that meets or exceeds the requirements in AASHTO M 180 and M 30 as well as other AASHTO/ASTM designated standards and follow the minimum quality control provisions of the program.

### **11. Pavement Marking Materials (PMM)**

The Pavement Marking Materials Technical Committee facilitates the laboratory and field performance evaluation of these products in various climatic regions in the United States. The general product categories include traffic paint (standard and thick-film varieties), thermoplastics (extrude, spray and preformed), cold tape (temporary and permanent) and multi-component materials (epoxies, polyesters, polyureas, MMAs, etc.). The field evaluations expose the markings to traffic and weather conditions that may be experienced in a standard installation in a representative climatic region. The laboratory evaluation includes a battery of performance and compositional tests specific to each general category of pavement markings.

### **12. Spray Applied Non-Structural Pipe Liners (SAPL)**

Cementitious and resin based spray products are evaluated on a rolling submission cycle. These products are evaluated and laboratory tested by a NTPEP contracted laboratory.

### **13. High Friction and Thin Overlays (HFTO)**

The High Friction and Thin Overlays Technical Committee facilitates the laboratory and field evaluation of high friction and thin overlays. This program consists of a battery of laboratory evaluations and 36 month field evaluation. Field test sites will be selected on asphalt pavement, concrete pavement, and concrete bridge deck. These evaluations are intended to assess the product adhesion properties and any improved skid resistance of the applied products.

#### **14. Portable Changeable Message Signs and Flashing Arrow Panels (PCMS & FAP)**

The Portable Changeable Message Signs (PCMS) and Flashing Arrow Panels (FAP) Technical Committee facilitates the evaluation and field performance of these trailer mounted products utilized for the temporary control and management of vehicular traffic on State and local highways. General product categories for PCMS include a standard 3-line, 8-characters per line display consisting of either a character-matrix, line-matrix or full-matrix message board. FAP (arrow boards) consists of either a 15 or 25 LED lamp board that can display right/left arrows, chevrons and caution indications. Testing of both PCMS and FAP include the following three areas: a performance test for evaluating the functional operation of the sign; a field test for evaluating the visibility, legibility and angularity of the message display; and a shutdown test for evaluating the capacity of the battery bank.

#### **15. Raised Pavement Markers and Snow Plowable Raised Pavement Markers (RPM & SRPM)**

The Raised Pavement Marker and Snow Plowable Raised Pavement Marker Technical Committee facilitates the laboratory and field evaluation of raised pavement markers. For non-plowable RPM's the case and lens are evaluated. For plowable RPM's the casting and lens are evaluated. In addition, this committee evaluates Temporary RPM's, Temporary Chip Seal RPM's, and Adhesives used to secure non-plowable RPM's. The field evaluations expose the markers to traffic and weather conditions that may be experienced in a standard installation.

#### **16. Rapid Set Concrete Patching (RSCP)**

The Rapid Set Concrete Patching Technical Committee facilitates the laboratory and field evaluation of cementitious, polymer, and polymer modified rapid setting concrete patching materials. Products are evaluated for two years consisting of laboratory testing the first year and field performance evaluations the first and second years.

#### **17. Reinforcing Steel (REBAR) & Welded Wire Reinforcement (WWR)**

The Reinforcing Steel Technical Committee manages the audit program for mills that produce reinforcing steel bar and wire fabric for concrete reinforcement used in transportation facilities. The program includes a review of the mill's quality system and testing procedures, and an on-site audit which reviews records and mill test reports, production of steel, materials traceability, and material testing of select samples. The program also includes comparison sample testing performed by a NTPEP designated laboratory. Audits are conducted annually to determine whether the producing mill has the capabilities to consistently meet the specification requirements (AASHTO/ASTM) for the bar product being produced.

## **18. Protective Coatings (SSC & CCS)**

The Protective Coatings Technical Committee facilitates the laboratory and field evaluation of protective coatings for structural steel and concrete. The evaluation of structural steel is performed in accordance with the testing procedures designated in AASHTO Reference Standard R 31, 'Evaluation of Protective Coatings Systems for Structural Steel'. Standardized testing procedures provide analytical characterization data and evaluate the performance of coating systems through accelerated weathering and 2-year atmospheric exposure testing.

## **19. Sign Sheeting Materials/Roll Up Signing Materials (SSM/RUP)**

The Sign Sheeting Materials Technical Committee facilitates the laboratory and field evaluation of sign sheeting material and roll up signing materials. Field test sites which expose the material for up to three years are located in various climatic regions of the country.

## **20. Temporary Traffic Control Devices (TTCD)**

The Temporary Traffic Control Devices Technical Committee facilitates laboratory and field evaluation of flexible delineators and drums. Field conditions are utilized to represent hot summer conditions as well as cold winter conditions.

## **21. Thermoplastic Pipe (TPP)**

The Thermoplastic Pipe Technical Committee manages the audit program for facilities that produce thermoplastic pipe in one of the product areas listed below. Audits are conducted by NTPEP manufacturing auditors and the results are published on the NTPEP DataMine website. The Thermoplastic Pipe Committee encompasses three product areas: Corrugated High Density Polyethylene (HDPE) Pipe, Profile Wall Polyvinyl Chloride (PVC) Pipe and Corrugated Polypropylene Pipe (PPP).

## **22. Warm Mix Additives (WMA)**

The intent of the NTPEP Warm Mix Technologies program is to evaluate the various Warm Mix Asphalt products (additives) and technologies (foaming and other processes) being used to ensure they meet the performance standards of a normal Hot Mix Asphalt. By evaluating changes in the asphalt binder, volumetric properties of the mix, and performance test results, we are able to compare the Warm Mix to the standard baseline mix. The goal is to verify that the warm mix performs as well as or better than the baseline standard mix.

## Appendix E: Established NTPEP Policies

### Policy for Automatic Release of Data in DataMine

- Once a lead state reviews/releases data in DataMine, each manufacturer will receive an email notification to let them know data is available for review and release in DataMine. The email notification will state the manufacturer has 30 calendar days to review and release the data. If a manufacturer does not respond and release the data within 30 calendar days, the data will be automatically released to the public by the DataMine system. When this occurs there will be an automated notice from the system indicating that Data has been released by AASHTO.
- If a manufacturer has a technical question about reported data values, they will need to provide a detailed query specifically detailing the issue and basis for their concern in the comment box, on the data release page along with an email notification to the NTPEP Liaison and the Lead State. Once the manufacturer provides this detail through DataMine, the Lead State, AASHTO and the test facility will also be notified automatically. The Lead State will need to put the data for the product back “on hold” at this point. The correspondence will serve as notice to interrupt the 30 day automatic release function.
- The manufacturer must work with the Lead State to resolve the issue. A minimum fee of \$500 or the actual cost of the retest (whichever is greater) will be assessed to the manufacturer if the data query requires test verification or retest of a product. If the manufacturer questions the validity of the data, then they must send an email to the NTPEP Program Manager and the lead state. The lead state will put the product on Hold and initiate the Review/Retest. Once the review is complete, AASHTO and the TC Chairman will decide if the review/retest showed errors in testing. If errors were found, they will be corrected and the manufacturer will not be charged. If no errors were found, the original data will remain and the manufacturer will be charged \$500 per sample number being reviewed/retested, or the actual cost of the retest. If the test validates the manufacturer's concern the fee will be refunded in full. If the original values are validated by the test facility, the fees will be used to compensate the test facility for the additional work.
- Once the issue is resolved; the manufacturer will be given the option of releasing their data to the public or restricting the data to registered state users. At this point the data will be moved directly from ‘On Hold’ Status to the final status of ‘Public’, or ‘Restricted’ based on the final decision, which will be made between the manufacturer and the TC Chair. Note: The email notifications are sent to the manufacturer representative who submitted the electronic product evaluation form through the NTPEP DataMine website. When a product is restricted, all collected data will be

viewable only by registered state users and no longer available to the public.



## **POLICY FOR WITHDRAWING MATERIALS FROM NTPEP EVALUATIONS**

If a manufacturer chooses to withdraw a product from NTPEP after it has been accepted by the NTPEP staff, they need to provide a written request (email) to the NTPEP Program Manager. If adequate, the product will then be withdrawn in DataMine. If data has already been collected (including the data at the point of withdrawal) for this product, this data will then become restricted (shown in blue font which will remain viewable to the submitting manufacturer and all registered state users). Once a product is withdrawn, no additional data will be collected or reported for the purposes of this program. A written request (email) to withdraw the Product Evaluation Form must be received by the NTPEP Program Manager at least five business days before the testing is to begin in order to receive a partial refund. When a field test is performed, the beginning of testing is taken as the scheduled application date. When laboratory tests only are performed, the beginning of testing is taken as the date products are sampled or sent to the testing laboratory. A handling fee of ten (10) percent of the testing fee or \$1000, whichever is less, will be charged in this event. Testing fees will not be refunded after this deadline. Results obtained up until the time of withdrawal will only be available to registered state users.

## **POLICY FOR ACCESSING ARCHIVED DATA IN DATAMINE**

If a manufacturer is interested in accessing archived data for a product, he or she needs to provide a written request (email) to the NTPEP Program Manager. If adequate, an invoice will be generated in the amount of \$100/product and sent to the individual who requests access to the archived data. Once AASHTO receives payment for the invoice, the NTPEP Program Manager will provide the archived data for each product the manufacturer is requesting.

If a registered state user is interested in accessing archived data for a product, he or she needs to provide a written request (email) to the NTPEP Program Manager. If adequate, the NTPEP Program Manager will provide the archived data for each product the registered state user is requesting.

Note: Archived data is not readily available to manufacturers or registered state users in DataMine. Archived data is only available to AASHTO staff. Data becomes archived once the product data “expires” under the work plan for that specific technical committee.

## **NON-INTERFERENCE POLICY**

Once a product or audit application has been submitted to NTPEP, a non-interference policy will go into effect. The NTPEP Technical Committee Liaison will be the point of contact for the manufacturer regarding submission status, testing or audit status, and appeal of results. Under no circumstances shall the manufacturer directly contact the NTPEP Designated Laboratory regarding any NTPEP related product or audit results. The NTPEP Technical Committee Liaison will work with both the manufacturer and NTPEP Designated Laboratory to make sure the manufacturer's inquiry is resolved.

## **POLICY FOR REVIEW OF NTPEP TEST REPORTS**

Industry will receive a copy of the report in draft status and asked to review the data for their product(s) for correctness. Upon receipt of results to be reviewed, any response from industry must be submitted in writing to the NTPEP TC Liaison within ten (10) working days.

Once a response is received, the NTPEP TC Liaison, TC chair, the testing state/agency and if applicable, the agency generating the report, will review the response to determine if an error was made. Typographical errors that are found will be corrected. When technical errors that challenge the integrity of the test data are alleged, the data will be as reported unless an investigation by the responsible testing entity confirms conclusively that a technical error occurred.

A notification will be sent by the NTPEP TC Liaison to the submitter indicating the decision within fifteen (15) working days. If the decision by the technical committee does not resolve the issue, the manufacturer may refer the disagreement to the Appeals Board. See Appendix C for the Appeals Board Process.

## **POLICY ON MANUFACTURER PUBLICATION OF NTPEP TEST DATA**

Manufacturers may publish NTPEP data under the following conditions:

1. Only test data for the manufacturers own products may be reproduced. Manufacturers may utilize the test data on their own products as a source of independent test data. However, the data may not be used for comparative marketing purposes with those of other manufacturers.
2. Whenever NTPEP test data is used or presented, the following statement will be used.

“The preceding test data excerpts were reproduced with the permission of AASHTO, however, this does not constitute endorsement or approval of the product, material or device by AASHTO.”

Some areas in which a manufacturer may use NTPEP data are as follows:

1. To indicate that the product was tested by NTPEP in their own product bulletins and brochures;
2. Use as references on Product Evaluation Forms (PEF) required by many government agencies.

Manufacturers that misrepresent the NTPEP/APEL process, results, or use their data inappropriately will no longer be able to participate in AASHTO programs, their products will be delisted, any funds processed by AASHTO will be forfeited, and legal action may be pursued.

## **POLICY ON REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY DATA BY AASHTO MEMBER DEPARTMENTS**

NTPEP recognizes that AASHTO member departments may desire to review the evaluation results created by the program prior to release of the final report of those results. Such preliminary results will be released using the following procedure:

1. The member department must submit an emailed request to the NTPEP Program Manager that clearly identifies the evaluation results to be released.
2. The NTPEP Program Manager will notify the TC Chair, relevant testing agency and the manufacturer that such a request has been made by sending a copy of the original request to each party.
3. The NTPEP Program Manager will request the relevant testing agency to release the requested evaluation results to the requesting member department and the manufacturer concurrently.

Any release of the data will be accompanied by a statement clearly indicating that the data is preliminary, has not undergone any review process and is not allowed to be distributed beyond the requesting agency.

## **POLICY FOR REVIEW/PUBLISHING OF AUDIT RESULTS BY NTPEP**

Upon completion of an Audit, the NTPEP Auditor will review and complete the report generated during the on-site audit and reviewed with the Manufacturer at the close out meeting. When completed, the report is forwarded to the NTPEP Associate Program Manager or another NTPEP Auditor for review.

Once the report has been reviewed and any revisions finalized, the audit results, pre-audit documentation and current Quality Manual are uploaded to the appropriate DataMine module. The responsible manufacturer representative and any AASHTO member departments that participated in the audit will be notified the audit results are available through DataMine. Once the results are posted, they are available to all member Departments for review.

If major deficiencies are noted during an audit, the facility is required to provide Corrective Action Reports detailing the action taken to correct deficient items. Corrective Action Reports are uploaded after review by the NTPEP Auditor. Comparison testing results are posted on DataMine when received from the independent testing laboratory and reviewed by the NTPEP Auditor. The manufacturer representative is notified when these results are posted.

## **POLICY FOR CONDUCTING MANUFACTURER AUDITS OUTSIDE OF NORMAL CYCLE FOR NTPEP AUDIT PROGRAMS**

If a manufacturer wants to be audited outside of the facility's designated month then the manufacturer is responsible for covering the cost of a hotel and rental car for the auditor, in addition to the published audit fee. These fees will be referred to as the "out of sequence fees".

Once the manufacturer's application is accepted on the NTPEP DataMine website, a NTPEP Auditor will schedule the audit within 60 days.

Note: If the audit is completed in March and your state is usually audited every November, you would then have your next audit scheduled for November of the following calendar year.

## **POLICY FOR CONDUCTING ON-SITE AUDITS FOR ALL NTPEP DESIGNATED TEST LABORATORIES**

AASHTO's NTPEP Program will perform an on-site Quality Assurance Testing Facility Audit at each private and state laboratory currently under contract for the program. The audits will be conducted every 3 years, the purpose of which will be to review the processes utilized by the lab to complete an evaluation and report the test data in DataMine. This will serve to enhance the credibility of the testing completed at each lab as well as provide an opportunity to review and keep current with any changes made to work plans and AASHTO/ASTM standards being utilized.

Each audit will be conducted by either (1) the AASHTO NTPEP Liaison for that particular technical committee (2) The Program Manager or Associate Program Manager for NTPEP or (3) the technical committee Chairman or Vice-Chairman. All associated charges for this audit shall be incorporated into the manufacturer's NTPEP evaluation fee.

The auditor shall review the following components during each audit:

- a. AASHTO/ASTM/State Specifications
  - i. Verify the laboratory is in possession of and is utilizing the most current AASHTO/ASTM/State specifications to conduct NTPEP evaluations.
- b. Training/Competency Evaluation Records
  - i. Confirm training and competency evaluation records for all technicians are current and conform to internal procedures.
- c. Equipment Records
  - i. Confirm equipment calibrations are being conducted in accordance with AASHTO R18 (as well as specified by manufacturer) and that records are maintained for all equipment used for NTPEP testing. Each record shall contain the following details: (1) frequency of calibration (2) model & serial number (3) name of worker who completed calibration (4) identification of equipment used to perform calibration (5) date calibration was completed (6) detailed data results (7) reference to procedure used to complete calibration.
- d. How product evaluation data is managed and traceable to data uploaded to DataMine.
  - i. The Auditor shall review the process employed by the lab for data collection during testing and subsequent transfer to DataMine,
- e. Timeline for testing and reporting
  - i. The Auditor shall inquire with laboratory personnel for the timeframe from receipt of a NTPEP product through report and release of data.
- f. Review of previous evaluations
  - i. The Auditor shall review all data collected for a minimum of three NTPEP products tested within the last two calendar

years. A comparison will be made to the data reported in DataMine.

- g. Demonstration of test methods
  - i. The Auditor shall observe all AASHTO/ASTM/State test methods used to complete each NTPEP evaluation. This exercise will determine if the correct equipment is being utilized and to ensure technician qualifications.
- h. Test Decks (if applicable)
  - i. The Auditor shall review the test lab's procedures for monitoring products installed on a test deck. This will include frequency of on-site observations at the test deck and recording of measurements.
- i. Review of safety rules and regulations on test decks (if applicable)
  - i. The Auditors will review a documented procedure the state follows to ensure all individuals are safe while performing NTPEP related activities.

Each audit will include an opening and closeout meeting. During the opening meeting, the Auditor will review the agenda, which will provide an outline for conducting the on-site audit. Any safety and security concerns will also be addressed.

The closeout meeting will be held in order to review any findings or feedback from the audit. Any deficiencies or items needing resolution will also be discussed at this time. A Corrective Action Form will be provided to the laboratory personnel; a form must be filled out for each deficiency and returned to Auditor and Program Manager for NTPEP within 15 business days of receipt of the final audit report.

## **POLICY FOR NTPEP CODE OF CONDUCT**

If a NTPEP participant creates a hostile work environment or behaves in a manner that is detrimental to the reputation of AASHTO's NTPEP Program, the NTPEP Program Manager will work with the NTPEP Steering Committee to take appropriate action to resolve the situation.

If a NTPEP Auditor feels unsafe or threatened in the field while conducting an audit, the NTPEP Auditor has the right to leave the facility and refuse service. The Auditor would then report this situation to the NTPEP Program Manager who will then take appropriate action.

Depending on the severity of these types of situations, the result may be removal from involvement/participation in the Program.

### **Appendix F: Introduction & Development of a New Product Category and Assessment of Existing TCs**

#### **Introduction & Development of a New Product**

The NTPEP Program Manager will refer proposals for development of a New Product Category to the Product Implementation Task Force. The Task Force will be comprised of one representative from each of the four AASHTO regions (at a minimum). The members of the task force will be nominated by the member states from each of the regions and affirmed by the Steering Committee.

The Product Implementation Task Force consensus recommendation for consideration of proposals will be referred to the Steering Committee and placed on the SC agenda for review. All submissions must include the expected scope of the test project accompanied by a statement of expected benefits and



estimated costs. Any available documentation indicating the need for the new test project by the AASHTO members should be included. Solicitation and review are described herein:

- a. Product Implementation Task Force shall solicit state members to nominate candidates for a new product category.
- b. State members shall provide any information regarding critical need and/or return on investment for each candidate submitted and indicate degree of willingness to participate in the development of the new product category.
- c. Upon receiving candidates to be added as a new product category, AASHTO staff shall survey member states to rank level of interest.
- d. Requests from industry received by AASHTO to consider additional new product categories will also be included in the survey.
- e. Survey shall include any information provided by state members related to critical need and/or return on investment.
- f. Product Implementation Task Force shall review results of survey and select potential new product categories for development.

The Product Implementation Task Force, assisted by AASHTO staff, shall select an AASHTO state member to lead the task of determining the feasibility and need for the new product category. Responsibilities of this task leader shall be as follows:

- a. Form initial small task force of state members (typically this group will become the TC)
- b. Contact states to determine existing methods of qualification
- c. Determine type of evaluation to be proposed by NTPEP (audit, lab and/or field evaluation)
- d. Develop NTPEP draft work plan
- e. Obtain “short list” of potential state members capable and willing to perform evaluation(s) for NTPEP
- f. Determine approximate cost of evaluation(s) – lab and field
- g. Present proposal for the new product category to the Steering Committee with recommendations of the task group. This proposal should include the draft work plan, potential testing facilities (state, university or private) and estimated costs.

- h. Upon acceptance by the Steering Committee, the proposal shall be forwarded to the NTPEP chair for approval.

## **NTPEP Technical Committee Assessment and Dissolution Procedure**

The Assessment and Dissolution Procedure was created in an effort to maintain programs that create value to AASHTO state members and the transportation industry.

The procedure is outlined in detail below, but the general process is the following: as part of the annual program review, the NTPEP Program Manager will identify programs with low level of participation from states and industry. This information will then be reviewed by the NTPEP Steering Committee during their scheduled in-person meeting of each year. Programs that receive a limited number of submissions will be placed “Under Review.” Leadership from programs under review will be notified immediately following the Steering Committee meeting to put together an Action Plan to share with the Steering Committee at the Annual Meeting. The NTPEP Product Implementation Task Force will monitor the progress of programs under review and recommend program changes to the Technical Committee. Any program under review for three consecutive years will be balloted to be “Suspended.”

To assist the NTPEP Program Manager with program assessment, NTPEP staff will survey states and industry participants every 2 years for their perspective of the success/state of each program. The survey will include a request for feedback on reliability of NTPEP data as it compares to field performance.

### Identify – prior to each Annual Meeting

- a. Technical Committees identified as “under review” will work with the corresponding AASHTO liaison and industry partners to review their TC’s performance and put together an Action Plan
- b. Compare state participation and number of product submissions to previous years
- c. Consider technology changes in the product areas (current and future) and work to incorporate into Work Plan when feasible
- d. Recommendations can include:
  - i. Work Plan/scope revisions
  - ii. Outreach plan to increase participation
  - iii. Recommendation to suspend program to be put on hiatus with a outlined criteria to reactivate program

### Review and Engage

- a. Technical Committee leadership to meet with SC at Annual Meeting to finalize Action Plan
- b. Work Plan revisions, skeleton program, or program suspension to be balloted by NTPEP membership and Steering Committee within

- 2 months after Annual Meeting and if approved, implemented within 3 months
- c. Involve other Technical Committees where merging programs is feasible
- d. Involve Technical Committee's industry partners for input on technology trends

Post Review Procedure/Suspension Ballot – January as part of Steering Committee meeting

- a. *A TC will only undergo this last step after three years under review or if immediately recommended by TC itself to suspend. Programs that successfully fall out of under review status will not be balloted for suspension.*
- b. Based on recommendation from the Product Implementation Task Force and NTPEP Steering committee motion made to entire NTPEP membership for vote
- c. Motion made by TC Chairman or Vice-Chairman to the NTPEP membership (2/3 vote majority needed to pass)
  - i. Does not pass (do not suspend)
    - 1. Return to Under Review status
  - ii. Pass (suspend program)
    - 1. Notify states and industry

## **Appendix G: Standard Operating Procedure for Receiving and Distributing Research Proposals**

**Purpose:** This document is intended to provide instructions on how to handle receiving a research proposal for a product that is within the scope of AASHTO NTPEP.

**Procedure:**

1. When NTPEP receives a research request from a state agency or one of the NTPEP technical committees, a copy of the research request will be submitted via email to the ***NTPEP Associate Program Manager*** in charge of tracking research proposals. Research proposals shall be tracked in the *Research Proposal Tracking Table*. The liaison for the applicable technical committee shall be provided an email notification of the request with the following information:

- a. Primary contact information for the originating party
- b. The affected product
- c. Details about the proposed research topic
- d. Any stated reason for why the research should be conducted

If the Technical Committee in charge of the product is requesting a research topic, the Chair shall provide the information noted above via email to the liaison of the technical committee. When a research topic is directly presented to NTPEP, the liaison shall provide the research proposal to the Chair and Vice Chair of the applicable technical committee.

1.1. If a manufacturer wishes to request a research topic, they shall consult with the Chair and Vice Chair of the appropriate technical committee. The request may then be presented to the technical committee to discuss the benefits and feasibility of performing the requested research.

2. Upon receiving the initial proposal, the Chair and Vice Chair are responsible for determining what, if any, actions are taken. Any research topics that are found to be potentially beneficial shall be submitted to the NTPEP Steering Committee for further deliberation. The NTPEP Steering Committee will be responsible for determining how to handle each particular research.

2.1. If it is determined that the matter has large scale implications, and is outside of the ability of the NTPEP technical committee to handle, the research topic may be submitted for consideration by the appropriate AASHTO Subcommittee. In order to submit a research proposal to an AASHTO Subcommittee, the technical committee will be tasked with drafting a document that describes the product and research proposal, why it is beneficial for the particular AASHTO committee to be involved, and other supporting information that the committee may require in order to consider the proposal.

2.1.1. The NTPEP liaison and the **NTPEP Associate Program Manager** shall work together to determine the appropriate AASHTO committee best suited to the proposed research. The **NTPEP Associate Program Manager** shall present the research proposal with all supporting evidence to the AASHTO Subcommittee. It is at the subcommittee's discretion to accept or reject any proposal. Accepted research proposals shall be subject to further instructions from the committees. Rejected research proposals shall have no further actions taken.

2.2. If it is determined that the research topic is beneficial, and can be handled directly by the technical committee, the NTPEP Steering Committee shall request that the Chair and Vice Chair of the appropriate committee submit a Plan of Action that contains an explanation of the proposed research, how it is beneficial to the NTPEP, all available options for funding the research topic, and how the technical committee plans to perform the research.

- 2.2.1. The NTPEP Steering Committee will review the documentation, and in conjunction with the Chair and Vice Chair of the committee, will decide if the technical committee should continue to move forward with the proposal.
3. The liaison shall notify the originating party of the Technical Committee's decision and any next step(s) that will occur. If the Technical Committee found the research proposal to be unnecessary or unfit in any manner, they should present reasoning for this decision, which shall be passed along to the originating party. The liaison shall copy any decision to the **NTPEP Associate Program Manager** in charge of tracking research proposals. Any further actions taken based upon a research proposal shall be mediated by the **NTPEP Associate Program Manager** between the originating party, the Technical Committee, and the parties performing research and all notes shall be logged in the *Research Proposal Tracking Table*.
4. Upon completion of any research, the Technical Committee and the originating party shall be provided any results that are publically available. Further distribution of the findings will be decided by the technical committee and the NTPEP Steering committee.

## **Appendix H: General Terms and Conditions**

### **Applicable to All Technical Committees**

1. Submission of information in the electronic Application (eAPP), required supplementary information, and test fees constitute acceptance by the product manufacturer/supplier of the Technical Committee Work Plan as the basis for testing, evaluation, or auditing of the submitted products and administration of the program through AASHTO/NTPEP.
2. All test materials shall be furnished by the manufacturer/supplier at no cost to the NTPEP or to AASHTO member departments. Sample selection and shipment will be as prescribed in the individual Technical Committee's Work Plan.
3. Manufacturer must submit an eAPP for all products or materials submitted.
4. Invoiced testing fees must be received and processed before evaluation of the product or material proceeds. The invoice payment for an on-site facility audit performed within the United States is due within 30 days of its audit completion. For an on-site facility audit performed at a location outside of the United States, the invoice payment is due upon acceptance of the application by AASHTO/NTPEP. The payment of an invoice may be completed using the following options: eCheque, Purchase Order, Wire Transfer, or Credit Card.
5. Incomplete forms and/or erroneous information provided as part of this submittal package may result in a delayed acceptance for testing.
6. A handling fee of 10% of the total testing fee or \$1000.00 USD, whichever is less, will be retained if a product is withdrawn prior to the testing process. Testing fees will not be refunded once the testing process has begun.
7. A cancellation fee of 50% of the audit fee shall be assessed if a manufacturer cancels an audit after it has been scheduled.
8. All testing for NTPEP shall be performed by NTPEP Designated Laboratories under contract with AASHTO/NTPEP.
9. Once a product or audit application has been submitted to NTPEP, a non-interference policy will go into effect. The NTPEP Technical Committee Liaison or NTPEP Auditor will be the point of contact for the manufacturer regarding submission status, testing or audit status, and appeal of results. Under no circumstances shall the manufacturer directly contact the NTPEP Designated Laboratory regarding any NTPEP related product or audit results.
10. According to NTPEP Policy and Procedures, a manufacturer/supplier may elect to withdraw their product from the test cycle with an email request to the NTPEP Technical Committee Liaison. If withdrawal is approved, Results obtained up until the time of withdrawal will only be available to registered state users, and the manufacturer who entered the data.
11. Unauthorized removal of any products or material specimens from a NTPEP field test site shall result in being disqualified from future NTPEP product evaluations.

12. For guaranteed consideration in a particular test cycle, the electronic Application (eAPP) and accompanying documents must be submitted under its corresponding evaluation program through the NTPEP DataMine website. Additionally, the eAPP must be submitted no later than the product submittal deadline indicated on the NTPEP website.
13. AASHTO member departments may use the test data obtained from NTPEP to establish approved products listings or to augment their own product approval processes.
14. AASHTO will copyright all reports, with all rights reserved. NTPEP Reports, or any parts thereof, may not be reproduced in any form without explicit, written permission granted by AASHTO in the form of an email.
15. The manufacturer/supplier is hereby notified that the NTPEP reserves the right to release or distribute any of the information included in or attached to this application and the test results obtained as part of our field and laboratory test procedures to our Member Departments. This information will be used to determine appropriate Quality Assurance parameters for product evaluation when materials are supplied for use on highway contracts.
16. AASHTO/NTPEP may use results from NTPEP evaluations to promote the program; however, this does not constitute an endorsement of the products or materials tested.
17. The NTPEP Technical Service Program within AASHTO operates as an independent agent in service to AASHTO Member Departments of Transportation. AASHTO does not affect any force on its members for decisions regarding use of NTPEP results. Industry participants are responsible for marketing products evaluated in this program in a manner that meets the needs of their customers.
18. Appeals by Industry Participants, in regard to test results, will be in accordance with the Appeals Process in the "NTPEP Information and Operations Guide."
19. DataLink and its associated logo is in no way a representation of third party approval from AASHTO/NTPEP, nor does it contain a defined measurable trait associated with any information it may act as a reference toward.
20. Policy and expectations for manufacturers/suppliers observing field evaluation impact testing of their products:
  1. Cooperate with the Test Facility Personnel and abide by their instructions
  2. Do not impede the Test Facility Personnel in their collection of test data
  3. Use of still cameras is acceptable
  4. Use of video camera is not permitted
21. Products/Devices become the property of the Test Facility for purposes of examining physical properties at a later date. Upon release of the NTPEP report related to the product/device, the manufacturer/supplier may submit an email for release of the product saved by the Test Facility; the manufacturer must pay for any and all costs associated with shipping and handling to return the product/device to them. The Test Facility or

- AASHTO/NTPEP assumes no responsibility for the condition of said device/product in removal, handling or shipping.
22. Product name changes will be reviewed by the TC Chair and Vice-chair on a case by case basis to determine if a new submission is required or if the name change can be reflected on pending reports.


### Specific Terms and Conditions Applicable to Noted Individual Technical Committees

- Erosion Control Products
  1. Manufacturers may be present during field installation of products. The test facility and NTPEP agree to provide the manufacturer with a minimum 10 day advance notice of product sample installation. The test facility and NTPEP reserve the right to delay planned installation due to inclement weather or other unforeseen variables that may result in inappropriate installation, without further scheduling accommodation for the manufacturer. Manufacturers are responsible for any associated travel costs necessary to get a NTPEP representative to the installation. Once the installation of the product is completed, no further on-site, in-person contact with the testing facility or test facility personnel is permitted with regard to the relevant NTPEP test.
- Joint Sealants and Crack Sealers
  1. Manufacturers/Suppliers are required to install their own sealant/sealer materials on each of the field test sites on the days and times scheduled by the Test Facility. All manpower and equipment for installation shall be supplied at no expense to the Test Facility or NTPEP. Traffic control will be provided by the Test Facility.
- Portable Changeable Message Signs and Flashing Arrow Panels
  1. During the course of product evaluation, those products/devices which do not perform as specified, or are otherwise found defective during the course of evaluation procedures may not be substituted. A record will be made of any such defect; e.g., mechanical or electrical failure, computer hardware or software errors, or any other such performance defect which may occur during the normal handling and evaluation of product/device by the NTPEP Test Facility.
  2. Manufacturers will NOT be allowed on the testing grounds unaccompanied during the evaluation period.
- Pavement Marking Materials
  1. Manufacturers/Suppliers are required to install their own pavement marking materials on each of the field test sites on the days and times scheduled by the Test Facility. All manpower and equipment



- for installation shall be supplied at no expense to the Test Facility or NTPEP. Traffic control will be provided by the Test Facility.
2. A manufacturer/supplier may elect to withdraw their product from the test cycle at any point during the field evaluation process.
- Raised Pavement Markers/Plowable Raised Pavement Markers
    1. Manufacturers/Suppliers are required to install their own markers on each of the field test sites as scheduled by the Test Facility. All manpower and equipment for installation shall be supplied at no expense to the Test Facility or NTPEP. Traffic control will be provided by the Test Facility.
  - Sign Sheeting Materials
    1. Manufacturers/Suppliers are strongly advised to have a responsible representative present at the Test Facility during the fabrication process of their test panels. The test facility will notify the Manufacture/Supplier of the scheduled application.
    2. 2. If ink is submitted, it is particularly important that the representative be completely familiar with the ink application process. Manufacturers will be responsible for disposal of leftover ink if it is not compatible with the Test Facility waste stream. The Test Facility reserves the right to recover from the manufacturer any costs resulting from disposal or mitigation of surplus waste material.
  - Temporary Traffic Control Devices
    1. Manufacturers/Suppliers are required to install their products at the field test site during the dates and times designated by the Test Facility. The plastic barrels will be supplied with a sufficient number of ballast units in the event the ballast is destroyed during impact testing, new ballast can be installed in the unit.

## Appendix I: APEL Evaluation Review Process Flowchart



## **Annex I: DEFINING “RETEST” REQUIREMENT AND RECOMMENDED “RE-EVALUATION”**

### **“RETEST” REQUIREMENT**

Product design may change over time as manufacturers improve their products and optimize their manufacturing processes. When a design or formulation change is made in a NTPEP listed product, the Manufacturer shall notify the NTPEP of the change and submit an application through DataMine to have this product evaluated, when the submission cycle is open for that specific technical committee.

### **RECOMMENDED “RE-EVALUATION”**

Many NTPEP technical committees include a recommended “re-evaluation” cycle. A recommended “re-evaluation” includes an evaluation being performed for a product previously evaluated through NTPEP, within the specific timeframe documented within the technical committee work plan.


## **Annex II: Manufacturer Request to Visit Field Site, Test Deck, or Laboratory Evaluation**

1. Any manufacturer desiring to visit a field site or test deck of NTPEP shall submit an official request to the TC chair with the following information:
  - a. Specific field site or test deck location to visit
  - b. Requested date of visit
  - c. Reason visit or inspection is necessary
  - d. Detailed plans for samples (such as visual inspection, measurement, photos, etc.)
  - e. NTPEP sample numbers to be inspected
2. TC chair will discuss the request with TC members and Liaison.
3. If approved, TC chair will send request to testing state and arrange for time and date of visit.
4. Manufacturer will be financially responsible to cover any associated travel costs for a NTPEP representative, either staff or local agency representative, to be present at the time of the manufacturer’s visit.
5. Testing state will take steps to prevent manufacturer from viewing, inspecting or photographing products of other manufacturers.

### **Annex III: NTPEP Succession Plan**

This succession plan shall be utilized when a member of a technical committee announces they will no longer be able to perform their current duties. Each step of the succession plan shall be completed prior to resigning from your current position. Please include the current AASHTO Liaison responsible for that specific technical committee when completing each of these items.

# NTPEP Succession Plan



## **Summary of Changes**

The following revision was made to this document on May 6, 2019:

1. Policy for NTPEP Code of Conduct was added on page 40 to Appendix E: Established NTPEP Policies.