ARA Committee Conference Call

Date: Thursday, December 19, 2019
Monday, January 27, 2020
Time: 11:00 am (EST)

Agenda

1. Self-introduction of attending members – Richard Willammee
   A. Current members
   B. New members
   C. Industry Representative(s)

2. Action Items
   A. Work Plan
      1. Application submittals
         a. All information must be < 6 months old?
            i. Paul – believes the data should be up to date
            ii. Less than 6 months old or the same calendar year
            iii. Data must be less than a year old from the submittal date, and if it does not compare to test lab within 85% testing will stop and have to resubmit all new data
            iv. Interim 2.5 year test for FTIR test?
            v. Jim - Are checking on a regular basis, if there is a difference they are removed from the QPL
            vi. Paul – if a date is set the MFG will be ready for that test and then 2 weeks later it may be different
            vii. Should be added in the workplan
            viii. Dawn- when they are submitting for their 5 year resubmittal, the data should be 6 months or less
            ix. Paul – when there is a change they resubmit their product as new with the same name
            x. Dawn – should leave the 85% match if the mfg is submitting under the same name and same formula
               1. Paul – don’t tell mfg, but just make everyone comply
xi. Action Item: Dawn – put together wording on this topic to send out to the group for feedback

b. Using a Review template to provide comments back to manufacturers.
   i. Manufacturer cannot proceed with testing until all comments are resolved

c. SDS - Insufficient information provided by manufacturers.
   i. Maine – don’t include much info. They may be going too far on claiming proprietary. Don’t know how to dispose of material
   ii. IL - misunderstanding for the law to only report less information. There is a OSHA requirement they have added to their chemical hygiene plan
   iii. Action Item: Kelly to share with the group on what IL is now requiring
   iv. Paul – tough situation due to legal conclusion is being drawn because the law is stating they don’t require it. Make mfg send a return to sender to dispose
   v. Try to find a mechanism to ensure safe products are being sent for testing
   vi. Recommendation: Train committee on what to look for with Paul and Dave to help with the SDS
      1. Kelly – Paul would be a “competitor” reviewing the SDS for protection of manufacturers

2. Stripping test – Add wording to define that the initial photographs are taken immediately after liquid is added to all 3 or 6 jars.
   a. Define a timeframe

3. Stripping Test – Both testing labs will add a comment that “Photos are only available for individual States to aid in determining an acceptable level of stripping.”
   a. Paul agrees it will be okay with manufacturers

4. Asphalt Performance – change wording from “Pour No.” to “Rep”.
   a. Have it to match the header in DataMine
   b. Last pull data has been and will continue to be reported

5. Rolling submission vs. Cycles - Section 5, Note 3.
   a. Testing labs are okay with this
   b. Changes will need to be done in workplan

B. Test Procedure T383

1. Stripping Test comments – Remove Section 5.3.14 and Section 9.1.1?
   - Barry - Still need statement in the procedures for the states to make the call in T383, but change the workplan
   - Leaving photos and language in the procedures
- Test procedure will not change

2. Spray plate surface with an even coat, Section 6.3.3 and Section 7.3.2 – need to define clearer
   - Currently spraying 3 rows with 3 sprays in each (left, middle, right) starting from top left to bottom right
     - May put pictures
     - Brush may remove product, brushing on metal will change the characteristics of the product.
     - No physical contact with the material
     - Agree to spray and not brush due to spraying at the plant into the truck beds.
     - Jim – dousing (or flooding) and tipping the plate
       - Overapply and drain off the excess
       - Experiment at labs and refine for the next meeting

3. Sections 8.1 and 8.3 – can the same sample used for the FTIR be used to measure the %solid
   - Kelly – The same technique, ASTM D2369, should be used for both criteria.

4. Section 9.1.8 - should the temperature be reported with the recorded pH?
   - Kelly - pH is a temperature dependent criteria and the temperature should be within +/- 2 degrees of the buffer temperature in accordance with ASTM E70. I agree that the temperature should be noted, but pH when done in compliance with ASTM E70 the resultant pH value should be “corrected” and “comparable”.
   - Recording temp would be of value for any possible discrepancies
     - Paul – agrees
   - SDS reported out of tolerance but tested it is not
   - Will begin to record the temperature according to the test procedure

5. Precision and Bias, Section 10 - statement to be updated?
   - Recommendation is to leave the statement as is
     - Not a requirement by AASHTO, and can be reviewed later if anything changes with AASHTO

C. Flashpoint

1. Oil based vs. water based
2. If oil based, can the sample be tested against known oils (ex. Vegetable oil) and recorded as the known oil?
a. Kelly – Unsure of the nature of the question, but due to our conversation, I did dig a little into the flash point and GHS. Not a typical technique I found that in the GHS documents, Chapter 2.5, paragraph 11, it requires that flashpoints be established using closed cup methods and that the initial boiling point should also be reported. The close cup methods referenced in GHS are the tag ASTM D56, Pensky-Martens ASTM D93 and Small scale closed cup ASTM D3278 (withdrawn by ASTM in 2020). My thought is that we should change AASHTO T 383 to reference the first two closed cup methods only. I also believe we should add the initial boiling point. This helps classify the material and would address some of the initial concerns we had with the ARA products boiling over and affecting the flash point. The impact to the producers and test labs should be minimal since the Pensky-Martens was already the predominate choice.

From there, the GHS classification of flammable is derived as

1. Flash Point < 23 degrees C, initial boiling point ≥ 35 degrees C
2. Flash Point < 23 degrees C, initial boiling point > 35 degrees C
3. Flash Point ≥ 23 degrees C, initial boiling point ≥ 60 degrees C
4. Flash Point > 60 degrees C, initial boiling point ≥ 93 degrees C

b. Paul – Flashpoint is a standardized test so there is no need & would cause problems

D. PRI Lab testing – TxDOT to continue to send bulk samples of asphalt binder and mix.
   a. Will continue to send Mix and Binder
   b. Will keep the product the same between to 2 labs
   c. Richard to talk with successor to continue to send mix after his retirement
   d. No longer do fingerprint testing in TXDOT
      i. All future products will go to PRI

3. Industry Items – Paul Wilson and Dave Fogg
   A. GHS – some SDS pH is greater than 11.5, but they are saying there are no hazards. Would need supporting documents
      a. Some ARA manufacturers are not reporting properly
      b. On the work plan, we allow up to 12.5 (from EPA). Will get current documentation and review to potentially change in the workplan
         i. Kelly – this will need changed as the new GHS requirements are now extremes in pH < 2 or > 11.5 to identify a hazard class.

4. Open Discussion
   a. Julie - Maybe add D93 to referenced documents in the workplan
      i. T383 reference D92, D93, and E502. May need to select just D93
      ii. Richard – take out D92 to only have 1 reference document on workplan
iii.  See Kelly’s notes on flashpoint in minutes above
b.  Possible submission of a procedural ballot
c.  T383 edited with application rate need to be sent out asap
d.  Courtney to send out Information and Operations guide link

5.  Next Meeting – April 2020 (Quarterly Update Meeting)