Joint Sealant / Crack Sealant
Technical Committee Meeting Agenda
Working Session #7
Tuesday, April 24, 2018 11:30AM – 1:00PM

1) 11:30AM-11:35AM: Call to Order and Introductions

2) 11:35AM-11:40AM: Review of Current Technical Committee Members (Insert membership list from NTPEP website)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Member Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gallistel, Allen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:allen.gallistel@state.mn.us">allen.gallistel@state.mn.us</a></td>
<td>Minnesota Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romero, Matt</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mromero@odot.org">mromero@odot.org</a></td>
<td>Oklahoma Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glick, Vince</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vglick@aashto.org">vglick@aashto.org</a></td>
<td>American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstead, William Chance</td>
<td><a href="mailto:armsteadc@dot.state.al.us">armsteadc@dot.state.al.us</a></td>
<td>Alabama Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Non-Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingram, Steven</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ingrams@dot.state.al.us">ingrams@dot.state.al.us</a></td>
<td>Alabama Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotzer, David</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david.kotzer@state.co.us">david.kotzer@state.co.us</a></td>
<td>Colorado Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Eliana</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eliana.carlson@ct.gov">eliana.carlson@ct.gov</a></td>
<td>Connecticut Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byram, Karen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karen.byram@dot.state.fl.us">karen.byram@dot.state.fl.us</a></td>
<td>Florida Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baah, Prince</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pbaah@indot.in.gov">pbaah@indot.in.gov</a></td>
<td>Indiana Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Non-Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Kevin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin.jones@iowadot.us">kevin.jones@iowadot.us</a></td>
<td>Iowa Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) **11:40AM-11:50PM: Brief summary of the technical committee (for those states who do not participate in quarterly calls or who are new to NTPEP)**
   a) **Additional Information at:** [http://www.ntpep.org/Pages/JSCS.aspx](http://www.ntpep.org/Pages/JSCS.aspx)
   b) **Presentation for JS/CS Test Deck Field Evaluation Training**
      i) **This is the same presentation provided to TXDOT when they installed their deck**
         (1) **Inventory forms are provided for recording the specific loss measurements based on location on the length of the joint**
         (2) **Cohesion failure and adhesion failure examples are provided**
         (3) **Pictures of all joints are captured in DataMine**
         (4) **Debris retention is recorded**
         (5) **Pullouts across the length are recorded**
         (6) **Crack movement is measured through a number of means**

4) **11:50PM-12:15PM: Review of Outstanding Action Items**
   a) **Lab Audit**
      i) **QA audits performed across all contracted labs for performing product evaluations**
      ii) **Melting – cover left slightly open to monitor creeping up mixer**
      iii) **Cone penetration – time stated for conditioning in bath was 1 – 1.5 hours when it should be 2 hours, technician confused the time needed for asphalt Pen vs. sealant cone Pen**
      iv) **Hardness – durometer type used was not according to work plan, will be purchasing the correct one for future work**
v) **Apparent Viscosity – Standard Presented Was Out of Date, No Testing Has Been Performed Using the Equipment That Was Not Verified With a Current Standard**

vi) **Softening Point – Two Rings Varied by More Than 1 C, Retest Will Be Conducted and If 1 C Limit Is Still Not Met Result Will Be Reported With a Note of the Variance.**

(1) Reaching Out to Manufacturers Regarding the 1 Degree Difference on the Rings, Is It Easily Achievable or Material Dependent

(a) Maxwell --

(i) Offer to Provide a Second Set of Eyes on the Retest Outcome, and Made Note Regarding the Importance of Rate

vii) **Resilience, Cone Pen and Bond Are Used for Verification Testing**

(1) Very Few Failures Found in Verification

b) **SG Discussion**

i) There Are 2 Reports Published Regarding This Work

(1) Development of Performance – Based Guidelines for Selection of Bituminous-Based Hot-Pour Pavement Crack Sealant: An Executive Summary Report

(a) [HTTP://VTRC.VIRGINIADOT.ORG/PUBDETAILS.ASPX?PubNo=09-CR7](http://VTRC.VIRGINIADOT.ORG/PUBDETAILS.ASPX?PubNo=09-CR7)

(2) Validation of Hot-Poured Crack Sealant Performance Based Guidelines

(a) [HTTP://VTRC.VIRGINIADOT.ORG/PUBDETAILS.ASPX?PubNo=17-R26](http://VTRC.VIRGINIADOT.ORG/PUBDETAILS.ASPX?PubNo=17-R26)

(3) One Manufacturer Essentially Said “It Is Up to the States to Request What They Would Like to See and Use”

ii) There Are Several Provisional AASHTO Standards – Released June 2015

(1) MP 25
(2) PP 85
(3) Melting, Vacuum Oven Aging, Rotational

iii) Maxwell --

(1) Movement Within the Manufacturers With DSR Testing
(2) BBR Testing Showed Good Correlation in the Past
(3) Indication of Performance at the Temperatures the Sealants Would Be Used At

iv) MN DOT Full Adoption

(1) If Full Adoption Were Taken On, the Biggest Obstacle Would Be Direct Tension For Both States and Manufacturers.

c) **Usage Survey**

d) **Mastic Update**


ii) Would Need a Task Group to Be Assembled to Discuss How a Field Evaluation Would Be Conducted

(1) Finding the Right Road or Creating a Test Environment
(2) What Would Be Looked at in the Evaluation

(a) Material Loss
(b) Tracking and Rutting
(c) Water Infiltration Similar to Sealants (Possible or Necessary?)

5) **12:15PM-12:30PM: Update-Program Status**
a) 2016 Texas CS Deck – 4 products
   i) Installed in 2016 and 1 year data is entered into DataMine
   ii) 2 year data is being entered into DataMine

b) 2017 Minnesota CS Deck – 6 products
   i) This material will be installed within the next couple of weeks. Delays due to weather.

c) 2018 – Host Sites?
   i) **Action Item:** Open invitation will remain available for hosting a 2018 deck

d) Lab Only Re-evaluations
   i) Waiting on accepted samples to be sent in

6) 12:30PM-12:35PM: Discuss DataMine Items
   a) Photo issues resolved
   b) **Action Item:** Detail Inspection Data Tab Column Order – requires revision
   c) **Action Item:** Sample Submittals – restricting the re-evaluation option for the ongoing application submissions since there needs to be more clarification between the lab only evaluation products and those products that are receiving both lab and field evaluation (there was significant confusion which delayed product acceptance)

7) 12:35PM-12:45PM: Industry Concerns
   a) No major concerns

8) 12:45PM-12:55PM: Open Discussion
   a) **Is there a difference in or can there be a comparison made between the products installed on the warm weather decks as compared to cold weather decks?**
      i) Most often, those products installed on the cold weather decks are applicable to only 1/3 of the market (Northern regions, Canada, and portions of China)
      ii) Even products that can perform in a particular climatic region can vary in availability across the country for that particular climate due to marketing and regional spec variations

9) 12:55PM-1:00PM: Review of Action Items for 2018