Attendees:
Bill Real – New Hampshire DOT
J. Michelle Owens – Alabama DOT
Jay Goldbaum – Colorado DOT
Cathy Ford – Idaho DOT
Omar Qudus – Nebraska DOT
Ed Reasoner – Pennsylvania DOT
Ed Lucas – New York DOT
Tony Allen – Washington DOT
Patrick Johnson – Propex
Scott Manning – Propex
Joe Putherkka – Iowa DOT
Stephen Loop – Idaho DOT
Sam Allen – TRI
Kurt Kelsey – American Excelsior

Review of 2006 Activities

Reviewed number of products that have been tested, submitted and reported on. There are currently 92 products listed in the most recent report

There was discussion of ASTM 6475 method for determining mass per unit area. There is manufacturer concern that the reported values, as sampled per the ASTM specified method, do not agree with the manufacturer’s stated values. Manufacturers values are obtained from whole rolls and, unlike the ASTM method, are not dry weights. As these are natural fibers, moisture can vary significantly. TRI conducted a study on this to determine if this concern is valid. Based on this, it was decided that we would not make any changes to our sampling at this time.

Pictures of germination results have been added to reports.

Discussion regarding products manufactured at multiple plants

TRI ran index tests of plants producing the same product to access the variability between plants. A review is currently underway and initially mass per unit area shows that results are within two standard deviations of the mean. Is there a correlation between index testing and the more expensive performance test results? There is some rough correlation between mass index test and bench scale test results.
Manufacturers are concerned about paying for the full range of testing of each product at each plant that produces it. Approximate cost is $3000 per product. Pennsylvania and Colorado require that product submittals include the plant where the product is produced. They require that testing be performed on product from each plant. Colorado uses NTPEP for product qualification. Member States will be surveyed regarding this issue.

**Hydraulic mulches**
Testing issues to be resolved include preparation of samples for testing and development of a standard soil for use in the tests. TRI has proposed a method of sample preparation and some manufacturers have given it a cursory review. A standardized test soil would combine an ASTM sand and some portion of clay.

**Quality of data**
TRI is accredited by the Geosynthetics Institute. They are required to perform proficiency tests annually. It was decided that documentation of TRI’s accreditation will be sent to Mike McGough on an annual basis.

The ECP program requires that products be retested every 3 years. Some products are coming due for retesting. Products have to be in the cue for testing, with payment received, prior to the expiration of the 3rd year as appearing in the printed report to remain listed. NTPEP is in the process of sending out notices.

A product submitted by Maccaferri required a modification to the tensile test because of the reinforcement structure of the product. The product had a reinforcement that resembled chain link fence. To accommodate this, the sample width was modified to 8 inch width to allow the sample machine to grasp the sample.

The topics of the last conference call focused primarily on spray on products and the multiple plant issue.

There has been discussions with a couple of DOTs to help them better utilize NTPEP results for ECPs. Alabama and Nebrasks are using NTPEP for final approval of Rolled Erosion Control Products.

Discussion about American Excelsior products that are manufactured at 2 plants should be tested now or stay in the cue until a decision is made as to how to handle products produced at multiple plants. A decision is pending. A brief review of DataMine revealed that the advanced search function is missing units for the windows where desired values are selected.