GTX Quarterly Conference Call
Date: Thursday, November 12, 2015

Attendees:
Tony Allen-WA(Chair), John Schuler-VA(Vice Chair), Jim Curtis(NYSDOT), Joel Sprague(TRI), Katheryn Malusky(NTPEP), Vince Glick(NTPEP), Kevin Palmer (AHTD), Jarrett Nelson(TRI), Brian Whitaker(Avintiv), Jonathan Curry(IFAI), Bill Real(NTPEP), Keith Gardner (Crown Resources), John Rublein (WIDOT), Doug Brown (Tensar), Mark Lindemann (NEDOT)

Introductory Notes:
- GTX Work Plan changes need to be in by tomorrow morning to be considered for balloting this year.
- Most of the changes to this plan were completed and sent out to the TC on October 19. A position paper from the GMA was sent out as well.

1. Private label and converter source issues (e.g., number of sources allowed, private labeling a private labeled product).
   - 3.1.0, 3.1.1, 3.1.2 discussed at the NTPEP meeting
   - 3.1.2 – Add “Prime Supplier” terminology as a separate definition; Tony to cross-check the “Prime Supplier” term is not used to denote another term in the work plan
     - GMA – limiting the manufacturer on the number of suppliers may be a trade restriction
     - Jim Curtis – When building the approved list, there needs to be a streamlined ability to associate a prime with a private label; limiting the primes to be manufacturers and not private labels
     - Final – Leave off the limitation of the number of primes

2. Converter labeling, and prerequisites needed to do so.
   - 8.2.2.1 – Why can’t the manufacturer print the mark at a higher frequency across the roll width
     - Mechanical process of printing changes physical properties of a product
     - Raised the question of painting by manufacturer which changes the properties as well
   - 8.2.2.3 – John Schuler (VDOT) concerned about the cutting of a product which may leave off the product mark
     - Final – Agreed to leave the work plan as revised just before this conference call regarding this issue.

3. Converter “QA” testing.
   - 8.2.4.1 – GMA confused on what it means to “take full responsibility”
     - Second portion is where they are actually changing the properties. First part may not be needed in terms of retaining responsibility
     - Traceability is the issue when part of the roll doesn’t have the manufacturers mark on it
       - They do not have the option of using materials from manufacturers not participating in the program
Tony is doing a rewrite regarding what the changes specifically are the converter makes, and he will provide the rewritten work plan provisions to the TC by the end of the day for final review/input

Table 1 has been approved

Table 2 would be used if the converter has changed the property of that fabric

4. Unscheduled audits.
   - Surprise inspection item will be crossed out.

5. Discussed whether or not to keep unit weight testing in the work plan, and how it should be reported to the states that request it.
   - Tony mentioned that unit weight testing has been in the GTX work plan from the very beginning (i.e., mid-1990’s).
   - Brian Whitaker countered that GMA recognizes this, but that having unit weight removed from the work plan, based on the logic in their position paper, is still GMA’s position.
   - Most of the TC members, even after reviewing the GMA’s position paper on unit weight, still wanted to keep unit weight in the work plan.
   - It was decided that unit weight testing will remain in the work plan, but that the unit weight issue will remain on the table for further, future discussions.

6. Briefly discussed statistical analysis of test results and basis for MARV’s or minimum certifiable values; also when failing test results should be included in the MARV determination. It was decided that the proposed changes in the work plan on this issue were acceptable.

7. Briefly discussed whether or not to add a product code number to the mark (per proposal from PENNDOT before the annual meeting last Spring. The GMA sent a position paper on this issue the day before this conference call. Tony indicated that there was not enough time to review the position paper, but he said that he would get the GMA a TC response on this issue in the next 30 days.

8. Definition of what constitutes and change in a product (this also relates to unit weight issue).

9. The GMA brought up the issue of late NTPEP test results
   - Lead State waits until UV testing is complete before releasing to the public; Takes TRI 3 to 4 weeks to test
     - This should be dealt with as a process issue if it continues. This is not a work plan issue.

10. Tony will provide final draft of work plan with changes discussed in this conference call before end of day to provide everyone one last chance for input, but the work plan must go out to Katheryn by tomorrow morning. Meeting was adjourned.