JS/CS
Technical Committee Meeting Minutes
Working Session # 6
Tuesday, March 14, 2017 10:30 AM – 12:00 PM

1) 10:30 AM-10:35 AM: Call to Order and Introductions

2) 10:35 AM-10:40 AM: Review of Current Technical Committee Members (Insert membership list from NTPEP website)
   • Some minor changes. Editorial mostly
   • If you are interested in joining the committee, filter requests through NTPEP liaison Vince Glick

3) 10:40 AM-10:50 PM: Brief summary of the technical committee (for those states who do not participate in quarterly calls or who are new to NTPEP)
   • Evaluate hot and cold applied materials, and preformed seals like neoprene.
   • For crack sealants it is hot applied
     o If there is interest in cold applied speak up
   • The goal is to prevent introduction of moisture into the pavement
   • Going to try to improve communication within the committee
     o Going to generate list of member emails in Outlook to involve in conversations
     o Won’t result in a huge increase in emails, but do expect a 2 or 3 more a month
   • Bill’s Survey
     o This is one of the smaller committees
       ▪ Need to make sure to keep the committee viable

4) 10:50 AM-11:05 AM: Review of Outstanding Action Items
   a) Re-test Requirement
      • MNDOT is the test lab for JSCS.
        o Delayed while a new contract is put into place
Performance Grade “SG” Sealant Spec – Update and Discussion

- For hot pours
- Pooled fund study to look at updating the grading system over the last 6 to 8 years
  - Similar to the development of PG system for asphalt binder
  - There will be a paper coming out that details all of the tests and field data that has been performed
  - There is a website with more information on this study
  - As this moves forward the TC will be looking for input from the states and manufacturers how to implement this
- One of the goals is to use same equipment used in binder testing to perform evaluations
  - DSR and BBR
  - Direct Tension being looked at
    - This will be a hurdle to overcome in implementing a sealant grading system
    - Out of favor in binder testing
    - There is also an adhesion type test (like bond test) that uses the direct tension frame
- Test methods are provisional AASHTO Standards
  - MP25
- Going to look at using the SG spec in the NTPEP work plan
  - Going to have conference calls
  - States should take information back to their DOTs and be prepared for the discussions
- Allen will work on getting a link to the report for the committee

Mastics – Update and Discussion

- This is a potential avenue to take this committee
- We want to have a laboratory portion in place to make sure to get a full view of the systems
- These are very different from sealants, only similarities are they use a hot pour like binder
- Based on ASTM meetings, it looks like it will be a few years before there are standards available
- We can start hammering out a plan for a field evaluation for these materials if there is enough interest
  - Need to find the right pavement conditions to apply mastics
  - Discussion about the types of testing to put in place for it – ride, rutting, tracking
  - Until ASTM in place, putting down a test deck won’t happen
- Allen will wait to hear from interested parties on delving into field evaluations

5) 11:05 AM-11:20 AM: Update-Program Status
a) Texas Test Deck
- 1st year evaluation is complete
  - Showed photos
- 3 manufacturers and 4 products / test sections placed
- Evaluation finished up just over a week ago
  - Took 5 hours to complete
  - Rain and fog nearly delayed process, but managed to get it completed
  - Data will be uploaded to DataMine 3.0 within the coming weeks
  - Manufacturers were not invited out due to oversight, but in the future TXDOT is offering to allow them to come view the products

b) Future Locations
- Will depend upon product submittals
  - Chicken/egg issue of wanting to know where deck will be before submitting, but can’t determine until there is a deck in place
- North Carolina is potentially interested depending on how many and the situation
- Other states can also be considered
- TX was an attempt to get some data pertinent to southern states
- Texas will not be able to add any more to their deck
  - The deck is falling apart quicker than expected
- How many states are familiar with the field evaluation process?
  - 3 hands raised in the room
  - Allen had several slides and discussed how to perform the evaluations
    - Cohesive and adhesive failures and spalling
    - Debris retention
    - Tracking of wheel paths
    - Pull outs
    - Crack movement
    - DataMine entry sheets

6) 11:20 AM-11:35 AM: Industry Concerns
- It could be helpful to put together a group to look into transitioning industry and DOTs to the new grading system
  - There is already interest in putting together a short guidance document for how to get started with the new system
- Direction tension devices are not being produced by manufacturers
  - Does appear that there are some for sale by manufacturers online

7) 11:35 AM-11:50 AM: Open Discussion
- No discussion

8) 11:50 AM-12:00 PM: Review of Action Items for 2017
- Distributing info on SG
• Keeping everyone in the loop on field evaluations for mastics
• General effort to improve communication