1) Introductions

2) CCS mix design from NY
• Sent it out to some states, but had not heard much back about this particular design
• Illinois & PA had offered
• Put together CCS Task Force that is made up of the concrete experts from the DOTs
  o Would only be a short term assignment until we get the mix design nailed down and testing started
  o Kelly can lead the task force and get her concrete expert involved
    ▪ Todd will reach out to Iowa (big concrete state) and see if we can get someone involved
    ▪ Kelly and Dave will check with their contacts to try to figure out if they have contacts from other states that are experts with concrete
    ▪ Awilda with Florida may be able to get in touch with their concrete expert
      • Send her the info we have in place right now
  o Derrick mentioned that concrete people may not have a background with concrete coatings
    ▪ Thinks that northern states have data about concrete mixes that meeting their freeze-thaw requirements
      • Get this data and look at those mix designs for suitability
    ▪ Mentioned also that accelerated testing is just a screening process
      • Publish what the mix design is, show the data that was gathered, and it would be on the states to determine whether the data is useful
  o AI: Jonathan will send out emails to gather people and set date for meeting
• Kelly mentioned that the NY design does not offer specifics beyond “fine agg”, “coarse agg”.
  o This would create issues with consistency since local sources would be different
  o Derrick mentioned that we may just need to pick an aggregate and accept that sources may vary in different locals
    ▪ He believes most manufacturers would understand those differences are unavoidable
• Derrick asked about whether we would use a single mix design or would we entertain more than one mix design and split testing between them
  o KTA agrees that you would need at least two because of the divergent requirements on the properties of the concrete for various test methods
    ▪ 1 mortar mix, 1 concrete mix
    ▪ Kelly mentioned that the Work Plan has nonstandard requirements in the concrete
      • May need to look at changes to the work plan to use more traditional requirements
3) KTA Discussion Items

a) Reporting $\Delta E$

- $\Delta E_{00}$ or CMC… Currently calculating $\Delta E_{AB}$
  - Should we use $\Delta E_{00}$ since it is best below 5?
  - Work Plan originally wrote in $\Delta E_{STAR}$
  - **AI: Todd will edit the Work Plan to change this, will need to be balloted**

b) Spherical color meter in Work Plan

- There are differences in the results between the instruments
- At the Annual Meeting in Boston, we agreed that KTA could use Spherical
- KTA mentioned that Spherical meter is recommended for use in weathering (E1331?)
  - Spherical does not take into account gloss and texture
- Ahren Olson w/ Covestro will check into what his company runs. He will email Todd with further information
- Derrick indicated that because we are using gray, he is not sure that it matters much which instrument is used
  - Todd has seen differences and why we want to check on it
- May need to look at setting different requirements based on the type of instrument
- Could end up having products that fail 10 $\Delta E$ requirement with spherical that may have passed with 0/45
  - **AI: KTA should use 0/45 for Color Comparison, use Spherical for Weathering**

c) CCS
d) Other Items

- Slip Coefficient
  - Proposing that at end of test when increasing load to Postload, measuring deformation at 49 and again at 52 (clamping force currently used by the machine)
  - NEPCOAT likely doesn’t get that detailed, they look at the certification from the testing
    - State engineers may scrutinize the details and have an issue with stopping at 49
  - RCSC had put a ballot out to completely remove the post load requirement
    - Was unanimously approved, but has not been published
  - Todd thinks we should proceed and do both
  - Derrick concerned with how the certificate would read if it passed at 49 but failed at 52
    - The certifications currently on NTPEP are all based on 49 kips
  - Todd indicated that we should stick with what we are doing and continue only doing at 49 kips

- Develop a validity monitor for Tensile Adhesion testing
  - Can’t compare data accurately because repeatability statement requires 3 replicates, but we currently run 4 replicates
o Thought was maybe to just compare the first 3 replicates, and collect the 4th replicate, but do not include it
o Todd mentioned moving our requirement to 3 replicates
o Derrick mentioned that the 4 replicates was speced because of the inherent variability of the testing, and it gave states the ability to throw out one as an outlier

4) Industry Concerns on SSC/CCS.
   • CCS
   • Manufacturers are interested in removal of intermediate evaluations
   • What we are going to do with Slip post load requirements?

5) SSC work plan changes:
   a) Removing interim evaluations for Salt Fog / Cyclic Testing
      • Last conference call we discussed not removing panels between initial and 5000
      • DOTs and NEPCOAT only look at total amount, not interim
      • NEPCOAT may require an evaluation at 4000 hours / 12 cycles
         o We will accommodate NEPCOAT requirements, but we should check with them since 4000 hrs is not post scrape data so it is much more subjective
   b) Shelf life of submitted materials
      • “The shelf life of the material sent for testing, must exceed the expected time of the longest testing to be completed”
      • There may be certain products that won’t be able to meet that, those will need to be addressed separately
         o Currently no products that seem to fall into this
         o Derrick mentioned that certain components may not be able to meet a 12 month shelf life
      • Material would be retained by the manufacturer
   c) Spelling out items that are not clearly defined with the Work Plan
      • Items that are not clearly spelled out in the Work Plan
         o For instance, KTA has internal SOPs that they use for testing, but the methodology is not available in the Work Plan
   d) Other Changes?
      • 23 +/- 2 oC 50 +/- 5% RH drying time requirement
      • Rockwell hardness of abrasive is specified, but KTA is having issues with procuring abrasive in the range specified
         o Can we specify a grade or align/remove hardness requirement in the Work Plan?
            ▪ Does it even matter as long as you get the proper profile?
            ▪ This is a holdover from the very first version of the Work Plan from the late 90’s
      • Note that color gloss samples do not have to be put into bags when they come out of cyclic weathering
- Sometimes the bags stick to the samples
- Derrick suggested to dry them, wrap them up, and put them in a box to avoid UV exposure
  - No issue with not putting them in a bag
- Panel requirements in Work Plan page 21
  - Work Plan talks about grade of steel to be used
    - For Slip/Creep KTA would like to use a non-alloy generic steel
    - Francisco noted that he has seen galvanizing that has failed based on the type of steel used
      - Should review more closely to make sure there is no detrimental effects on the coatings
      - Can’t always get a cert at the grade with the proper ksi
    - AI: Todd will contact manufacturers and see if there is any concerns
- DataMine changed to include $\Delta E_{00}$ and $\Delta E_{CMC}$
  - AI: Jonathan will remove the requirement for $\Delta E_{CMC}$ to be entered

6) Laboratory concerns on SSC committee.

7) Task Force Updates
   a) SSPC BCI Review
   b) Color
   c) CCS
   d) FTIR Methods

8) Discuss DataMine

9) Industry Concerns?