1) Call to Order @ 3 PM

   a. New Vice Chair –
      Ivan Silbernagel with Oregon DOT has been appointed as the vice chair of
      the Structural Steel Coatings Project panel. He replaces Bob Kogler who
      recently left the FHWA.

   b. CETG – The Coatings Expert Task Group has been developed as a sub
      committee within this project panel. The group has worked over the last 4
      years on the development of the BCI (Bridge Coatings Inspection)
      curriculum through SSPC (Society of Protective Coatings). There is joint
      ownership of the course materials through AASHTO and SSPC. The
      CETG is comprised currently of members from Kentucky, California,
      Massachusetts, TBTA, Texas, Illinois, North Carolina and FHWA. An
      executive committee of that group consists of members from California,
      Kentucky and Massachusetts.

         The first course offering was in January 2006 in Tampa as part of the
         Technical Education program of PACE (Paint and Coatings Expo)
         Since the initial offering Kentucky has hosted 2 classes and there are
         additional classes scheduled for Florida and Pittsburgh later this year.

2) 30 systems in program and 1 system pending application. Handout of
systems currently in test and the status of the systems (time line)

PolySpec and Polymerright upload will require some changes to the database for
appropriate cells for analytical upload.

Data Mine – some revisions are necessary to incorporate all data. There are fields
that are vacant and there is data where there are no fields to collect the data. Data
Mine task force being formed to address issues overall for the system and all
modules. Send any concerns to Derrick for updates.

Q: DataMine upload process:
A: When KTA received the current contract their Standard Operating Procedure
(SOP) referenced production of a paper report. This has been updated. They do
have set time frames for upload. The longest is compositional testing with 14
days. When uploaded an email is sent to NTPEP administrator (McGough).
McGough forwards to the manufacturer for review. Manufacturer is given 14
days to review data. When the data is released by the manufacture, it is released
to public/private domain.
Q: Intermediate data review?
A: Approximately one month from upload to view by manufacturer
Q: Manufacturer’s comment – We would like more real time review of performance data.
A: The analytical data should be complete before application. The Manufacturer needs to review data when on site for application. Manufacturers must have materials in laboratory 15 days prior to application.
Q: Where is the 2 year exposure data?
A: In some instances the data is not available. It has not been reported by one lab.
Q: Have the NEPCOAT formats been considered for incorporation in the datamine module? These are spreadsheets developed to pull data from data mine and place in report form
A: There are shared needs for datamine among the project panels. There is a need to reactivate the datamine task force to further develop the reporting functions.

3) Manufacturers Concerns
Greg Girard reported on concerns expressed by the manufacturers in a meeting held prior to the project panel meeting.
 a. There was a general consensus with the manufacturers that Salt Fog Testing did not provide useful data for evaluation of the coating systems and elimination of the test would help contain costs. The long term performance of the coating systems may not relate at all to the testing. It was also pointed out that SSPC is removing the test from all specifications

A general discussion regarding the use of the B117 test as a tool for evaluation followed. The manufacturers were tasked with supporting their argument for removal of the test.

AI: (Greg) Allow mfg to provide data to present argument and discuss at fall conference call. Ask Manufacturer to provide information to support request to remove test from protocol.

b. An additional item related to containing the cost of testing was elimination of the 1000 and 2000 hour reading. The states present were asked if the intermediate readings were utilized for evaluation of systems. It was agreed to poll the oversight committee regarding elimination of these data points.

AI: Regarding intermediate readings – survey oversight committee

c. The manufacturers expressed concern regarding input from FHWA – The perceived effect of regional groups on the program and discussion of individual states taking NTPEP data and requiring additional testing.
They specifically requested an update regarding the SEPCOAT group.

Henry Lacinak provided an update regarding the SEPCOAT meeting. Primarily SEPCOAT will serve as a focused regional peer group and discussion group regarding use of NTPEP data and development of goals for the region. He also related the recommendations for action and where the group intends to go.

4) **Atmospheric Exposure Site:** LaQue is closing – Kure beach will not accept additional panels for testing –

   Q: Is the Atmospheric testing used? Little to no cut back at the scribe there is gloss and color shift. Would there be any need or desire to extend the testing?
   
   **KUNIEGA:** Field exposure data rather than field histories. Follow up on field histories does not appear to give useful data for change.
   
   **AI:** Canvass mfg and states for continued viability of testing?

   Q: Consideration of alternate site for exposure testing?

   **May be better evaluated as a research project – validation of field evaluations – would look for additional funding to support the evaluation. Should be sponsored on more of a national research.**

   **Conclusion for program:** for panels in program yes – allow the manufacturers submitting systems to suspend in the interim. Derrick Castle and Paul Vinik will discuss rack rental at the NASA test site. Vendors allow an option to either have products exposed or not through ’07.

   **Note:** Paul Vinik confirmed that the NASA site is available for use and the exposure can continue at this site. Evaluation of corrosion rates (KURE vs NASA) will permit further evaluation of the data.

5) **Specifications and Work Plan**

   Proposed changes to the R-31 standard discussed.


   b. Require manufacturers to report type and quantity of EPA Exempt Solvents incorporated into each submitted product. Require laboratory verification of exempt solvents. Consider requiring manufacturers to report the solvent and dwell time used for QC analysis of VOC.
c. Scribe panels in accordance with D 1654 with parallel 100 mm scribe lines using the current lathe cutting tool. Scribe lines shall be 1 inch from any edge of the panel and 2 inches from one another.

d. Change the atmospheric exposure site due to Kure beach discontinuing business.

AI: Make changes to Work Plan as interim let R-31 catch up. Will complete changes by mid June for Work Plan.

6) New Business

Q: Acrylic submissions – needed changes for R-31 to encourage the manufacturers to submit Acrylic systems for evaluation.
A: Performance criteria in place to evaluate system –

Expectation is that mfg would have testing data that would serve as a guide for specification development and bars to measure the system by.

The panel chair noted there had been a request by the manufacturers for an additional representative on the project panel. (The manufacturers met briefly after the meeting adjourned and selected Greg Hardig of Wasser)

AI: Manufacturers reply to request regarding Acrylic test parameters (through lead state by June 30)

Meeting adjourned 5:00 PM