2003 ACTIVITIES

During calendar year 2003 there were 88 geotextiles submitted for testing in the program. They came from 14 companies. There were 7 new companies included in this total.

During 2003, 15 companies were notified of products that were being deleted from the report due to the information being three years old or older. Two of the 15 companies have been completely eliminated from the report as they have not submitted their products for re-testing according to the three year test cycle requirement.

The 21st edition of the report, containing all current test results through the September 2003 submissions has been published. This report contains results for 27 companies and 209 product designations.

The January 2004 submission contained 60 products from eight companies. Testing is currently underway on these products.

As part of the quality assurance program for the testing program, surveys were sent out to all fifty states, and all companies listed in the January 2003, 18th edition of the report. Thirty-five states responded to the survey. Of the thirty-five, 25 indicated that they use the geotextile report in some fashion. An overall average score of 2.6 out of a possible 3.0 was attained.

Unfortunately, only 7 out of 27 companies listed in the January 2003 report responded to the survey. An overall average score of 2.75 out of a possible 3.0 was attained for those companies responding.

Copies of the summaries for each survey are attached to this report.

There have been two problems encountered in tying to produce timely reports for products submitted during each testing period. One is the recurring problem of being able to fit the scheduling of state personnel to visit the sites where the samples are to be obtained into their already overloaded schedule. In some instances where a company has made several submissions in the past, the panel chairperson has made exceptions to the requirement of having a state person on site during the sampling. The appropriate labels and a copy of the sampling protocol have been supplied directly to the manufacturer in these instances. This has only been done when an extended period of time has elapsed from the time of the request from the panel chairperson to the state.
The other problem has been in the panel chairperson receiving the applications from AASHTO in a timely manner. As with the state problem, this is assumed to be a result of overload on the part of the NTPEP coordinators.

There has been one revision to the process which is aimed at improving the timeliness of the reports. This has been for the lead state to e-mail a copy of the page(s) of a company’s test results directly to them at the time of submitting the first draft of the entire report to AASHTO. They are instructed to follow the normal procedure of notifying AASHTO in requesting any retesting, along with submitting the appropriate fees, and at the same time, to also notify the lead state by e-mail of any request they may have. The testing begins upon receipt of this e-mail request.

DISCUSSIONS AT THE 2004 MEETING

There were five state members, one industry association members, and 14 non-members in attendance. The Florida DOT, Karen Byram, and the Washington, DC DOT, Kwabena Ofori-Awauh representatives expressed interest in becoming members of the panel.

Regarding the low response by industry to the 2003 survey, the GMA representative will follow up with the association members. We may resend the survey to industry.

Following discussion of the above 2003 activities, Tony Allen of the Washington State DOT called in on a conference call to discuss the outcome of the ballot on the reinforcement project work plan. The work plan has been accepted, with three states submitting comments. Tony went through each of the comments explaining how they have been or will be addressed. All changes to be made as a result of the comments and the discussion are deemed to be editorial, and thus will not require a re-ballot. As the work plan will allow “grandfathering” of current test data due to the fact that some manufacturers have recently had their products tested in the full evaluation scenario for WSDOT, there will be a requirement of these companies to submit a certified letter that neither formulations, nor manufacturing processes have changed since the original testing. They will then be tested under the quality assurance portion of the program. Some discussion on the lay out of the data report was held, resulting in Tony indicating he will draft up a template for the report, with the understanding that after the first round of testing there may need to be some revisions. At this point in time the only item left to complete prior to announcing the first solicitation for product submittals, is to work out the contractual agreement with a testing laboratory. As there are no State DOT or university labs that would be ale to perform the complete set of tests, it will be necessary to go to a private third party laboratory for this program. Within the US there is only TRI/Environmental that would be able to perform the entire suite of tests. Therefore, AASHTO will be asked to develop an agreement with them as quickly as possible, and hopefully no later than September 1, 2003. In that effort, Sam Allen will develop a costing estimate, and send it to Tony and Mujeeb as soon as possible. As soon as the agreement is formalized, the request for submittals will be issued.
In regards to the discussion on performance measures, it was decided that a way to help shorten the time from application to final report is to ask the manufacturers to submit a copy of the application to AASHTO and at the same time to the lead state. The lead state will assign the NTPEP sample numbers, and proceed with the request of the State DOTs to assist in the sampling. However, before sampling and testing, the lead state will confirm with the AASHTO/NTPEP Coordinator that the appropriate fees have been paid.

It was agreed that if the AASHTO M-288 Specification is revised to replace the index puncture test with the 50mm puncture test, the program will be revised to reflect that change. Discussion was also held on whether or not an additional revision to the specification outlining basic requirements for a manufacturing quality control program would be appropriate. In concept, it was agreed to be a good idea. Joel Sprague of TRI/Environmental will develop a draft as a possible suggestion to the Task Force of the SOM TS 4e working on the puncture revision. Some discussion was then held as to whether or not we ought to require the manufacturers to submit the QC plan when they make submissions to the NTPEP geotextile program. No definitive decision was made.

The work plan does need to be revised deleting Maryland as a test state.

Oscar Mousavi, ADOT, reported that all the information required for incorporation of the geotextile work into the DataMine program ad been submitted to the consultant. Further work is on hold.

The meeting was adjourned at 5 pm.

ATTENDANCE – NTPEP GEOTEXTILE PANEL
MONDAY, MAY 3, 2004
COLUMBUS, OHIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>PANEL MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan Rawson</td>
<td>NH DOT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Mousavi</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Hawkins</td>
<td>BBA Fiberweb</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Goddard</td>
<td>ADS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Kreider</td>
<td>KS DOT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel Soriano</td>
<td>SI Geosolutions</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Byram</td>
<td>FLDOT</td>
<td>Interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greta Smith</td>
<td>KYTC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Lacinak</td>
<td>LADOTD</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwabena Ofori-Awuah</td>
<td>DC DOT</td>
<td>Interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Baker</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Allen (phone)</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Pluimer</td>
<td>Prinsco, Inc.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Hiott</td>
<td>PPI</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Locander</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Allen</td>
<td>TRI/Environmental</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Stewart</td>
<td>UT DOT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Sprague</td>
<td>TRI/Environmental</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Suits</td>
<td>NYS DOT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Woolstrom</td>
<td>Nebraska Dept. of Roads</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In an effort to maintain the AASHTO/NTPEP Geotextile Program as a quality program, you are asked to indicate your satisfaction with the program by responding to the questions below. Please rate your responses for questions 2 - 8 from 1 to 3, with 1 being low and 3 being very high.

1. Do you use the NTPEP Geotextile Program Results?  
   Yes 25  No 10
   If “Yes,” how do you use the results?  
   Required for use 9  Information 17  
   Quality Assurance 5

2. Please indicate overall satisfaction with the program.  
   Comments:  
   2.5

3. Please indicate usefulness of the program to our agency.  
   Comments:  
   2.35

4. Please indicate timeliness of test report publication.  
   Comments:  
   2.5

5. Please indicate satisfaction with test results.  
   Comments:  
   2.65

6. Please indicate satisfaction with responses to questions on test results.  
   Comments:  
   2.69

7. Please indicate satisfaction with final report format and clarity.  
   Comments:  
   2.60

8. Please indicate satisfaction with report content.(Intro., Photos, M-288 Specification)  
   Comments:  
   2.73

1. Thank you for taking time to help us maintain a quality program to meet the needs of the customers of the AASHTO/NTPEP Geotextile Program. If you have further comments or suggestions, please use additional pages to do so.

These questions are not part of the quality survey, but are of interest to the project panel:

1. Does your State use the AASHTO Specification M-288 for Geotextiles?  
   Yes 15  No 17

2. Would your State like to see geomembranes added to the program?  
   Yes 14  No 13

3. Would your State like to see geosynthetic clay liners added to the program?  
   Yes 8  No 20
In an effort to maintain the AASHTO/NTPEP Geotextile Program as a quality program, you are asked to indicate your satisfaction with the program by responding to the questions below. Please rate your responses from 1 to 3, with 1 being unsatisfied and 3 being very satisfied.

1. Please indicate overall satisfaction with the program.  2.5
   Comments:

2. Please indicate satisfaction with the product submission process.  2.83
   Comments:

3. Please indicate satisfaction with the product sampling process.  2.67
   Comments:

4. Please indicate satisfaction with test results.  2.83
   Comments:

5. Please indicate satisfaction with responses to questions on test results.  3.0
   Comments:

6. Please indicate satisfaction with final report format.  2.83
   Comments:

7. Please indicate satisfaction with timeliness of final report.  2.6
   Comments:

8. Thank you for taking time to help us maintain a quality program to meet the needs of the customers of the AASHTO/NTPEP Geotextile Program. If you have further comments or suggestions, please use additional pages to do so.