NTPEP RSCP Conference Call Agenda

August 4, 2014 @ 11 am eastern time

Attendees:

Pat Galarza (NY), William Goss (NY), Rick Douds (GA), Darryl Johnson (GA), Kathryn Malusky (AASHTO), Mark Nelson (Nelson Testing), Bill Real (NH), Wendy Henry (Quikrete), Brad Young (OH), Merrill Zwanka (SC), Steve Hermanson (BASF), Scott Wutzke (ND), Richie Charoenpap (LA), Grant Kao (CTS), Rick Carpenito (MA)

Status of current test cycle (2013)

All lab data should be entered and released to manufacturers. The year 1 field data for 2013 will be collected at the time of the 2014 installation.

Products submitted for 2014 test cycle

Currently, there are 7 products accepted. The cycle will remain open until August 8th.

DM 3.0 tasks

- Define “Find” search parameters
  Suggest the following:
    - Manufacturer
    - Product Name
    - Submittal Year
    - Product Category (Cementitious, Polymer-modified, Polymer)
    - Product Use (Horizontal, Vertical/overhead, Horizontal and Vertical/overhead)
    - NTPEP #
  
  Everyone is ok with these search parameters.

- Time Line
  Suggest the following milestones
    - Product application accepted
    - Product sample received
    - Lab testing complete
    - Field installation complete
    - 1 year field evaluation complete
    - 2 year field evaluation complete
  
  These are the discussed milestones. There may be some slight adjustments.

Define testing variables

- ASTM C1583 – Bond testing by direct tension
  The specimen age at the time of test is not defined by the method or the work plan. Suggest 28 days. 28 days was agreed upon.

  The specimen thickness is not defined by the method or the work plan. Recommend we follow ICRI “Guideline for Inorganic Repair Material Data Sheet Protocol” which suggests the mid-
point of manufacturers recommended thickness. **Extended products may not have a maximum depth.** The recommended depth should to be indicated by the manufacturer.

We need to define the surface preparation of the substrate material. I recommend specifying a CSP (Concrete Surface Profile) range that is attained by shot blasting. Suggest CSP 3-5. We also need to define how the surface is prepared i.e. wetting, priming, etc. Should we prepare as prescribed by the manufacturer’s literature? **Bill will draft wording for review.** Everyone was ok with using CSP 3-5 for surface texture and following manufacturer’s recommendations for surface preparation (wetting, priming, etc).

- **AASHTO T161 – Freeze/thaw testing**
  T161 states that the specimen age should be 14 days or as specified. This may be too young for some product types. Recommend 28 days. Currently this isn’t specified in the work plan. 28 days was agreed upon.

### Work plan issues

- **Remove NY fz/thaw test from work plan.** NY is moving away from this method and it will be removed from the NTPEP work plan. 2013 data should be uploaded for NY Freeze thaw soon and released.
- **Add AASHTO TP 95-11 – Surface Resistivity Indication of Concrete’s ability to Resist Chloride Ion Penetration.** This would be in addition to the current testing.
- Previously, images of freeze/thaw prisms were posted in DM showing condition after testing. This isn’t required by the current work plan. Add them? **Wording will be added to include images of the prisms.**
- Retest cycle. Work plan (Section 15) currently says products should be submitted for retesting every 5 years. This should be clarified to say that resubmittal should be 5 years from date of previous submittal. **We didn’t discuss this topic.**
- Products produced at multiple facilities. How should we handle this? **NY requires separate application for each manufacturing facility.** The idea is to list places where the product is produced and randomly select facility (s) to sample. There are probably too many plants to require them all to submit a sample for NTPEP.
- Withdrawal policy. Discuss scenarios where withdrawal is allowed and when withdrawn product can be resubmitted for testing. Decide what is shown in DM when product is withdrawn. If product is withdrawn before testing, the manufacturer can resubmit. If manufacturer wants to question test results, there needs to be protocol. There is a retest protocol in the work plan (Section 14) but it may need some adjustments.
- **Continue field testing?** How many states are using this? **MA and NY do not use field test results for qualification.** GA does use field data to some extent. Field testing will continue with enough product for only one sample.
- Should we be testing only products as packaged or also test products that are extended as part of our evaluation? **This topic needs more discussion.** There seems to be confusion from states on the definition of NTPEP "neat" and "extended". It does appear that many states do want extended aggregate testing completed though as they normally have the manufacturer provide the aggregate or used local pre-approved aggregate suppliers.
- DM 3.0 Tasks
- Data entry spreadsheets
- Product evaluation application
- Reporting data export spreadsheet
- Data Dictionary
- Numerical condition of Fz/thaw specimens? Pictures are not “searchable” in DataMine. Do we want to assign some numerical values that would allow degree of fz/thaw deterioration to be a searchable parameter in DM3? (Assumes that we still want pictures to be provided). These topics can be discussed once the work plan changes are made.