

AASHTO National Transportation Product Evaluation Program

Plastic Pipe Committee Minutes 2009 Meeting May 6, 2009

1. Call to Order
2. Accepted 2008 minutes by acclamation
3. Introductions
4. Revised Workplan is ready for publishing on website. Membership Corrections – adopted.
5. Industry concerns
 - a. DOTS still requiring additional testing to accept pipe, including stock lot type programs (E.g., North Carolina, Georgia and Michigan).
 - b. North Carolina reported that there are some producers having quality issues. Eventually they plan to use NTPEP and drop their own testing.
 - c. Second issue: should DOTs be coming on the audits when invited?
 - d. Website and Document Management System Fee was added this year and the cost for 16 plants cost \$16,000.00. Noted.
 - e. Note: Indiana wants separate quality system manuals for every individual plant. Several producers/industry (ADS, PPI) and others (TRI) noted that this did not make sense, that corporately all labs work under the same quality manual. The details of the records will be different but the framework is identical. Washington noted that all AMRL labs (over 1200) use the same quality system manual (R18).
 - f. Industry brought up the issue of 100-year service life. This is an issue for the appropriate AASHTO subcommittees (Bridge and Structures, Materials, etc.)
 - g. Some of the states showing up as red or pink on usage chart really are not barring HDPE, they simply do not employ a QPL/APL for pipe. Given this, the number of states using HDPE without additional testing for qualification may be much larger.
 - h. Industry would like to see at least one more lab do the NTPEP testing. NTPEP is considering this. Sam Allen of TRI noted that labs need to perform proficiency testing (round robin), be accredited, etc. to maintain a specific level of quality in testing.
 - i. Industry would like to see more states using the program; so would NTPEP.
6. Discussion of potential changes to the Plastic Pipe Work Plan and data reported. Industry and DOT input.
7. Test data summary by Jim Goddard of ADS. (PowerPoint presentation: AASHTONTPEPmtg2009 – will be posted online with the minutes)

- a. Data from 10 different manufacturers shows that throughout over 100 test samples, failures are under 1%, several show 0% failure.
 - b. Not shown but data averages for NCLS are improving over time.
8. Task Assignment: the TC is charged with developing a Quality Assurance Work Plan for the HDPE Program. This needs to include how the TC assures the quality of the data they publish, may also include how testing labs are accredited. **ACTION ITEM FOR CHAIR** – submit to NTPEP Administrator (Keith)
9. Discussion on Fitting traceability. How much information is really necessary to ensure quality?
 - a. M294 requirements
 - b. Two types of fittings
 - i. Fittings made using injection molding or blow molding have the M294 data as required. The data is built into the molds. These are usually built by the manufacturer.
 - ii. Fitting built up using welding process may or may not have all of the information, depending on where the pipe is cut and where the molded in fitting is on the length of pipe. These may or may not be built by the manufacturer; many are outsourced to fabrication shops.
 - c. NTPEP wrote a letter to a manufacturer stating that the fitting requirement on traceability was being waived and removed from the Workplan.
 - d. Decisions:
 - i. Require M294 requirements for fittings
 - ii. Stickers are acceptable
 - iii. Change 3.E. needs to be changed
 - iv. The Chair decided that this is not a change, merely a clarification, so it will not be balloted.
 - v. Need a new letter stating the changes to the Workplan, clearly noting the changes and the effective date. **ACTION ITEM FOR CHAIR** – write letter to all manufacturers noting the above.
10. Discussion on the Florida 100 year service life specification. Deferred to the AASHTO Subcommittee on Bridges and Structures / Materials
11. Administrative Oversight Committee – need for new name. New name is adopted as the “HDPE Administrative Group.” **ACTION ITEM FOR CHAIR** – change the names as appropriate in the workplan
12. Review by Kathy Koretz, AMRL, on plant visits.
 - a. PowerPoint presentation
13. How should the final reports look on DataMine? **ACTION ITEM FOR CHAIR** – provide example of how the data should be displayed on DataMine.

14. Timeline for HDPE Pipe submittals. **ACTION ITEM FOR CHAIR** – submit timeline for HDPE pipe submittals to Keith Platte.

15.

16. Adjourn