

PRI Construction Materials Technologies LLC

6412 Badger Drive Tampa, FL 33647 813.621.5777 https://www.pri-group.com/

Email Correspondence

To: From: Subject:	Frank Carman Jason Simmons Test Status: Proprietary testing	Date: for treatment of asphalt	April 13, 2021 shingles
Background:	Client requested testing compare the effects of a was resistance to water p	n accordance with a prospecific treatment for as enetration.	oprietary test method to evaluate and phalt shingles. The property evaluated
Specimen:	Three different types of s treatment, 2) unaged asp aged shingles with the pro- Specimens were excised f samples. Specimens wer the cut specimens was co shingle edges.	peceimens were evaluat halt shingles with a pro oprietary treatment app rom a larger, client supp e cut approximately 4 ir pated in wax to prevent	red: 1) unaged asphalt shingles with no prietary treatment applied and 3) 20yr lied. lied sample of the each of the identified thes by 6 inches and the perimeter of uptake of water through the exposed
Methods:	Specimen weights were resubsequent drying. An in minute exposure to a corspray requirements of A following water exposure exposure to UV light and	ecorded prior to and dur nitial weight was record ntrolled and uniform wa STM G154. Specimen and after 15 minutes, i heat in accordance with	ing a series of exposure to wetting and ed for each specimen followed by a 3 ter spray in accordance with the water weights were recorded immediately 30minutes, and 60 minutes of a drying ASTM G154 Cycle 1.
Observations:	Refer to page 6.		

2320T0002

The test results, opinions, or interpretations are based on the material supplied by the client. This report is for the exclusive use of stated client. No reproduction or facsimile in any form can be made without the client's permission. This report shall not be reproduced except in full without the written approval of this laboratory. PRI Construction Materials Technologies LLC assumes no responsibility nor makes a performance or warranty statement for this material or products and processes containing this material in connection with this report.

Shingle Magic Proprietary Testing for Asphalt Shingle Treatment Page 2 of 6

Representative Photographs:



Untreated Specimens – As Received

Untreated Specimens – After Testing



Treated Specimens – As Received

Treated Specimens – After Testing



2320T0002

The test results, opinions, or interpretations are based on the material supplied by the client. This report is for the exclusive use of stated client. No reproduction or facsimile in any form can be made without the client's permission. This report shall not be reproduced except in full without the written approval of this laboratory. PRI Construction Materials Technologies LLC assumes no responsibility nor makes a performance or warranty statement for this material or products and processes containing this material in connection with this report.

Shingle Magic Proprietary Testing for Asphalt Shingle Treatment Page 3 of 6

Test Data: Untreated shingles





2320T0002

The test results, opinions, or interpretations are based on the material supplied by the client. This report is for the exclusive use of stated client. No reproduction or facsimile in any form can be made without the client's permission. This report shall not be reproduced except in full without the written approval of this laboratory. PRI Construction Materials Technologies LLC assumes no responsibility nor makes a performance or warranty statement for this material or products and processes containing this material in connection with this report.

Shingle Magic Proprietary Testing for Asphalt Shingle Treatment Page 4 of 6

Test Data: Treated shingles





2320T0002

The test results, opinions, or interpretations are based on the material supplied by the client. This report is for the exclusive use of stated client. No reproduction or facsimile in any form can be made without the client's permission. This report shall not be reproduced except in full without the written approval of this laboratory. PRI Construction Materials Technologies LLC assumes no responsibility nor makes a performance or warranty statement for this material or products and processes containing this material in connection with this report.

Shingle Magic Proprietary Testing for Asphalt Shingle Treatment Page 5 of 6

Test Data: Treated 20yr old shingles





2320T0002

The test results, opinions, or interpretations are based on the material supplied by the client. This report is for the exclusive use of stated client. No reproduction or facsimile in any form can be made without the client's permission. This report shall not be reproduced except in full without the written approval of this laboratory. PRI Construction Materials Technologies LLC assumes no responsibility nor makes a performance or warranty statement for this material or products and processes containing this material in connection with this report.



Observations: The treatment of the asphalt shingle specimens did appear to have a significant effect on the resistance to water penetration of the asphalt shingle specimens that were tested.

Zone 1: Illustrates the increased specimen weight due to water – both the surface water "on" the specimen as well as the absorbed moisture "in" the specimen. The lower peak, or initial increase in weight is due to the repellency caused by the treatment. The surface repellency is likely the more significant contributor, minimizing the exposure of the inner asphalt coating to the liquid water. Notice the treated unaged specimens and the treated aged specimens took on 22% and 31% as much water weight as the untreated specimens respectively.

Zone 2: Illustrates the effectiveness of the treatment and relative rapid loss in weight of the specimens primarily due to the drying of surface water on and in the granulated surface of the shingle. Notice the treated unaged specimens and the treated aged specimens both lost more weight in Zone 2 than they gained in Zone 1 while the untreated shingle only lost 60% of the weight that it gained in Zone 1. This indicates that the untreated shingle absorbed a significant amount of water while the treated shingles absorbed little to no water.

Zone 3: The weight loss in Zone 3 is minimal for all shingles – indicating the moisture content of the specimens themselves. The more easily evaporated surface water was removed in Zone 2, while the moisture that was absorbed <u>into</u> the shingle in zone 1 is more difficult to drive off and thus will take considerably more time. Of note in Zone 3 is the difference between the treated aged specimens and the treated unaged specimens. The average overall weight change of the treated aged specimens was -0.11g, twice that of the treated unaged specimens at 0.05g. This observation is not unexpected due to the combination of the ability for moisture to both entire as well as exit the oxidized asphalt coating.

END OF TEST STATUS

2320T0002

The test results, opinions, or interpretations are based on the material supplied by the client. This report is for the exclusive use of stated client. No reproduction or facsimile in any form can be made without the client's permission. This report shall not be reproduced except in full without the written approval of this laboratory. PRI Construction Materials Technologies LLC assumes no responsibility nor makes a performance or warranty statement for this material or products and processes containing this material in connection with this report.