Truncated Domes
Task Force Meeting Agenda
Working Session # 13
Wednesday, March 15, 2017 2:00PM – 3:00PM

1) Call to Order and Introductions

2) Review of Current Technical Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Voting Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byram, Karen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karen.byram@dot.state.fl.us">karen.byram@dot.state.fl.us</a></td>
<td>Florida Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roskam, Natalie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nroskam@ncdot.gov">nroskam@ncdot.gov</a></td>
<td>North Carolina Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingram, Steven</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ingrams@dot.state.al.us">ingrams@dot.state.al.us</a></td>
<td>Alabama Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Non-Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon, Kidada C.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dixonk@dot.state.al.us">dixonk@dot.state.al.us</a></td>
<td>Alabama Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna, Maysa F.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mhanna@azdot.gov">mhanna@azdot.gov</a></td>
<td>Arizona Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Non-Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis, Anne</td>
<td><a href="mailto:AEllis@azdot.gov">AEllis@azdot.gov</a></td>
<td>Arizona Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Non-Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang, Stephanie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shuang@azdot.gov">shuang@azdot.gov</a></td>
<td>Arizona Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb, Todd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:todd.webb@state.de.us">todd.webb@state.de.us</a></td>
<td>Delaware Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson-Perry, Erany</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Erobinson@dot.ga.gov">Erobinson@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
<td>Georgia Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Non-Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khoda, Mahbub E</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mahbub.khoda@dot.iowa.gov">mahbub.khoda@dot.iowa.gov</a></td>
<td>Iowa Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Non-Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon, Jozsef T.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jae.t.simon@tn.gov">jae.t.simon@tn.gov</a></td>
<td>Tennessee Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton, Darby</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Darby.J.Clayton@wv.gov">Darby.J.Clayton@wv.gov</a></td>
<td>West Virginia Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Non-Voting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you aren’t on the list and want to be contact Chair, Vice Chair, or Liaison

3) Brief summary of the task force (for those states who do not participate in quarterly calls or who are new to NTPEP)

This committee oversees the work plan that covers the evaluation of truncated domes, aka detectable warning systems. Different laboratory material testing is required for the various materials used by manufacturers of these products.

- No longer a task force, now a full committee
- This is all pre-formed items, nothing formed in-situ
- Used the American with Disabilities Act standards
- Not intended for vehicular traffic
- May be wet set or dry set
- The work plan will use laboratory testing
  - No field testing
  - The type of testing is dependent upon the type of material
- First went through and figured out what the states wanted from testing
  - Didn’t get as much participation as was hoped for. Hoping this changes now that the committee is off the ground.
- The work plan was sent to all states
  - It was finalized and adopted
  - Posted on the website for public view
- RFP went out to testing facilities
  - Due April 21st
- Questions received from test facility suggest there is an opportunity to clarify the work plan.
- Showed how to get to the DWS technical committee section on ntpep.org website
- Discussion of color testing
  - Manufacturer can submit different colors and only perform full scope of testing once and then each color would be subjected to the color testing portion.
- During the first attempt by NTPEP to form DWS committee, the costs were prohibitive and caused the committee to disband
  - More cost conscience with this attempt
4) **Review of Outstanding Action Items**
   
   **a)** Task Force conversion to Technical Committee Status
   
   **b)** Workplan is finalized, adopted, and ready to be posted on the NTPEP website.
   
   **c)** Laboratory contract bid solicitation status
   
   **d)** Product submittals are contingent on the Laboratory contract, testing solicitations are expected to begin in late summer or early autumn.
   
   **e)** DataMine development for the data reporting
   
   **f)** Usage guide for Workplan development
   
5) **Industry Concerns**
   
   - If the testing has already been performed would that still need to be done on that product for inclusion on DataMine?
     
     o NTPEP does not accept third party data submitted to it
     
     o Must be tested by the NTPEP testing laboratory
     
     o If the testing is performed in compliance with ASTM why can’t I use my own lab?
       
       ▪ Because the states want to keep some control over the way that testing is performed
       
       ▪ Prevents any issues with bias in testing
   
   - Some concern about cost
     
     o NTPEP has the advantage that you have the ability to test the product once and have it accepted in many of the states
     
     o A big portion of the manufacturers intended customers are not DOTs so a high cost could discourage them from using the program because they have customers in other areas
       
       ▪ While the municipalities may not have stringent requirements, often they don’t have the resources to evaluate and will just look at the state QPL
   
   - Does NTPEP have some sort of acceptance criteria?
     
     o NTPEP just collects the data, it is up to the states to decide what is acceptable or not
   
   - Is there a retest every 5 years?
     
     o There doesn’t have to be, the committee decides this
   
   - There are a lot of systems that are down right now that don’t meet any specification, is there intent to eventually test those types of systems too?
     
     o There could be, the selection of product types available right now are there because we had to start somewhere
   
6) **Open Discussion**
   
   - Has a guide been produced to help states determine acceptance?
     
     o Has not been completed yet
• Will vary from state to state depending on the particular environmental conditions
• Can you bid on testing for just certain tests
  o Yes
  o The work plan may go through some iterations while we figure out what works and doesn’t work
• One of the issues with the tests that are being required, is that the test specimens can’t be made from the product itself
  o Might mean that the product may need to make special test specimens
  o Going to ask states that are already requiring this to get answers to this and see what they are doing
• ALDOT performs a visual inspection for their and were wondering if states were really performing elaborate testing on the product
  o They are, some environmental conditions caused cracking and failures in some states
  o The testing in the DWS comes directly from state requirements

7) Review of Action Items for 2017
   • Committee will need to work on the DataMine module
   • Need to develop the usage guide