Panel Officers Present: Dave Kuniega, Chairperson (Pennsylvania DOT)
John Corcoran, Vice-Chair (New Hampshire DOT)
Meredith McDiarmid, Secretary (North Carolina DOT)

Panel Members Present: Ned Schmitt, Wisconsin DOT
Jason Davis, Louisiana DOT
John Vance, Mississippi DOT
Craig Graham, Vermont AOT

Total Member State Attendance: 25
Total Number of States Represented: 17
Total Industry Attendance: 27

Chairman Dave Kuniega began the meeting with a presentation of a short history of where pavement marking began all the way through where it has evolved to today.

An update on the status of existing pavement marking test decks was given individually by each host state:

- Utah and Pennsylvania Test Decks were installed last year (2005).
  - Utah’s test deck had a relatively small number of samples submitted for testing
  - Utah deck is experiencing a high snowplow rate resulting in low retroreflectivity readings
  - The lab testing state (Louisiana) for the Utah deck has received all the 2005 materials for testing
  - Preliminary Data on the Utah deck will be available through NTPEP very soon

- Pennsylvania also experienced a lower volume of applications on their deck in 2005
  - Installation took a lot less time since there were not as many applications
  - Testing is still taking the same amount of time as a result of the recent additions to the work plan (wet retroreflectivity, photo logs, etc.)
  - Pennsylvania deck is getting State Patrol assistance during application and testing
  - State Patrol assistance has lowered the speeds at the sites to the posted speed limit
Future decks were also described by the host states:

✓ 55 +/- products (with the potential of 70 +/-) have been submitted to the Mississippi test deck for installation in mid July 2006
✓ Site locations are posted on the NTPEP web site
✓ Asphalt pavement site location is on I-20 east of Meridian, MS
✓ Concrete pavement site location is on US 45 southeast of Meridian, MS

- Pennsylvania will host a deck in 2007
- Installation is scheduled for the first full week after July 4th

- Wisconsin has also committed to hosting a deck in 2007
- Wisconsin may have a scheduling conflict
- Ned Schmitt and Dave Kuniega will discuss the conflict and resolve

- Florida is entertaining the possibility of hosting a deck in the near future
- Florida has started their own 3 year test deck already
- Karen Byram and Paul Vinik with Florida DOT are talking with Dave Kuniega to make a determination

Data Mine Update

The PMM Panel currently has an application in Data Mine. Testing States and NTPEP are working diligently to input data into Data Mine in a timely fashion. The application is currently being “debugged” of issues already recognized by users (repair, upgrade, maintenance, etc.). All other comments about Data Mine should be directed to PMM Panel Officers or NTPEP. The current process of uploading information by the testing states into Data Mine goes through a third party. Some data entry mistakes have been noted and are being corrected.

Some proposed changes include:

- Having lab and field data in the same place in Data Mine to make it more user friendly.
- Having testing states directly input data to avoid third party mistakes
- Updating Data Mine to reflect changes in the work plan (i.e. wet retroreflectivity measurements) in the next month
Wet Retroreflectivity Measurements
Since wet retroreflectivity measurements are relatively new to PMM Work Plan, some specific issues/actions have been identified:

- Wet retroreflectivity measurements take more time and should be reflected in the testing costs for those materials
- Industry should formally indicate which materials should be included in wet retroreflectivity measurements
- If a product does not seem to be providing wet retroreflectivity, should it continue to be measured as a wet retroreflective marking?
- Industry made the point that there is no "standard" for what is wet retroreflective, so products that have been identified by the industry as such will continue to be measured
- Kuniega will follow up with the industry to formalize the procedures for wet retroreflectivity measurements
- Currently, the work plan calls for the wet recovery method to be used when taking wet retroreflective measurements
- PMM Panel will review Wisconsin data to determine if the wet recovery method of measurement is still sufficient

AASHTO ASTM D04.38 Liaison Report to NTPEP (Jason Davis)

- D4505-01a, D4592-03 – Changes to Specifications
  - Readings in both roll directions shall be measured
  - Both readings shall meet minimum retroreflectivity values

- Wet Retroreflectivity Standard Specification
  - Ballot did not go forward
  - More research on rain rates is necessary
  - Data to be collected based on NTPEP experience

- D6359-99
  - To be balloted for withdrawal
  - Will transform it into a practice for measuring retroreflectivity with a handheld retroreflectometer

- Thermoplastic
  - Moving towards the use of AASHTO M249
  - ASTM group will make recommendations to AASHTO SOM
Industry Comments to the PMM Panel

- The deadline for the Mississippi test deck took the industry by surprise...they would like a reminder via e-mail to provide more notice of deadlines.
- Industry wonders if there will be an experienced person on the Mississippi test deck.
- Industry asked the PMM Panel to consider longitudinal testing versus transverse testing.
- Kuniega asked the industry to submit a formal request to specify exactly which materials the industry would like to be tested longitudinally.
- Kuniega also reminded the industry that site space and safety were the two major concerns with longitudinal measurements.
- Industry would like for the PMM Panel to consider allowing outside entities to assist in evaluations.
- Kuniega mentioned that Mississippi State and Utah LTAP were already assisting NTPEP in the collection of data.
- The industry is holding comments on the Accelerated Wear Simulator until after the mediated meeting between the industry and NTPEP.

Accelerated Wear Simulator Update

Kuniega gave an overview of the Accelerated Wear Simulator issues that have been developing over the past year. He mentioned the three factors that need to happen for an accelerated wear simulator to be considered in the US:

- All States should agree on a unified specification.
- All States should use the specification in their state.
- All States should have a warranty related to that specification.

It seems the next steps should include taking NTPEP test deck materials to Spain to test them on their accelerated wear simulator to determine if the materials would perform that same on the accelerated wear simulator as they do in field evaluations. There are European studies that have been performed on this subject. Those studies have been provided to NTPEP and are being reviewed. There will be a mediated discussion in the next month with the industry before any samples are submitted. There is a consensus that the industry should be able to deny permission for their material to be tested in Spain.
Work Plan Update

The Pavement Marking Material Work Plan is presently being balloted through NTPEP. The next intent is to put the approved Work Plan into AASHTO format and submit it to be an AASHTO standard. It is hopeful that if there is national adoption of the work plan, more States will start using NTPEP and embrace the NTPEP concept.

Lab Tests Update

The Pavement Marking Material Panel still needs to work on incorporating IR testing into the work plan for all pavement marking materials. Most of the comments from the task force for Multi-Component and Tapes lab testing changes were accepted by the Panel. Since there was little to no input from the industry on Thermoplastic materials, the States are going to determine what lab testing will be required of thermoplastic materials. However, the States’ proposal will be presented to the industry for review and comment. The next hurdle will be to determine if there will be enough lab testing facilities to perform the tests that are required.

Presentation by Potters Industries on the use of North American Glass Cullet

Chris Davies reported that Potters has submitted an AASHTO M247 Technical Revision to include the requirement to use North American glass cullet. He said that non-North American cullet has been tested for and found to have heavy metals in the glass. Heavy metals are considered hazardous materials. Potters recommends X-ray diffraction as a fingerprinting method to determine if beads have been made with non-North American cullet.

Resulting discussion included the question of whether AASHTO intended to apply the North American raw material requirement to all aspects of pavement marking. Some States wonder why one wouldn’t just test for heavy metal content through a leaching test. One manufacturer suggested the entire industry should be considering lead content in pavement marking as a whole.

State Meeting Agenda

Kuniega gave States an agenda for the upcoming States Only Pavement Marking Materials Panel meeting. He reminded the States he would be asking them to provide information about how they are using the NTPEP data.
**Future Activity of PMM Panel**

Kuniega suggested that the PMM Panel should be taking a more active role in the testing procedures nationally, not just in their host states. He feels a more active role would provide more consistency to the program. The Panel agreed a more active role would be beneficial.