An update on the status of existing pavement marking test decks was given by Dave Kuniega and test deck host States:

Utah
- 2007 is the last year of the Utah test deck
- Test deck data unofficially reported as having been uploaded onto Data Mine

Pennsylvania
- Test deck data uploaded to Data Mine is current as of November 2006
- 2007 summer data will be collected next week

Mississippi
- April 2007 data has been uploaded into Data Mine

Wisconsin
- Temporary Tape installation scheduled for May 15
- Durable product installation scheduled for the 2nd week in July
- Test deck is in central part of the state
- AASHTO applications for product submittals were posted 6 weeks ago
- Rank Order List is due by the end of May
**Future decks were also described by Dave Kuniega:**

Pennsylvania
- 2008 test deck is anticipated to be performed at typical times
- Permanent product installation is scheduled for the first full week after July 4th. Installation will take 2-4 weeks.

Florida
- Has volunteered to host a test deck
- AASHTO is discussing this possibility with Florida

**Lab Testing Work Plan Changes**

Any lab testing proposals should be evaluated by lab testing states to determine if the tests are realistic for the labs to perform.

Multi-Component Materials
The panel has the most information about these lab testing change proposals. Dave Kuniega presented proposed changes to those in attendance. There was some discussion about why a whiteness index test was not included in the lab tests proposed. It was decided that whiteness index could be determined using Y, x, y data. Susannah Dobbs asked what ASTM method was going to be used to measure for infra-red (IR) analysis. Input will be accepted and reviewed for the final draft. There were no further comments on the proposal and the panel accepted them.

Preformed Tapes (Temporary and Permanent)
Dave Kuniega highlighted the proposed changes to those in attendance. Burt Sutker asked about testing for ash content. **Burt has input he will provide to Dave for further consideration.**

Thermoplastic
The panel has the least information about these lab testing change proposals. Dave Kuniega presented a proposal that referenced T250 for all tests. Florida DOT expressed concern about not specifically identifying test methods as it could lead to confusion and individual interpretation. Dave also showed additional testing that is under consideration. Susannah Dobbs suggested a couple of testing methods for consideration. It was also suggested QUV weathering similar to the methods in the multi-component test battery should be considered for fingerprint purposes. Burt Sutker suggested defining the method of determining the acceptable amount of lead if we are using the term lead-free. Karen Byram suggested making careful distinction between Total Lead Content vs. Biologically Active Lead Content.
**State Utilization of NTPEP Evaluations**

Dave Kuniega reported that as compared to the amount of interest in the Pavement Marking Material Evaluations, there is minimal usage of the data by member States. He is interested in determining the root cause of the disconnection between interest and usage. Manufacturers are beginning to be forced to make business decisions not to participate in some test decks because of the lack of requirements for NTPEP data by member States. The industry warned the panel not to encourage participation by the member States if it becomes merely an additional hurdle to overcome as opposed to having NTPEP evaluations replace current evaluation and product approval efforts of the member States. **Dave is going to address specific concerns during the States Only meeting.**

**Industry Concerns**

**Validity of Test Deck Data**

Personnel turnover during data collection and evaluation can lead to inconsistencies. The industry want to make sure the evaluations are consistent between varying host states and also consistent within one state’s evaluations from year to year. They reported that some of the reported data has been erroneous. **The industry was asked to inform Dave Kuniega of the specifics of their concerns so he can address them.**

**PMM Panel Response:**

After some discussion, it was suggested that some of the inconsistencies in evaluations and/or data collecting could be related to the personnel issues the host States face. As a result of manpower challenges, there is a high turnover rate for evaluators. This creates even more challenges as the host states attempt to train the evaluators to properly collect data. It was suggested to make sure each host state was aware of the demands of Pavement Marking Material (PMM) evaluations before becoming a host State in the future. **Specific data errors will be addressed as the industry brings those to Dave’s attention.**

**Product and/or Company Name Changes**

The industry asked the panel to determine what the procedure will be for product or company name changes. There was discussion about whether to capture these changes in Data Mine. Dave Kuniega reminded the
attendees that the Pavement Marking Material (PMM) number never changes and could serve as the datum for a specific product. **Dave agreed to address this issue in the States Only meeting.**

PMM Panel Response:

Dave encouraged the States to make reference to the PMM number when working with the industry to reduce confusion. After lengthy discussion it was determined that the panel does have some responsibility for providing name change information. The panel also determined there were too many questions and details to be addressed at this meeting. **The panel determined there would be a need for a conference call to determine the specifics of addressing this issue.**

**Control Samples**

The industry asked the panel to consider having control samples to be able to compare one material on the test decks in different years. **Dave agreed to address this issue with the states in the States Only meeting.**

PMM Panel Response:

After considerable discussion, attendees agreed this would be another tool to use as States evaluate pavement marking materials. **The panel unanimously voted to investigate the details of including control samples as part of the PMM evaluations through a conference call in the next year.**

**New Product Evaluation Consideration Process**

Lastly, the industry asked the panel to determine a process to be used to evaluate new products that don’t fit into the standard methods of evaluation in the current work plans. **Dave agreed to address this issue in the States Only meeting.**

PMM Panel Response:

In the case of a product that does not fit into the work plan, the attendees agreed conceptually to this process:

1. Industry will present information to clearly detail the intended use, performance expectations as well as any product specific information the panel feels necessary.
2. After being approached by industry, the panel will determine if there is an interest of the States to see such a product evaluated through NTPEP. If not, there will be no further consideration of the new product. If so, proceed to Step 3.

3. Panel and industry determine whether the new product would necessitate a change in the work plan in order to be evaluated. If not, the new product would be incorporated into the existing work plan. If so, proceed to Step 4.

4. The industry would be required to submit proposed work plan changes to address the intent of the new product. The industry would need to coordinate to submit changes to the work plan to accommodate that category of new product before submission. This would prevent the States from having to review product specific proposed work plan changes on a product specific basis for each new product.

5. Once the proposed work plan changes are received by the industry, the panel will review and comment.

6. Proposed changes will be balloted to both the industry and member States.

Note: For the specific Sherwin Williams (SW) new product (temporary removable paint), there did seem to be an interest to further investigate the possibility of having this product evaluated by NTPEP. **SW must provide more detailed information to determine if there is an interest in having the product evaluated through NTPEP.** It was also agreed this product would necessitate work plan changes. **Sherwin Williams should submit those changes in accordance with Step 4 above for the Panel to proceed with consideration of this product.**

**2005 Test Deck Variability and Cold Temperature Study Presentation**

Rohm and Haas presented information about an informal test deck that was performed with Dave Kuniega in Pennsylvania in 2005. The intent of the deck was to determine how cold temperatures were affecting the retroreflectivity and dry times of various paint materials. The data that was presented generated considerable interest and discussion. NTPEP is going to post the presentation on the web site. To obtain more detailed information about this evaluation, contact Dave Kuniega.
**Wet Retroreflectivity Measurement Test Discussion**

Currently, the test decks are performing a wet recovery test on materials that have been designated as wet reflective materials by the manufacturer. Measurements are taken between the right wheel path and the right edge line with the beam facing outwardly towards the edge line. Jim Swisher suggested the TTI methods for testing wet retroreflectivity should be presented to the panel. Dave acknowledged there were still some details to be addressed and will be as the test decks progress.

**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.