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Panel Officers Present: Dave Kuniega, Chairperson (Pennsylvania DOT)
Meredith McDiarmid, Secretary (North Carolina DOT)

Panel Members Present: Derrick Castle, Kentucky DOT
Jason Davis, Louisiana DOT
Dave Iverson, Minnesota DOT
Henry Lackinak, Louisiana DOT
Terry Rawls, South Carolina DOT
Gil Rushton, Maryland DOT
Ned Schmitt, Wisconsin DOT
John Vance, Minnesota DOT

Total Member State Attendance: 28
Total Number of States Represented: 20

Chairman Dave Kuniega began the meeting by informing attendees that a Data Mine task force had been formed and is being chaired by Jason Davis. Dave asked for a volunteer to represent the Pavement Marking Materials Panel on that task force. If anyone is interested in filling that need, contact Dave Kuniega.

Dave continued by expressing industry concerns to the states in attendance (see PMM minutes of State & Industry meeting on 5/9/07):

Validity of Test Deck Data
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 in the future. Specific data errors will be addressed as the industry brings those to Dave’s attention.
Product and/or Company Name Changes
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
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
In the case of a product that does not fit into the work plan, the attendees agreed conceptually to this process:
1. 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 2.
2. 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 3.
3. 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.
4. Once the proposed work plan changes are received by the industry, the panel will review and comment.
5. Proposed changes will be balloted to both the industry and member States.

For the specific Sherwin Williams (SW) new product (temporary removable paint), it was determined there was an interest to have this product evaluated by NTPEP. It was also agreed this product would necessitate work plan changes in order to be evaluated. As a result, SW is requested to submit proposed work plan changes for consideration using the procedure above.
**Accelerated Wear Simulator Update**

Kuniega updated attendees on the issues about the Accelerated Wear Simulator:

- Industry is opposed to the concept. They feel it would simply be another hurdle in the product approval process without any tangible benefit to either the States or industry.
- ATF wants to see for themselves by moving forward with investigation by testing a series of paints only on the Pennsylvania and Mississippi test decks this summer for comparison to the accelerated wear simulator data.

**State Commitments to the Use of NTPEP**

After discussion about the determination of the cause of the lack of State participation, the panel leadership decided to further address NTPEP usage through discussions with specific States. They will begin with panel members by sending each panel member specific questions about their NTPEP usage. The panel members will have 30 days to respond. Panel leadership will then follow up with each State on this issue. After working with panel member States, panel leadership will start to address those that attended the PMM panel meeting but are not panel members. Finally those that did not participate in our panel meeting will be approached in the same fashion.

**Proposed Lab Testing Work Plan Changes**

Panel leadership will e-mail proposed changes to panel members for comment. Then they will move forward towards finalization of changes.

**Symposium of States**

Dave Kuniega asked member States to consider having one of these in their region of the country as a way to share PMM information.