Objective: Discuss and Resolve Issues Regarding 2009 Test Deck in Florida

Item 1: 30 minutes
1. Issues Raised by the Manufacturers (06/08/2009 email from Dave Villani)
   a. Safety Concerns
      i. Distance from traffic during application
         Close to active traffic – the selection of the test site is on a 6 lane highway and 2 lanes will be closed for application of the products. The lines will be in the high speed lane, far left of travel lanes. That also prevents traffic from trying to cut across work zone for exit. The shoulder will also provide an additional area for set up and the center median will provide space for vehicles and staging of striping application. Interstate 4 – Lakeland FL location.

      ii. Lighting of the test deck causing distraction to the motorist
          There is some high mast lighting in the area – additional lighting will be possible as long as we do not impede traffic. Paul will need to check with the District to determine the amount of lighting allowed.

   b. Lighting and visibility for testing
      i. Adequate lighting to evaluate bead distribution and line quality
      ii. Ability to determine no track

   c. Humidity levels and effects on dry time of products
      Average humidity in the evening is 60% in October in Orlando area.

      Villani – this could cause a problem with dry time for products
      Kuniega – can append report regarding application time and humidity.

      Villani – products may dry within 60 seconds anyway
When you are close to dew point it will also affect Thermo adhesion.

**Vinik** – we have done application at that location at night and have experience with these conditions. The 2 component is longitudinal as well as transverse

**Item 2: 10 minutes**

2. Additional concerns from the manufacturer

**Villani** - Biggest concern is still adequate lighting for evaluation.

**Kuniega** - Until the number of vendors is known cannot estimate time and resources as well.

**Wood** – Whole process regarding selection of test deck was surprising – night application seems contrary to work plan.

**Kuniega** – Had never considered this to be a conflict

**Villani** – While it does not specify night or day – vendors not expecting the change

**Kuniega** – There are benefits of moving testing back to a member department and should also benefit Industry for Florida access and using a state agency versus academia should carry more credibility with other states

**Wood** – That is Florida’s intent for use of this data?

**Vinik** – The 2 component products are already using NTPEP work plan. There is an additional product that has gone to NTPEP entirely – there are differing opinions within FDOT regarding moving to NTPEP – additional pressure from Industry would help move FDOT to NTPEP.

**Wood** – Can we get something in writing from FDOT that indicates intent regarding use of this (WB and Thermo) data?

**Vinik** – Do not have that authority.

**Platte** – Will have that conversation with FDOT

**Villani** – Will AL be using this data?

**Platte** – We can contact Materials/Chief Engineer to discuss possible use.

**Kuniega** – LA has had several product approval issues and they are deferring to NTPEP data – FL better suits the climate than PA

**Vinik** – Will have a stronger argument for performance of products in FL if performing on FL roads.

**Wood** – Is there a time we can expect an answer prior to submitting products from these states?

**Platte** – At what point is it economical to move forward?

**Wood** – It would be good to have commitment from 1

**Kuniega** – Have none of the states used MS data for approvals?

**Wood** – AL has QPL with products from SASHTO – not sure how they update

**Platte** – Will have conversation with SE states and gage usage for all products for this TC

**Wood** – If you could get some feedback regarding the FL deck it would be appreciated

**Platte** – No problem doing leg work – but need assurance that if ½ of states are going to use it then industry will supply products

**Villani** – We will supply materials – the number of products will be determined by potential use.

**Wood** – Both surfaces on I4?

**Vinik** – Yes
Wood – Do both at same time?
Vinik – That is the plan
Kuniega – One no track may make sense – should evaluate

**Item 3: 15 minutes**
3. Open Discussion
Time restriction for lane closure will not allow flexibility with application schedule
Window of time – 8:30 PM to 5:30 AM approximate – Vinik will get exact times.

**Action Items:**

Platte – Will contact SE States to get a gage on use of data from the FL Deck. Response by June 26th.