RPM Conference Call  
August 20, 2014  
11:00 AM Eastern Time  
Minutes

1. **Conference Call Attendees:**  
   Rick Douds – GA DOT  
   Brad Young – OH DOT  
   Jim Swisher – VA DOT  
   Pam King – GA DOT  
   Paul Vinik – FL DOT  
   Ken Berg – UT DOT  
   Katheryn Malusky - AASHTO  
   Henry Lacinak – AASHTO

2. **DataMine 3.0**  
   Participants asked to review design documents distributed with the conference call invite with the following goals:  
   a. How can we improve upon DM 2.0 (what issues need to be addressed?)  
   b. What we can get from the new DM 3.0 with the design planned by i-Engineering. (Need detailed input.)

   **Pam King:**  
   • Issues with DataMine 2.0 were mentioned  
     o Unable to put in information for control marker  
     o Cannot scroll on NTPEP front page (home page)  
     o Getting information to manufacturers in a timely manner after test deck is completed. Sometimes problems are encountered in getting data into the DataMine. So far, problems with these issues have been fixed.

   • List of features to be added to DataMine 3.0  
     o Marker rating of 0 to 5 – a description is needed to define each rating  
     o Field tab – more info needed to enter Month / Asphalt or Concrete or both  
     o Change to larger font / Change to something more readable such as Arial (better than Calibri)  
     o Under Lab Lens tab – lab impact results – more space is needed for text description  
     o Under Retro tab – more space is needed to place graph image vs time to make a larger image.  
     o Photos of new markers (prior to field exposure) are being added into the DataMine currently. This feature needs to be maintained.
Jim Swisher:
- Stated to be clear in expressing critical needs to make sure it is understood the necessity as opposed to just a desirable change.
- Suggest taking screen shot to document current DataMine 2.0 features in case these features are deleted or changed in DataMine 3.0. It will also reinforcement the position that any lost feature was actually possible and being implemented in the past version of DataMine.

Pam King:
- Excel spreadsheets developed by Pam and Brad Young were submitted to i-Engineering and put into DataMine format. Some of the new format looked similar to what was submitted in the excel format, however, some did not. Excel is what we wanted it to look like, but it did not always translate as such. Some suggestions for improvement. (If really important, make sure your suggestion is more of a demand.)
- Graphs within DataMine 2.0 are a result of plotting graphs by the state of Georgia and placed manually into DataMine.
- Photos of new markers (prior to field exposure) are being added into the DataMine currently. This feature needs to be maintained.

Henry Lacinak:
- Stated that in the previous conference call for Sign Sheeting Materials, Derrick Castle mentioned a new feature that was planned for DataMine 3.0. The new feature is to bring back the specification search for products. The user would be able to filter products by listing criteria regarding specified properties unique to a particular state.
- Stated that Derrick Castle also noted that graphing is not planned as a feature of DataMine 3.0. However, as mentioned in the previous call for Sign Sheeting Materials, Jason Davis (LA) indicated the goal within the state of Louisiana to develop a software or macro which would be able to utilize data and develop a graph. The intent is to possibly upload the mechanism enabling the graphing as a file into the DataMine 3.0 in order to be used by other states. It was suggested that Pam King and Jason Davis work together in this venture.

Rick Douds:
- Will trial runs be done to make sure system is operating properly prior to full implementation?
- Ability to enter control data needs to be done now for DataMine 2.0.

Jim Swisher:
- Suggested to repeat concerns regarding past problem areas in the development of the new DataMine 3.0. Don’t assume that an issue previously discussed will be remembered when the new version is developed.

Katheryn Malusky:
- Roll out date has not been established for DataMine 3.0. However, the quicker input is received from TCs, the sooner the new version can be implemented. Implementation is planned to be done for all the modules at one time, rather than piece meal.
- Any changes or improvements requested should be sent to Henry Lacinak at AASHTO.
Brad Young:
- Will everything in DataMine 2.0 be carried over into 3.0?

Katheryn Malusky:
- Yes. However, fields added or changed will need to be worked out between i-Engineering and AASHTO.
- Format (layout) will be similar to past version (regarding data field) in order to allow entry and exporting of data by users to be smooth without introducing a new learning curve.

Henry Lacinak:
- Exporting data into excel spreadsheet by SSM TC has been developed. This may be desirable for the RPM TC.
- Pam King – Data is currently put into excel by Georgia DOT and then copied into the DataMine. Georgia has not gone the other way – DataMine format back to excel. Other states may wish to have this feature. Graphing can be done more easily by pulling data from the excel spreadsheet.
- Pam King – Sometimes when manufactures have trouble getting data, Georgia will make PDFs of the original spreadsheet (not in DataMine) and send to manufacturers.
- Need to make data entry and export simple and easy accomplish by states and manufacturers.
- Rick Douds – Comparison of data over past year needs to be available by use of a query (looking at more than one product at a time). A spreadsheet would better enable a user to review and research data for comparative results. Current research done with Georgia Tech incurs a cost to get the information from previous years.
- Suggested Rick Douds, Pam King & Jim Swisher participate in a webinar (facilitated by AASHTO) to discuss further development of excel spreadsheets as a means for data entry and export.

Jim Swisher:
- Suggested a review of how manufacturers enter company and product data to improve efficiency by copy and paste or using auto filling of fields and drop down menus. Submittal of a previously submitted product could allow repopulation of fields for the new submission.

Rick Douds:
- Screen shots will be taken to document current features in DataMine and to indicate needed changes. Checks will be made after implementation to determine if appropriate changes were made and to determine if current features which are desirable are maintained.

3. Retesting Pavement Markings
   - Re-test after 5 years – Full field evaluation or lab testing only?
   - If we perform lab testing only should the re-evaluation be performed every 2-3 years?

Rick Douds:
- RPM manufacturers may change product and states may wish retesting periodically. Individual states would need to put into specifications to require retesting after a particular time period.
• Survey should be distributed to states to determine retesting requirement and ask if this requirement is currently in state specification or does state plan to include this requirement in the specifications in the near future.
• Survey should also ask if state would prefer full testing or lab testing only.
• Wording for survey would be developed by GA DOT. AASHTO will assist in distribution.

4. **Round Robin Study – Test Results – Questions?**

**Rick Douds:**
• Statistical analysis was performed on results
• Summary — no significant difference noted in results of round robin study between labs.
• Range of difference (precision) can be obtained in more detail if needed.
• Review of ASTM D4820 was suggested to determine what is stated regarding precision and bias.
• Request will be made to develop precision and bias based upon results obtained in study.

**Rick Douds:**
• Will send email to AASHTO to request TC membership for Jim Swisher (VA DOT) and industry representative.

**Henry Lacinak:**
• Announced webinar with i-Engineering and TC chairs and vice-chairs planned for September 2, 2014 to further explain needs for DataMine 3.0.
• Solicited ideas from TC members after further reviewing documents
• Input from members should be sent in prior to call of September 2nd.

**Rick Douds:**
• Use of epoxy work plan is planned – manufacturers will be asked to submit epoxy to NTPEP to reduce man hours devoted to testing of this product.

**Paul Vinik:**
• Received information that raised pavement markers used in China were made out of cast aluminum. Housing may be better than materials current used. Rigorous laboratory is currently being performed in Florida DOT laboratory. These markers are similar to standard markers with an integral lens.

**Pam King:**
• Question if Ray-O-Lite Markers submitted in 2013 were withdrawn. Need to contact manufacture to confirm action.

**Rick Douds:**
• All markers for submitted for the 2014 test cycle have been received early this year.