Raised Pavement Markers and Snow Plowable Pavement Markers
Conference Call Minutes
Thursday, July 23, 2015
1:30PM – 2:00PM Eastern Time

1) Roll Call and Introductions

Daryl Johnson (GA)
Brad Young (OH)
Rick Douds (GA)
George Lian (GA)
Paul Vinik (FL)
Nikita Wilson (FL)
Jim Swisher (VA)
Henry Lacinak (AASHTO)

2) Work Plan revision – The RPM work plan was revised to combine all products into one document.

Summary of changes:
• Added recommended re-test cycle
• Reinstated temporary pavement marker evaluation
• Reinstated chip seal marker evaluation to work plan
• Reinstated adhesive evaluation to work plan
• May be changes in deadline date for submittals starting in 2016

ACTION ITEM: Technical Committee was asked to review and submit comments to Rick Douds by **July 31st**.
Upon acceptance by the RPM TC, this work plan will be submitted for full ballot in August 2015.

3) Notification of manufacturers of products other than raised pavement markers.

Adhesive manufacturers were all notified by email shortly after last conference call regarding the 2015 submittal cycle.
4) **Evaluation of new experimental snow plowable pavement marker on Ohio test deck.**

A new type of snow plowable marker with a lighter, primarily plastic body (not cast iron) will be placed down in Ohio. This lighter body may take away some of the liability due to decreased weight of the marker.

5) **Increase costs proposed for lab testing and field evaluation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre 2015 Cost and Payments</th>
<th>2015 New Cost and Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>Field Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Permanent Raised Pavement Markers</td>
<td>$1000</td>
<td>$3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Temporary Raised Pavement Marker</td>
<td>$1000</td>
<td>$3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip-Seal Type RPM</td>
<td>$1000</td>
<td>$3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhesives</td>
<td>$1000</td>
<td>$3500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTION ITEM:** Rick Douds has requested a cost increase implemented in the 2016 evaluation cycle of the RPM products. Rick was asked to send an official request to increase reimbursement to states by email to Henry Lacinak. Upon receiving request, this will be forwarded to the AASHTO administration for review and approval.
6) Review of failing pavement markers 2 of five withdrawn from test deck in past two years.

Potentially 3 of five. (See six month evaluation below Figure 1 and Figure 2)

Installed October 2014 - 6 month evaluation

CONCRETE PAVEMENT  I-75 SIX MONTH EVALUATION

**Lens Damage**  Adhesive is separating
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**Figure 1**

OPEN GRADE FRICTION COURSE  I-75 SIX MONTH EVALUATION

**Lens Damage**
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**Figure 2**

Discussion regarding the failures noted in the photos:

- Question was raised, “Should the adhesive used to install markers be tested in addition to the marker?”
- Manufacturers have been responsible for choosing adhesive and installing the marker.
- Traffic control is the responsibility of the agency.
• Some manufacturers appear to have quality control testing done by private laboratories.
• Sometimes manufacturers have problems with applications.

7) Call was adjourned at 2:00 PM Eastern time