TEMPORARY TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES PROJECT PANEL
MEETING MINUTES

Project Panel Chair: Meredith McDiarmid (NC)
Project Panel Vice-Chair: Danny Lane (TN)
Project Panel Secretary: Steve Hall (TN)

Member State Panel Members Present: Masha Wilson (NV)
Member State Panel Members Absent: Scott Koczman (TX)  
Doug Gayne (ME)

Industry Representatives Present: Jim Crowley (Quixote)
Ken Smith (Vermac)
Bill Ward (Carsonite)

Industry Representatives Absent: Peter Speer (Bunzl Extrusion)

The project panel met in two morning sessions on Tuesday, May 4, 2004. Seven (7) member states, one (1) AASHTO, one (1) university, and eleven (11) industries were represented.

The panel addressed several housekeeping items:

Data Mine: The panel feels it has reports that are suitably formatted to be incorporated into Data Mine with little to no adjustments. When NTPEP is ready for our panel, we will form a task force to address any issues that arise.

Performance Measures: TDOT has refined their reporting process to be able to submit a report to NTPEP within 2 weeks of evaluation. The industry wanted to reiterate to NTPEP the importance of expeditious reporting.

NCDOT is aware of the importance of expeditious reporting and is striving to have the report ready ASAP.

Starting and Ending on time have been accomplished in both testing states.

Industry Inspired Implementation: The industry had a couple of suggestions they thought fit in this category. They suggested including NTPEP more in the ATSSA mid-year and yearly meetings and trying to make other states more aware of the program when they make
their sales calls. It is the chairperson’s opinion the industry will warm up to the concept and be better prepared to respond to this call in the near future.

Then the panel proceeded to discuss Temporary Traffic Control Devices evaluations:

**Delineators and Drums**

- TDOT has lost their evaluation deck. They have plans for another site and do not anticipate it affecting future testing.
- There was discussion about whether the industry should submit 48” delineator posts for evaluation. TDOT stated that 36” and 48” delineators did react different when evaluated on the TDOT deck. There was a consensus of member states that they would require a 48” delineator to have been NTPEP evaluated to be on the approved products listing in their state. The panel will re-word the work plan to mention the 48” delineator as well as the 36” delineator. The industry will have to decide if submitting a 48” delineator as well as a 36” delineator would be necessary.
- The industry inquired if summer testing advance notice had been issued by NTPEP.
- One of the member states inquired if the TTCD Panel had ever entertained the idea of evaluating vertical panels. The chair suggested that member state submit their proposal to NTPEP for consideration.

**Portable Changeable Message Signs and Flashing Arrow Panels**

- NCDOT presented highlights of the recent evaluations.
- Individual raw data was issued to participating industry for their review.
- Industry asked for some clarification on test methods.
- NCDOT suggested the following changes to the existing work plan:
  - Require a switch on each sign to turn solar panels on and off
  - Require each sign have the same password
  - Require manufacturer to pre-program signs

  These will be incorporated into the work plan and submitted for ballot.

- NCDOT had some other issues that need to be addressed in the next conference call:
  - Photocell covering methods
  - Luminance testing procedures

- The general presentation was given again during Session #2 for the benefit of the member states that were not able to attend Session #1.

This concluded our project panel meetings.