# echnic も note echnical 4 te

**Polyester Marking Material Study** 

August 2006

DOT/FAA/AR-TN06/33

This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161



U.S. Department of Transportation **Federal Aviation Administration** 

#### NOTICE

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The United States Government assumes no liability for the contents or use thereof. The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade or manufacturer's names appear herein solely because they are considered essential to the objective of this report. This document does not constitute FAA certification policy. Consult your local FAA airports office as to its use.

This report is available at the Federal Aviation Administration William J. Hughes Technical Center's Full-Text Technical Reports page: actlibrary.act.faa.gov in Adobe Acrobat portable document format (PDF).

Technical	Report	Documentation	Page
-----------	--------	---------------	------

				rechnical Report Documentation Page
DOI:/YAA/ARETNIG33       0. Report bate         POLYESTER MARKING MATERIAL STUDY       0. Report bate         August 2006       1. August 2006         7. Authonis       0. Performing Organization Code         ATO-P R&D       1. Voor Date No.         Holly M. Cyrus and Rence Frierson*       10. Voor Date No.         9. Performing Organization Report No.       10. Voor Date No.         William J. Hughes Technical Core       Scarborough Dr., Suite 108         Egg Harbor Twp., NJ 08234       11. Commator Generation         Research and Development Division       11. Commator Generation         Arigon Technology Research and Development Division       11. Termination Generation         V Sponsoring Agent Water and Address       13. Type of Report and Period Control         V. Sponsoring Agent Water and Address       13. Type of Report and Period Control         V.S. Department of Transportation       Technical Note         Federal Aviation Administration       11. Sponsoring Agentry Code         Messard       Assect Amal Development Water Mark Address         Vis Supprementary Notes       Assect Amal Development Division         Mifer Aviation Administration       Technical Note         Office of Aviation Administration       Technical Note         Stappermentary Notes       Aspecial thanks to Trace Stadtmueller, a summer in	1. Report No.	2. Government Accession No		3. Recipient's Catalog No.
	DOT/FAA/AR-TN06/33			
POL-YESTER MARKING MATERIAL STUDY     August 2006       a. Petroming Organization Scale     ATO-P R&D       7. Autor(ii)     a. Petroming Organization Report No.       Holly M. Cyrus and Rence Frierson*     a. Petroming Organization Report No.       9. Petroming Organization Name and Autores     10. Work Unit No. (TRAB)       Federal Aviation Administration     *HF-Tec Systems       Stilliam J. Hughes Technical Center     500 Scarborough Dr., Suite 108       Argort and Aircraft Safety     Figg Harbor Twp, NJ 08234       Research and Development Division     Figg Harbor Twp, NJ 08234       Attantic City International Airport, NJ 08405     13. Type of Report and Petod Coviesd       U.S. Department of Transportation     Technical Note       Federal Aviation Administration     14. Stonsom & Advesse       U.S. Department of Transportation     Technical Note       Federal Aviation Administration     14. Stonsom & Advesse       U.S. Department of Transportation     Federal Aviation Administration       Petroming Shours of data.     Technical Center assisted in the evolution of the pavement markings. A special thanks to Traci Stadtmueller, a summer intern, who setup all of the graphs and took approximation available addition to the existing paint material specified in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Citotal 150377010A Item P-500. Remaya and Taxiway Painting. The polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint pape formere advaiting material avoital AdvA Advesory Citotal 15047104A Item P	4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE	·		5. Report Date
7. Autority       0. Performing Organization Code ATO-P R&D         8. Performing Organization Report No.       0. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)         9. Performing Organization Nerve and Address       10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)         Federal Aviation Administration       *Hi-Tec Systems Sufficient Center       10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)         Research and Development Division Airport Technology Research and Development Division Attentic City International Airport, NJ 08405       11. Contract or Grant No.         12. Sponsoring Agenty Name and Address       13. Type of Report and Petod Covered         12. Sponsoring Agenty Name and Address       13. Type of Report and Petod Covered         12. Sponsoring Agenty Name and Address       13. Type of Report and Petod Covered         13. Type of Report and Petod Covered       14. Sponsoring Agenty Name         14. Separation Administration Office of Aviation Research and Development       14. Sponsoring Agenty Code         14. Spensoring Agenty Name       14. Sponsoring Agenty Code         15. toget methy Name       14. Sponsoring Agenty Code         16. Supplementary Name       15. Type of Report and Petod Covered         17. Sey Works       14. Sponsoring Agenty Code         18. toget the test results, the polyester marking material was applied on the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center assisted in the evaluation of the payment marking material was applied on the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center 4 the FAA Strang in Augus12004. Three differe	POLYESTER MARKING MATERIAL STUDY			August 2006
7. Author(s)       8. Performing Organization Resort No.         Holly M. Cyrus and Rence Frierson*       8. Performing Organization Resort No.         9. Performing Organization Name and Address       10. Work Und No. (TRAIS)         Federal A viation Administration       *Hi-Tec Systems         Stop Care Charact Safety       Feg Harbor Twp., NJ 08234         Research and Development Division       *Hi-Tec Systems         Attantic Ciry International Airport, NJ 08405       11. Context or Grant No.         12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address       13. Type of Report and Percal Covered         12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address       14. Type of Report and Percal Covered         12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address       14. Type of Report and Percal Covered         13. Support International Airport, NJ 08405       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         Actancing Name       Actancing Name         Washington, D.C 20591       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         14. Sponsoring Agency Code       Acta-100         15. Supplementary Name       Acta Nation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/5370-10A Irbe er Stating in August 2004. Three different types of Payerster marking material wastapping Irbe and Advisory Circular 150/5370-10A. Irbe er Stating in August 2004. Three different types of Payerster marking material maintained its retro-reflectivity, but the chromaticity, Reverser Marking material is not suitable for the airport environment.         16. Keented <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>6. Performing Organization Code</td>				6. Performing Organization Code
7. Aurorig)       a. Performing Organization Report No.         Holly M. Cyrus and Rence Frierson*       a. Performing Organization Report No.         9. Performing Organization Nume and Address       10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)         Federal Aviation Administration       *Hi-Tec Systems         Stipport and Anironal Safety       Fgg Harbor Twp, NJ 08234         Airport Technology Research and Development Division       Figg Harbor Twp, NJ 08234         Airport Technology Research and Development Branch       11. Comment or Gram No.         V2. Sponsong Reprov Name and Address       13. Type of Report and Pend Covered         U.S. Department of Transportation       Technical Note         Federal Aviation Administration       Technical Note         Office of Aviation Research and Development       Washington, DC 20591         10. Supprementary Notes       14. Sponsong Agency Code         Assista       Takis Specified in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/5370-10A there strating in August 2004. Three different types of pavers transking material was aphilic, The polyester marking material was aphilic, The Polyester marking material was aphilic, Advisory Circular 150/5370-10A three orthand Cement Correte. The chromaticity, retro-reflectivity, baseline, pull-off strength, and friction tests were performed on the polyester marking material         Taking Parality       Y. Ney Words       14. Baselband Bauement         Takispearine trave used during the tests: Hot-Nix A				ATO-P R&D
Holly M. Cyrus and Rence Frierson*     10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)       Federal Aviation Administration     *Hi-Tec Systems 500 Scarborough Dr., Suite 108 Ligg Harbor Twp., NJ 08234     11. Contract or Grant No.       Research and Development Division Airport Technology Research and Development Branch     11. Contract or Grant No.     11. Contract or Grant No.       12. Separation of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration Office of Aviation Research and Development Washington, DC 20591     13. Type of Report and Period Covered       14. Stoomoorg Agency Code AAS-100     14. Stoomoorg Agency Code AAS-100       15. Supplementary Notes     14. Stoomoorg Agency Code AAS-100       16. Advance This research was conducted to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint particles hours of data.       16. Advance Types of provide during the federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/5370-100 A Item P-620, Ruway and Taxiway Painting. The polyester marking material was applied on the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center assisted in the evaluation of the pavement markings. A special thanks to Traci Stathmueller, a summer intern, who setup all of the graphs and took countless hours of data.       16. Advance This research was conducted to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint types of pavement were used used units the tests: Hort-MA Staphalt, Aged Portland Cemeret. On the Agust 2004. Three different types of pavement were used used for the Pavement Test Facility for an evaluation period of 1 year starting in August 2004. Three different types of pavement were used using the testst. Hort-MA Staphalt, Aged Portland Cemeret. Concrete, and	7. Author(s)			8. Performing Organization Report No.
9. Performing Organization Name and Address     10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)       Federal A viation Administration     *Hi-Tec Systems 500 Scarborough Dr., Suite 108 Figg Harbor Twp., NJ 08234     11. Contrast or Grant No.       Research and Development Division Airport Technology Research and Development Dranch     11. Contrast or Grant No.       12. Separational Airport, ND 08405     13. Types of Report and Period Covered       12. Separational Administration Office of Aviation Research and Development Washington, DC 20591     13. Types of Report and Period Covered       15. Separational Administration Office of Aviation Research and Development Washington, DC 20591     13. Types of Report and Period Covered       16. Separational Administration Office of Aviation Research and Development Washington, DC 20591     13. Types of Report and Period Covered       16. Separation Research and Development Washington, DC 20591     14. Sponsoring Jenney Code       16. Advited     Ass-tool       17. Separations Notes     A special thanks to Traci Stadtmueller, a summer interm, who setup all of the graphs and took countless hours of data.       16. Advited     This research was conducted to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint material specified in the Federal Aviation (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/s370-10A Item F-620, Rumay and Taxiway Painting. The polyester marking material was applied on the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center at the FAA ramp, Pangborne Road, and the Pavement Test Facility for an evaluation portiod of 1 year starting in August 2004. Three different types of pavement were used during the tests: Hot-Mix Asphal	Holly M. Cyrus and Renee Frierson*			
Federal Aviation Administration       *Hi-Tec Systems         Surport and Aircraft Safety       500 Scarborough Dr., Suite 108         Research and Development Division       Figg Harbor Twp., NJ 08234         Attantic City International Airport, NJ 08405       11. Contract or Grant No.         12. Support Planch       13. Type of Report and Period Covered         12. Support Name and Address       13. Type of Report and Period Covered         U.S. Department of Transportation       Federal Aviation Administration         Office of Aviation Research and Development       14. Sponscring Agency Code         Mashington, DC 20591       14. Sponscring Agency Code         15. Supplementary Notes       14. Sponscring Agency Code         Messroat       13. Type of Report and Period Covered         16. Supplementary Notes       14. Sponscring Agency Code         Messroat       14. Sponscring Agency Code         17. Barbord       This research was conducted to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint materials specified in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/5370-10.1 (Tem P-620, Runway and Taxiway Painting. The polyester marking material was applied on the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center at the FAA ramp, Pangborne Road, and the Pavement Test Facility for an evaluation period of 1 year starting in August 2004. Three different types of pavement were used during the tests: Hot-Mix Asphalt, Aged Portland Cemenet Concrete, and New Portland Cement Concre	9. Performing Organization Name and Address			10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)
Windlin J. Highes Technical Center       500 Scarobiologin Dir, Sulle 108         Airport and Aircraft Safety       Egg Harbor Twp, NJ 08234         Research and Development Division       Allantic City International Airport, NJ 08405         212. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address       13. Type of Report and Period Covered         U.S. Department of Transportation       Technical Note         Federal Aviation Address       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         U.S. Department of Transportation       Technical Center assisted in the evaluation of the payment markings. A special thanks to Traci Stadtmueller, a summer intern, who setup all of the graphs and took countless hours of data.         16. Supplementary Notes       AAS-100         15. Supplementary Notes       AAS-100         16. Supplementary Notes       AAS-100         16. Supplementary Notes       Traci Stadtmueller, a summer intern, who setup all of the graphs and took countless hours of data.         16. Automat       if Automat         17. Teresearch was conducted to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint materials specified in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/5370-10A Item P-620, Runway and Taxiway Painting. The polyester marking material was applied on the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center at the FAA ramp, Pangborne Road, and the Pavement Test Facility for an evaluation period of 1 year starting in August 2004. Three different types of pavement were used during the tests: Hot-Nix AsphatI, Aged Portland Cement	Federal Aviation Administration	*Hi-Tec Systems	Swite 109	
Research and Development Division       Airport Technology Research and Development Branch         Atlantic City International Airport, NJ 08405       13. Type of Report and Period Covered         12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address       13. Type of Report and Period Covered         U.S. Department of Transportation       Federal Aviation Administration         Office of Aviation Research and Development       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         Massington, DC 20591       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         16. Supplementary Notes       AAS-100         17. Supplementary Notes       Aspecial thanks to Traci Stadtmueller, a summer intern, who setup all of the graphs and took counters hours of data.         16. Automatic Shours of data.       This research was conducted to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint materials specified in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/3570-10A Item P-620, Runway and Taxiway Painting. The polyester marking material was applied on the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center at the FAA mapp. Pangborne Road, and the Pavement Test Pacifity for an evaluation period of 1 year starting in August 2004. Three different types of pavement were used during the tests: Hot-Mix Asphalt, Aged Portland Cement Concrete, and New Portland Cement Concrete. The chromaticity, retro-reflectivity, baseline, pull-off strength, and friction tests were performed on the polyester marking material maintained its retro-reflectivity, but the chromaticity level for yellow was not acceptable. When simulated in a high-traffic airport environment, the polyester marking material failed (disintegrated) after less than a d	Airport and Aircraft Safety	Egg Harbor Twp., N	, Suite 108 J 08234	11. Contract or Grant No.
Airport Technology Research and Development Branch       Atlantic City International Airport, NJ 08405         12. Spenatoring Agency Name and Address       13. Type of Report and Period Covered         U.S. Department of Transportation       Technical Note         Federal Aviation Administration       Technical Note         Office of Aviation Research and Development       Technical Note         Washington, DC 20591       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         AAS-100       AAS-100         15. Supplementary Notes       AAS-100         Messrs. Paul Jones, James Patterson, and Donald Gallagher of the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center assisted in the evaluation of the pavement markings. A special thanks to Traci Stadtmueller, a summer intern, who setup all of the graphs and took countless hours of data.         This research was conducted to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint materials specified in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/5370-10A Item P-620, Runway and Taxiway Painting. The polyester marking material was applied on the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center at the FAA ramp, Pangborne Road, and the Pavement Test Facility for an evaluation period of 1 year starting in August 2004. Three different types of pavenent were used during the tests: Hot-Mix Asphalt, Aged Portland Cement Concrete, and New Portland Cement Concrete. The chromaticity, retro-reflectivity, baseline, pull-off strength, and friction tests were performed on the polyester marking material.         Based on the test results, the polyester marking material maintained its retro-reflectivity, but t	Research and Development Division	-88 F-,		
Development Tailand       International Airport, NJ 08405         12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address       13. Type of Report and Period Covered         12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address       13. Type of Report and Period Covered         14. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         Coffice of Aviation Research and Development       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         Massington, DC 20591       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         15. Supplementary Notes       AAS-100         16. Supplementary Notes       Messarca         Messarca       This research was conducted to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint materials specified in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/3570-10A Item P-620, Runway and took countless hours of data.         17. Asimat       This research was conducted to determine test Facility for an evaluation period of 1 year starting in August 2004. Three different types of pavement were used during the tests: Hot-Mix Asphalt, Aged Portland Cement Concrete, and New Portland Cement Concrete. The chromaticity, retro-reflectivity, baseline, pull-off strength, and friction tests were performed on the polyester marking material         Based on the test results, the polyester marking material maintained its retro-reflectivity, but the chromaticity level for yellow was not acceptable. When simulated in a high-traffic airport environment, the polyester marking material failed (disintegrated) after less than a day's worth of operations. Therefore, the polyester marking material is not suitable for the airport en	Airport Technology Research and			
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address       13. Type of Report and Period Covered         U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration Office of Aviation Research and Development Washington, DC 20591       13. Type of Report and Period Covered         14. Sponsoring Agency Code       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         15. Supplementary Notes       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         15. Supplementary Notes       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         16. Supplementary Notes       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         17. Supplementary Notes       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         18. Abstrate       This research was conducted to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint materials specified in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/5370-10A Item P-620, Runway and Taxiway Painting. The polyester marking material was applied on the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center at the FAA Tamp, Pangborne Road, and the Pavement Test Facility for an evaluation period of 1 year starting in August 2004. Three different types of pavement were used during the tests: Hot-Mix Asphalt, Aged Portland Cement Concrete, and New Portland Cement Concrete. The chromaticity, retro-reflectivity, baseline, pull-off strength, and friction tests were performed on the polyester marking material         Based on the test results, the polyester marking material maintained its retro-reflectivity, but the chromaticity level for yellow was not acceptable. When simulated in a high-traffic airport environment, the polyester marking material failed (disintegrated) after less than a day's worth of operations. Therefore, the polyester marking material is not	Atlantic City International Airport, NJ 08	405		
U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration Office of Aviation Research and Development Washington, DC 20591 14. Sponsoring Agency Code AAS-100 15. Supplementary Notes Messars, Paul Jones, James Patterson, and Donald Gallagher of the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center assisted in the evaluation of the payement markings. A special thanks to Traci Stadtmueller, a summer intern, who setup all of the graphs and took countles hours of data. 16. Austrad This research was conducted to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint materials specified in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/5370-10A Item P-620, Runway and Taxiway Painting. The polyester marking material was applied on the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center at the FAA ramp, Pangborne Road, and the Pavement Test Facility for an evaluation period of 1 year starting in August 2004. Three different types of pavement were used during the tests: Hot-Mix Asphalt, Aged Portland Cement Concrete, and New Portland Cement Concrete. The chromaticity, retro-reflectivity, baseline, pull-off strength, and friction tests were performed on the polyester marking material. Based on the test results, the polyester marking material maintained its retro-reflectivity, but the chromaticity level for yellow was not acceptable. When simulated in a high-traffic airport environment, the polyester marking material failed (disintegrated) after less than a day's worth of operations. Therefore, the polyester marking material is not suitable for the airport environment. 17. Key Words 18. Destruction Statement Retro-reflectivity, Chromaticity, Polyester, Friction test, Baseline test, Pull-off strength test, Glass beads 19. Security Classified 10. Security Classified 10. Security Classified 10. Destruction Statement 11. Content is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. 21. No. of Pag	12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address			13. Type of Report and Period Covered
Federal Aviation Administration Office of Aviation Research and Development Washington, DC 20591       14. Sponsoring Agency Code AAS-100         15. Supplementary Notes Messrs. Paul Jones, James Patterson, and Donald Gallagher of the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center assisted in the evaluation of the pavement markings. A special thanks to Traci Stadtmueller, a summer intern, who setup all of the graphs and took countless hours of data.         16. Abstract       This research was conducted to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint materials specified in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/5370-10A Item P-620, Runway and Taxiway Painting. The polyester marking material was applied on the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center at the FAA ramp, Pangborne Road, and the Pavement Test Facility for an evaluation period of 1 year starting in August 2004. Three different types of pavement were used during the tests: Hot-Mix Asphalt, Aged Portland Cement Concrete, and New Portland Cement Concrete. The chromaticity, retro-reflectivity, baseline, pull-off strength, and friction tests were performed on the polyester marking material.         Based on the test results, the polyester marking material maintained its retro-reflectivity, but the chromaticity level for yellow was not acceptable. When simulated in a high-traffic airport environment, the polyester marking material failed (disintegrated) after less than a day's worth of operations. Therefore, the polyester marking material is not suitable for the airport environment.         17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         19. Security Classified       19. Security Classified       21. No. of Pages       22. Price	U.S. Department of Transportation			Technical Note
Office of Aviation Research and Development Washington, DC 20591       14. Sponsoring Agency Code AAS-100         15. Supplementary Notes       Asservent         Messrs. Paul Jones, James Patterson, and Donald Gallagher of the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center assisted in the evaluation of the pavement markings. A special thanks to Traci Stadtmueller, a summer intern, who setup all of the graphs and took countless hours of data.         16. Abstrad       This research was conducted to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint materials specified in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/5370-10A Item P-620, Runway and Taxiway Pangborne Road, and the Pavement Test Facility for an evaluation period of 1 year starting in August 2004. Three different types of pavement were used during the tests: Hot-Mix Asphalt, Aged Portland Cement Concrete, and New Portland Cement Concrete. The chromaticity, retro-reflectivity, baseline, pull-off strength, and friction tests were performed on the polyester marking material.         Based on the test results, the polyester marking material maintained its retro-reflectivity, but the chromaticity level for yellow was not acceptable. When simulated in a high-traffic airport environment, the polyester marking material failed (disintegrated) after less than a day's worth of operations. Therefore, the polyester marking material is not suitable for the airport environment.         17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement <tr< td=""><td>Federal Aviation Administration</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr<>	Federal Aviation Administration			
14. Sponsoring Agency Code         15. Supplementary Notes         Messrs. Paul Jones, James Patterson, and Donald Gallagher of the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center assisted in the evaluation of the pavement markings. A special thanks to Traci Stadtmueller, a summer intern, who setup all of the graphs and took countless hours of data.         16. Abstrad         This research was conducted to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint materials specified in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/5370-10A Item P-620, Runway and Taxiway Paulting. The polyester marking material was applied on the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center at the FAA ramp, Pangborne Road, and the Pavement Test Facility for an evaluation period of 1 year starting in August 2004. Three different types of pavement were used during the tests: Hot-Mix Asphalt, Aged Portland Cement Concrete, and New Portland Cement Concrete. The chromaticity, retro-reflectivity, baseline, pull-off strength, and friction tests were performed on the polyester marking material.         Based on the test results, the polyester marking material maintained its retro-reflectivity, but the chromaticity level for yellow was not acceptable. When simulated in a high-traffic airport environment, the polyester marking material failed (disintegrated) after less than a day's worth of operations. Therefore, the polyester marking material is not suitable for the airport environment.         17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         19. Security Classif. (of this report)       20. Security Classif. (of this page)         21. No. of Pages	Washington, DC 20591	ment		
16. Supplementary Notes       Messrs. Paul Jones, James Patterson, and Donald Gallagher of the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center assisted in the evaluation of the pavement markings. A special thanks to Traci Stadtmueller, a summer intern, who setup all of the graphs and took countless hours of data.         16. Abstract       This research was conducted to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint materials specified in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/5370-10A Item P-620, Runway and Taxiway Painting. The polyester marking material was applied on the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center at the FAA ramp, Pangborne Road, and the Pavement Test Facility for an evaluation period of 1 year starting in August 2004. Three different types of pavement were used during the tests: Hot-Mix Asphalt, Aged Portland Cement Concrete, and New Portland Cement Concrete. The chromaticity, retro-reflectivity, baseline, pull-off strength, and friction tests were performed on the polyester marking material.         Based on the test results, the polyester marking material maintained its retro-reflectivity, but the chromaticity level for yellow was not acceptable. When simulated in a high-traffic airport environment, the polyester marking material failed (disintegrated) after less than a day's worth of operations. Therefore, the polyester marking material is not suitable for the airport environment.         17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement				14. Sponsoring Agency Code
16. Supplementary Netes         Messrs. Paul Jones, James Patterson, and Donald Gallagher of the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center assisted in the evaluation of the pavement markings. A special thanks to Traci Stadtmueller, a summer intern, who setup all of the graphs and took countless hours of data.         16. Abstract         This research was conducted to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint materials specified in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/5370-10A Item P-620, Runway and Taxiway Painting. The polyester marking material was applied on the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center at the FAA ramp, Pangborne Road, and the Pavement Test Facility for an evaluation period of 1 year starting in August 2004. Three different types of pavement were used during the tests: Hot-Mix Asphalt, Aged Portland Cement Concrete, and New Portland Cement Concrete. The chromaticity, retro-reflectivity, baseline, pull-off strength, and friction tests were performed on the polyester marking material.         Based on the test results, the polyester marking material maintained its retro-reflectivity, but the chromaticity level for yellow was not acceptable. When simulated in a high-traffic airport environment, the polyester marking material failed (disintegrated) after less than a day's worth of operations. Therefore, the polyester marking material is not suitable for the airport environment.         17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         19. Security Classif. (of this report)       20. Security Classif. (of this page)       21. No. of Pages       22. Price         19. Security Classif. (of this report)       20. Security Classif. (of this page)       21. No.				AAS-100
16. Abstract         This research was conducted to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint materials specified in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/5370-10A Item P-620, Runway and Taxiway Painting. The polyester marking material was applied on the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center at the FAA ramp, Pangborne Road, and the Pavement Test Facility for an evaluation period of 1 year starting in August 2004. Three different types of pavement were used during the tests: Hot-Mix Asphalt, Aged Portland Cement Concrete, and New Portland Cement Concrete. The chromaticity, retro-reflectivity, baseline, pull-off strength, and friction tests were performed on the polyester marking material.         Based on the test results, the polyester marking material maintained its retro-reflectivity, but the chromaticity level for yellow was not acceptable. When simulated in a high-traffic airport environment, the polyester marking material failed (disintegrated) after less than a day's worth of operations. Therefore, the polyester marking material is not suitable for the airport environment.         17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         18. Distribution Statement       This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161.         19. Security Classified       20. Security Classified       21. No. of Pages       22. Price	15. Supplementary Notes Messrs. Paul Jones, James Patterson, an evaluation of the pavement markings. A took countless hours of data.	d Donald Gallagher o special thanks to Trac	f the FAA William J. i Stadtmueller, a sumr	Hughes Technical Center assisted in the ner intern, who setup all of the graphs and
11. Instruction of the product of the report       12. Security Classif. (of this report)       20. Security Classif. (of this report)       21. No. of Pages       22. Price	16. Abstract This research was conducted to determine	ne if polvester marking	material would be a	n acceptable addition to the existing paint
Based on the test results, the polyester marking material maintained its retro-reflectivity, but the chromaticity level for yellow was not acceptable. When simulated in a high-traffic airport environment, the polyester marking material failed (disintegrated) after less than a day's worth of operations. Therefore, the polyester marking material is not suitable for the airport environment.         17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         18. Distribution Statement       This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161.         19. Security Classif. (of this report)       20. Security Classif. (of this page)       21. No. of Pages       22. Price	materials specified in the Federal Aviat Taxiway Painting. The polyester markin ramp, Pangborne Road, and the Pavemen types of pavement were used during the Concrete. The chromaticity, retro-reflect marking material.	ion Administration (FA ng material was applie t Test Facility for an ev tests: Hot-Mix Aspha ctivity, baseline, pull-c	A) Advisory Circula d on the FAA Williar aluation period of 1 ye alt, Aged Portland Cer ff strength, and fricti	r 150/5370-10A Item P-620, Runway and n J. Hughes Technical Center at the FAA ear starting in August 2004. Three different ment Concrete, and New Portland Cement on tests were performed on the polyester
17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         Retro-reflectivity, Chromaticity, Polyester, Friction test, Baseline test, Pull-off strength test, Glass beads       18. Distribution Statement         This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161.         19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified       20. Security Classif. (of this page) 21. No. of Pages 29       21. No. of Pages 29	Based on the test results, the polyester ma	1		
17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         Retro-reflectivity, Chromaticity, Polyester, Friction test, Baseline test, Pull-off strength test, Glass beads       18. Distribution Statement         19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified       20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified       21. No. of Pages 29       22. Price	not acceptable. When simulated in a hig less than a day's worth of operations. The	h-traffic airport enviro erefore, the polyester m	ned its retro-reflectivity nment, the polyester n arking material is not	y, but the chromaticity level for yellow was narking material failed (disintegrated) after suitable for the airport environment.
Retro-reflectivity, Chromaticity, Polyester, Friction test, Baseline test, Pull-off strength test, Glass beads       This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161.         19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified       20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified       21. No. of Pages 29       22. Price	not acceptable. When simulated in a hig less than a day's worth of operations. The	the polyester in the polyester maintain the p	ned its retro-reflectivity nment, the polyester n arking material is not	y, but the chromaticity level for yellow was harking material failed (disintegrated) after suitable for the airport environment.
19. Security Classif. (of this report)     20. Security Classif. (of this page)     21. No. of Pages     22. Price       Unclassified     Unclassified     29	not acceptable. When simulated in a hig less than a day's worth of operations. The 17. Key Words	h-traffic airport enviro	need its retro-reflectivity neent, the polyester n arking material is not 18. Distribution Statement	y, but the chromaticity level for yellow was harking material failed (disintegrated) after suitable for the airport environment.
	not acceptable. When simulated in a hig less than a day's worth of operations. The 17. Key Words Retro-reflectivity, Chromaticity, Polyeste Baseline test, Pull-off strength test, Glass	rking material maintain h-traffic airport enviro erefore, the polyester m r, Friction test, beads	<ul> <li>18. Distribution Statement</li> <li>This document is av Technical Informatio 22161.</li> </ul>	ailable to the public through the National on Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia

Unclassified Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose Objective Background Discussion Related Documents	1 1 1 2 5
EVALUATION APPROACH	6
Method	6
Baseline Test Chromaticity Test Retro-Reflectivity Test Pull-Off Strength Test Friction Test	6 6 6 7
Data Collection	7
Chromaticity Test Retro-Reflectivity Test Pull-Off Strength Test Friction Test	7 8 8 8
TEST RESULTS	8
Baseline Test Chromaticity Test Retro-Reflectivity Test Pull-Off Strength Test Friction Test	8 8 9 9 10
SUMMARY	10

# APPENDIX A—DATA COLLECTED

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figures	S	Page
1	Polyester Marking Material on Asphalt With Type I and III Beads	3
2	Centerline Polyester Marking Material on Asphalt With Type I Beads	3
3	Polyester Marking Material on Aged Portland Cement Concrete With Type I and Type III Beads	4
4	Polyester Marking Material on New Portland Cement Concrete With Type I and Type III Beads	4
5	Sample Color Readings (Yellow) Type III Beads on Aged Concrete	7

# LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Polyester Marking Material Locations	2
2	Pass/Fail Rate for Chromaticity Test	8
3	Average Retro-Reflectivity Readings for Type I Beads	9
4	Average Retro-Reflectivity Readings for Type III Beads	9
5	Pull-Off Strength Test	10
6	Friction Test (Asphalt)	10

# LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AC	Advisory Circular
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
IOR	Index of Refraction
NAPTF	National Airport Pavement Test Facility
PCC	Portland cement concrete
psi	Pounds per square inch
R&D	Research and development

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Maintenance of pavement markings is a common problem for airports due to the frequency of repainting and life cycle cost. As a result, airports have been looking for alternative paint materials that will be able to withstand the varied environmental conditions of an airport rather than the standard paint materials that are specified in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5370-10A Item P-620, Runway and Taxiway Painting. One possible candidate, a polyester marking material, was presented to the FAA for consideration. In the past, polyester marking material was used for paint markings on aircraft and for highway pavement markings.

This research effort was conducted to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint materials specified in the FAA AC 150/5370-10A Item P-620, Runway and Taxiway Painting.

The polyester marking material was applied at the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center at the FAA ramp, Pangborne Road, and the Pavement Test Facility for an evaluation period of 1 year starting in August 2004. Three different types of pavement were used during the tests: Hot-Mix Asphalt, Aged Portland Cement Concrete, and New Portland Cement Concrete.

Based on the test results, the polyester marking material maintained its retro-reflectivity, but the chromaticity level for yellow was not acceptable. When simulated in a high-traffic airport environment, the polyester marking material failed after less than a day's worth of operations. Therefore, the polyester marking material is not suitable for an airport environment.

#### INTRODUCTION

#### PURPOSE.

This research effort was conducted to determine whether or not polyester marking material would be an acceptable marking material for the airport environment. The Airport Technology Research and Development (R&D) Branch evaluated the polyester marking material.

#### OBJECTIVE.

The objective of this evaluation was to determine if polyester marking material would be an acceptable addition to the existing paint materials specified in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5370-10A Item P-620, Runway and Taxiway Painting.

#### BACKGROUND.

Maintenance of pavement markings is a common problem for airports due to the frequency of repainting and life cycle cost. As a result, airports have been looking for alternative paint materials that will be able to withstand the varied environmental conditions of an airport. One possible candidate, a polyester marking material, was presented to the FAA for consideration. In the past, polyester marking material was used for paint markings on aircraft and for highway pavement markings. Manufacturers have been postulating that the durability of the polyester marking material surpasses current paint marking materials; however, polyester marking material has not been used in an airport environment and required testing.

In March 2004, Lambert-St. Louis International Airport requested a deviation from FAA standards in order to install polyester marking material on a new runway under construction. Consequently, the FAA Airport Engineering Division office requested that the Airport Technology R&D Branch conduct a formal evaluation of the polyester marking material.

Additionally, the Airport Engineering Division office requested that various reflective media (glass beads) be tested for compatibility with the polyester marking material. Glass beads are used in paint markings to reflect light toward the pilot, giving the pilot better visual acquisition of the paint marking during nighttime operations. Glass beads are characterized by their Index of Refraction (IOR), which is a scale index of the rate at which a material refracts light toward the source. The characteristics of the IOR vary depending on the type of glass used, whether it is virgin (never been used), or recycled. Virgin beads produce a higher IOR than recycled beads because recycled beads retain some color from previous use. Depending on the paint material used, glass beads incorporated within the paint may exhibit rapid failure when not properly embedded. Three types of beads are detailed in the Federal Specification TT-B-1325C, i.e., Type I (1.5 IOR) low-index recycled glass bead, Type III (1.9 IOR) high-index virgin glass bead, and Type IV (1.5 IOR) low-index direct-melt glass. The Type I bead is commonly referred to as a highway bead, and the Type III bead is commonly referred to as an airport bead. The glass beads evaluated in this study were Type I and Type III.

#### DISCUSSION.

The polyester marking material was applied at the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center for an evaluation period of 1 year starting in August 2004. The polyester marking material was applied on Hot-Mix Asphalt on Pangborne Road, on Aged Portland Cement Concrete at the FAA ramp, and on New Portland Cement Concrete in the National Airport Pavement Test Facility (NAPTF) at the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center. The polyester marking material was applied to the pavement using an extrusion method. The extrusion method requires equipment that continually mixes the polyester coating with a peroxide catalyst solution. The mixture is then poured into a form that helps to ensure the uniform shape of the line being applied to the pavement. Airports do not use the extrusion method to apply pavement paint markings; normally a spray method is used. The polyester marking material was applied at a thickness of 15 mil for each line tested. In addition, as a part of determining the acceptance of this material, the compatibility of standard Type I and Type III beads were examined. Table 1 shows the pavement type, color, type of bead, and tests conducted on the polyester marking material.

Pavement Type	Color	Type of Bead	Tests Conducted
	2 white stripes	Type I, Type III	Chromaticity, retro-reflectivity,
Asphalt	White centerline	Type I	pull-off strength, friction,
(figures 1 and 2)	2 yellow stripes	Type I, Type III	baseline
	Yellow centerline	Type I	
Aged Portland	2 white stripes	Type I, Type III	Chromaticity, retro-reflectivity
Cement Concrete (figure 3)	2 Yellow stripes	Type I, Type III	
New Portland	Yellow	Type I, Type III	Chromaticity, retro-reflectivity
Cement Concrete (figure 4)	White	Type I, Type III	

|--|

\*Installed at the NAPTF at the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center, which has the capability to simulate a high-traffic volume airport of Boeing 747s and 777s. The test vehicle did 20 passes over the polyester marking material, which amounted to less than a day's worth of operations. The polyester marking material failed after 20 passes and was removed.



FIGURE 1. POLYESTER MARKING MATERIAL ON ASPHALT WITH TYPE I AND TYPE III BEADS



FIGURE 2. CENTERLINE POLYESTER MARKING MATERIAL ON ASPHALT WITH TYPE I BEADS



FIGURE 3. POLYESTER MARKING MATERIAL ON AGED PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE WITH TYPE I AND TYPE III BEADS



FIGURE 4. POLYESTER MARKING MATERIAL ON NEW PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE WITH TYPE I AND TYPE III BEADS

#### RELATED DOCUMENTS.

Related documents dealing with this evaluation project are:

- ASTM E 2380-05, "Standard Test Method for Measuring Pavement Texture Drainage Using an Outflow Meter"
- ASTM D 2177-01, "Standard Test Method for Pull-Off Strength of Coatings Using Portable Adhesion Testers"
- ASTM E 2177-01, "Standard Test Method for Measuring the Coefficient of Retroreflected Luminance  $(R_L)$  of Pavement Markings in a Standard Condition of Wetness"
- DOT/FAA/AR-TN03/22, "Development of Methods for Determining Airport Pavement Marking Effectiveness," March 2003
- DOT/FAA/AR-02/128, "Paint and Bead Durability Study," March 2003
- DOT/FAA/AR-TN96/74, "Follow-On Friction Testing of Retro-Reflective Glass Beads," July 1996
- DOT/FAA/CT-94/119, "Evaluation of Alternative Pavement Marking Materials," January 1995
- DOT/FAA/CT-94/120, "Evaluation of Retro-Reflective Beads in Airport Pavement Markings," December 1994
- FAA Advisory Circular AC 150/5340-1H, "Standards for Airport Markings," December 1, 2000
- FAA Advisory Circular AC 150.5320-12C, "Measurement, Construction, and Maintenance of Skid-Resistant Airport Pavement Surfaces," March 18, 1997
- FAA Advisory Circular AC 150/5370-10A, "Standards for Specifying Construction of Airports," Item P-620, "Runway and Taxiway Painting," February 17, 1989
- ICAO Annex 14, Volume I, "Aerodrome Design and Operation," August 9, 2000, pp. 131-132
- Specification TT-B-1325C, "Beads (Glass Spheres) Retroreflective," June 1, 1993

#### EVALUATION APPROACH

#### METHOD.

The Airport Technology R&D Branch team conducted monthly chromaticity and retro-reflective readings at the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center. Upon initial application of the polyester marking material, outflow water meter, 2-liter water recovery, pull-off strength, friction, and baseline tests were performed. The following is a brief description of equipment used.

- Equipment Description
  - Spectrophotometer, Color guide 45/0, BYK-Gardner USA, 20 mm, 6805-SVC, built by BYK-Gardner of Germany.
  - Retro-Reflectometer, Flint Trading, Inc., 30-meter geometry, LTL 2000 built by Delta Lights and Optics of Denmark
  - Dyna-Meter Z16 Pull-Off Tester
  - Saab Friction Tester ASTM 1551 Tire at 30 pounds per square inch (psi)
- Evaluation Participants
  - Individuals from the manufacturer of the polyester marking material

<u>BASELINE TEST</u>. At initial application, baseline measurements of the polyester marking material were taken for each color (yellow and white) on asphalt and concrete. Once the material was applied to the pavement, chromaticity and retro-reflective readings were taken using a spectrophotometer and a retro-reflectometer.

<u>CHROMATICITY TEST</u>. The chromaticity test was conducted using a spectrophotometer. The readings were taken by placing the instrument on the pavement marking and activating the device. Using the spectrophotometer, two readings per marking were taken. Color readings were performed after initial application of the polyester marking material was completed and continued monthly thereafter for 1 year.

<u>RETRO-REFLECTIVITY TEST</u>. Retro-reflectivity was obtained with the use of a retroreflectometer. The readings were taken by placing the instrument on the pavement marking and activating the device. Six readings per polyester marking material were obtained using the retroreflectometer. Prior to each use, the instrument was calibrated and had an accuracy of  $\pm 5\%$ . Readings were taken after initial application of the polyester marking material was completed and continued monthly thereafter for 1 year.

<u>PULL-OFF STRENGTH TEST</u>. The pull-off strength test was used to determine the tensile strength of the bond between the polyester marking material and hot-mix asphalt or PCC. Using a Dyna-Meter Z16 Pull-Off Tester, a metal disc was glued down on the polyester marking

material while it dried for a period of 24 hours. The Dyna-Meter Pull-Off Tester was connected to the disc via a draw bolt, adjusted to level via adjustable legs, turned on, and the crank was turned until the metal disc separated from the pavement. This test was performed in accordance with ASTM D 4541-02.

<u>FRICTION TEST</u>. Using a Dyna-Test 6850 Runway Friction Tester, multiple test runs were conducted. Testing took place on asphalt at the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center, where two 150-foot test stripes were located. The friction runs were conducted at 30 psi with the water on.

#### DATA COLLECTION.

<u>CHROMATICITY TEST</u>. For the chromaticity test, the spectrophotometer produced (Y, x, y) coordinate readings. The readings were compared to the International Commission on Illumination standard illuminant D65 chromaticity chart found in International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Annex 14, Volume I. However, the aviation yellow region was modified to suit the FAA in-service yellow used on airports, since the region for the FAA in-service boundaries of aviation yellow are not the same as for ICAO yellow. The region for FAA inservice yellow was obtained and is documented in figure A-5 in appendix A of DOT/FAA/AR-TN03/22, "Development of Methods for Determining Airport Pavement Marking Effectiveness." The region for white is the ICAO white region. A white data point that falls outside the ICAO white region is considered failed. A yellow data point that falls outside the FAA in-service aviation yellow region is considered failed (see figure 5).



CONCRETE

<u>RETRO-REFLECTIVITY</u>. The retro-reflectometer produced millicandela per meter squared per lux readings. Currently, the FAA has no standard for retro-reflectivity limits. A paint marking study conducted by the Airport Safety Technology R&D team determined that the recommended minimum was 100 mcd/m<sup>2</sup>/lx for white and 70 mcd/m<sup>2</sup>/lx for yellow. Additional information can be found in FAA report DOT/FAA/AR-TN03/22.

<u>PULL-OFF STRENGTH TEST</u>. This test determined whether there was an internal failure of the polyester marking material or an external failure of the pavement material (asphalt or concrete). When the polyester marking material fails, there is a cohesive failure, when the asphalt or concrete fails, there is an adhesive failure. The tensile strength readings were measured in psi. The best result should end in a pavement failure (adhesive) rather than a marking material failure (cohesive). To pass, the psi reading should be equal or higher than the baseline.

<u>FRICTION TEST</u>. The data output of the friction tester readings was measured in Mu ( $\mu$ ). The readings for friction can range from 0 to 1  $\mu$ , with 1  $\mu$  being the best possible friction reading.

#### TEST RESULTS

#### BASELINE TEST.

The initial chromaticity readings for white and yellow polyester marking material all fell within their acceptable ranges. (See appendix A for additional data.)

The initial retro-reflectivity readings for Type I and Type III beads were above the recommended minimums of 100 mcd/m<sup>2</sup>/lx for white and 70 mcd/m<sup>2</sup>/lx for yellow. (See appendix A for additional data.)

#### CHROMATICITY TEST.

The acceptability range for the white x-coordinate is 0.2895 to 0.3442 and the y-coordinate is 0.3100 to 0.3650. The acceptability range for the yellow x-coordinate is 0.4261 to 0.5266 and the y-coordinate is 0.4300 to 0.5346. A Pass or Fail rating was based on the last data point taken at the end of the study, as shown in table 2. (See appendix A for additional data.)

Surface Material	Color	Total Evaluated	Pass	Fail
Asphalt	White	3	3	0
	Yellow	3	0	3
Aged Concrete	White	2	2	0
	Yellow	2	0	2

#### TABLE 2. PASS/FAIL RATE FOR CHROMATICITY TEST

#### RETRO-REFLECTIVITY TEST

The recommended minimum is  $100 \text{ mcd/m}^2/\text{lx}$  for white and  $70 \text{ mcd/m}^2/\text{lx}$  for yellow. Table 3 shows the average retro-reflectivity readings for Type I beads, and table 4 shows the average retro-reflectivity readings for Type III beads.

		September 2004*	July 2005	Percent
Color	Surface Material	$(mcd/m^2/lx)$	$(mcd/m^2/lx)$	Remaining
White	Asphalt	516	363	70
White	Asphalt	520	323	62
Yellow	Asphalt	161	101	63
Yellow	Asphalt	139	59	42
White	Aged Concrete	535	562	105
Yellow	Aged Concrete	146	121	83

#### TABLE 3. AVERAGE RETRO-REFLECTIVITY READINGS FOR TYPE I BEADS

\*Due to the polyester marking material covering most of the beads at initial application, readings from the second month were collected instead of the first month for a more accurate reading.

#### TABLE 4. AVERAGE RETRO-REFLECTIVITY READINGS FOR TYPE III BEADS

		September 2004*	July 2005	Percent
Color	Surface Material	$(mcd/m^2/lx)$	$(mcd/m^2/lx)$	Remaining
White	Asphalt	657	428	65
Yellow	Asphalt	296	87	29
White	Aged Concrete	798	998	125
Yellow	Aged Concrete	344	276	80

\*Due to the polyester marking material covering most of the beads at initial application, readings from the second month were collected instead of the first month for a more accurate reading.

#### PULL-OFF STRENGTH TEST.

As a comparison for polyester marking material, a past study (DOT/FAA/AR-02/128) was conducted on waterborne paint in which yellow waterborne paint had an average tensile strength of 77 psi and white waterborne paint had an average tensile strength of 86 psi. Both markings were tested on asphalt (see table 5).

	Tensile Strength	
Surface Material	(psi)	Cohesive/Adhesive
Asphalt	214	Adhesive
Concrete	13	Cohesive

#### TABLE 5. PULL-OFF STRENGTH TEST

#### FRICTION TEST.

The readings for friction can range from 0 to 1  $\mu$ , with 1  $\mu$  being the best possible friction reading. The only friction readings taken were on asphalt (see table 6).

	Average	
Description	(μ)	Average Speed (mph)
Baseline (dry pavement)	0.55	30
Yellow/White Centerline	0.12	30
(Type I)		

#### TABLE 6. FRICTION TEST (ASPHALT)

#### SUMMARY

One of the markings for yellow polyester on asphalt with Type I beads failed during the 1-year evaluation with a final reading of 59 mcd/m<sup>2</sup>/lx and a reduction of 42%. In addition, for Type III beads, one marking failed with a final reading of 87 mcd/m<sup>2</sup>/lx and a reduction of 29%. All white polyester markings passed for retro-reflectivity.

Of the ten markings, only one marking failed with Type I beads and one marking failed with Type III beads.

For chromaticity, yellow polyester marking material failed to maintain its color for the duration of the test with all markings failing at the end of 1 year. The white polyester marking material maintained its color for the duration of the test.

The pull-off strength test indicates that polyester marking material, if applied correctly on asphalt, provides a better bond than waterborne marking material.

Friction test results indicated that the polyester marking material did not provide sufficient resistance with an average reading of 0.12 at 30 mph on asphalt.

Based on the test results, the polyester marking material maintained its retro-reflectivity, but the chromaticity level for yellow was not acceptable. When simulated in a high-traffic airport environment, the polyester marking material disintegrated after less than a day's worth of operations. Therefore, the polyester marking material is not suitable for the airport environment.

### APPENDIX A—DATA COLLECTED

#### TABLE A-1. BASELINE TEST FOR CHROMATICITY READINGS ON ASPHALT

Color	Type of Bead	X-Reading	Y-Reading
White	Type I	0.3356	0.3549
White	Centerline Type I	0.3358	0.3549
White	Type III	0.3396	0.3598
Yellow	Type I	0.5161	0.4299
Yellow	Centerline Type I	0.5230	0.4343
Yellow	Type III	0.5046	0.4270

# TABLE A-2. BASELINE TEST FOR CHROMATICITY READINGS ON AGED PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE

Color	Type of Bead	X-Reading	Y-Reading
White	Type I	0.3278	0.3484
White	Type III	0.3394	0.3570
Yellow	Type I	0.5237	0.4365
Yellow	Type III	0.4780	0.4073

#### TABLE A-3. BASELINE TEST FOR RETRO-REFLECTIVITY ON ASPHALT

Color	Type of Bead	Initial Reading
White	Type I	240
Yellow	Type I	163
White	Centerline Type I	462
Yellow	Centerline Type I	139
White	Type III	430
Yellow	Type III	293

# TABLE A-4. BASELINE TEST FOR RETRO-REFLECTIVITY ON AGED PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE

Color	Type of Bead	Initial Reading
White	Type I	321
Yellow	Type I	170
White	Type III	309
Yellow	Type III	269

	Acceptability Range	Acceptability Range
	(0.2895-0.3442)	(0.3100-0.3650)
Month	X-Readings	Y-Readings
August	0.3356	0.3549
July	0.3349	0.3511

# TABLE A-5. COLOR READINGS (WHITE) FOR TYPE I BEADS ON ASPHALT



FIGURE A-1. COLOR READINGS (WHITE) TYPE I BEADS ON ASPHALT

	Acceptability Range	Acceptability Range
	(0.4261-0.5266)	(0.4300-0.5346)
Month	X-Readings	Y-Readings
August	0.5161	0.4299
July	0.4933	0.4186

# TABLE A-6. COLOR READINGS (YELLOW) TYPE I BEADS ON ASPHALT



FIGURE A-2. COLOR READINGS (YELLOW) TYPE I BEADS ON ASPHALT

	Acceptability Range	Acceptability Range
	(0.2895-0.3442)	(0.3100-0.3650)
Month	X-Reading	Y-Reading
August	0.3396	0.3598
July	0.3335	0.3497

# TABLE A-7. COLOR READINGS (WHITE) TYPE III BEADS ON ASPHALT



FIGURE A-3. COLOR READINGS (WHITE) TYPE III BEADS ON ASPHALT

	Acceptability Range	Acceptability Range
	(0.4261-0.5266)	(0.4300-0.5346)
Month	X-Readings	Y-Readings
August	0.5046	0.4270
July	0.4701	0.4089

# TABLE A-8. COLOR READINGS (YELLOW) TYPE III BEADS ON ASPHALT



FIGURE A-4. COLOR READINGS (YELLOW) TYPE III BEADS ON ASPHALT

	Acceptability Range	Acceptability Range
	(0.2895-0.3442)	(0.3100-0.3650)
Month	X-Reading	Y-Reading
August	0.3358	0.3549
July	0.3360	0.3510

# TABLE A-9. COLOR READINGS (WHITE) CENTERLINE TYPE I ON ASPHALT



FIGURE A-5. COLOR READINGS (WHITE) CENTERLINE TYPE I ON ASPHALT

	Acceptability Range	Acceptability Range
	(0.4261-0.5266)	(0.4300-0.5346)
Month	X-Reading	Y-Reading
August	0.5230	0.4343
July	0.4846	0.4158

# TABLE A-10. COLOR READINGS (YELLOW) CENTERLINE TYPE I ON ASPHALT



FIGURE A-6. COLOR READINGS (YELLOW) CENTERLINE TYPE I ON ASPHALT

	Acceptability Range	Acceptability Range
	(0.2895-0.3442)	(0.3100-0.3650)
Month	X-Reading	Y-Reading
August	0.3278	0.3484
July	0.3325	0.3481

# TABLE A-11. COLOR READINGS (WHITE) TYPE I BEADS ON AGED CONCRETE



FIGURE A-7. COLOR READINGS (WHITE) TYPE I BEADS ON AGED CONCRETE

	Acceptability Range	Acceptability Range
	(0.4261-0.5266)	(0.4300-0.5346)
Month	X-Reading	Y-Reading
August	0.5237	0.4365
July	0.5027	0.4248

# TABLE A-12. COLOR READINGS (YELLOW) TYPE I BEAD ON AGED CONCRETE



FIGURE A-8. COLOR READINGS (YELLOW) TYPE I BEAD ON AGED CONCRETE

	Acceptability Range	Acceptability Range
	(0.2895-0.3442)	(0.3100-0.3650)
Month	X-Reading	Y-Reading
August	0.3394	0.3570
July	0.3351	0.3489

# TABLE A-13. COLOR READINGS (WHITE) TYPE III BEADS ON AGED CONCRETE



FIGURE A-9. COLOR READINGS (WHITE) TYPE III BEADS ON AGED CONCRETE

	Acceptability Range	Acceptability Range
	(0.4261-0.5266)	(0.4300-0.5346)
Month	X-Reading	Y-Reading
August	0.4780	0.4073
July	0.4732	0.4178

# TABLE A-14. COLOR READINGS (YELLOW) TYPE III BEADS ON AGED CONCRETE



FIGURE A-10. COLOR READINGS (YELLOW) TYPE III BEADS ON AGED CONCRETE