1957 PERFORMANCE TESTS ON WHITE AND YELLOW TRAFFIC PAINT

A. J. PermodaWm. MartinM. H. Janson

Research Laboratory Division Office of Testing and Research Report No. 298 Research Project 47 G-36(10) Progress Report No. 2



Michigan State Highway Department John C. Mackie, Commissioner Lansing, November 1958

1957 PERFORMANCE TESTS ON WHITE AND YELLOW TRAFFIC PAINT

Twenty-two paints were put down in the 1957 tests including one white and one yellow from each of ten producers, a white only from another producer, and one yellow experimental paint formulated by the Research Laboratory Division. The sources of the test paints were:

1. Baltimore Paint and Color Works, Baltimore.

2. Boydell Brothers Company, Detroit.

3. Buckeye Paint and Varnish Company, Toledo.

4. Cook Paint and Varnish Company, Detroit.

5. Franklin Paint Company; Franklin, Massachusetts.

6. Glidden Company, Cleveland.

Jaegle Paint and Varnish Company, Philadelphia; white only.
MSHD No. 13A Yellow Experimental Traffic Paint.

8. L.K.R. Chemical Company, Detroit.

9. Patterson-Sargent Company (BPS), Cleveland.

10. Prismo Safety Corporation; Huntingdon, Pennsylvania.

11. Truscon Laboratories, Detroit.

Deposition particulars covering the above white and yellow traffic paints (applied August 14-21, 1957) were presented in Research Laboratory Report 282, the first progress report on this project.

QUALIFICATION TESTS

All paints were tested for conformance with specification requirements for color, reflectivity, consistency, bleeding, and settling; results are presented in Table 1. A review of the results shows that the following paints failed to meet the noted specification requirements and therefore are not eligible for bid requests:

White Paints

No. 96 Low reflectivity and excessive viscosity

Yellow Paints

No. 89 Muddy color of low reflectivity

No. 91 Excessive viscosity

No. 95 Excessive viscosity

No. 103 Not matching color standards, low reflectivity, and low settling index

No. 105 Excessive field drying time.

An interim letter report dated March 27, 1958, listing qualification test results, was issued to the Committee prior to its Spring meeting. Manufacturers of paints not meeting specification requirements were to be notified of their respective paints' shortcomings when requisitions were submitted to them for 1958 performance paints.

FIELD PERFORMANCE RATING

Test stripes were rated in the four test areas eight days after deposition, and at three-month intervals thereafter for one year after deposition.

- 2 -

Ratings from the four test areas, averaged from the findings of the four observers, are tabulated for all test paints in Table 3. These average quality values for the individual paints were then used to calculate the respective weighted ratings, which are also recorded in Table 3.

There was considerable difference in the durability ratings of the test paints, especially in Test Area No. 3 (concrete) on US-127 which has proven especially tough on stripe-life. This is brought out in Figure 1 showing the terminal condition, in Test Area 3 (concrete), of white Stripes 7 to 12 of poor durability flanked by white Stripes 13 to 18 of better durability.

FIELD TEST RESULTS

Table 2 contains a summary of evaluation values for all 1957 test paints, listed in descending order of terminal "Percent of Best"values. Half-year and one-year service factor values for all test paints are tabulated in Table 2, which also contains a column summarizing results of the previously mentioned qualification tests.

The "Qualification Tests" column in Table 2 shows that one white paint and five yellow paints failed to meet all specification requirements and therefore became ineligible for bid requests.

Three of the four road areas used in the 1957 tests were the same as used in the 1956 tests, while the fourth area (bituminous) was transferred from US-16 east of East Lansing to US-127 south of Lansing, because of construction in progress at the former area at the time of stripe deposition.

- 3 -

Apparently this change of locale accounts for generally slightly lower terminal service factor values being obtained in the 1957 tests than in the 1956 tests of paints produced by the same manufacturers. This can be noted by comparing the respective columns in Table 2.

No recommendation is made concerning paints to be selected for bids. If the 50-percent, one-year service factor were used as the mini – mum acceptable value, then seven white paints and four yellow paints would be eligible for bid requests.

TABLE 1

QUALIFICATION TEST RESULTS 1957 Performance Paints

| · | | | a | Drying Time | D1 II | | | |
|-------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|----------|-----|--|
| Paint | Color | Reflectivity | Consistency | Field – Avg. | Bleeding | Settling | | |
| No. | | Percent | K. U 77 F. | Minutes | Asphalt | Index | | |
| | White | · | , | | | | | |
| 90 | | 85.4 | 67 | 44 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 8 | |
| 92 | | 83.9 | 80 | 41 | 7.3 | 4.6 | 8 | |
| 94 | | 91.5 | 75 | 31 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 7 | |
| 96 | | 78.4 | 87 | 23 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 8 | |
| 98 | | 85.4 | 71 | 33 | 6.0 | 4.6 | 7 | |
| 100 | | 79.6 | 72 | 36 | 8.6 | 5.0 | 8 | |
| 102 | | 83.7 | 77 | 40 | 6.6 | 4.0 | 8 | |
| 104 | | 84.3 | 68 | 40 | 6,0 | 5.0 | 7 | |
| 106 | | 86.5 | 71 | 48 | 5.3 | 4.3 | 7 | |
| 108 | | 84.2 | 72 | 25 | 6.3 | 4.6 | 7 | |
| 110 | | 84.8 | 72 | 34 | 6.3 | 4.8 | 7 | |
| | | 2 - <u>-</u> | | | | | | |
| | Yellow | | | | | | | |
| 89 | NP_m^* | 50.9 | 68 | 29 | 6.3 | 8.0 | 8 | |
| 91 | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{g}}$ | 60.7 | 88 | 28 | 7.3 | 6.3 | 9 | |
| 93 | pg | 65.1 | 74 | 30 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 7 | |
| 95 | $\mathbf{P_{g}}$ | 61.1 | 86 | 26 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 8 | |
| 97 | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{g}}$ | 58.4 | 80 | 36 | 6.6 | 7.3 | 8 | |
| 99 | P | 53,6 | 73 | 31 | 7.3 | 6.0 | 8 | |
| 101 | P | 54.1 | 80 | 16 | 7.3 | 6.0 | 8 | |
| 103 | NPr | 44.8 | 68 | 34 | 4.6 | 7.0 | 5 | |
| 105 | Po | 56.6 | 71 | 56 | 6.0 | 5.6 | 7 | |
| 107 | P _a | 57.3 | 70 | 38 | 8.6 | 6.6 | 8 | |
| 109 | P ₀ | 54.9 | 73 | 32 | 8.6 | 6.6 | . 8 | |

*P = passing; NP = not passing

o = exact color match with standard;

g = green side of standard;

r = red side of standard;

 $m = muddy \ color$.

TABLE 2

| 1956 | | 105 | | Domont | | | | |
|------------------------|----------|------------------|--------------|---------|---------------|--|--|--|
| Service | Deint | 190 [°] | 7 Footoma | Percent | Qualification | | | |
| ractor 271 days (a) | | Service 1 | Pactors | Deat | | | | |
| 571 uays (a) | INO. | 195 days | 374 days | Desi | | | | |
| | | White | Paints | · | | | | |
| | 92 | 75.5 | 63.2 | 100.0 | Р | | | |
| 60.0 | 98 | 79.1 | 62.7 | 99.2 | Р | | | |
| 63.1 | 100 | 73.3 | 60.7 | 96.0 | Р | | | |
| 54.6 | 102 | 74.0 | 57.5 | 91.0 | P | | | |
| 54.4 | 90 | 70.8 | 54.3 | 85.9 | Р | | | |
| 52.4 | 106 | 69.2 | 53.3 | 84.3 | Р | | | |
| 56.5 | 110 | 71.2 | 53.3 | 84.3 | Р | | | |
| 57.6 | 108 (c) | 68.3 | 48.1 | 76.1 | Р | | | |
| 57.1 | 104 | 65.7 | 46.4 | 73.4 | Р | | | |
| 54.0 | 96 | 62.0 | 45.2 | 71.5 | NP | | | |
| 54.0 | 94 | 54.6 | 36.2 | 57.3 | P | | | |
| · . | • | Yellow | Paints | | | | | |
| 69.1 | 97 | 77.9 | 66.5 | 100.0 | Р | | | |
| 61.6 | 89 | 74.0 | 59.3 | 89.2 | NP | | | |
| 42.3 | 105 | 72,9 | 58.2 | 87.5 | NP | | | |
| 58.0 | 101 Exp. | 73.4 | 56.8 | 85.4 | P | | | |
| 59.5 | 107 (c) | 74.6 | 56.6 | 85.1 | Р | | | |
| 61.3 | 109 | 72.7 | 56.1 | 84.4 | Р | | | |
| | 91 | 72.1 | 53.6 | 80.6 | NP | | | |
| 57.7 | 99 | 70.0 | 53.5 | 80.5 | Р | | | |
| 52.0 | 95 | 68.7 | 51.7 | 77.7 | NP | | | |
| 51.4 | 93 | 61.3 | 42.0 | 63.2 | P | | | |
| 59.9 | 103 | 57.7 | 37.4 | 56.7 | NP | | | |

SERVICE FACTORS AND TERMINAL RATINGS 1957 Performance Paints*

* All paints applied at rate of 16.5 gal per mi of 4-in. stripe, with 6 lb of drop-in beads per gal.

(a) Three test areas same as in 1957, one bituminous area different.

(b) P = Passing; NP = Not Passing.

(c) Special beads, not MSHD Type III as all others.

- 6 -

TABLE 3

HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE DATA 1957 Transverse Stripes

| Freedown | | | | | White Paints | | | | | | Yellow Paints | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------|-----|------|-----|------|------|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| Days | Factor Evaluated | 90 | 92 | 94 | 96 | 98 | 100 | 102 | 104 | 106 | 108 | 110 | 89 | 91. | 93 | 95 | 97 | 99 | 101. | 103 | 105 | 107 | 109 |
| 8 | General Appearance | 9.4 | 9.7 | 9.6 | 8.4 | 9.8 | 9,8 | 9.2 | 9.5 | 9.6 | 9.8 | 9,5 | 9.2 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 9.0 | 9.9 | 10.0 | 9.9 |
| | Durability | 9.3 | 9.8 | 9.5 | 9.8 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 9.8 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 9.8 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 9.6 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 9.6 | 9.9 | 10.0 | 9.6 | 9.8 | 9.6 |
| | Night Visibility | 7.5 | 6.9 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 8.5 | 6.7 | 8.5 | 7.7 | 7.8 | .8.0 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.1 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7,4 | 6.8 | 7.4 | 7.0 | 7.2 | 8.0 | 7.5 |
| | Weighted Rating | 8.4 | 8.3 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 9.2 | 8.3 | 9.1 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 8.4 | 8.5 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 8.2 | 8.7 | 8.4 | 8,4 | 8.9 | 8.6 |
| 103 | General Appearance | 6.5 | 7.6 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 7.6 | 7.4 | 6.7 | 6.5 | 6.4 | 7.1 | 6.9 | 6.6 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 7.6 | 7.0 | 6.8 | 6.0 | 7.4 | 7.5 | 7.1 |
| | Durability | 9.1 | 9.4 | 6.6 | 7.3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 9.2 | 8.9 | 8.4 | 9.1 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 9.1 | 7.3 | 8.2 | 9.6 | 8.7 | 8.9 | 8.0 | 8.9 | 9.3 | 9.3 |
| | Night Visibility | 6.4 | 6.5 | 4.4 | 5.4 | 7.3 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 5.0 | 5.8 | 5,6 | 5,9 | 6.3 | 6.8 | 5,3 | 6.2 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 6.7 | 4.3 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 6.6 |
| | Weighted Rating | 7.5 | 7.8 | 5.4 | 6.1 | 8.1 | 7.5 | 7.4 | 6.7 | 6,9 | 7.2 | 7.4 | 7.5 | 7.8 | 6.2 | 7.0 | 7.9 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 6.0 | 7.6 | 7.8 | 7.7 |
| 195 | General Appearance | 4.4 | 6.2 | 2.2 | 3.2 | 6.3 | 5.7 | 5.3 | 3.7 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 4.8 | 5.2 | 4.8 | 3.1 | 4.4 | 6.7 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 2.5 | 5.9 | 5.5 | 5.4 |
| | Durabilîty | 5.9 | 7.5 | 2.7 | 4.4 | 6.8 | 7.1 | 7.0 | 4.8 | 5.6 | 4.4 | 5.7 | 7.1 | 5.4 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 7.6 | 5.4 | 6.4 | 3.1 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 5.6 |
| | Night Visibility | 3.7 | 5.0 | 1.7 | 3.2 | 5.3 | 5.1 | 4.0 | 2.6 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 4.3 | 3.9 | 2.7 | 3.8 | 5.4 | 3.5 | 4.4 | 1.5 | 4.4 | 4.0 | 3.9 |
| | Weighted Rating | 4.7 | 6.1 | 2.2 | 3.7 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 5.3 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 5.5 | 4.6 | 3.1 | 4.3 | 6.4 | 4.4 | 5.2 | 2.2 | 5.4 | 5.1 | 4.7 |
| 276 | General Appearance | 4.2 | 6.0 | 2.1 | 3.0 | 5.8 | 5.3 | 5,2 | 3.4 | 4.5 | 3.6 | 4.5 | 4.7 | 3.9 | 2.6 | 3.6 | 6.0 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 2.0 | 5.2 | 4.9 | 5.1 |
| | Durability | 5.1 | 6.6 | 2.1 | 3.4 | 5.8 | 6.4 | 5.8 | 3.6 | 4.8 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 5.9 | 4.3 | 2.9 | 4.1 | 6.9 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 2.3 | 5.6 | 5.3 | 5.9 |
| | Night Visibility | 2.0 | 3.1 | 0.9 | 1.8 | 2.3 | 2,7 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 2,5 | 3, 7 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 0.6 | 2.7 | 1.8 | 2.0 |
| | Weighted Rating | 3.5 | 4,8 | 1.5 | 2,6 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 3.7 | 2.3 | 3,4 | 2.4 | 3.1 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 3.3 | 5,2 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 1,4 | 4.1 | 3.5 | 3.9 |
| 374 | General Appearance | 3.6 | 5.6 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 4.7 | 2.5 | 4.0 | 2.9 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 3.4 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 6.1 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 1.5 | 5,0 | 4.3 | 4.4 |
| | Durability | 4.4 | 6.1 | 1.9 | 2.8 | 5.3 | 5.8 | 5.3 | 3,0 | 4.4 | 3.1 | 4.1 | 5.4 | 3.6 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 6.8 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 1.7 | 5.2 | 4.7 | 4.8 |
| | Night Visibility | 1.9 | 2.7 | 0,9 | 1.5 | 2.6 | 2,5 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 1.6 | 3.4 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| | Weighted Rating | 3.1 | 4.4 | 1.4 | 2,1 | 3.9 | 4, 1 | 3.3 | 2.1 | 3.0 | 2.1 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 2,5 | 1,6 | 2,6 | 5.0 | 2, 9 | 2.9 | 1.1 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 3.0 |





Figure 1. Some 1957 White Stripes after one year's exposure in Test Area No. 3 (concrete). Poor Stripes 7-12 (top) were flanked by Stripes 13-18 of better durability (bottom).