MICHIGAN STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT Charles M. Ziegler State Highway Commissioner

1952 PERFORMANCE TESTS OF TRAFFIC PAINTS

By

E. A. Finney

Joint investigation between Maintenance, Planning and Traffic, and Testing and Research Divisions

Research Project 47 G-36 (5)

Second and Third Interim Reports

Research Laboratory Testing and Research Division Report NO. 188 April 1, 1953



1.50

1952 PERFORMANCE TESTS OF TRAFFIC PAINTS

Included in this report are two interim reports, the second and third respectively on the 1952 performance tests of traffic paints started in June of that year. The first interim report was issued on December 18, 1952, Research Laboratory Report No. 187, giving results for the transverse stripes to that date. The first report also presented the facts surrounding the inception of the project, and stated its scope and principal objectives. Certain important limitations in purchasing traffic paints on the basis of this test program were also pointed out.

The purpose of the second interim report is twofold: first, to supplement the first report with information concerning the operation of the project; and second, to present the results of the paint tests in both longitudinal and transverse stripes as of January 28, 1953. At the time of these evaluations, the longitudinal stripes had been down an average of 203 days and the transverse stripes 170 days. Attached to this second interim report is a third report giving the results of evaluations at 253 days and 229 days for the longitudinal and transverse stripes respectively.

Second Interim Report

Application of Paints

The layout of longitudinal test stripes and decision to include transverse stripes were agreed upon in a joint conference of representatives of Planning and Traffic, Maintenance, and Testing and Research Divisions on April 29, 1952. An attempt was made to include application of white and yellow paints on both bituminous and concrete surfaces. Owing to lack of sufficient mileage of four-lane undivided pavement and shortages of some of the test paints, this was not always possible in the longitudinal stripes. The transverse stripe test sections contained all paints on both types of surfaces.

Longitudinal Stripes: The first stripes were put down on June 23, and the application was complete on July 10. Paints and beads were applied by regular Department paint crews, using standard field equipment. Detailed observations by Research Laboratory personnel were made throughout the work, including air temperature and relative humidity, tank and atomization pressures, wet film thickness, drying time, and amount of paint used in each test stripe. Locations of the longitudinal test stripes are given in the schematic layout of Figure 1 and a summary of application data in Table 1. While every effort was made to assure a uniform film thickness of 15 mils for all paints, a check of the thickness calculated from the amount of paint consumed against the measured thickness showed a wide disparity in some cases. Measurements were made with a wet film gage on steel plates laid in the line of the stripe and at least two such measurements were made on each test stripe if possible.

<u>Transverse Stripes</u>: Locations of the transverse stripes were selected by the Research Laboratory to provide sections of pavement where traffic is heavy and free-rolling and wear is uniform, with no grades, curves, intersections or access points near enough to cause excessive braking or turning movement. Four test sections were laid out - two on portland cement concrete and two on bituminous concrete surfaces - in the following locations (see also map of locations in Figure 2):

- 2 -

Test Section	Type of		
Number	Surface	Route	Location
		1	
1	Concrete	US-27	About 1.5 miles south of St. Johns
			west roadway
2	Bituminous	US-27	About 1.5 miles south of St. Johns
			east roadway
. 3	Concrete	US-127	Between Miller Rd. and Pennsylvania
			extension
4	Bituminous	us-16	Between Okemos and Haslett Roads

Paints were applied in alphabetical order of code letter, white section first, from north to south on the first three test sections, regardless of the direction of traffic; on test section 4, the order was from west to east, on the two south lanes. In all cases, the trial stripes for adjusting film thickness of the various paints were kept separate in a section preceding the test section proper. Three stripes were put down for each paint in each test section. The paints were applied with a hand-operated machine fitted with a full-size spray gun and bead dispenser of the same type used in regular field equipment. Observations and measurements similar to those for longitudinal stripes were made during the work and are summarized in Table 2.

Evaluation

Both longitudinal and transverse stripes were evaluated independently by a committee of three representing Maintenance, Planning and Traffic, and Testing and Research Divisions. At each inspection, the paints were identified only by their code letters and ratings of 0 to 10 were assigned to each test stripe by the individual members of the committee and the three ratings averaged. Performance rating is based on four qualities defined as follows:

- 3 -

1. <u>General Appearance</u>.- This is the complete impression conveyed when the painted surface is viewed at a distance of at least 10 feet before any detailed inspection has been made, and is estimated purely in terms of satisfactory or unsatisfactory appeal to the observer.

2. <u>Color</u>.- This term designates a comparison of the color of the surface under consideration with the original color, and includes changes due to yellowing, darkening, fading, dirt collection, mold growth, etc. The determination is made without preliminary washing or any other modification of the surface of the test lines.

3. <u>Durability</u>.- The factor used in rating film failure is equal to one-tenth of the percentage of material remaining on the pavement when examined closely by the unaided eye. For transverse stripes, durability was evaluated only in each wheel track 9 inches each side of the point of greatest wear in accordance with the method prescribed in recent ASTM cooperative traffic paint tests.

4. <u>Night Visibility</u>.- This term designates the apparent brightness when examined from an automobile at a distance of at least 75 feet. Hunter Night-Visibility Meter readings may be substituted for visual comparison, the rating being based on a factor of 10 for the highest reading, and 0 for complete failure.

Hunter readings were taken on all transverse stripes, three readings each wheel track, each lane - which means 12 readings for each stripe or a total of 144 readings for each paint at every evaluation. Readings were not taken on the longitudinal stripes because of sampling uncertainties and the excessively large number of observations required for statistical validity.

- 4 -

As explained in the first interim report, the four qualities just defined are not considered of equal importance and are not given equal weight in the composite performance rating in these tests. Durability and night visibility are much more important attributes than color and general appearance, and for analytical purposes the ratings have been weighted on the basis of 40 percent for durability, 40 percent for night visibility, and 10 percent each for color and general appearance in summarizing the test results.

In addition to weighting the ratings on the basis of these four qualities at each evaluation, some consideration should be given to the overall level of performance for the entire period of service up to the last evaluation. It is obviously inequitable to rate a given paint only on its record at a single specific time near the end of the test without taking into account its previous performance from the very beginning. For the present tests a single performance figure, which will be called "service factor" for convenience, has been worked out by summing the products of the average weighted rating for each interval between evaluations and the number of days in the interval, and dividing this sum by 100. In this way, outstanding performance in the early phases of the test is recognized as well as durability. Service factors based on performance for the periods covered by evaluations of both longitudinal and transverse stripes are therefore included in the tabulated summaries of test results.

Test Results

The results of the tests on transverse stripes at the age of 170 days are given in Tables 3 and 4. Table 3 contains data representing the average ratings assigned by the inspection committee, and their weighted

- 5 -

average. In Table 4, these ratings are compared on the basis of 100 percent for the paint having the highest rating. Service factors are similarly compared and, in addition, the service factor of each paint is compared with that of a perfect paint having a rating of 10 throughout the given period. In making this comparison, the white and yellow paints are grouped separately and compared within their respective color groups.

Test results for the longitudinal stripes are given in Table 5. Values in this table represent the average rating of all stripe segments containing the given paint as listed in Table 1, irrespective of location or other qualifying conditions. In Table 6, ratings and service factors are given in the same way as for the transverse stripes, and compared on the basis of 100 percent for the paint having the highest rating. The results obtained with two methods of rating night visibility are given in Table 7.

It should be noted that test paints of relatively limited extent of application whose assigned areas include a large proportion of pavement subjected to unusually severe abrasion are placed at a disadvantage in these tests. Examples of this are found in the yellow centerlines of Paints D and F on US-127 from Willard Avenue south to Miller Road, which constitute the only test of these paints in longitudinal stripes on concrete pavement.

Concluding Remarks

1. At this point in the tests it is quite evident that specification paint has deteriorated to a considerably lower level than the others. Recent alternate periods of wet and freezing weather have accelerated the

- 6 -

deterioration since the last previous evaluation, and the method of estimating durability intensifies the apparent rapidity of change after the paint has worn to the point where the first small areas of pavement under the stripe are uncovered.

2. The order of the other paints is not well defined. Although they have all deteriorated considerably, especially in the longitudinal stripes, the differences between paints are not great. More time will be needed to establish a final order of merit for these paints.

3. The test program to date has demonstrated the fallibility of using longitudinal stripes as a basis for performance testing. While records were kept of pavement condition at the time of application, amount of paint remaining from previous applications, film thickness, and weather conditions, it is utterly impossible to take these conditions quantitatively into consideration when making evaluations of comparative performance. All of the above conditions varied widely in the tests of longitudinal stripes. Besides this, there are invariably local areas subjected to extremely severe abrasion from high traffic volume combined with dirt tracked from access roads. Test paints located largely or entirely in such areas are penalized from the beginning. On the other hand, a yellow paint which is applied only as no-passing lines on a three-lane pavement outside the city has an unfair advantage.

4. As far as these tests are concerned, it is apparent once more that the "drop-in" method (beads on only) does not produce as durable a line or as permanent brightness as the "overlay" method (beads in and on). This may possibly be chiefly a matter of bead gradation and should be investigated further.

- 7 -

Third Interim Report

Subsequent to the preparation of the second interim report, another evaluation was made on March 11 and 12 at which time the longitudinal and transverse stripes had been down an average of 253 days and 229 days respectively.

The results of these observations are given in Tables A through C and show little change in the trends noted in previous reports. It seems worthy of mention, however, that Paint C apparently is dropping slightly behind Paints B, D, and E in the durability run, although it has given excellent performance in these tests so far.



.

FIGURE I



TABLE 1 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION DATA 1952 Longitudinal Stripes

 $\sim -\frac{1}{2}$

k.

loute	Location	Line	Type Surf	Longth	Date	Tine Comiste	Air Teap,	R.B.	Drying Tine	Ant. Peint	Calo. Film	Neas. Film	Tank Press,	Atom. Press.	Remotive
						PAIST A.	97 VEL 71	<u>_</u>	<u></u>		mils	<u>pile</u>	pui.	P81.	
US 27	N. City Limits to State Hd. State 2d. to UL 454	3. ¥.	0	1.477	6-24-52 7-1-52	10100 A	6? 67	66 50		12	18.5	15	78 58	95 95	
	CL 454 to Round Lake Rd. Round Lake Ed. to Jason Ed.	ai Y,	Č C	2,811 4,155	6-24-52 7-1 -52	12:00 H 1:15 P	91 87	56	25 30	23 24	18.6	17 14.5	78 58	95 95	
05 127	Villard Ave. to Jolly Ed.	3. 2.	0	1,422	7-1-52	4100 P	92 86	50 54	22	9	17.9	. 15 14	72 58	95 95	
M 78	Jolly Ed. to Miller Rd. Abbott Ed. to Hagadorn Ed.	•. 8.	c	1,000	7-1-52	3:50 P	86 93	54 52	41 26	7 4.5	16,0 9.3	16	55 60	95 95	
¥ 178.16	Hagadorn Ed. to Park Lake Ed.	¥. 8.	o c	0.855	7-2-52 7-10-52	3:27 P	93 83	52 42		3.5	9.3	16 14	60 70	95 04	
4, 65 16	Rnd of 4-Lans to Macousta Ed. Wacousta Ed. to M-100	и. 5,	B B	4,612	7-3-52 7-3-52	10:30 A 11:40 A	78 82	74 72	48 32	24 11	11.9 12,4	14 14	58 60	95 95 95	Cloudy, rain
B. US 16	Hagedorn Rd. to W. Meridian Rd. W. Meridian Rd. to Williamston	н. 8.	в. В	5.144 3.700	7-2-52 7-2-52	2105 ₽ 11130 ▲	88 86	56 56	23 43	30 18	13.9 11,1	14 13.5	60 58	95 95	
USI 27	N. Gity Limits to State Bd.	٧.	a	1.477	6-25-52	B:00 A	101108 83	66		22	13.6		. 20	95	•
•- •1	State Bd, to Sta, 134+40 Sta, 134+40 to CL 454	R. 1	a o	0.500	6-25-52 7-1 -52	8:15 A 11:15 A	83 67	66 50	30	8 27	14.6 15.7	16	70 60	95 95	
US 127	Willard Ave. to Jolly Rd. Jolly Rd. to Miller Rd.	¥. 2	o o	1,422	7-1-52 7-1-52	6:30 P 5:06 P	66 66	47 47	36 	17 15	10.9 13.7	14 14	55 53	95 95	
W. US 16	Balta Biver Dr. to end 4-Lans'	я.	c	2.177	7-3-52	8: <i>5</i> 4 A	78	74	44	27	11.3	15	58	95	
I. US 16	Hagadorn Hd. to Park Lake Hd. Park Lake Hd. to Okence Hd. Okence Hd. to and M.Lane	3. 3. 3.	B B B	0.799	7-2-52 7-2-52 7-2-52	9:15 ▲ 9:33 ▲	78 80 83	63 61	29	10 13	11.4 13.4 11.2	14 14 14 5	58 58	95 95	
		~•	-		1. 5 - 55	PAIRT D.	NH ITH			,		***5	50.	*5	
US 27	Stoll Hd, to CL 454 Taft Hd, to Wildcat Hd.	Я. V.	6 0	0.966 2.621	7-7-52 7-7-52	1:20 P 2:31 P	90 91	47 47	30 27	? 17	16.5 14.8	15 16,5	45 45	95 95	
B. US 16	N. Meridian Ed. to Burkley Rd.	и,	B	1,212	7-7-52	11 i 35 A	88	54	34	9	16.9	15	45	95	I.
-						PAIRT B.	TRULOW						1		
US 27	Stoll Ed. to CL 454	۰.	U	0.966	7-7-52	J146 P PALHE C.	92 VB178	47	25	15	14.2	15	35	95	
US 27	D, City Limits to State Hd.	¥,	6	1.477	6-27-52	2:15 P	83 78	47	29	11 25	17.0	15 15	50 50	95 95	
	Jason Ed. to Taft Ed.	Ŷ.	č	2,988	6-27-52	12:16 P	80	șî Si		Ĩ9	14,5	ĩś	50	95	
14 78 W. OS 16	Lans, City Limits to Abbott Ed. Delta Biver Dr. to and 4-Lane	¥. 8.	c c	2,177	6-20-52	3:42 P 3:05 P	89 84	61 44	59 27	13 13	18,7	15	50 50	95 95	
R, US 16	Hagadorn Bd, to Fark Lake Bd.	8.	B	0.855	6-26-52	4:41 P	67	63	40	5	13,3	12	50	95	
			_		<i>.</i>	PAIPT 0.	TILLON								
US 27 N 78	N. City Limits to State Rd. Lans. City Limits to Abbott Ed.	в. 8.	с 0	1,477	6-27-52 6-26-52	9140 A	68 91	76 59	30 41	26 35	20,1	15	42 40	95 95	
W. US 16	Belta River Dr. to end 4-Lane	8.	C	2,177	6-27-52	4105 P	84	44	34	40	16.7	18	50	95	
N. US 16	Hagadorn Rd, to Park Lake Ed.	8 , `	в	0.855	6-26-52	5120 P	67	63		25	26.6	21	50	95	
US 127	Jolly 8d, to Miller 8d.	3.	ø	1.000	7-9-52	<u>PAINT D</u> 12:30.P	74	51	21	6	13.7	14.7	80	95	Paint very beavy
¥ 78	Willard Ave. to Jolly Ed.	¥,	0	1,422	7-9-52	2:20 P	77 20	38 38		10 «	16.0	14	70 70	95 95	Thinned with } pt. LT-1 per gal. Thinned with > nt.
	Abbatt Ed. to Hagadorn Rd.	я.	č	1.099	7-9-52	4:28 P	77	41		6	12.4	ĩš	67	95 	LT-1 per gal,
S, US 16	Haslett Ed. to Yan Atta Ed. Yan Atta Ed. to N. Maridian Ed.	8. 8.	3	2,225	7-9-52 7-10-52	5:05 P 12:00 M	77 79	41 41	19	13 5	13.3 16.6	15	67 68	95 95	Thinned with # pt, LT-1 per gal. Used # pt, THP in-
	VillieustonLimits toBurkley R.	X.	B	2,486	7-10-52	1:55 P	82	41.	15	18	16,5	14	72	95	stead of LT-1
US 127	Jolly Ed. to Miller Ed.	٧,	¢	0,900	7-10-52	10:19 4	75	42	19	15	15.2	15	50	95	g pt. 70P per gal.
						PALET X	. мат	l							
US 27 N 78	State Ed. to Stoll Ed.	3, 5	C A	1,000	6-25-52	2:00 P	94 97	55	40	10	22,8 2) 5	15-20	65 65	95 05	Film thick, increases during run Film thick increases
₩, US 16	N-100 to Vaccusta Ed.	я.	3	2,022	6-25-52	10:35 A	84	66	36	21	23.7	17-20	69	95	during run Film thick, increases
B. US 16	Forest Hill Hd. to Francis Rd. Okence Hd. to and 4-Lana	4. 5.	н В	0,366	6-26-52	12:00 M	89 93	62 65		6	35.2	15	05 65	95 95	during run
						PAIET 8.	TELLOW								
US 27	State Rd. to Stoll Hd.	Ψ,	¢	1.000	6-25-52	3:00 P	94	55		22	20.0	19	60	95	
N 78 1. US 16	Lans, City Limits to Abbott Ed. Changas Ed. to end 4-Lans	н. Н.	0 36	1.588	6-26-52	10:00 A	86 92	56 62	25 28	40 15	23.0 35.2	15-20	60 60	95 95	Film thick, increases during ran Film thick, increases
						PALET 7	<u>. VHITA</u>	i							during run
US 27	Alward Ed. to Jason Rd.	3, ^{''}	0	1,500	7-8-52	9135 🛦	80	68	19	10	15.2	15.5	50	95	Settles badly
W. US 16	Vaccusta Ed. to Porest Bill Ed. Francis Ed. to 4-Lane pvt.	8, 8,	9	2,256	7-8-52 7-9-52	8:25 A	72 62	90 63	20	12	12,1	17.5	50 55	95 95	Finished in light rain
18 127	William to Jolly BA	ж.	c	1.422	7-9-52	PAIRT 7.	70 YELLOW		17	15	9.6	13	54	65	
W. US 16	Lowell Ed. to M-100	5 (d)	2		7-10-52	8115 4	70	44	14	10			65	95	
						PALITY O.	YKITZ				10				
108 27 H 118 14	Co. Ed. 454 to Round Lake Ed.	¥. s	C C	2,166	6-30-52	12:25 P	76 81	70	20	14	14,6 ^(b)	14.3	53	75 X	
M, US 16	Park Lake Ed. to Okeaos Ed.	s.	3	1.044	6-30-52	5:12 P	50 50	57 61	25	5	10.9(b)	14(3)	53	75 75	
						PAINT G.	TRULOW								
W. US 16	DeWitt Ed. to Delta River Br.	я. я.	0 14	0,634 1.044	6-30-52	3:45 P	81	57 4-	21	7 ,4	10,1 ^(b)	15(%)	53	75 74	
. 00 10	rard with mu, to Uteria au,	••	5	1.044	u-jv-j4	יז לנוכ <u>Palif H.</u>	SO VEITE	6]	25	16	13.7.77		53	75	
W. 09 16	Dewitt Ed. to Delta Hiver Dr.	н,	c	0.634	7-1 -52	10115 A	73	74	36	3	10,8(b)	14,5(%)	55	75	
W. 588 3.4	Dawitt Hd. to Dalta Biwaw Dr.	я.	c	0 674	2_1.**	PAINT H.	TELLOW			-	10 - (h)	1 .(5)			
	we weare water we,		-	~1	,,-	7115 A	73	73	19	7	10'1	144.07	59	75	

(a) - G = concrete, B = bituminous (b) - File thickness for paint only, exclusive of bands

(c) - Total distance is 2,811 mi, First 3300 ft. S. of Round Lake Rd. spplied 6-23-54 with large beeds premimed. (d) - All south no-passing lines

TABLE 2 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION DATA 1952 Transverse Stripes

Code	Paint Lab	Color	Time	Air Temp.	R.H.	Drying Time	Amt. Paint	Calc. Film	Meas. Film	Tank Press.	Atom. Press.	Stripe	Hunter Reading
Letter	No.		t Aren) HS_	27 25 Ft.	Concrete	min	<u>92.</u>	/2 mt. Sout	h of St. J	Del.	<u>D91</u> I=52	WIGTH	<u>AV6 [3/6</u>
			e area r, ∪o≂,	C/	, concrete		147 <u>7</u>] 14 C	/				- 10	
A	52 PR 20	White	9:42	70	55	47			14.5	85	85	3-5/8	14.4
в	52 FK 22	White	10:06			50			14.5	54	60	3-13/16	27.2
Ď	52 PR 26	White	10:24			33		====	15.5	65	75	3-9/16	21.0
- 21	52 PR 28	White	11:26			23			12,5	40	70	3-9/16	27.1
G	52 PR 30	White	11:55			42			14.5	45	75	3-3/4	1000
r	52 PA 32	White	12:33			20			15	70	75	3-7/8	25.7
*	52 PR 21	Yellow	2:07	79	40	35			14.5	70	75	3-5/8	45.5
в	52 PH 23	Tellow	2:27			84	36	20.5	16	50	75	4	344
c	52 PR 25	Yellow	2:43			67 h 3	30 32	21.8	15	50	75	3-3/4	47.4
и v	52 51 27	Yellow	3:30			42	36	21 5	15	52	65	3-13/16	35
F	52 PR 33	Yellow	3:55			37	32	19.1	15	60	75	3-13/16	12.4
G.	52 PR 31	Yellow	4:10	78	43	24	21	12.7	14	40	75	3-3/4	580.4
		Test Ar	rea 2, 115-27,	18 ft., Bi	tuminous,	East Roady	ay, 1-1/2	m1. 3outh	of St. Jo	hns 7-25-	52		
A	52 Pk 20	White	8:30	70	64	43	32	23.6	11.5	90	95	3-3/4	63.3
В	52 PR 22	White White	8:47		+-	54	21	11.0	15	50	60	4-1/4	25.9
n	52 FR 24	White	9:04			30	28	20.7	10 .	50	25	3_7/8	101
ž	52 PR 28	White	9:56			31	32	22.2	14.5	40	50	4	68.3
F	52 PH 32	White	10:15			36	29	20,7	15	52	64	3-7/8	119
0	52 PR 30	White :	10:34			26			14.5	50	75	3-7/8	584
۸	52 PH 21	Yellow	12;12	83	42	45	26	18.7	15	75	75	3-7/8	25
B	52 PR 23	Yellow	12:24			63	34	22.9	14.5	45	55	4-1/8	10,4
C	52 PR 25	Yellow	12:38			57	48	33.3	15	50	75	4	38.1
2	52 FR 27	Tellow	12:52)0 30	20	23.7 22 a	13	35 45	40	3-7/8	44.6
F	52 PR 33	Yellow	1:35			41	27	20.0	11.5	45	55	3-3/4	155
G·	52 PR 31	Yellow	2:05	86	39	31	26	19.2	15	34	50	3-3/4	607.3
	7	lost Area 3,	US-127, 22 ft	Concret	te, East R	oadway, Nea	r Interse	ction with	Pennsylva	nia Ave. Ex	tension 7	- 31-52	
A ·	52 PR 20	White	12:17	68	54	45	28	15.7	15	60	65	4-1/16	21.6
В	52 PR 22	. Vhite	10:31			70	41	22	15	48	55	4-1/4	13.9
C	52 PR 24	White	10):47			68			14.5	40	55	4-1/8	22.9
D	52 PR 26	White	11:10			32	26 3	16.6	11.5	52	55	3-5/8	46
a r	52 PR 32	White	11:21)0 35	304	22 1	15	38 h.c	50	4-1/5	13.9
Ĝ	52 PR 30	White	12:38			14	28	16.0	14	43	74	4-1/10	446.8
H	52 PR 20B	White	1:58	73	39	19	. 28	16.2	14	45	75	3-15/16	550
Å	52 PH 21	Yellow	3:04			49	32	20.0	15	75	65	3-5/8	28.3
В	52 PH 23	Yellow	3:16			67	16	10.9	15	40	53 ,	3-7/8	10.0
<u>°</u> .	52 PR 25	Yellow	3:23			75	43	25.3	15	45	55	3-7/8	11.9
D	52 FR 27	Yellow	3:40			43	46	27.6	15	50	55	3-13/16	36.3
r ·	52 PR 33	Vellow	3:51			41	32	24.8	15	50	50	2 4/9	17.5
0	52 PR 31	Yellow	4:22			36	19	11.7	14	30	55	3-11/16	707
н	52 PR 21B	Yellow	4:41	76	38	30	32	19.1	14	38	50	3-13/16	456
		Test A	rea 4, E. US-1	.6, 2) ft.	Bitumiao	us, South L	ธบุรุ.2 ซา	. West of	Okemo s- II.a a	lett Rd.	R-1-52		
A	52 PR 20	white	9:12	68	58	50	21	14	14	65	70	3-3/4	23.1
3	52 PR 22	White	9:26			. 62	28	18	14	35	45	3-7/8	16.6
'n	52 FR 24	White	9:40			50	19	12.7	13	38	52	3-3/4	40.5
л Х	52 Pit 28	White	10:05			35	35	22.6	14.5	· 45	22	3-2/8	17.8
F	52 PR 32	white	10:33			23	21	14.0	13.5	27	27	3-3/4	13.3
G	52 PH 30	White	10:51			32	2 2	14.4	14	35	50	3-13/16	456
Ħ	52 PR 209	White	11:04	77	45	58	23	15,2	14	45	75	3-13/16	316.6
Å	52 PR 21	Yellow	1:05	79	43	32	20	13.4	15	60	70	3-3/4	í6.1
B	52 FR 23	Yellow	1:15			51	32 36	20.7	14.5	35	40	3-7/8	4.7
U D	54 FR 25	Terlow	1:24			62	30 23	23.2	15	37	40	3-7/8	14.3
E	52 PH 29	Yellow	1:45			-41	2 <i>2</i> 38	25 3	15	57	75	3-3/4 3-3/4	22.9
7	52 PR 33	Yellow	1;59			50	32	21.4	15	30	35	3-3/4	3.9
G	52 Pk 31	Yellow	2:13			37	22	14.7	14	36	60	3-3/4	254.1
H	52 PR 21B	Yellow	2:25	82	36	46	32	21.4	14	45	55 .	3-3/4	119

NOT%: Test Areas 1, 2, and 3 - Code applies north to south

Test Area 4 - Code applies west to east

Each letter represents 3 stripes

TABLE 3, SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE DATA 1952 Transverse Stripes

		\int_{-}^{-}		Wh	ite	Pain	t T			Y		Yol	low	Pair	.t	• •••••	~~~~	Ņ
Age Days	Factor Evaluated	A	в	C	Ð	E	F	G	н	A	В	C	D	E	F	G	H	
0*	General Appearance Color Paint Remaining Night Visibility Weighted Rating**	10 8.8	10 7.2	10 7.7	10 8.0	10 7.9	10 8.4	10 8.7	10 8.8	 10 8.7	10 7.3	10 8,0	10 8.4	10 8.2	10 8.1	10 8,8	10 9,2	
31*	General Appearance Color Paint Remaining Night Visibility Weighted Rating	8 8 10 8 8.8	8 8 10 4 7.2	9 8 10 5 7.7	8 8 10 6 8.0	8 7 10 6 7.9	8 8 10 7 8.4	7 8 10 8 8.7	8 5 10 8 8,8	8 7 10 8 8.7	8 9 10 4 7.3	8 8 10 6 8,0	8 10 7 8.4	7 7 10 7 8.2	9 5 10 6 8,1	8 8 10 8 8,8	8 8 10 9 9.2	
80	General Appearance Color Paint Remaining Night Visibility Weighted Rating	8 8 9 10 9,2	8 8 10 7 8,4	8 8 10 9 9.2	8 9 8 8.4	8 8 9 8 8.4	8 9 8 8.4	8 9 8 8,4	8 8 9 9 8,8	8 9 9 8.8	9 9 10 7 8,6	8 8 10 8 8,8	8 8 10 8 8.8	8 8 10 8 8,8	8 8 9 7 8_0	8 8 9 9 8,8	8 7 9 10 9.1	
108	General Appearance Color Paint Remaining Night Visibility Weighted Rating	9 8 9 8.5	8 9 6 7.6	8 9 8 8,4	8 9 7 8.0	8 9 7 8.0	8 8 6 7.2	8 8 7 7.6	8 8 7 .7.6	8 8 9 8.4	9 9 10 6 8,2	8 9 7 8,0	8 9 7 8,0	8 9 7 8,0	8 8 6 7,2	8 8 8 8.0	8 8 7 8.4	
170	General Appearance Color Paint Remaining Night Visibility Weighted Rating	5 6 4 5 4.7	8 8 7 7.6	7 7 8 8 7.8	8 8 6 7.2	8 8 7 7.6	6 7 6 7 6.5	8 8 6 7.2	5 6 5 4	4 6 4 4 4.2	8 9 8 7 7.7	8 9 8 8.4	8 9 9 7 8,1	8 9 7 8,0	7 7 7 7.0	7 7 6 6.6	6 6 4 5,2	
		l.						,		λ								Ţ

Evaluation by Research Laboratory only
** Initial ratings assumed to be the same as those at 31 days for the purpose of calculating service factor in Table 4.

TABLE 4, WEIGHTED RATINGS AND SERVICE FACTORS 1952 Transverse Stripes

ł.

		\subseteq		W);	ite P	aint		<u> </u>	· ,	(<u> </u>	ell ou	Pain	.t		<u> </u>
Age Days	Factor Evaluated	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	н		B	C	D	E	F	Ģ	H
0	Weighted Pating* Percent of Maximum Service Factor Percent of Maximum Percent of Perfect	8.8 100 0 	7.2 82 0 	7.7 88 0 	8.0 91 0 	7.9 90 0	8.4 95 0 	8.7 99 0	8.8 100 0	8.7 95 0 	7.3 79 0 	8.0 87 0	8.4 91 0	8.2 89 0	8.1 88 0 	8.8 96 0 	9.2 100 0
31	Weighted Rating Percent of Maximum Service Factor Percent of Maximum Percent of Perfect	8.8 100 2.7 100 87	7.2 82 2.2 81 71	7.7 88 2.4 89 77	8.0 91 2.5 93 81	7.9 90 2.4 89 77	8.4 95 2.6 96 84	8.7 99 2.7 100 87	8.8 100 2.7 100 87	8.7 95 2.7 93 87	7.3 79 2.3 79 74	8.0 87 2.5 86 81	8.4 91 2.6 90 84	8.2 89 2.5 86 81	8.1 88 2.5 86 81	8.8 96 2.7 93 87	9.2 100 2.9 100 94
80	Weighted Rating Percent of Maximum Service Factor Percent of Maximum Percent of Perfect	9.2 100 7.1 100 89	8.4 91 6.1 86 76	9.2 100 6.5 92 81	8.4 91 6.5 92 81	8.4 91 6.4 90 80	8.4 91 6.7 94 84	8.4 91 6.9 99 86	8.8 96 7.0 100 88	8.8 97 7.0 96 87	8.6 95 6.2 85 78	8,8 97 6,6 90 83	8,8 97 6,8 93 85	8.8 97 6.7 92 84	8.0 88 6.5 89 81	8.8 97 7.0 96 87	9.1 100 7.3 100 91
108	Weighted Rating Percent of Maximum Service Factor Percent of Maximum Percent of Perfect	 8.5 100 9.6 100 89 	7.6 89 8.3 86 77	8.4 99 9.0 94 83	8.0 94 8.8 92 81	8.0 94 8.7 91 81	7.2 95 8.9 93 82	7.6 89 9.1 95 84	7.6 89 9.3 97 86	8.4 100 9.4 96	8.2 90 8.5 87 79	8.0 95 8.9 91 82	8.0 95 9.2 94 85	8.0 95 9.1 93 84	7.2 86 8.6 88 80	8.0 95 9.4 96 87	8.4 100 9.8 100 91
170	Weighted Rating Percent of Maximum Service Factor Percent of Maximum Percent of Perfect	 4.7 60 13.7 98 81 	7.6 98 13.0 93 77	7.8 100 14.0 100 82	7.2 92 13.5 96 80	7.6 98 13.6 97 80	6.5 83 13.2 94 77	7.2 92 13.7 98 81	4.7 60 13.1 94 77	4.2 50 13.3 94 78	7.7 92 13.4 95 79	8,4 100 14,0 99 82	8,1 96 14,2 100 83	8.0 95 14.0 99 82	7.0 83 13.0 92 77	6.6 79 13.9 98 82	5.2 62 14.0 99 82

 Initial ratings assumed to be the same as those at 31 days for the purpose of calculating service factors

	,			₩h	ite	Pain	t			Ý		¥el	low :	Pain	t)
àge Days	Factor Evaluated	A	B	C	D	E	F	0	H	Å	B	С	D	E	F	G	н
	Number of Test Stripes	14	3	6	?	5	3	3	1	9	1	4	1	3	2	2	1
0	General Appearance Color Paint Remaining Night Visibility Weighted Rating*	10 8.4	10 8.4	 10 8.4	 10 8.0	 10 8.0	10 8.0	10 8.7	10 6.6	10 7.4	10 8.4	10 7.9	10 7.6	 10 8,5	10 6.4	 10 9.2	10 7.0
77	General Appearance Color Paint Remaining Night Visibility Weighted Rating	8 9 8 8,4	8 8 10 7 8.4	8 9 8 8.4	8 8 10 6 8.0	8 8 10 6 8.0	8 9 7 8.0	8 7 10 8 8.7	7 7 9 4 6.6	7 7 8 7 7.4	10 10 10 6 8.4	8 7 97 7 7•9	8 9 6 7.6	8 9 10 7 8.5	8 8 4 6.4	8 8 10 9 9.2	7 7 9 7.0
105	General Appearance Color Paint Remaining Night Visibility Weighted Rating	8 8 8 8.0	8 9 7 8.0	8 9 8 8.4	8 9 6 7.6	8 8 9 7 8.0	8 9 7 8.0	8 7 9 9 8.7	7 6 8 4 6.1	7 7 8 7 7.4	9 9 10 7 8.6	8 8 9 7 8.0	7 8 9 4 6.7	9 9 9 6 7.8	5 5 3 4.6	8 8 9 8.4	7 8 9 4 6.7
161	General Appearance Color Paint Remaining Night Visibility Weighted Rating	7 7 7 7.0	8 8 7 7.6	7 7 7 7.0	6 7 8 5 6.5	7 8 8 7 7.5	9 9 8 8 8.2	7 7 8 7 7.4	3 4 5 4.3	7 6 7 6.5	9 9 9 6 7.8	8 8 7 7.6	7 7 9 5 7.0	8 8 9 5 7•2		7 7 8 7 7.4	5 5 6 5.8
203	General Appearance Color Paint Remaining Night Visibility Weighted Rating	4 4 4 4.0	6 7 6 6.4	6 5 6 5 5•5	5 5 6 4 5.0	6 7 6 6.4	7 7 6 6,6	5 5 3 4.2	0 0 0 0	3 3 1 2.2	7 7 8 4 6.2	6 6 6.0	6 6 7 3 5.2	7 6 7 6.5	4 4 4 4 4.0	6 7 6 5 5.7	1 1 0 0.6
•	•	Ţ								λ							j

TABLE 5. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE DATA 1952 Longitudinal Stripes

* Initial ratings assumed to be the same as those at 77 days for the purpose of calculating service factors in Table 6.

TABLE 6, WEIGHTND RATINGS AND SMRVICE FACTORS 1952 Longitudinal Stripes

					hite	Paint	· ·					Y	allow	Pain	t		<u> </u>
Ago Days	Factor Evaluated	A	B	C	D	E,	F	G	H	٨	B	.0	D	N.	F	0	н I
0	Weighted Rating* Percent of Naximum Service Factor Percent of Maximum Percent of Perfect	8.4 97 0	8.4 97 0	8.4 97 0 	8.0 92 0	8.0 92 0	8.0 92 0	8.7 100 0	6.6 76 0 	7.4 80 0	8.4 91 0	7.9 86 0	7.6 83 0	8,5 92 0	6.4 70 0	9.2 100 0	7.0 76
77	Weighted Rating Percent of Naximum Service Factor Percent of Maximum Percent of Perfect	8.4 97 6.5 97 84	8.4 97 6.5 97 84	8.4 97 6.5 97 84	8.0 92 6.2 92 81	8.0 92 6.2 92 81	8.0 92 6.2 92 81	8.7 100 6.7 100 87	6.6 76 5.1 76 66	7.4 80 5.7 80 74	8.4 91 6.5 92 84	7.9 86 6.1 86 79	7.6 83 5.9 83 77	8.5 92 6.5 92 84	6.4 70 4.9 69 64	9.2 100 7.1 100 92	7.0 76 5.4 76 70
105	Weighted Rating Percent of Maximum Service Factor Percent of Maximum Percent of Perfect	 8.0 92 8.8 97 84	8.0 92 8.8 97 84	8.4 97 8.8 97 84	7.6 87 8.3 91 79	8.0 92 8.4 92 80	8.0 92 8.4 92 80	8.7 100 9.1 100 87	6,1 70 6,9 76 66	7.4 86 7.8 82 74	8.6 100 8.8 93 84	8.0 93 8.3 87 79	6.7 78 7.9 83 75	7.8 91 8.8 93 84	4.6 54 6.5 68 62	8.4 98 9.5 100 90	6,7 78 7.3 77 70
161	Weighted Rating Percent of Maximum Service Factor Percent of Maximum Percent of Perfect	 7.0 85 1 3.0 96 81 	7.6 93 13.1 96 81	7.0 85 13.1 96 81	6.5 79 12.3 90 76	7.5 92 12.7 93 79	8,2 100 12,9 95 80	7.4 90 13.6 100 84	4.3 52 9.8 72 61	6.5 83 11.7 84 73	7.8 100 13.4 96 83	7.6 97 12.7 91 79	7.0 90 11.7 84 73	7.2 92 13.0 93 81	48446 III 12444 144444 144444 144444 144444 144444 144444 144444 144444 144444 1444444	7.4 95 14.0 100 87	5.8 74 10.8 77 67
20 3	Weighted Rating Percent of Maximum Service Factor Percent of Maximum Percent of Perfect	4.0 61 15.3 95 75	6.4 97 16.1 100 79	5.5 83 15.8 98 78	5.0 76 14.7 91 72	6.4 97 15.7 98 77	6,6 100 16.0 99 79	4.2 64 16.1 100 79	0.0 0 10.7 66 53	2,2 34 13.5 81 66	6,2 95 16,4 98 81	6.0 92 15.5 93 76	5.2 80 14.3 86 70	6.5 100 15.9 95 78	4.0 62 10.7 64 53	5.7 88 16.7 100 82	0.6 9 12.2 73 60
	1·	t				· .				<u>ا</u>							\rightarrow

* Initial ratings assumed to be the same as at 77 days for the purpose of calculating service factors

TABLE 7. NIGHT VISIBILITY1952 Transverse Stripes

ł

		(·		W	hite :	Paint			- 1	Ŷ		Ye	11ow 3	Paint				١
Age Days	Method of Evaluating Night Visibility	A A	В	C	D	E	F	G	н	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	н	
0*	Estimated Hunter Meter	 	` 20		 54	 - 32	 41		 433	 29		 23						
31*	Estimated Hunter Meter	 8 151	4 28	5 46	6 31	6 27	7 41	8 104	8 138	 8 57	4 13	6 24	7 45	7 28	6 16	8 83	9 110	
80	Estimated Hunter Meter	10 174	7 63	9 64	8 43	8 20	8 27	8 59	9 198	 ₉ ⁴⁷ 	7 <u></u> 17	8 20	8 37	8' 21	7 10	9 164	10 168	
108	Estimated Hunter Meter	9	6 12	8 18	7 12	7 7	6 9	7 14	7 19	 9 13 	6 7	7 8	7 12	7 7	- 6 6	8 14	9 48	
170	Estimated Hunter Meter	5 , 6	7 14	8 22	6 8	7	?	6 4	4 3	 4 4	7 9	8	7 8	7 8	7 5	6	4 4	
										λ								J

. .

* Evaluation by Research Laboratory Only

						ite P	aint			,	Y		ie.10	w Pai	int				
	Age Days	Factor Evaluated	٨	в	c	D	S	F	G	н	*	B	j	D	Е	7	G	Ħ	
									Tra	18vers	e Str	lpee							
nence 1,4 8	229	General Appearance Golor Paint Memaining Night Visibility Weighted Rating	4 3 3 3,3	7 7 8 7.3	7 7 7 6,9	7 7 7 7.1	7 7 7 7.0	5 5 6 5•?	7 7 6 6.1	4 4 2 3,3	4 4 3 4 3.2	7 7 6 6.4	8 7 7 7.2	7 7 8 6 7.0	7 7 7 7.1	6 6 7 6,1	7 7 6 6,5	5 5 4 3 4.0	
erfori Ratii			i .						Long	itudi	nal St	ripes							
	253	General Appearance Color Paint Kemmining Night Visibility Weighted Rating	4 4 3 3.2	6 5 5 5.5	5 5 4 4•6	5 6 3 4.7	6 6 6 6	7 7 6 6,2	4 3 3 3+2	0 0 0 0,0	2 2 2 1 1.6	8 8 5 6.2	5 5 4 4.6	7 8 7 4 5.9	7 7 6 6,6	3 3 3 3.0	5 5 3 4.2	0 0 0 0	
<u> </u>									Trar	187018	e Str	pes	_						
hted ings	229	Weighted Rating Percent of Maximum Service Factor Percent of Maximum Percent of Perfect	3.3 45 16.1 88 70	7.3 100 17.4 95 76	6,9 95 18,4 100 80	7.1 97 17.7 96 77	7.0 96 17.9 97 78	5.7 78 16.8 91 73	6.1 84 17.6 96 77	3.3 45 15.5 84 68	3,2 45 15,5 83 68	6.4 89 17.6 95 77	7.2 100 18.6 100 81	7.0 97 18.6 100 81	7.1 99 15.5 99 81	6.1 85 16.9 91 74	6.5 90 17.8 96 78	4.0 56 16.7 90 73	
Weig Rat									Long	itudi	nal St	ripes							
	253	Weighted Rating Percent of Maximum Service Factor Percent of Maximum Percent of Perfect	3,2 52 17,1 89 68 	5.5 89 19.0 99 75	4.6 74 18.3 95 72	4.7 76 17.1 89 68	6.0 97 18.8 98 74	6.2 100 19.2 100 76	3,2 52 17.9 93 71	0.0 0 10.7 56 42	1.6 24 14.4 73 57	6.8 100 19.6 100 78	4.6 68 18.2 93 72	5.9 87 17.0 87 67	6.6 97 19.2 98 76	.3.0 44 12.4 63 49	4.2 62 19.2 98 76	0.0 0 12.3 63 49	
Visibility	229	Night Visibility Estimated Hunter Meter	 3 4	8 15	7 15:	7 6	7 9	6 7	63	2 1		6	7	6 5	7 5	7 4	6 3	32	
·		L	t								<u>ل</u>								;

Table A. Summary of Performance Data, 1952 Traffic Paint Tests

Table B. Weighted Ratings and Scrvice Factors, 1952 Traffic Paint Tests

Table C. Night Visibility, 1952 Transverse Stripes