

ASTM SUBCOMMITTEE E17.52
on
TRAFFIC MONITORING DEVICES
Minutes of June 26, 2002, Meeting
Grand America – Salt Lake City, Utah

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m. by Chair, Luz Elena Y. Mimbela. The following were present:

Members

Perry Kent
John Hamrick
Clyde Lee
Larry Klein
Jerry Legg
Dan Smith
J. M. (Mulder) Brown

New Members

Dennis Kroeger

MINUTES

Minutes of the December 4, 2001 meeting were approved as written.

TASK GROUP REPORTS

E17.52.97.1 – Test Methods (Chairman - John Hamrick)

The “Standard Specification and Test Methods for Highway Traffic Monitoring Devices” was balloted at the subcommittee level in March 2002. The balloted version of this standard received a total of 3 negative votes with comments from the following individuals: John Hamrick, Ralph Gillmann, and Richard B. Rogers. The negatives were discussed during the Tuesday and Wednesday task group and subcommittee meetings and the results are as follows:

John Hamrick commented that the standard should distinguish between data being created by the traffic monitoring device (TMD) and those data items being developed from post processing of the data gathered by the TMD. After discussion, the group decided that the balloted version of the standard already distinguished between these two types of data. John also commented that types 1, 5, & 10 on Table 4 needed to be defined. After discussion, the group decided to incorporate a short sentence describing these types into the existing standard. The group decided to replace traffic flow rates with vehicle flowrates in section 6.2 of the standard. The term vehicle mix in section 7.2.6.4 was removed and other language was substituted, as per request from John. John also commented that values in Table 5 in section 7.2.6.5 should read a minimum of 4 hours. After discussion the group decided to include a minimum time for obtaining the required number of samples as listed in Table 5. However, the group decided to include a statement into the existing standard to allow the user to stop collecting sample data after the required minimum times as specified in Table 5 or the collection of the required number

of samples was achieved. Once John's comments were considered and the changes made to address some of the comments as described previously, John withdrew his negative vote.

Ralph Gillman's negative dealt with the preference to use inch-pound units in the balloted standard. Ralph commented that there is no reason to prefer inch-pound units and that SI or SI and inch-pound units should be standard. The group declared Ralph's negative non-persuasive due to the fact that ASTM Blue Book guidelines were being followed for this standard concerning units. The preferred units for this standard are the inch-pound units with SI as secondary. Ralph developed and submitted a draft titled "Standard Practice for the Use of Inch-Pound Units" to E17 ASTM staff manager, Dan Smith for follow-up with the appropriate committee.

Other comments submitted by Ralph were discussed and changes were made to section 3.2.4 to incorporate his comment that "the time over..." should be "the period over..." Furthermore, Ralph's comments on sections 3.2.11 and 3.2.14 were considered non-persuasive. The last comment on section 7.3.5 dealing with the superscript 2 was addressed by pointing out that the footnote for this superscript is found in a previous page and as per ASTM Blue Book, this was a satisfactory method.

Richard Rogers submitted a negative with several comments that were discussed and changes incorporated where appropriate. The first comment did not require action from the group. Richard's comment that TMDs used for vehicle classification also measure axle spacing and yet such equipment was not reflected in Table 3 was considered persuasive and changes were incorporated in Tables 1 through 3 to include axle spacing along with axle length to data from TMDs used for classification. Richard also commented that the usefulness of Table 4 was very limited since many TMDs have multiple functions and each will most likely have different tolerance limits. This comment was found to be non-persuasive by the group since they felt that this issue was already addressed in sections 5.1, 7.2.7, and 7.3.4. Also, a new paragraph was added to the scope to emphasize that multiple function TMDs can require data with different tolerance limits. Richard commented that samples were not being randomly selected. The group declared this comment persuasive and made changes to sections 5.1 and 5.1.1 to address this comment. Richard also commented that the radar gun needed to have a resolution an order of magnitude greater than the tolerance specified. This comment was declared persuasive by the group and changes were made to section 7.1.1 of the standard to address this.

Other comments not involving negative votes were received on this balloted item from the following individuals: Clyde E. Lee, Ted Gilfert and Bill McCall. These comments were addressed during the task group and subcommittee meetings and changes made to the standard where appropriate. Plans are to submit a revised version of this draft standard that incorporates all the changes discussed previously for concurrent subcommittee/main committee ballot during the next balloting process.

E17.52.97.3 - Traffic Device Interconnect (Chairman – Les Vickers)

Mr. Les Vickers was to replace Peter Keen as PEEK's representative in E17.52 and thus as the chairman for the Traffic Device Interconnect Task Group. However, Mr. Vickers was unable to

attend the December 4, 2001 and June 26, 2002 meetings due to other travel commitments. As a consequence this task group has not met in the past two years and plans are to disband since at least four E17.52 subcommittee members receive news regularly on the activities of the NTCIP DCM Working Group. Attachment #1 is a status report on the NTCIP DCM Working Group.

E17.52.98.2 - Piezo Sensor (Perry Kent, Chairman)

Bill McCall has stepped down as chairman of the Piezo sensor task group. Perry Kent volunteered as Piezo Sensor task group chairman. Perry Kent developed a draft titled “Standard Practice for Installing Piezoelectric and Quartz Highway Traffic Sensors.” The draft is included as attachment #2 with the minutes for review.

E17.52.98.3 - Revamp of E1318 (Perry Kent, Chairman)

The revised standard has been published in the 2002 edition of the Annual Book of ASTM Standards Vol. 4.03. The revamp of E1318 has been successfully completed! Thanks to all those that helped achieve this revamp!

E17.52.01.1 – Axle Count Adjustment Factors (Perry Kent, Chairman)

The group discussed action items needed to begin development of the “Standard Practice for Estimating Vehicle Counts from Single Axle Counts.” Perry Kent distributed a draft of the standard titled “Standard Practice for Developing Axle Count Adjustment Factors.” Plans are to submit a revised version of the distributed draft for the next balloting process via concurrent subcommittee and main committee ballot.

E17.52.01.2 – Loop Sensor (Ryan Gidluck, Chairman)

The scope of this task group was defined to include the development of a standard practice for the design and installation of inductive loop sensors used for traffic monitoring data collection. During the December 4, 2001 meeting, the group developed the following action items and individual(s) responsible to move the development of this standard forward:

- Collect information from States on what is currently being done, All;
- Obtain States’ information on loop sensors from Turner Fairbanks, Larry Klein;
- Obtain North Dakota’s specification for loop installation, Jeff Patten;
- Obtain West Virginia’s specification for loop installation, Jerry Legg;
- Obtain Anaheim, California’s specification for loop installation, Larry Klein.

Ryan Gidluck was not present at the June 2002 meeting to report on the status of this task group.

OLD BUSINESS

The group discussed extensively the fate of past, present and future standards developed by E17.52. Specifically, how to get the standards out to the users. The following ideas were discussed: 1) refer to standards in the FHWA’s Traffic Monitoring Guide (TMG), and 2) have FHWA purchase copies of respective standards from ASTM and distribute to traffic monitoring field people. The group felt very strongly that if steps were not taken to make the users aware of

these standards, the standards would all suffer the same fate of several standards developed by E17.52, which was to delete them from the books due to their not being used.

Dan Smith volunteered to send an email to State DOT personnel that would include an invitation to join ASTM and E17.52 along with a listing of all the standards that E17.52 has developed and is currently developing. The email would also pose the question of whether they would be interested in receiving any of the existing standards that E17.52 has developed. Based on the response to this question, E17.52 subcommittee members would take action to disseminate the standards to those interested.

Another new business item discussed was the need to spread the word out to vendors that they are welcome and needed as active participants in E17.52. The group members present agreed to inform those vendors they come in contact with about E17.52 activities.

FUTURE MEETINGS

December 8-11, 2002 – Miami Beach, FL

June 15-18, 2003 – Denver, CO

December 7-10, 2003 – Tampa, FL

June 13-16, 2004 – Kansas City, MO

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 am.