Exhibit *Waterblasting – 2018*

Appl. No. 10/884,643 Reply to Office action of August 17, 2006

an oil/water separator and thereafter through a clean fluid filter before being returned to the clean water tank 12. The clean water is supplied to a pump capable of pressurizing the water to 1500 psi for cleaning asphalt surface and up to 5000 psi for cleaning concrete surfaces. The low pressure water is supplied to a hand propelled device similar to a hand operated lawnmower, where the fluid is directed toward a surface and vacuumed to return the water through the filter system. This system requires a person to propel the lawnmower type device across a surface for removal of light surface coatings. The low pressure and hand-operated nature of the spray assembly make the device unsuitable for removing road type markings that are constructed from polymers to extend below the upper surface of the roadway. In addition, if the device were capable of removing such markings, it would be extremely inefficient to remove several miles of markings with the hand operated device.

In contrast, the instant invention includes a high pressure pump capable of delivering 2-15 gallons per minute of fluid at 25,000 - 40,000 psi. The high pressure fluid is delivered to blast head mounted at the end of an articulated arm. The articulated arm is mounted to the front portion of a self-propelled mobile tractor. The tractor including an engine for propulsion thereof. The tractor is tethered to a truck or combination truck and trailer to

12

Application/Control Number: 10/884,643 Art Unit: 1746

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 11/17/2006, with respect to the 102

rejection of claims 1-3 and 5 have been fully considered and are persuasive. In light of the amendments, the 102 rejection of claims 1-3 and 5 has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 11/17/2006, with respect to the drawings have been fully considered and are persuasive. The previous objection of the drawings has been withdrawn. However, there are numerous other problems associated with the drawings and will be discussed below.

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 11/17/2006, with respect to the 103 rejection of claims 8-10 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 103 rejection of claims 8-10 has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 11/17/2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 11 and 12 under 35 USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Akagi.

Drawings