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• MDOT’s plan for implementation
• PMS data considerations
• Recognize support from within MDOT for adoption of the new guide
Need for New Design Guide
A Little History

• Current MDOT flexible pavement design method based on the results of the AASHO Road Test
• Ottawa, Illinois
• Constructed between August 1956 and September 1958
• Test traffic placed between October 1958 and November 1960
Summary of Design Guides Since AASHO Road Test

• Current MDOT flexible pavement design procedure based on the 1972 Interim Guide
Differences Between 1972 Design Guide and New MEPDG

- One climate vs. multiple climates using EICM
- Flexible pavements – materials
  - 1972 guide characterized by structural layer coefficients (basically equivalency factors)
  - MEPDG fundamental engineering properties
- Traffic
  - 1972 guide – ESALS
  - MEPDG – Load Spectra (direct consideration of actual wheel loads, axle configurations and specific load intervals)
Current design traffic is far beyond AASHO road test limits.

Current design traffic is far beyond AASHO road test limits?
Changes in Design Traffic

• Road Test Design Traffic – 8,000,000 ESALs
• Some current MDOT 20-year design traffic data:
  – MS 302 from US 51 to Swinnea RD - 21,762,000 ESALS
  – US 82 from Raceway RD to Leland – 16,504,000 ESALS
  – I-10 from Harrison County Line to SR 609 – 71,814,000 ESALS
  – I-55 from SR 24 to US 98W – 35,872,000 ESALS
• Extrapolation of traffic loadings from 2 to 9 times that of the Road Test
Mechanistic-Empirical Design

Climate → Materials → Structure → Damage Accumulation → Damage → Time → Distress

Response
ME PDG Pavement Responses

- Design of new and rehabilitated pavement structures based on engineering mechanics principles
Flexible Pavement Distresses

- Fatigue Cracking
- Thermal Cracking
- Longitudinal Cracking
- Rutting
- IRI
Pavement Responses and Pavement Distresses Related Via Transfer Functions
ME PDG Fatigue Cracking

\[ N_f = 0.00432 \times C \times \beta_{f1} k_1 (\varepsilon_t)^{-\beta_{f2} k_2} (E)^{-\beta_{f3} k_3} \]

\[ C = 10^M \]

\[ M = 4.84 \left( \frac{V_b}{(V_a + V_b)} - 0.69 \right) \]
Where:

• $N_f$: number of repetitions to fatigue cracking (predicted)
• $\varepsilon_t$: tensile strain at the critical location
• $E$: stiffness of the material
• $k_1, k_2, k_3$: regression coefficients
• $\beta_{f1}, \beta_{f2}, \beta_{f3}$: calibration parameters
• $V_a$: air voids (%)
• $V_b$: effective binder content (%)
ME PDG generates

- $N_f$: number of repetitions to fatigue cracking (predicted)
- $\varepsilon_t$: tensile strain at the critical location
Sources of Data

• $E$ : stiffness of the material
  – Dynamic modulus laboratory test
  – Estimated from models

• $V_a$ : air voids (%)
  – Laboratory tests related to HMA mix design
  – Extraction tests on field cores

• $V_b$ : effective binder content (%)
  – Laboratory tests related to HMA mix design
  – Extraction tests on field cores

• $k_1, k_2, k_3$ : regression coefficients obtained from laboratory testing of HMA mixes
$\beta_{f1}, \beta_{f2}, \beta_{f3}$: calibration parameters
PMS Data for Local Calibration

- Rut Depth
- Fatigue Cracking
- Thermal Cracking
- Ride Quality

Pavement Management Sections

- Traffic
- Materials
- Soils
National Field Calibration

Purpose of field calibration is to eliminate bias!
State/Local Calibration

Actual State Field Performance ($n_f$)

Calibrated National Predicted Performance ($N_f$)

$\beta_s$
MDOT’s Plan for Implementation
Mississippi Two – Phase Implementation Approach

• Phase I - SS No. 163 “Develop Mississippi DOT’s Plan to Implement the 2002 Design Guide”
• Applied Research Associates (ARA)
• Logical choice due to firms’ involvement with:
  – NCHRP 1-37a – Initial MEPDG development
  – NCHRP 1-40 – Continued evolution of MEPDG
• Dr. Athar Saeed – PI, Vicksburg, MS office
Phase I Continued

- Consultant introduced MDOT staff to the requirements of the MEPDG
- Consultant became familiar with scope of pavement types and rehabilitations in MS
- Consultant prepare detailed plan for implementation – Phase II
Identification of Typical Pavements Used in Mississippi

• Product of SS # 163 - development of Factorial Experiment Design for Calibration and Validation of Distress Prediction Models

• Table that captures various combinations of pavement structural sections and materials used in Mississippi; i.e. for a given pavement:

• Type pavement – HMA or Concrete?
Experiment Design Continued

- If HMA:
  - Conventional?
  - Semi Rigid?
  - Deep Strength?
  - AC Overlay?
    - JPC?
    - CRCP?
- Polymer modified or neat binder?
- Superpave or Marshal mix design?
- Thickness of HMA – Low, medium, high?
- Chemically Stabilized or non stabilized subgrade?
Experiment Design Continued

- 44 potential different combinations just for HMA
- Each one requires calibration/validation!
- Agreement on definitions
  - What is a semi rigid pavement?
  - What is a deep strength pavement?
- Definitions are not the same between MDOT PMS and MEPDG
- MDOT queried the PMS data base, provided ARA with information, ARA divided pavements based on MEPDG definitions
Implementation - Phase II

- SS No. 170 “Implement the 2002 Design Guide for MDOT (Phase II)
- 12 funded support studies
Research Tasks for SS No. 170

• Applied Research Associates (ARA)
• Dr. Athar Saeed– PI, Vicksburg, MS office
• Review inputs required by the MEPDG
• Complete design guide software sensitivity analysis
• Assemble data for calibration and validation of performance models
Research Tasks for SS No. 170
Continued

- Calibration and validation of national performance models for Mississippi conditions/pavements
- Facilitate establishment of materials libraries
- Develop training materials and conduct training for MDOT personnel
Research Tasks for SS No. 170
Continued

• Subcontractor - Burns, Cooley, Dennis, Inc. (BCD)
• Performing $M_t$ testing of typical MS subgrade soils
• Unbound aggregates
• Testing cementitious stabilized soils
  – Lime
  – LFA
  – Cement
• Test data included in materials library
12 Support Studies

- 2 in-house support studies
- 2 traffic
- 4 soils
- 2 HMA
- 2 Portland Cement Concrete
SS No. 171 “In-House Support to SS 170”

• Research Division engineer and technician salaries

• Huge amount of data to be provided by MDOT to ARA to support calibration/validation of models

• Need minimum 3 pavement analysis sections for each of the 44 potential combinations of pavement structure and material type

• 132 pavement analysis sections
SS # 171 Continued

• Each pavement analysis section includes at least 1-500 ft. sample – one per each mile of section length for collection of distress data

• One 500-ft sample selected from each analysis section for calibration/validation

• Selection criteria:
  – Located in tangent section
  – No intersections
  – No rail roads
  – No business sections

• Many sample sections do not fit the criteria
• For each selected 500-ft sample section:
  – Distress data from PMS
  – Materials data from Materials Division
  – Construction data from project diaries

• Visits to minimum 25% of selected 500-ft samples to confirm PMS data, coring, fwd testing, trench studies, and traffic control
SS No. 165 “Traffic Load Spectra Development for the 2002 AASHTO Design Guide”

• Dr. Shane Buchanan – Previously with MSU

• Original study objective was to perform a state-wide characterization of traffic

• MDOT generated monthly W cards only contained traffic data from the last 2-4 days of each month instead of the entire month
SS No. 165 Continued

- Raw binary code files still available to generate correct W card files, but traffic data would still be suspect because WIMs had not been calibrated on a regular basis
- Issue of WIM calibration also addressed
- Study limited to Mississippi LTPP traffic data
• 2 of several conclusions:
• Characterize each road in State by Truck Traffic Classification (TTC) not functional classification
• Current flexible pavement design traffic inputs to obtain SN:
  – AADT
  – % Trucks
  – ESALS for 10 or 20 year design period
  – Flexible factor
• MEPDG design method requires data files to supply all of the inputs
SS # 188 Development of Mississippi DOT’S Advanced Traffic Loading Analysis System (MS-ATLAS) to Support MEPDG Implementation
Traffic Data Software

- 3 potential sources of software:
- MS ATLAS – ARA
- WIM Net – Fugro Consultants LP
- Traf Load – Developed under NCHRP 1-39
SS No. 188 Continued

- Basis for selection of software
- ATLAS used by ARA to provide national calibration of MEPDG distress models
- MDOT Planning Division personnel understand the collection of traffic data, but not issues related to designing pavements using load spectra
- ARA understands both traffic and design
- MS-ATLAS would require the least amount of beta testing by the Department’s limited staff (both number and expertise)
Latest Issue With Traffic

• MDOT Planning Division is purchasing Transmetric R Traffic & WIM NET TR

• MDOT is first state to purchase

• Planning Division plan:
  – have raw traffic data processed, including QC/QA checks, by this new software
  – output of new software serve as input to MS-ATLAS

• Issue – MS-ATLAS programmed to accept raw traffic data, not output from new program
Materials Characterization

- Subgrade soils
- HMA
- Portland Cement Concrete
Methods to Evaluate Subgrade

- MEPDG requires resilient modulus, $M_r$, at optimum moisture content and maximum dry density
- Direct measurement – Level 1 input using laboratory test
- Estimate – level 2 input
  - Materials Library
  - Equations using soil index properties
  - In-situ testing
Laboratory Method

- Recommended by MEPDG
- Harmonized test procedure – Matt Witczak
- Considerations:
  - Time consuming
  - Expensive
  - Problems related to obtaining “representative” samples for testing
Materials Library

• BCD testing 30 typical Mississippi subgrade soils with Harmonized laboratory procedure

• Test sample preparation:
  – optimum moisture content
  – 95% Standard Proctor density

• Design $M_r$ selection based on subgrade AASHTO soil classification, Group Index and volume change
SS No. 172 “Resilient Modulus Prediction Employing Soil Index Properties”

- Dr. K.P. George – University of MS
- Looked at various equations to predict soil $M_r$ value from soil atterberg limits, gradation, moisture content, etc.
- Conclusion - LTPP equation yielded reasonable approximations
In-Situ

• Subgrade soil most variable component of pavement structure

• In-situ testing of subgrade may provide better estimate of subgrade $M_r$
  – Automated Dynamic Cone Penetrometer (ADCP)
  – Falling Weight Deflectometer (FWD)
    • Trailer Mounted typically used to test existing pavements
    • Portable FWD - PRIMA 100
SS No. 131 “Subgrade Characterization for Highway Pavement Design”

- ADCP correlated to $M_r$
  - TP-46 test protocol
  - Shelby tube samples
- Drs. K.P. George and Waheed Uddin – University of MS
- Positive:
  - Pick up any layering in top 3 ft. of subgrade
SS # 131 Continued

• Concerns:
  – Marginal correlation equation for fine grain soils
  – More work needed on coarse grain soil equation
    • Issue is trying to correlate results from a punching or shearing type test
  – Relatively time consuming
  – Manual DCP operation is labor intensive
  – MDOT has 1 ADCP and more would be needed
  – ADCP equipment is expensive
    • Estimated $25,000 per unit
    • Not including truck
SS No. 134 “In-House Support to SS No. 131”

- Research Division engineer and technician salaries
- 12 field test sections
- Obtain Shelby tube samples of soil for $M_r$ testing
SS No. 153 “Falling Weight Deflectometer for Estimating Subgrade Moduli”

- Dr. K.P. George – University of MS
- Top of untreated in-place subgrade tested with trailer mounted FWD
  - Correlated to laboratory determined $M_r$ (TP-46 protocol)
- Rapidly obtain numerous test results
- Good results
- Drawbacks – Need to correct field W% and density to lab opt. and density, 1 FWD
SS No. 179 “Portable FWD for In-Situ Subgrade Evaluation”

• Dr. K.P. George – University of MS
• Top of untreated in-place subgrade tested with PRIMA 100
  – Correlated to laboratory determined $M_r$ (harmonized procedure)
• Rapidly obtain numerous test results
• Each of the 6 MDOT Districts could have one for total price much less than one FWD
• Need to correct field W% and density to lab opt. and density
SS No. 166 “Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA) Characterization for the 2002 AASHTO Design Guide”

- MSU study
  - Initiated by Dr. Shane Buchanan
  - Continued by Dr. Tom White
- MSU purchasing new test equipment
- Dynamic modulus, indirect tension
- Test results included in Materials Library and used for:
  - Calibration/validation of performance models
  - Subsequent flexible pavement designs
24 typical MDOT HMA mixes tested for dynamic modulus. Selection for testing:

- 3 different nominal maximum aggregate sizes 9.5mm, 12.5mm, 19.0mm
- 2 different types of aggregate
  - Gravel
  - Gravel/limestone blend
- 3 PG grades of binder
  - PG 67-22 (No polymer modifier)
  - PG 76-22, PG 82-22 (Polymer modifier)
- 3 levels for $N_{\text{design}}$ 50, 65, 85 based on traffic
SS # 181 Structural Characterization of Asphalt Drainage Course Layers

• Drainage layer study
  – MDOT includes a 4” drainage layer in new 4-lane facilities
  – #57 crushed limestone, sandstone, or granite
  – 2.5 % PG67-22

• Purpose of study:
  – Evaluate design modulus and Poisson’s Ratio for new MEPDG
SS # 181 Continued

• Determine required test method
  – Mr?
  – Some shear strength test and then limit developed stresses in layer?

• Develop appropriate transfer function
  – Needed for MEPDG
  – Needed for overlay design using ELMOD 5

• Current MDOT pavement design policy does not include any structural benefit of drainage layer. Perhaps replace cementitious stabilized soil base course
SS No. 177 “Inputs of Portland Cement Concrete Parameters Needed for the Design of New and Rehabilitated Pavements in Mississippi”

- Dr. Ahmed Al-Ostaz – University of MS
- Laboratory testing 20 PCC mixes for potential rigid pavement construction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Specimen size</th>
<th>Testing Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modulus of Rupture</td>
<td>ASTM C78</td>
<td>6” x 6” x 24” beams</td>
<td>7,14,28,90 days, 2 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressive Strength</td>
<td>ASTM C39</td>
<td>6” x 12” cylinders</td>
<td>7,14,28,90 days, 2 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulus of Elasticity</td>
<td>ASTM C469</td>
<td>6” x 12” cylinders</td>
<td>7,14,28,90 days, 2 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensile Strength</td>
<td>ASTM C496</td>
<td>6” x 12” cylinders</td>
<td>7,14,28,90 days, 2 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient of Thermal</td>
<td>AASHTO TP60</td>
<td>4” x 8” cylinders</td>
<td>28 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Shrinkage</td>
<td>ASTM C157</td>
<td>1” x 1” x 11.24” bars</td>
<td>28 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Weight</td>
<td>ASTM C138</td>
<td>6” x 12” cylinders</td>
<td>7,14,28,90 days, 2 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson’s ratio</td>
<td>ASTM C469</td>
<td>6” x 12” cylinders</td>
<td>7,14,28,90 days, 2 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Cement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Weight Chert</td>
<td>Northern part of Mississippi (B&amp;B Concrete, Oxford-MS)</td>
<td>Cement Type I, Cement Type I+ FA Class F, Cement Type I+ FA Class C, Cement Type I+ Slag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dense Chert</td>
<td>Central part of Mississippi</td>
<td>Cement Type I, Cement Type I+ FA Class F, Cement Type I+ FA Class C, Cement Type I+ Slag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Maximum Size Chert</td>
<td>Southern part of Mississippi (Gulf Concrete, LLC)</td>
<td>Cement Type I, Cement Type I+ FA Class F, Cement Type I+ FA Class C, Cement Type I+ Slag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama Lime Stone</td>
<td>B&amp;B Concrete, Oxford-MS</td>
<td>Cement Type I, Cement Type I+ FA Class F, Cement Type I+ FA Class C, Cement Type I+ Slag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Lime Stone</td>
<td>Kentucky (MMC)</td>
<td>Cement Type I, Cement Type I+ FA Class F, Cement Type I+ FA Class C, Cement Type I+ Slag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use of PCC Lab Results

- Calibration/Validation of MEPDG concrete performance models
- Included in materials library being developed in conjunction with SS # 170
FHWA Mobile Concrete Laboratory

- Workshop on Implementation of Rigid Pavement portion of MEPDG
  - University of Mississippi
  - August 2, 2005
- Utilized for interlaboratory comparison testing between the MCL and UM
  - AASHTO TP 60 Standard Test Method for the Coefficient of Thermal Expansion of Hydraulic Cement Concrete
SS No. 187 “Effect of Moisture Content on Thermal Coefficient of Expansion of Concrete”

- AASHTO TP 60 utilizes saturated samples
- In-service rigid pavements are not usually saturated
- SS NO. 187 evaluates:
  - CTE at varying levels of concrete moisture content for a given aggregate
  - Looks at this effect for different aggregates
  - Same mix designs used as for SS No. 177
Research Approach

• Perform CTE testing of specimens:
  – fully saturated
  – no moisture

• Perform sensitivity analyses with MEPDG software (ARA)

• If sensitivity is significant then test for CTE at intermediate levels of moisture content

• 3 different methods used to evaluate CTE:
  – AASHTO TP 60
  – Strain Gauging Technique
  – Danish Standard T1-B
PMS Data Considerations
Network vs. Project Level Data

- PMS reports average values of distress and IRI over entire analysis section
- MEPDG calibration/validation requires data extracted for a 500-ft sample section within a given analysis section
- Disconnect with referencing points on ground
  - Construction plans and material data referenced to stations
  - PMS data referenced via County/route/log mile
- Distress rater subjectivity for different survey years - block vs. alligator, level of severity, pavement condition improves?
2-Stage Implementation Strategy

• Via SS # 170 complete initial calibration/validation of MEPDG models using construction, materials and PMS data on existing pavements

• For new construction begin building data base of requisite information for a recalibration in possibly 10 years
2-Stage Strategy Continued

- Collect project-level distress data on 500-ft sample sections of new projects
- Use following criteria for data collection:
  - Collect data on a sunny clear day to obtain clear picture for distress analysis.
  - Collect data 1 hour after sunrise or no later than 1 hour before sunset.
  - Collect data every year at approximately the same time and/or temperature
  - Collect at speeds over 40 mph for IRI
  - Keep lenses clean
2-Stage Strategy Continued

• Data collection criteria continued:
  – Train raters well and use same raters every year for distress analysis (Thanks Cindy)
  – Use good quality control plan for data collection
  – Have good definition of distress types and severity levels
Support from within MDOT for adoption of the new guide

- Management
- Financial
9 Member Technical Advisory Committee

• Upper Management:
  – Richard Sheffield, P.E. – Assistant Chief Engineer Operations
  – David Foster, P.E. – Assistant Chief Engineer Preconstruction
  – Melinda McGrath, P.E. – Assistant Chief Engineer Operational Maintenance
9 Member Committee Continued

• Randy Battey, P.E. – State Research Engineer
• Keith Purvis, P.E. – Assistant Roadway Design Engineer
• Barry Boyd, P.E. – District One Materials Engineer
• Alan Cross, P.E. – District Five Materials Engineer
• Jeff Altman, P.E. – Traffic Analysis Manager, Planning Division
• William Barstis, P.E. – Pavement Research Engineer, Research Division
Summary of Budget Study Costs

- SS 163 Phase I: $14,715
- SS 170 Phase II: $807,163
- SS 171 Support: $200,000
- SS 165 Traffic: $40,000
- SS 188 MS-ATLAS: $174,997
- SS 172 M_r - Equations: $19,098
- SS 131 ADCP: $244,340
- SS 134 Support to 131: $75,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS 153 M₉ - FWD</td>
<td>$122,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 179 M₉ - PFWD</td>
<td>$157,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 166 HMA</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 181 Drainage Layer</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 177 PCC</td>
<td>$ 89,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 187 Concrete CTE</td>
<td>$ 53,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,208,796</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Support

- Financial support from three MDOT Central Office Divisions to fund SS No 170
  - Roadway Design Division
  - Materials Division
  - Research Division
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Today @ MDOT... Friday, August 19, 2005

Recent Press Releases
- MDOT Launches Study for Relocation of Rail Lines in Tupelo
- Repair Work Begins on I-20 Bridge Over State Street
- Traffic Change to Occur on Highway 84 in Lawrence County

Recent Additions to goMDOT.com
- Construction Bid Awards for July 26, 2005 Letting
- Construction Bid Tabulations for July 26, 2005 Letting
- MDOT ADA Compliance
- Construction Bid Advertisement for June 28, 2005 Letting
- Natchez Trace Parkway Completion Ceremony
- Roundabout at Old Agency Road and Highland Colony Parkway
- RIDES - Roadways Into the Development of Elementary Students
- DOT LAW TALK Email List Service

MDOT offers streaming video and traffic images statewide for you to monitor traffic conditions.
Legal Advertisements
Contains current legal advertisements for Procurement and Consultant Services.

Product Evaluation Form
Download the MDOT Information for Product Evaluation form used by product manufacturers seeking approval for new products.

Construction Division
- 2004 Standard Specifications Online
- Purchase Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction
  Includes contact information for purchasing MDOT Standard Specifications.

Roadway Design Standard Drawings and Design Manual
- Roadway Design Standard Drawings - View or download Standard Drawings (Microstation DGN and TIF format).
- Roadway Design Manual - View or download manual (PDF Format).
  - 2001 Version
  - 1998 Version
  - 1976 Version
- Purchase Drawings and Manual - Includes contact information for purchasing MDOT Standard Drawings and Design Manual.

Permits
- EXPRESSPASS - Buy permits online!
- Harvest Permits - Read the regulations regarding this permit and download a Harvest Permit Application form.
- Commercial Vehicle Permits - See the types of permits and regulations governing commercial vehicle travel on Mississippi roads.

Research Reports
The research findings are published in reports. All publications are available for download in the PDF format, which is viewable using Adobe Acrobat Reader.
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