TECHNICAL REPORT STANDARD PAGE

1. Report No.	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.
FHWA/LA-86/188		
4. Title and Subtitle		5. Report Date
	mental Project Construction	July 1986
and First Year Evaluation Demonstration Project No.		6. Performing Organization Code
	30	
7. Author(s)		8. Performing Organization Report No.
Harold R. Paul and Sarah I	. Kemp	188
9. Performing Organization Name and Address		10. Work Unit No.
	cansportation and Development	
Louisiana Transportation (11. Contract or Grant No.
P. O. Box 94245 Capitol St		DTFH-71-84-50-LA-03
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 7	70804-9245	13. Type of Report and Period Covered
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address		
	ransportation and Development	Interim Report
Louisiana Transportation F		September 1984 - July 1986
P. O. Box 94245 Capitol St		14. Sponsoring Agency Code
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 7	70804-9245	
15 Supplementary Notes		

Conducted in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Demonstration Project No. 50.

16. Abstract

This report documents the construction of a Sprinkle Treatment field trial and presents the first year performance evaluation data. Normal plant and roadway production rates were maintained during the construction of the 3.1 mile Sprinkle Treatment section. Sprinkle chip spreading was accomplished with a Bristowes Mk V Chip Spreader which remained immediately behind the paver throughout laydown operations. The precoated chips were uniformly placed at rates of 7 lbs/yd² and 10 1bs/yd2. The only problem occuring during construction was related to the densification of the wearing course mix. Less than the 95% specification requirement was achieved. Whether the reduced densities were due to compactive effort or due to the rough surface texture imparted from the sprinkle aggregate could not be determined.

Performance evaluations will be conducted on an annual basis and will include Pavement Condition Ratings, structual evaluation, skid resistance, critical hydroplaning speeds, and aggregate retention. The first year evaluation demonstrated that both Sprinkle Treatment sections were performing as well as an asphaltic concrete friction course utilized as a control section.

Sprinkle Treatment; Skid Resistant Friction Course	Unrestricted. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161
• 11	ified 21. No. of Pages 22. Price

SPRINKLE TREATMENT EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT

CONSTRUCTION AND FIRST-YEAR EVALUATION

By

HAROLD R. PAUL MATERIALS RESEARCH ENGINEER

And

SARAH F. KEMP RESEARCH ENGINEER-IN-TRAINING

DEMONSTRATION PROJECT NO. 50

Conducted by
LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
AND DEVELOPMENT
Louisiana Transportation Research Center
In Cooperation With
U. S. Department of Transportation
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

"The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the State or the Federal Highway Administration. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation."

JULY 1986

METRIC CONVERSION FACTORS*

To Convert from	To	Multiply by		
	Length			
foot inch yard mile (statute)	<pre>meter (m) millimeter (mm) meter (m) kilometer (km)</pre>	0.3048 25.4 0.9144 1.609		
	- Area			
square foot square inch square yard	square meter (m ²) square centimeter (cm ²) square meter (m ²)	0.0929 6.451 0.8361		
	Volume (Capacity)			
<pre>cubic foot gallon (U.S. liquid)** gallon (Can. liquid)** ounce (U.S. liquid)</pre>	cubic meter (m³) cubic meter (m³) cubic meter (m³) cubic centimeter (cm³)	0.02832 0.003785 0.004546 29.57		
	Mass			
ounce-mass (avdp) pound-mass (avdp) ton (metric) ton (short, 2000 lbs)	gram (g) kilogram (kg) kilogram (kg) kilogram (kg)	28.35 0.4536 1000 907.2		
	Mass per Volume			
<pre>pound-mass/cubic foot pound-mass/cubic yard pound-mass/gallon (U.S.)** pound-mass/gallon (Can.)**</pre>	kilogram/cubic meter (kg/m³) kilogram/cubic meter (kg/m³) kilogram/cubic meter (kg/m³) kilogram/cubic meter (kg/m³)	16.02 0.5933 119.8 9 9.78		
<u>Temperature</u>				
<pre>deg Celsius (C) deg Fahrenheit (F) deg Fahrenheit (F)</pre>	kelvin (K) kelvin (K) deg Celsius (C)	t _k =(t _c +273.15) t _k =(t _F +459.67)/1.8 t _c =(t _F -32)/1.8		

^{*}The reference source for information on SI units and more exact conversion factors is "Metric Practice Guide" ASTM E 380.

^{**}One U.S. gallon equals 0.8327 Canadian gallon.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

METRIC CONVERSION FACTORS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
GIST OF FIGURES	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
Eackground	1
Location and Section Design	2
Traffic and Accident Data	5
EXPERIMENTAL FIELD PROJECT	6
Materials and Mix Design	6
Plant Production	7
Construction	10
Quality Control	14
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION	21
Serviceability	22
Structural Evaluation	23
Field Samples	25
Skid Resistance and Critical Hydroplaning Speed	25
Aggregate Retention	28
ECONOMIC ANALYSIS AND MATERIALS CONSERVATION	31
CONCLUSIONS	33
APPENDIX A	35
ADDENDIA B	41

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.		Page No
1	Preconstruction Traffic And Accidenta Data	5
2	Sprinkle Aggregate Properties	6
3	Project Job Mix Formulae	8
4	Plant Production	9
5	Sprinkle Aggregate Extracted Properties	15
3	Marshall Test Data For Plant Specimens	16
7	Extracted Gradation and Asphalt Cement	
	Content	18
3	Roadway Densities and Percent of Plant	
	Densities	20
9	Pavement Condition Rating	23
10	Structural Analysis	24
11	Roadway Core Analysis	26
12	Skid Resistance Data	27
13	Critical Hydroplaning Speeds	28
1-4	Aggregate Retention	29

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.		Page No.
1	Project Location	3
2	Design Typical Section	4
3	Bristowes Mark V Chip Spreader	10
4	Haul Truck and Front End Loader	12
5	Fully Charged Hopper	12
6	Chip Spreading Operation	13
7	Initial Compaction and Embedment	13
8	Evaluation Sites	22
9	Aggregate Photo Log	30

INTRODUCTION

Background

Louisiana developed an open-graded friction course in the late 1960s and early 1970s in order to provide a skid resistant surfacing. Also, due to the open texture of this material water spray was reduced and critical hydroplaning speeds were increased. While the State's native chert gravel could produce acceptable skid resistance initially in dense-graded wearing courses, it was found that skid numbers declined rapidly. Thus, the development of open-graded friction course utilizing a locally produced expanded clay aggregate or other imported non-polishing aggregates such as stone and slag, filled a void just prior to the initiation of the Federal Highway Safety Program Management Guide, Highway Safety Program 12, and Instructional Memorandum 21-3-73 of 1973 dealing with the establishment of a Skid Accident Reduction Program.


Many miles of friction course were placed, and by the late 1970s it had become the standard for high speed, high volume roadways. By 1980, however, some of these surfacings reached end of life, which was manifested by severe ravelling and an ensuing decrease in serviceability. This, in conjunction with a number of friction course failures either in the construction stage or shortly thereafter led to a moratorium on its use, in 1980. Use was continued after revisions were made to specifications. Severe winter weather conditions in 1982 and 1983 led to an inordinate amount of ravelling of friction courses regardless of age. The decrease in serviceability of these roadways was vocalized by the driving public, and the construction of open-graded friction course was suspended in 1984.

The Department's Research Section recognized the need for alternatives to the friction course materials. One such alternative which appeared promising was Sprinkle Treatment. Sprinkle Treatment, initiated in 1977 by the Federal Highway Administration under the auspices of Demonstration Project No. 50, was developed in England where it has been widely utilized to provide skid resistant wearing surfaces. Sprinkle Treatment is the application of a properly graded, pre-coated, non-polishing aggregate to a hot asphaltic concrete wearing course immediately behind the paving machine. The "sprinkled" chips are embedded into the mat with the initial rolling operation. By embedding costly imported non-polishing aggregates only in the wearing course surface, rather than using it in the entire mix, a substantial conservation of materials and cost could be realized.

The success of Demonstration Project No. 50 and the Department's problems with open-graded friction course led to the approval of an experimental project to examine Sprinkle Treatment. In May 1984 a plan change was issued to an ongoing contract to include the use of the Sprinkle Treatment process for approximately 3.0 miles on La. 20 from Chacahoula to Schriever. An agreement with the Demonstration Projects Division of FHWA provided for the use of a Bristowes Mk V chip spreader. This report documents the construction and presents the first-year performance data of the Sprinkle Treatment field trial.


Location and Section Design

An agreement was made whereby the construction of the trial section was made part of an ongoing contract with Louisiana Paving Co., Inc., Kenner, Louisiana. This 6.1-mile project on La. 20 in Terrebonne Parish extended from Chacahoula to Schriever, as shown in Figure 1. This roadway was scheduled for cold planing (2-inch average), 3-1/2-inch overlay and the application of a 5/8-inch asphaltic concrete friction course (ACFC). The plan change



Project Location
FIGURE 1

substituted Sprinkle Treatment for approximately one-half of the scheduled friction course. The existing roadway was composed of portland cement concrete which had been overlaid twice with asphaltic concrete, adding approximately 6 inches to the cross section. Figure 2 presents the design typical section.



- A 5/8" Asphaltic Concrete Friction Course
- B 1-1/2" Type 3 Wearing Course
- C 2" Type 3 Binder Course
- Existing Asphaltic Concrete to be Cold Planed (2" Avg)
- E Existing Asphaltic Concrete Overlay
- 2 2" Asphaltic Concrete Shoulder Mix
- G 6" Cement Stabilized Base Course
- H Existing P.C.C. Pavement

Design Typical Section

FIGURE 2

Traffic and Accident Data

In 1984 the average daily traffic (ADT) was 8520, with 18 percent truck traffic. Accident data was obtained for the period 1980 through 1984 with a summary of accidents by type as classified by property damage only, injury excluding fatalities, and fatalities. This information is presented in Table 1 along with the total number of injuries or fatalities. Wet weather accidents have also been extracted and are indicated in parentheses.

TABLE 1

PRECONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC AND ACCIDENT DATA

Year ADT	Total Accidents	Property Damage Only	Injury	Fatality	Number of Injuries	Number of Fatalities
1980 7538	67 (12)*	25 (6)	40 (5)	2 (1)	75 (10)	2 (1)
1981 7116	53 (7)	34 (5)	18 (2)	1(0)	28 (3)	1(0)
1982 7572	64 (13)	41 (13)	22 (0)	1 (0)	44 (0)	1 (0)
1983 6284	50 (7)	35 (6)	15 (1)	0(0)	24 (1)	0(0)
1984 8520	64 (8)	40 (6)	22 (2)	2 (0)	54 (4)	2 (0)

^{*}All data in parentheses refer to wet weather accidents.

EXPERIMENTAL FIELD PROJECT

Materials and Mix Design

The Special Provisions for this plan change, found in Appendix A, required that the sprinkle aggregate be either slag or stone graded such that most of the material passed the 1/2-inch screen and was retained on the No. 4 screen. The aggregate chosen for use was a slag from Godwin, Tennessee, supplied by Southern Stone. According to the specification, this material was required to possess a polish value greater than 35. Test results on material sampled from the stockpile representing 300 tons of aggregate are presented in Table 2 along with the gradation requirements. It was noted that the stockpiled material was slightly outside specification requirements.

TABLE 2

SPRINKLE AGGREGATE PROPERTIES

Gradation U.S. Sieve Size	Specification (% Passing)	Stockpile (% Passing)
1/2 inch	100	99
3/8 inch	20 - 55	42
No. 4	0 - 5	8
No. 200	0 - 1.5	O
Polish Value	35 min.	38
Specific Gravity		2.51

The Type 3 (high stability) wearing course used on the conventional section design was modified to create room in the mix matrix for the sprinkle aggregate so that a satisfactory level of embedment could be attained. A necessary criterion for proper embedment established through other Demonstration Project No. 50 field trials was the requirement that a minimum of 50 percent of the total aggregate should pass the No. 10 screen. The job mix formulae (JMF) submitted and approved for this project are provided in Table 3.

Three Rivers Rock Co. of Smithland, Kentucky, was the source of the limestone coarse aggregate and screenings for the modified wearing course. Normally this material source is prohibited from use in wearing surfaces where the average daily traffic per lane exceeds 1000 vehicles because of its low polish value. The sources of coarse and fine sands were Pearl River Sand and Gravel and Weber Pit, respectively. Sunshine Oil Co. supplied the AC-30 asphalt cement that was utilized to both pre-coat the slag sprinkle aggregate and in the asphaltic concrete. Southern Stone also supplied the slag aggregate used in the ACFC.

Plant Production

Louisiana Paving Co. utilized its 5-ton screenless batch plant located at Bayou Blue in Houma, Louisiana, for mix production on this job. The plant was located approximately 17 miles from the project site. There were no modifications required to normal plant operations for the production of either the pre-coated aggregate or modified Type 3 mix.

In March of 1984, Type 3 binder course material was placed on the planed surface an average of 2 inches thick. The material was placed in six lots, numbers 21 through 26, between the 16th and the 30th of March. There were 8697 tons of binder course produced. The contractor ceased work on this project at that point.

TABLE 3
PROJECT JOB MIX FORMULAE

Sequence No.	49	87	03	01
Mix Use	Type 3	Type 3	Type 3	
Recommended Formula Percent Passing	Binder	Wearing	Mod Wearing	ACFC
U.S. Sieve Size				
l inch	100	100	100	
3/4 inch	91	99	100	
1/2 inch	7 6	85	91	100
3/8 inch		_	-	95
No. 4	50	57	70	43
No. 10	41	44	54	14
No. 40	27	27	30	
No. 80	13	14	15	
No. 200	8	8	9	3
% AC	4.5	4.2	5.1	6.5
Mix Temp.	315	300	300	
Marshall Properties	(75 blow o	design)		
Specific Gravity	2.40	2.43	2.38	
Theoretical Gravity	2.50	2.52	2.48	
% Theoretical	96.0	96.4	96.0	
% Voids	4.0	3.6	4.0	
% V.F.A.	72.4	73.3	75.0	
Marshall Stability	2130	2280	1820	
Flow	9	9	10	

In September, work on the roadway was resumed. The Type 3 wearing course for the control section (JMF No. 87) was placed in three lots, Nos. 55 through 57, between the 10th and the 13th of the month (4137 tons). The asphaltic concrete friction course (JMF No. 01) was placed over the control section from the 24th to the 26th. Two lots (Nos. 62 and 63) were produced, totaling 1202 tons.

All of the sprinkle aggregate was pre-coated at the plant approximately two weeks prior to production of the modified wearing course. This material was stockpiled according to the special provisions at the contractor's yard.

The modified Type 3 wearing course for the sprinkle treatment section (JMF No. 03) was produced from the 27th to 29th, in lots 64 through 66. There were 3321 total tons placed on the roadway. Table 4 presents the production data for the project.


TABLE 4
PLANT PRODUCTION

Lot No.	Date	Mix Type	Tonnage	Temp.
21	3/16	Binder	1481	314
22	3/19	Binder	1486	313
23	3/22	Binder	1385	307
24	3/23	Binder	1511	301
25	3/28	Binder	1519	317
26	3/30	Binder	1315	299
55	9/10	Wearing	1312	307
56	9/11	Wearing	1406	306
57	9/13	Wearing	1419	317
62	9/24	ACFC	661	249
63	9/25	ACFC	541	252
64	9/27	Mod. Wearing	1515	3 13
65	9/28	Mod. Wearing	1522	319
66	9/29	Mod. Wearing	284	312

Construction

Perhaps one of the most critical aspects to a successful treatment is the uniform dispersion of the sprinkle aggregate in a timely manner so that the breakdown roller can embed the chips while the mat is still hot. It is thus important that the chip spreader be able to keep a fully charged hopper holding a sufficient quantity of material in order to keep up with the paving machine. As part of the special provisions the FHWA would provide a Bristowes Mk V chip spreader which reportedly could fulfill these requirements.

The Bristowes Mk V chip spreader is the culmination of fifteen years of chip spreader development. This self-propelled, variable speed spreader completely spans the newly paved mat (Figure 3) and can spread the chips along the full 12-foot




Bristowes Mk V Chip Spreader
FIGURE 3

width. As indicated in the figure there are two separate hoppers. The charging hopper is a powered self-trimming traversing hopper which operates on command. The spreading hopper lays the chips behind the spreader such that the aggregate's speed of fall is commensurate with the forward speed of the spreader thus reducing the tendancy of the chips to roll on the mat. Distribution rate is set by gates.


In addition to the chip spreader and operator, two trucks holding the pre-coated aggregate, a front-end loader and three operators were used on this project. Figures 4 and 5 depict the process of loading the aggregate into the chip spreader. Note that extension plates were welded onto the charging hopper to accommodate the size of the loader bucket.

Figures 6 and 7 portray the paving train in operation. The modified Type 3 wearing course was placed through a standard paving machine. It is observed that the Bristowes chip spreader maintained a position immediately behind the paver. This was the case throughout production. The uniform distribution of the sprinkle aggregate should also be noted. This uniform placement occurred during the entire course of construction. An occasional exception happened when the paving train would stop due to lack of haul trucks. However, with a slight overlap the operator could correct the uniformity. Generally, the breakdown roller followed immediately behind the spreader, as shown, thereby compacting the mix at the same temperature as in a conventional operation.


Two separate experimental sections were attempted during the field trial with the rate of application of the sprinkle aggregate providing the distinction. For approximately 1.2 miles a chip spread rate of 7 pounds per square yard was applied. This rate was recommended by personnel of the FHWA as an optimum rate in order to provide good skid resistance and



Haul Truck and Front End Loader
FIGURE 4




Fully Charged Hopper
FIGURE 5



Chip Spreading Operation

FIGURE 6



Initial Compaction and Embedment
FIGURE 7

reduce the amount of aggregate loss. The second section attempted utilized a spread rate of 10 pounds per square yard. It was reasoned that if this rate could be embedded, the surface macrotexture would behave similar to an open-graded friction course such that the critical hydroplanning speed could be increased.

Application rates for the sprinkle aggregate were checked by district laboratory personnel using a portable scale and a one square yard cloth. The cloth was placed on the freshly laid hot mix prior to spreading the chips. After the chips were placed, the cloth was gathered and the aggregate was emptied into a tared can. Several locations were checked both longitudinally and transversely. Gate settings were established at the beginning of each test section. The actual application rates for the 7 pound per square yard section ranged between 6.5 and 8.5 while the 10 pound per square yard section was found to range from 7.5 to 11. Despite this overlap in measured application rates there was a visual difference in the spread rates.

Quality Control

Several samples of the pre-coated slag aggregate were taken from the roadway to the research laboratory for gradation and asphalt content analysis. As is observed in Table 5, the aggregate did not meet the proposed specification and the asphalt content was higher than the 1.0 to 1.5 percent required. There were however no problems associated with these discrepancies at the roadway.

Marshall stability (75 blow design) was used for acceptance testing and other Marshall properties were used for mix control. Table 6 presents all Marshall data for this project. Table 7 contains the gradations and asphalt cement content from extracted loose mix samples. With the exception of two

TABLE 5
SPRINKLE AGGREGATE EXTRACTED PROPERTIES

Sample No.	1	2	3
US. Sieve Size (% Passing)	~		
1/2 inch	98	99	99
3/8 inch	40	37	38
No. 4	12	10	11
No. 8	3	3	3
% Asphalt Cement	2.2	2.2	2.1

TABLE 6

MARSHALL TEST DATA FOR PLANT SPECIMENS

Lot	Specimen	Stability (Lbs)	Flow	Specific	VFA	Voids
No.	Number		(0.01 In)	Gravity	(%)	(%)
		TYPE 3	BINDER COURS	3E		
21	1	2099	13	2.40	72	4.0
	2	2025	13	2.40	72	4.0
	3	2281	14	2.40	72	4.0
	4	2140	12	2.40	72	4.0
22	1	2198	9	2.40	72	4.0
	2	2257	9	2.40	72	4.0
	3	2343	8	2.40	72	4.0
	4	2168	9	2.40	72	4.0
23	1	2227	9	2.40	72	4.0
	2	2374	10	2.40	72	4.0
	3	2183	9	2.39	70	4.4
	4	2198	9	2.40	72	4.0
24	1	2140	9	2.39	70	4.4
	2	2124	9	2.40	72	4.0
	3	2388	10	2.40	72	4.0
	4	2083	10	2.40	72	4.0
25	1	2169	9	2.40	72	4.0
	2	2163	10	2.40	72	4.0
	3	2661	8	2.41	74	3.6
	4	2054	9	2.40	72	4.0
26	1	2225	9	2.40	72	4.0
	2	2169	9	2.40	72	4.0
	3	1955	8	2.39	70	4.4
	4	2113	9	2.40	72	4.0

TABLE 6 (CONTINUED)

MARSHALL TEST DATA FOR PLANT SPECIMENS

Lot	Specimen	Stability (Lbs)	Flow	Specific	VFA	Voids
No.	Number		(0.01 In)	Gravity	(%)	(%)
		TYPE 3	WEARING COUR	SE		
55	1	2100	8	2.42	71	4.0
	2	2135	10	2.44	76	3.2
	3	2096	10	2.42	71	4.0
	4	2192	9	2.42	71	4.0
56	1	1758	8	2.44	76	3.2
	2	1898	9	2.43	73	3.6
	3	1782	8	2.42	71	4.0
	4	1733	10	2.42	71	4.0
57	1	1901	7	2.45	78	2.8
	2	1930	8	2.42	71	4.0
	3	2079	9	2.44	76	3.2
	4	2029	9	2.43	73	3.6
		MODIFIED TY	PE 3 WEARING	COURSE		
64	1 2 3 4	1831 1742 2032 1837	8 10 8 10	2.41 2.41 2.39 2.39	81 77 77	2.8 2.8 3.6 3.6
65	1	1877	9	2.40	79	3.2
	2	1782	9	2.38	77	3.6
	3	1732	8	2.39	77	3.6
	4	1756	8	2.40	79	3.2
66	1	1831	10	2.40	79	3.2

TABLE 7

EXTRACTED GRADATION AND ASPHALT CEMENT CONTENT

llix Type		Ту	pe 3 Bino	der Cou	rse	
Lot No.	21	22	23	24	25	26
Date Laid	3/14	3/16	3/19	3/22	3/23	3/28
Gradation % Passing						
l inch 3/4 inch 1/2 inch No. 4 No. 10 No. 40 No. 80 No. 200	100 90 74 50 42 27 13 8	100 94 80 52 42 26 12	100 94 74 49 40 26 13 6	100 96 80 53 43 28 14	100 94 78 52 42 28 15	100 94 80 53 44 28 12 8
% Asphalt	5.1	5.1	4.8	3.1	4.8	4.8
Mix Type Lot No. Date Laid	<u>Type 3</u> 55 9/10	3 Wearing 56 9/11	57 9/13	Mod. 64 9/27	Wearing 65 9/28	Course 66 9/28
Gradation % Passing						
l inch 3/4 inch 1/2 inch No. 4 No. 10 No. 40 No. 80 No. 200	100 100 92 59 45 28 12	100 100 88 56 44 28 12 8	100 100 86 56 42 25 12 8	100 100 94 70 54 30 14 8	100 100 94 72 56 30 12 8	100 100 94 73 56 30 12 7
% Asphalt	4.4	4.4	4.6	5.2	5.3	5.7

briquettes in lot 64 which exceeded VFA and air void control criteria, all mix properties concurred with specifications. The low asphalt content on the lot 24 binder course was not found in a verification sample which indicated a 4.6 percent asphalt content.

The normal density requirement of 95 percent of design compaction was waived for this project as there was concern that the coarse surface texture imparted by the partially embedded sprinkle aggregate could mask the true compactive effort. 8 provides the specific gravities and percent compaction for each of the roadway samples. As the contractor was achieving good although inconsistent compaction on his conventional binder and wearing courses, no changes were made to his rolling pattern. The first day's production of the sprinkle treatment seemed to demonstrate that the modified Type 3 mix could also be readily compacted and that the surface texture did not interfere in the density determination. By the time the second day's production was sampled and tested, the short third day's production had already been laid and as can be seen did meet the normal densification requirement. For insurance, though, a short section of the modified mix was placed during the first day of laydown without the sprinkle aggregate. It was believed that this section would demonstrate the ability to compact the modified mix. Unfortunately, two specimens indicated 95.4 and 93.3 percent compaction leaving in doubt whether the low densities were due to the sprinkle aggregate or the contractor's inability to compact the modified mix.

TABLE 8

ROADWAY DENSITIES AND PERCENT OF PLANT DENSITIES

Mix Type		Ту	pe 3 Bin	der Cou	rse	
Lot No.	21	22	23	24	25	26
Date Laid	3/14	3/16	3/19	3/22	3/23	3/28
Specific Gravity	2.28 2.29 2.30 2.29 2.35	2.39 2.28 2.36 2.32 2.30	2.36 2.31 2.32 2.30 2.32	2.31 2.31 2.35 2.28 2.30	2.34 2.34 2.36 2.35 2.37	2.30 2.33 2.25 2.31 2.34
Mean	2.30	2.33	2.32	2.31	2.35	2.31
% of Plant	95.9	97.1	96.8	96.3	98.0	96.3
Mix Type	Type 3	Wearing	Course	Mod.	Wearing	Course
Lot No.	55	56	57	64	65	66
Date Laid	9/10	9/11	9/13	9/27	9/28	9/28
Specific Gravity	2.31 2.32 2.31	2.39 2.37 2.38	2.31 2.34 2.32	2.34 2.32 2.32	2.27 2.21 2.27	2.24 2.28 2.26
	2.33 2.28	2.31 2.39	2.31 2.35	2.35 2.31	2.25 2.29	2.25 2.30
Mean	2.33	2.31	2.31	2.35	2.25	2.25

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

The sprinkle treatment and conventional asphaltic concrete sections were examined to evaluate performance characteristics from both a structural and serviceability aspect. Serviceability was monitored with a pavement condition rating (PCR) which incorporates Mays Ridemeter measurements for smoothness and different types of pavement distress such as bleeding, block, transverse and longitudinal cracking, corrugations, patching, rutting and ravelling. Each distress type is evaluated and assigned weighted deduct points based on severity and intensity of the distress. The total of deduct points forms a pavement distress rating (PDR) by subtracting from 100 percent, weighting and then combining with a weighted Mays reading in PSI in the following manner to provide the pavement condition rating.

PCR = [(100 - Deduct Total Points)/4] + (Mays PSI) x 5


(A perfect pavement score would be 50)

The Dynamic Deflection Determination System (Dynaflect) was used to evaluate the relative strengths of both the modified and conventional pavements. Roadway cores were examined for further densification due to traffic and the quality of the asphalt cement.

The skid resistance of both experimental sections and the open-graded friction course were examined. Also, critical hydroplaning speeds were determined from texture depths obtained by sand patch testing. Finally, aggregate retention was monitored at selected locations on the project.

Figure 8 defines the experimental sections and identifies each evaluation site by log mile from the Chacahoula end of the project. There were nine sites chosen, each encompassing

approximately 200 feet, with 3 sites in each of the experimental sections and 3 sites in the conventional section.



Evaluation Sites
FIGURE 8

An initial evaluation was conducted in November 1984 shortly after construction. The one year evaluation took place in November 1985.

Serviceability

The Pavement Condition Rating forms are provided in Appendix B and are summarized in Table 9. Mays Ride Meter and rutting measurements which are included in the PCR have also been included. The slight reduction in Mays Ride Meter and PCR can probably be attributed to longitudinal and transverse reflection as indicated in the distress rating form.

TABLE 9
PAVEMENT CONDITION RATING

Rating		Rut	Rutting		<u>ys</u>	P	PCR		
Evaluation	Date	11/84	11/85	11/84	11/85	11/84	11/85		
Site ID									
Sp. Treat.	4	0.12	0.13	3.2	3.0	40.25	38.85		
7 lbs/yd	5	0.12	0.11	3.8	3.3	43.25	40.55		
	6	0.08	0.11	3.8	3.3	43.25	40.55		
Sp. Treat.	2	0.10	0.08	3.2	3.0	40.25	39.05		
10 lbs/yd	3	0.10	0.10	3.2	3.0	40.25	38.35		
	7	0.07	0.10	3.8	3.3	43.25	40.65		
ACFC	1	0.15	0.10	3.8	3.6	43.25	41.35		
	8	0.12	0.11	3.8	3.4	43.25	41.05		
	9	0.15	0.15	3.8	3.4	42.50	40.75		

Structural Evaluation

The Dynamic Deflection Determination System (Dynaflect) was used to evaluate the relative strength of both the conventional and sprinkle treated pavements. A temperature deflection adjustment procedure was applied to each section, converting all deflections to their equivalent deflection at 60 degrees Fahrenheit. Deflection data and corresponding structural number are included in Table 10. Additional deflection analysis with time will be used as a performance indicator.

TABLE 10 STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS

	Dynaflect Property	Correct Deflec		Percent	Spread	Surface Ind	Curvature	Subgrade Of Elas	Modulus ticity	Structural Numbe	
	Date	11/84	4/86	11/84	4/86	11/84	4/86	11/84	4/86	11/84	4/86
	Site ID										
	Sp. Treat.										
	4	0.82	0.68	86	90	0.07	0.04	4700	5 <u>0</u> 00	4.6	5.2
24	5	0.73	0.65	87	92	0.02	0.04	5000	4900	4.8	5.4
	6	0.72	0.69	88	90	0.05	0.02	4900	4900	4.9	5.1
	Sp. Treat.										
	10 lb/yd²										
	2	0.82	0.84	90	94	0.03	0.02	4500	4200	4.8	5.0
	3	0.99	0.84	85	89	0.11	0.05	4000	4400	4.3	4.8
	7	0.71	0.64	88	89	0.04	0.02	5000	5400	5.0	5.3
	ACFC										
	1	0.88	0.78	89	90	0.05	0.02	4300	4500	4.7	4.9
	8	0.93	0.82	91	93	0.04	0.03	4000	4300	4.6	5.0
	9	0.96	0.92	93	94	0.03	0.02	3800	3800	4.6	4.8

Field Samples

Six inch diameter cores were sampled from each site at both the initial and the one year evaluation. Specific gravities were obtained for the wearing course mix (the ACFC was removed from those samples taken in the conventional section) to observe additional compaction with time due to traffic. The results are provided in Table 11. Generally, the one year old cores demonstrated increased densification.

Each one year sample was subjected to extraction and asphalt recovery by the Abson process. Binder content and mix gradations were determined. The recovered asphalt cement was tested for vicosity (140°F), penetration (77°F) and ductility (77°F). The gradations and binder contents presented in Table 11 generally verify the construction data. Subsequent evaluations will include asphalt cement properties testing which along with the data from this first year evaluation will be used to track the asphalt quality. The properties attained after one year demonstrate higher vicosities and lower penetrations and ductilities for their age than Louisiana's historical asphalts. Data obtained recently from other projects indicates that these accelerated aging properties may be characteristic of a crude source which has been utilized over the last several years by some refineries.

Skid Resistance and Critical Hydroplaning Speed

A primary measure of the performance of the sprinkle treatment section will be their ability to maintain an adequate level of skid resistance for the life of the pavement. Skid resistance of the experimental sections and the ACFC has been measured on three occasions by the Department's skid truck according to ASTM E 274-79 procedures. The skid resistance data (Table 12) indicates that the ACFC has a slightly higher skid value than

TABLE 11 ROADWAY CORE ANALYSIS

	6	2.317	2.356		100	26	82	52	41	26	12	∞	5.1	22,494	24	69
ACFC	∞	2.349	2.355		100	66	85	53	40	25	10	2	3.8	29,347	25	35
]	2.340	2.322		100	100	87	52	42	28	13	6	4.6	73,715	23	10
ment	2	2.348	2.394		100	100	06	65	20	28	13	6	5 5	23,444	29	99
Sprinkle Treatment (10 1bs/yd²)	33	2.290	2.337		100	100	93	72	56	32	12	∞	⊛	25,836	29	40
Sprin]	2	2.304	2.343		100	100	95	70	54	27	11	7	5.2	52,232	24	13
ment	9	2.301	2.339		100	100	94	89	52	29	12	∞	5. 3.	36,386	2.5	22
inkle Treatment	5	2.267	2.277		100	66	95	73	58	35	14	6	ъ. 23	38,155	26	18
Sprinkle (7 1b)	4	2.304	2.348		100	100	91	29	52	30	12	7	ф * ф	35,487	25	22
Sample Site		Specific Gravity 11/84	11/85	(% Passing)	26	3/4"	1/2"	No 4	No 10	No 40	No 80	No 200	Asphalt Content (%)	Viscosity (140°F)	Penetration (77°F)	Ductility (77°F)

the sprinkle treatment at this point. An initial skid disparity between the eastbound and westbound direction for the sprinkle treatment sections appears to have been reduced with the latest set of test data.

TABLE 12 SKID RESTANCE DATA

Direction		Eastboun	<u>d</u>	Westbound					
Date	11/84	3/85	11/85	11/84	3/85	11/85			
Site									
Sp.Treat.	36.6	40.3	39.7	46.1	45.0	43.0			
(7 lb/yd^2)									
Sp.Treat.	39.0	43.9	40.0	45.8	44.9	43.0			
$(10 1b/yd^2)$									
ACFC	38.1	43.3	44.0	41.8	41.5	44.4			

Critical hydroplaning speed is defined as the speed at which a vehicle will begin hydro-planing, or riding on a film of water instead of the pavement surface. The speed is calculated using measured texture depths of the pavement's surface and other factors such as tire tread depth, rainfall intensity, tire pressure, spin down, and pavement gradients. FHWA Report No. FHWA-RD-75-11, Tentative Pavement and Geometric Design Criteria for Minimizing Hydroplaning, February, 1975, was used as the basis for the critical hydroplaning speed analysis. A rainfall intensity of 2 inches per hour was assumed as being typical of Louisiana conditions along with a pavement cross slope of 0.025 and a longitudinal gradient of 0.0. A worst case scenario was used for the vehicle characteristics including tire pressure of 18 psi, spindown of 10 percent and tire tread depth of 2/32inch. The pavement texture depth was measured using a sand patch. Table 13 contains the texture depth measurements and

the hydroplaning speeds developed according to the assumptions provided.

TABLE 13
CRITICAL HYDROPLANING SPEEDS

Date	Nove	ember 84	November 85				
Property	Texture	Hydroplaning	Texture	Hydroplaning			
	Depth	Speed	Depth	Speled			
	(in)	(mph)	(in)	(mph)			
Site							
Sp. Treat.							
(7 lbs/yd)							
4	0.036	52	.050	75			
5	0.039	54	.039	54			
ß	0.030	50	.039	54			
Sp. Treat.							
(10 lbs/yd)						
2	0.052	75	.053	75			
3	0.049	66	.050	75			
7	0.042	56	.045	58			
ACFC							
1	_	-	.047	61			
8	-		.048	62			
9		-	.053	75			


Aggregate Retention

In order to examine loss of the sprinkle aggregate on the experimental sections, a photographic log was established at three locations within each evaluation site. A box grid was used to assist in evaluating the aggregate loss. Each picture location was outlined so that the exact spot could be found at

subsequent evaluations. Figure 9 provides a sample photo. As observed in Table 14, the aggregate retention after one year was excellent.

TABLE 14
AGGREGATE RETENTION
(% RETAINED)

Test No.		1	2	3
Site				
Sp. Treat.	4	93	95	95
(7 lbs/yd)	5	96	98	96
	6	99	97	98
Sp. Treat.	2	98	99	98
(10 lbs/yd)	3	98	97	98
	7	99	90	90



Aggregate Photo Log
FIGURE 9

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS AND MATERIALS CONSERVATION

As per the special provisions in Appendix A there were three pay items associated with the experimental section along with rebates for the conventional asphaltic concrete and asphaltic concrete friction course. The unit cost for these items were bid as follows:

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	COST
501(1)	Asphaltic Concrete	TON	32.00
501(1)X	Modified Asphaltic Concrete	TON	36.50
502(1)	Asphaltic Concrete Friction Course	SYD	0.95
8-1	Pre-Coated Sprinkle Aggregate	MOT	42.50
S-2	Handling and Spreading	SYD	0.25

The additional cost bid for the modified asphaltic concrete is related to an increase in asphalt cement content and the use of stone screenings. Converting this difference in price to a square yard basis the total cost of the sprinkle treatment would be:

Pre-Coated Sprinkle Aggregate (10 lbs/yd) =
$$\$0.21$$

Handling and Spreading = 0.25
Modified Asphaltic Concrete = 0.38
 $\$.84/yd$

Thus, on a first cost basis, the sprinkle treatment provided a savings of \$.11 per square yard or \$1550 per mile of roadway. More typical bids for asphaltic concrete friction course in Louisiana average about \$1.50 per square yard, however, which would provide cost savings in the neighborhood of \$9300 per mile of roadway. Of course until the life cycle of the sprinkle treatment can be established long term savings cannot be addressed.

Perhaps a much larger savings is realized in the area of materials conservation. Using an application rate for the slag friction course of 56 lbs/yd² and the design asphalt content of 6.5%, one mile of two lane roadway would consume 25.6 tons of asphalt cement and 368.6 tons of slag aggregate. A sprinkle treatment of 10 lbs/yd² would utilize approximately 68.9 tons of slag aggregate. Considering the actual percentage of asphalt cement used on this project for sprinkle aggregate coating (2.2%) and the 0.7% additional asphalt in the modified wearing course, the asphalt cement requires were 1.5 tons per mile and 8.1 tons per mile, respectively. Thus an overall savings in materials of approximately 16 tons per mile of asphalt cement and 300 tons per mile aggregate was realized.

CONCLUSIONS

- 1. Normal plant and roadway operations were maintained throughout the construction of the sprinkle treatment section; there were no delays due to the chip spreader operation.
- 2. Specification density requirements were not met for two of the three lots representing the modified type 3 asphaltic concrete. Whether this lack of densification was due to the unfamiliarity of the contractor in compacting the modified mix or to the open surface texture imparted by the sprinkle aggregate could not be determined.
- 3. The first year performance evaluation indicated that both the 7 lb/yd² and 10 lb/yd² sprinkle treatment sections are performing as well as the asphaltic concrete friction course with respect to pavement condition rating, serviceability, structural integrity, skid resistance and critical hydroplaning speed. Only negligible losses of the sprinkle aggregate were found during this first evaluation.
- 4. On a first cost basis sprinkle treatment provided a small savings for this first project. When compared to typical costs for asphaltic concrete friction course savings of approximately \$10,000 per mile could be realized.

APPENDIX A

SPECIAL PROVISIONS

SPECIAL PROVISIONS SPRINKLE TREATMENT

DESCRIPTION: Sprinkle Treatment is the application of a properly graded, precoated aggregate on the surface of a wearing course immediately following laydown and prior to initial rolling in order to provide a skid resistant wearing surface.

MATERIALS:

Sprinkle Aggregate: The aggregate shall be slag or stone conforming to section 1003.06(b) of the Standard Specifications for Roads and Bridges, 1982 Edition, and meeting the following gradation:

U.S. Sieve Size	Percent Passing
1/2	100
3/8	20 - 55
No. 4	0 - 5
No. 200	0 - 1.5

Asphalt: The asphalt cement used to precoat the sprinkle aggregate shall be AC-30 with properly proportioned anti-strip additive.

Modified Type 3 Wearing Course: The aggregate used in the wearing course mix shall have a minimum of 50 percent passing the No. 10 sieve. The gradation requirements for the modified type 3 wearing course shall be:

U.S. Sieve Size	Percent Passing
3/4	100
1/2	80 - 100
No. 4	60 - 85
No. 10	50 - 70
No. 40	20 - 45
No. 80	10 - 25
No. 200	2 - 12

A job mix formula for the modified type 3 wearing course shall be submitted for approval prior to construction.

Modified type 3 wearing course shall meet all control and acceptance requirements of the Standard Specifications for Roads and Bridges, 1982 Edition, except as herein modified. Density requirements shall be waived for the modified type 3 wearing course.

EQUIPMENT: The equipment used for spreading the precated aggregate shall be a Bristowes Mk V Hydrostatic Pre-coated Chip Spreader. This equipment and an operator shall be furnished to the contractor by the Federal Highway Administration.

precoating the Sprinkle aggregate: The sprinkle aggregate shall be dried at a temperature of 250-300°F and precoated with asphalt cement at 1.0-1.5 percent by weight. Freshly coated aggregate shall be stockpiled no higher than three (3) feet until sufficient cooling has occurred to preclude coking of the asphalt. The precoated aggregate shall be stored to prevent contamination and deterioration. Storage for an extended period of time may require the stockpile to be covered. Wetting down the precoated aggregate and manipulation of the stockpile should prevent crusting. Generally, the sprinkle aggregate should be precoated several days prior to use in order to allow for complete cooling.

CONSTRUCTION: The precoated aggregate material shall be uniformly applied to the surface of the wearing course as soon as possible after laydown and prior to initial breakdown rolling. The application rate shall be as directed by the engineer with a target rate of 10 pounds per square yard. This rate may be adjusted up or down; however, 12 pounds per square yard shall be the maximum application rate.

Rolling shall begin immediately behind the aggregate spreader with a steelwheel roller according to the established rolling pattern. The use of pneumatic-tired rollers will not be permitted.

Traffic shall not be permitted on the surface until the pavement has cooled to such an extent that the precoated aggregate does not ravel under tire traffic. A water truck may be required by the engineer to facilitate surface cool-down.

MEASUREMENT AND PAYMENT: The precoated sprinkle aggregate shall be measured by the ton at the time of precoating and payment shall be made under Item S-1.

Handling and spreading of the precoated sprinkle aggregate shall be measured by the square yard of completed and accepted surfacing, and payment shall be made under Item S-2.

Modified type 3 wearing course shall be measured by the ton at the time of processing, and payment shall be under Item S-3.

- Item S-1, Precoated Sprinkle Aggregate, per ton.
- Item S-2, Handling and Spreading of Precoated Sprinkle | Aggregate, per square yard.
- Item S-3, Modified Asphaltic Concrete, 501(1)(X), per ton.
- Item S-4, Rebate, Asphaltic Concrete Friction Course, \$02, per square yard.
- Item S-5, Rebate, Asphaltic Concrete, 501(1), per ton.

APPENDIX B

PAVEMENT CONDITION RATINGS

SLAG ACFC

PAVEMENT CONDITION RATING FORM FOR COMPOSITE PAVEMENT								
DISTRICT OF PARISH							A 20	
CONTROL 244-0	<u> </u>	104	$\frac{-WB}{0}$		SUBSECT	TION DNAL CLA		00 2011
LENSTA 12 B NO	784 RATE	D 8Y						011
DISTRE		SEV	ERITY LEV	/EL		reatter CENT LEV	===== 'El	1 050007
		L O₩	MEDIUM	HIGH	occ	FREQ	£ X 7	POINTS
TYPE	WEIGHT FACTOR	WE	IGHT FACT	TOR	WE	IGHT FAC	T08	BELCHA
BLEEDING	5	N/4	AGG/811	r eree	1 <10%4	105-308	. > 30\$	1
222231.10				BIT		-		
		.8	.8	1.0	1 .6	.9 	1.0	0
8104-UP	5		1/2"-1" BUMP		1/MI	2-4/MI	>4/81	i
		.4	.6		.5	.8	1.0	0
LONGITUDINAL	10 ~	l <1/8"	1/8"-1"	>1"		50-100'	>100'	1
CRACKING			.6	, ,		STA		
		,2 *			¦	.8 		0
PATCHING	10	SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE	<10%L	10%-30%	> 30%	
		.6	.8	1.0	.6	.8	1.0	0
PUMPING	10	STAIN	STAIN	FAULT	+ <10%L	10%-25%	>25%	
		7	.7	1.0	,	7	. 1.0	
					÷			10
RAVELING	10		GREGATE MOD.		<20%A	20%-50%	>50%	1
			.6		-5	.8	1.0	0
RUTTING	10	<1/4"0	1/4"-3/	4" >3.4"	<20%L	20%-50%	>50%	
.15 .15 .15	15 15	٦ .	. 7	1.0	.6	. 8	1.0	3
SETTLEMENT	10		DIS- COMFORT		1/41	2-4/MI	>4/M1	
*		.4	.7	1.0	.6	.G	1.0	0
SHATTERED	10	TIGHT	CRACKS	SLAB IN				
SLAB			√8′'8 .8			AREAS		0
DE-SONDING	5	+	1'D & >1		+			.++
C1-SUMPTING	_	<15Y >	1"0 5 <1	SY >15Y	1			1
					+			
TRANSERVSE CRACKING	(R) 10 (1) 5	<1/8" CRACK	1/8"-1"	> }''	<20%L	20%-509	>50%	
CHACKING	(11)	.2	_	1.0	.4	.8	1.0	
DEDUCT POINTS =				###### FVFRITY	aaaaaaa W£1GHT	www. Y FYTFUT	T WEIGH	ET FECTOR
	0,011(200							
						EDUCT PO		
RURAL ROADS ~			R = (100				/ 4 -	
		MR	R = (MAY	S PSI) X	5 3	.8	-	19.0
URBAN ROADS -			R = (100			POINTS)	/ 5 -	
		HR	R = (MAY	S PSI) X	4		-	
PAVEMENT CONDIT	TON RATING	= PDR +	RR		•		-	43.25
REMARKS :								
-								

PAVS	HENT CONDI	TION RAT	TING FORM	1 FOR CO:	MPOSITE	PAVEMEN	T	
DISTRICT 03	1-30 SECT	гун Т	'er <u>rebo</u>	nne	ROUTE		I	A 20
contact $\frac{244-0}{12.2}$	1-30 sect	1104 1107 #11	$-\frac{WB}{0.6}$		SUBSEC	TION	$= \frac{1}{2}$	2
ELTE 8 NOV	84 RATE	. 100 mi.			FUNCTI	JARC CLA	22 – 70	777
######################################		**=***=:	ERITY LEV	**************************************	**************************************	******** ********	*****	730330
0131823.	•		MEDIUM					
TYPE	WEIGHT						()	(SEE
	FACTOR	WE	1GH: FAC:	. 02 	t	16h: FAC 	102	5110m/
BLEEDING	5		AGG/811	BIT		•	-	
		.8	.8	1.0	.6	.9	1.0	Q
BLCW-UP	5		1/2"-1"		1/MI	2-4/M1	>4/81	
			BUMP		_			
••••••		. 4 t	.6 	1.0	•5 +	.8 	1.0	0
LONGITUDINAL	10 ~	<1/8"	1/8"-1"	>1"				
CRACKING		. 2	.6	1.0	STA	STA .8	STA 1.0	
		*			+			0
PATCHING	10) SMALL	MU 1 G 3 M		1	10%-30%	>30%	
		.6	.8	1.0	.6	.8	1.0	0
PUMPING	10	STAIN	STAIN	FAULT	<10%L	10%-25%	>25%	
•		.7	.7	1.0	.3	-7	0.1	0
RAVELING	10	AG	GREGATE (_055	<208A	20%-50%	>50%	
	÷	SLIGHT	MOD.	SEVERE				
	·	• 3 	.6	1.0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	.8 	1.0	Ω
RUTTING	10	<1/4"0	1/4"-3/	>3.4"	<20%L	204-504	>50%	
.1 .1 .1 .1	.1	.3	. 7	1.0	.6	.8	1.0	3
SETTLEMENT	10	NOTE.	DIS	D1P>6"	1 1/81	2-4/M1	>4/M1	
		RIDE .4	COMFORT		1		, ,	
		• •	•/ 	1.0	+	.8 		0
SHATTERED SLAB	10	TIGHT	CRACKS S	SLAB IN	> 2	2-5	> 5	
26.2		.6	>1/8"W ; .8	1.0	AREAS	AREAS _Q	AREAS	. 0
Pr novolve					+			0
DE-BONDING	5	<1"0 <	1"D & >19	0"1< Y2	<202L	20%-50%	>50%	
	İ	-3	.6	1.0	1	.8	1.0	0
TRANSERVSE	(R) 10	 <1/8"	1/8"-1"	> 1"	+	 20%-50%	. 509	
CRACKING	(1) 5	CRACK		, ,	12000	104-204	2502	
**********		.2	.6 =======:	1.0	.4	.8	1.0	0
DECUCT POINTS = 0						X EXTENT	WE I CHI	FACTOR
					~~~			
						ESUCT PO ESUCT PO		97
RURAL ROADS -		P09	R - (100					24.25
.55			R = (MAYS				-	16.
URBAN ROADS -		Phi	R = (100	- TOTAL	DEDUCT	POINTS	/ 5 -	
ONDAR NORDS			R = (100 R = (MAYS			. 01.413)	, , . -	
PAVEMENT CONDITIO	N RATING =	POR + 6	₹.					40.25
_							7	ريکمالات
REMARKS :			<del></del>					<del></del>
								(

			DO T L
40.25	ŧ	# ************************************	PRVENENT CONDITION RATING
	DEDUCT POINTS) / 5 = 4	POR - (100 - TOTAL !	URBAN ROADS +
3 97 24.25 16.0	OTAL GEOUT POINTS - OTAL GEOUT POINTS - DEDUCT POINTS) / 4 - 5 3.2	100 - T PDR - (100 - TDTAL 1 MRR - (MAYS PSI) X 1	RUPAL ROADS -
-1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -	IGHT X EXTENT WEIGH	EIGHT FACTOR X SEVERIT	DUCT POINTS = DIS
0		ii u •	化异性 化二苯甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基
+ 1 1 1 1	<20%L 20%-50% >50%	<1/8" 1/8"-1" > 1" CRACK	TRANSERVSE (R) 10 CRACKING (I) 5
0	0%L 20%-50% >50	>15Y >1"	"
0	75 V	RACKS SLAB 1	The state of the s
0	. 6	COMFORT 1.	c e i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i
ω	1/4/ 2-4/8/ >4/8/	TC. 015-	\$577(5%5%1 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	108L 208-508 >50	4"0 1/4"-3/4" >3.	। । ।
0	5 .8 .50% >50 .8 .70% -50% >50	GGREGATE LOSS T MOD. SEVE	7 YVEL-
0	.7 7.	.7	• • •
1	<10%L 10%-25% >25%	STAIN STAIN FAULT	PUKP186 10
0	.6 .8 1.	.6 .8 1.	
1	<10%L 10%-30% >30%	SHALL MEDIUM LARGE	PATCHING 10
O	<pre></pre>	.2 .6 1.0	CRECKING 10 -
0	5 .8 1.	80 V	(C) 1 (C) 1 (C) 1 (C) 1
	\$A 10%-30% >30	AGG/81T	7. E. S. M. C. S.
; ; m (0) ; m (0) ; r m ; r m ; r m ; r m ; r m ; r m ; r m		WEIGHT FAC	i ()
400	EXTENT LEVEL	H ASC	0 :
	OFFICE CLASS	Terrebonne R	7. 244-01-30 SEC 12-2 C.S. 12-2 C.S.

03 0007801 244-01	-30 PARI	se Terrebon	ne_	ROUTE SUBSECTION		A 20
12.2 8 Nov	c.s.	LOS MILE $-2.83$		FUNCTIONAL CLAS	55 <u>C</u>	11
DISTRESS	Í	SEVERITY LEVEL LOW MEDIUM		EXTENT LEV OCC FREQ		DECUCT   POINTS   (SEE
. * - 5	WEIGHT FACTOR	WEIGHT FACTOR		WEIGHT FAC	TOR	8510-7
BLEEDING	5		BIT	<10\$A 10\$-30\$	ļ	0
810W-UP	5	<1/2" 1/2"-1" BUMP BUMP	>1" BUMP	1/M1 2-4/M1	>4/MI	0
LONGITUDINAL	10	.4 .6 <1/8" 1/8"-1"			>100'	0
CRACKING		.2 .6	1.0	STA STA	1.0	0
PATCHING	10	SMALL MEDIUM L			_	
PUMPING	10	STAIN STAIN F		<del>+</del>		<u> </u>
		.7 .7	1.0	.3 .7	1.0	0
RAVELING	. 10	AGGREGATE LOS SLIGHT MOD. SE .3 .6	VERE		-	
RUTTING	10	<1/4"0 1/4"-3/4"		İ		<u>                                     </u>
.1 .15 .15 .1		.3 .7		+		3
SETTLEMENT	10	RIDE COMFORT		.6 .8		0
SHATTERED Slab	10	TIGHT CRACKS SLA CRACKS >1/8"W PIE .6 .8	CES	AREAS AREAS	AREAS	0
CE-SONDING	5	<pre><!--"D <!"D & -->!SY <!--SY -->!"D &amp; <!--SY <!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!</td--><td>&gt;15Y</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></pre>	>15Y			
TRANSERVSE CRACKING	(R) 10 (1) 5	<1/8" 1/8"-1"	> 1"	<20%1 20%-50%		1 0
DEDUCT POINTS =		.2 .6 ETGHT FACTOR X SEVE	1.0 ===== RITY	4 .4 .8 WEIGHT X EXTENT	1.0 WEIGH	0
			100 -	TOTAL DEBUCT PO	-	97
RURAL ROADS -		PDR = (100 - MRR = (MAYS F	TOTAL S1) X	DEDUCT POINTS) 5 3.2	/ 4 -	24.2 16.0
URBIN ROADS -	-	PDR = (100 - MRR = (MAYS F		DEDUCT POINTS)	/ 5 <b>-</b>	
PAVEMENT CONDITT	ON RATING	* PDR + RR			*	40.25
PEMARKS :						

DISTRICT 03	3 PARI 1-30 SECT	SH Terrebonne		ROUTE SUBSECTION	LA 2	0
LENGTH 12.2 DATE 8 NOV	C.S.	105 MILE 3.1		FUNCTIONAL CLA	55 <u>Co</u>	1
DISTRES	*********	SEVERITY LEVEL JEVERITY LEVEL HI MUIGAM WOL	GH	EXTENT LEV		DEGUET POINTS
7495	WEIGHT FACTOR	WEIGHT FACTOR	- 1	WEIGHT FAC		(SEE
BLEEDING	5	_	τ	<10%	ţ	0
BLCW-UP	 5	.8 .8 .1 				
5.CW-OF	,	BUMP BUMP BU	פאנ	.5 .8		0
LONGITUDINAL CRACKING	10 -	<1/8" 1/8"-1" > .2 .6		<50' 50-100' STA STA .4 .8	STA	0
PATCHING	10	SMALL MEDIUM LAR		·		
				.6 .8		0
PUMPING	10	STAIN STAIN FAI	ULT	<10%1 10%-25	>25%	
		.7 .7	1.0	.3 .7	1.0	0
RAVELING	10	AGGREGATE LOSS SLIGHT MOD. SEV .3 .6	ERE	<20% 20%-50° .5 .8		0
RUTTING	10	<1/4"0 1/4"-3/4" >	3.4"	<20%L 20%-50	\$ >50\$	
.15 .10 .10	.10 .15	.3 .7	1.0	.6 .8	1.0	3
SETTLEMENT	10	NOTC. DIS- DIP RIDE COMFORT .4 .7		_		0
SHATTERED Slab	10	TIGHT CRACKS SLAB CRACKS >1/8"W PIEC .6 .8	٤٤	> 2 2-5   AREAS AREAS	> 5	0
DE-BONDING	5	<1"D <1"D & >1SY >   <1SY >1"D & <1SY >	15Y			
TRANSERVSE CRACKING	(R) 10	.÷		.6 .8   <20%L 20%-50		<u> </u>  O
*======================================	, , ,	.2 .6	1.0	1	1.0	<u> </u>  .Q
DECUCT POINTS =	DISTRESS	REVER X ROTDAR THRIES		WEIGHT X EXTENT TOTAL DECUCT F TOTAL DECUCT F	OINTS =	3
RURAL ROADS -		PDR = (100 - T MRR = (MAYS PS	DTAL	DEDUCT POINTS		~ . ~ -
URBAN ROADS -		PDR = (100 - T MRR = (MAYS PS		DEDUCT POINTS	) / 5 -	
PAVEMENT CONDIT	TON RATING	* PSR + RR			•	43.25
REMARKS :						
						1

- もじちょれじし - 乙はほーロユーンロー うしゅ	. LOS MILE $2.6$	ROUTE SUBSECTION FUNCTIONAL CLASS	LA 20 00 5011
DISTRESS  TYPE WEIGHT FACTOR	SEVERITY LEVEL LOW MEDIUM HIGH WEIGHT FACTOR	EXTENT LEVEL  DCC FREQ EXT  WEIGHT FACTOR	DESUCT POINTS (SEE BELOW)
SLEEDING 5	N/A AGG/BIT FREE BIT .8 .8 1.0	<10%A 10%-30% >30%  .6 .9 1.0	0
810H-UP 5	<1/2" 1/2"-1" >1" BUMP BUMP BUMP	1/MI 2-4/MI >4/MI .5 .8 1.0	0
LONGITUDINAL 10 T CRACKING	.2 .6 1.0	STA STA STA	0
PATCHING 10	SMALL MEDIUM LARGE .6 .8 1.0		0
PUMPING 10	STAIN STAIN FAULT		
RAVELING 10	AGGREGATE LOSS SLIGHT MOD. SEVERE .3 .6 1.0		
RUTTING 10 .05 .1 .1	<1/4"p 1/4"-3/4" >3.4" -3 .7 1.0		3
SETTLEMENT 10	NOTC. DIS DIP>6" RIDE COMFORT	+	0
SHATTERED 10 SLAB	TIGHT CRACKS SLAB IN CRACKS >1/8"W PIECES .6 .8 1.0	> 2	0
DE-SONDING 5	0"1< 13 0"1> 0"1> 0"1> 0"1> 0"1> 0"1> 0"1> 0"1>	· ·	0
TRANSERVSE (R) 10 CRECKING (I) 5	<1/8" 1/8"-1" > 1" CRACK .2 .6 1.0		0
DECUCT POINTS = DISTRESS W	EIGHT FACTOR X SEVERITY	WEIGHT X EXTENT WEIGH TOTAL DEDUCT POINTS = TOTAL DEDUCT POINTS =	3
RURAL ROADS		DEBUCT POINTS) / 4 -	04 07
URBAN POADS  PAVEMENT CONDITION RATING	MRR = (MAYS PSI) X	DEDUCT POINTS) / 5 - 4	43.25
PEHARKS :			

CONTROL 244-1 LENSTO 12.	3 PARI 01-30 SECT 2 C.S.	SH TO	erreboi	nne	ROUTE SUBSECT FUNCTIO	TEON SNAU CLA	SS LA	20 00 Coll
DATE O INO	<u>v 84                                    </u>	್ರ ರಿ: ≢ಜ≭ನ#≒ಜ=	= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =	=======	******	******	*****	****
DISTRE	{	SEVE LOW	RITY LEV MEDIUM	EL HIGH	00C	FREQ	EL EXT	DESUCT POINTS
7425	WEIGHT FACTOR	WEI	GHT FACT	ca	WE	IGHT FAC	T02	(SEE BELC+)
BUEEDING	5		AGG/BIT	BIT			1	
		.8 	.8 	1.0	· . b	.9		00
BUCHHUP	5		1/2"-1" BUMP .6	BUMP	1	2-4/MI _8		0
LONGITUDINAL CRACKING	10	<1/8"	1/8"-1"	>1"	<50' STA	50-100' \$TA	>100' STA	
		. 2	.6	1.0	.4	.8 	1.0	Q
PATCHING	10		WEDIUM		}			
		.6	.8 	1.0	1 .6	.8	1.0	Ω
PUMPING	to		STAIN		}			
		·	.7 		+			10
RAVELING	10	AGG SLIGHT	GREGATE ( MOD. .6	SEVERE	<20%A	20%-50 ⁵	\$ >50%	
		·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			0
RUTTING			1/4"-3/	-	j			
.05 .10 .1		+	•7					3
SETTLEMENT	10	RIDE	DIS- COMFORT					
		÷			.+			0
SHATTERED SLAB	10	CRACKS	2X24R3 V"8\I< 8.	PIECES	AREAS	AREAS	AREAS	. 0
DE-SONDING	5	<1"D <	1''0 & 5'1 1''0 & 5'1	 SY >1"D SY >1SY	<20%1	20%-50	% >50%	1
		.3	.6	1.0	.6	8.	1.0	0
TRANSERVSE CRACKING	(R) 10 (I) 5	<1/8" CRACK	1/8"-1"	> ۱"	<20€1	20%-50	\$ >50%	
		. 2	.6	1.0		.8	1.0	1 0
DEDUCT POINTS						x EXTEN	T WEIGH	T FACTOR
				100		DEBUCT P		
RURAL ROADS ~			R = (100 R = (MAY	- TOTAL	DEDUCT	POINTS		+
URBAN ROADS -			R = (100 R = (MAY			POINTS	) / 5 <b>-</b>	
PAVEMENT CONDI	DRITAR ROLT	<b>=</b> 1208 +	ea.				•	43.25
PEMARKS :					·			

#### Slag ACFC

PAVEMENT CONDITION RATING FORM FOR COMPOSITE PAVEMENT OISTRICT 03 PARISH Terrebonne ROUTE CONTROL 244-01-30 SECTION EB SUBSEC SECTION FB SUBSECTION OO C.S. LOS MILE U.38 FUNCTIONAL CLASS COL LENSTA 8 Nov 84 RATED BY DISTRESS SEVERITY LEVEL EXTENT LEVEL LOW MEDIUM HIGH OCC FREQ EXT WEISHT (S E E 7425 WEIGHT FACTOR WEIGHT FACTOR EELC-1 FACTOR ______ N/A ACC/BIT FREE ( <10%4 10%-30% >30% 5 .8 .8 1.0 .6 .9 1.0 BUCH-UP 5 | <1/2" | 1/2"-1" | >1" | 1/M1 | 2-4/M1 >4/M1 8UMP 8UMP 8UMP .4 .6 1.0 .5 .8 1.0 1.0 LONGITUDINAL 10 7 <1/8" 1/8"-1" >1" | <50' 50-100' >100' STA STA STA .4 .8 1.0 CRACKING .2 .6 1.0 0 _____ 10 | SMALL MEDIUM LARGE | <10%L 10%-30% >30% PATCHING .6 .8 1.0 .6 .8 1.0 10 | STAIN STAIN FAULT | <10%L 10%-25% >25% .7 .7 1.0 .3 .7 1.0 . . . 0 . . . AGGREGATE LOSS <20%A 20%-50% >50% RAVELING 10 SLIGHT MOD. SEVERE .5 .8 1.0 .3 .6 1.0 ___Q___ RUTTING 10 | <1/4"D 1/4"-3/4" >3.4" | <20%L 20%-50% >50% .15 .15 .1 .1 .1 .3 .7 1.0 .6 .8 1.0 1/M1 2-4/M1 >4/M1 | NOTC. DIS- . DIP>6" | SETTLEMENT 10 RIDE COMPORT .6 .8 1.0 .4 .7 1.0 1.0 SHATTERED 10 | TIGHT CRACKS SLAB IN | > 2 2-5 > 5 CRACKS >1/8"W PIECES AREAS AREAS AREAS SLAB 1.6 .8 1.0 .7 .9 1.0 1 **************** TE-SONDING 5 | <1"D & >1SY >1"D | <20%L 20%-50% >50% | <15Y >1"D & <15Y >1SY | .3 .6 1.0 .6 .8 1.0 0 TRANSERVSE (R) 10 | <1/8" 1/8"-1" > 1" | <20%L 20%-50% >50% | CRACKING (I) 5 | CRACK (1) 5 CRACKING .2 .6 1.0 .4 .8 1.0 DECUCT POINTS = DISTRESS WEIGHT FACTOR X SEVERITY WEIGHT X EXTENT WEIGHT FACTOR TOTAL DECUCT POINTS = 100 - TOTAL DEDUCT POINTS - 197 PDR = (100 - TOTAL DEDUCT POINTS) / 4 = 24.27
MRR = (MAYS PSI) x 5 3.8 = 19.0 RURAL ROADS -PDR = (100 - TOTAL DEDUCT POINTS) / 5 = URBAN ROADS -MRR - (MAYS PSI) X 4 **43.25** PAVEMENT CONDITION RATING - POR + RR REMARKS : __

CONTROL $\frac{244-01-30}{12.2}$ Section $\frac{EB}{0.06}$ Subsection $\frac{00}{\text{Functional class}}$	PAVEMENT CONDUCTION RATING FORM FOR COMPOSITE PAVEMENT							
DISTRICT   12.2   C.S. LOS MILE   O.O.O.   FACTIONAL CLASS   C.S.		I-30 sect	ICH EB SUBSEC					
TYPE	12.2	84 RATE		CNAL CLASS <u>CO11</u>				
Factor   Weight factor   Weight factor   Select		{		FREQ EXT POINTS				
B	, * - :	FACTOR	WEIGHT FACTOR WE					
BUMP   BUMP   BUMP   BUMP   La   BUMP	BUSSDING	5	BIT					
CRECKING	BLCH+UP	5	BUMP BUMP BUMP					
PATCHING		10	<1/8" 1/8"-1" >1"   <50'   STA	50-100' >100' STA STA				
Descripting   10	PATCHING	10	SMALL MEDIUM LARGE <10%1	. 10%-30% >30%				
10	DUMBLES	10						
SLIGHT   MOD.   SEVERE   3	rom ma	10	1					
1.2.2.15.1   3	RAVELING	10	SLIGHT MOD. SEVERE					
SETTLEMENT   10	RUTTING	10	<1/4"0 1/4"-3/4" >3.4" <20%	204-50% >50%				
RIDE COMFORT   1.0   .6   .8   1.0   0	.1 .2 .2 .15	.1	.3 .7 1.0 .6	.8 1.0 3				
CRACKS > 1/8" W PIECES	SETTLEMENT	10	RIDE COMFORT					
CISY > 1"D & CISY > 1SY   .3		10	CRACKS >1/8"W PIECES AREA	S AREAS AREAS				
CRACKING (I) 5 CRACK  .2 .6 1.0 .4 .8 1.0 0  DEDUCT POINTS = DISTRESS WEIGHT FACTOR X SEVERITY WEIGHT X EXTENT WEIGHT FACTOR  TOTAL DEDUCT POINTS = 94  RURAL ROADS - PDR = (100 - TOTAL DEDUCT POINTS) / 4 = 23.50  WARR = (MAYS PSI) X 5 3.8 - 19.0  PAYEMENT CONDITION RATING = PDR + RR	DE-BONDING	5	<15Y >1"D & <15Y >15Y					
DEDUCT POINTS = DISTRESS WEIGHT FACTOR X SEVERITY WEIGHT X EXTENT WEIGHT FACTOR  TOTAL DEDUCT POINTS = 6 100 - TOTAL DEDUCT POINTS = 94  RURAL ROADS - POR = (100 - TOTAL DEDUCT POINTS) / 4 - 23.50  WARR = (MAYS PSI) X 5 3.8 - 19.0  PARE = (MAYS PSI) X 4 - 42.50			CRACK					
PDR = (100 - TOTAL DEDUCT POINTS) / 4 - 23.50  WAR = (HAYS PSI) X 5 3.8 - 19.0  URBAN RCADS - PDR = (100 - TOTAL DEDUCT POINTS) / 5 - 42.50			ERGHT FACTOR X SEVERITY WEIGHT TOTAL	X EXTENT WEIGHT FACTOR DEDUCT POINTS - 6				
PAVEMENT CONDITION RATING = PDR + RR = 42.50	RURAL ROADS -		PDR = (100 - TOTAL DEDUC	T POINTS) / 4 - 23.50				
PAVEMENT CONDITION RATING - POR + ER - 42.50	URBAN ROADS -			T POINTS) / 5 -				
REFERENCE: Ravelling of ACFC, OWP 25'	PAVEMENT CONDIT	ION RATING		- 42.50				
	REMARKS : Rave	elling o	ACFC, OWP 25'					

district 0 control 244-0	3 PARI	SH 7	re <u>rret</u>	onne	ROUTE SUBSECT	TION		A 20
	01-30 SECT		- <u>0 1</u>	3	FUNCTIO	DHAL CL	455 📆	011
2476 <u>19 No</u>	<u>ov 85</u> rate	C SY				******		. * * * * * * * * *
DISTRE	\$ \$	SEV:	ERITY LEV MEDIUM	EL     HIGH		TENT LEY FREQ		POINTS
1456	WEIGHT FACTOR	WE	IGHT FACT	ar l	WE	IGHT FA	CT 02	SEE BELCH)
BUEEDING	5	N/A	AGG/BIT	FREE	<10%A	10%-30	\$ >30%	
			.8	BIT				6
BLCW-UP	5	BUMP	1/2"-1" BUMP	BUMP		2-4/#1		
		. 4	.6	1.0	.5	.8	1.0	0
LONGITUDINAL CRACKING	10 -		1/8"-1"		STA	50-100' STA		
		.2	.6	1.0	.4	.8	1.0	1.6.
PATCHING	10	SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE	<10%1		\$ >30%	
		.6	.8	1.0	.6	.8	1.0	10
PUMPING	10	STAIN	STAIN	FAULT	<10%L	10%-25	\$ >25\$	
		.7	.7	1.0	-3	-7	7.0	0
RAVELING	10		GREGATE : MOD.	SEVERE				
		<del>-</del>			÷			ļQ
RUTTING	10	<1/4"0	1/4"-3/	4" >3.4"	<20%L	20%-50	\$ >50°\$	
.10 .10 .10	.10 .10	.3	.7	1.0	.6	.8	1.0	3
SETTLEMENT	10	NOTC. RIDE	DIS- COMFORT .7			2-4/MI .8		0
SHATTERED	10		CRACKS					1
SLAB			w"8\1< 3	1.0		AREAS		
DE-BONDING	5	<15Y >	1 < 3 0"1 > 1	SY >1SY	1			1
		.3	.6	1.0	.6	.8	1.0	0
TRANSERVSE CRACKING	(R) 10 (I) 5	<1/8" CRACK			1			
		1	.6			.8	1.0	$\parallel_2$
DEDUCT POINTS :							IT WEIGH	T
				100 -	TOTAL C	DEDUCT F	POINTS +	93.4
RURAL ROADS -			R = (100 RR = (MAY				) / 4 -	23.35 18.0
URBAN ROADS -			R = (100 RR = (MAY			POINTS	5) / 5 -	
PAVEMENT CONDIT	TION RATING	- POR +	RR				•	41.35
REMARKS :	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
<del></del>								_

015TRICT <u>03</u> CONTROL <u>244</u> 0	1_30 SECT	SH Terrebonne WB	ROUTE I	A 20
12.2	C.S. <u>V 85</u> RATE	105 MILE <u>0.6</u>	FUNCTIONAL CLASS	011
DISTRES		SEVERITY LEVEL LOW MEDIUM HIGH	EXTENT LEVEL OCC FREQ EXT	DEGUCT   POINTS   (SEE
7488	WEIGHT FACTOR	WEIGHT FACTOR	WEIGHT FACTOR	81.5-7
BLEEDING	5	N/A AGG/BIT FREE BIT .8 .8 1.0	<10%A 10%-30% >30% .6 .9 1.0	
виси-ир	5	*1/2" 1/2"-1" >1" BUMP BUMP BUMP .4 .6 1.0		
LONGITUDINAL CRACKING	10	<1/8" 1/8"-1" >1" .2 .6 1.0	STA STA STA	8
PATCHING	10	SMALL MEDIUM LARGE	4	
		.6 .8 1.0	.6 .8 1.0	0
PUMPING	10	STAIN STAIN FAULT		}
RAVELING	10	AGGREGATE LOSS SLIGHT MOD. SEVERE	+	
RUTTING	10	<1/4"0 1/4"-3/4" >3.4"		
.05.,1005	.10 .10	1.0	1.0	3
SETTLEMENT	10	NOTC. DIS- DIP>6" RIDE COMFORT .4 .7 1.0		
SHATTERED SLAB	10	TIGHT CRACKS SLAB IN CRACKS >1/8" PIECES .6 .8 1.0	AREAS AREAS AREAS	. []
DE-SONDING	5	0"1< YSI< 3 0"1> 0"1> 0"1> 0"1> 0"1> 0"1> 0"1> 0"1>		
TRANSERVSE CRACKING	(R) 10 (1) 5	<1/8" 1/8"-1" > 1" CRACK .2 .6 1.0	<20%L 20%-50% >50%	
DECUCT POINTS =			"我们们还有这种现象是是这种证明的现代的	
		100 -	TOTAL DEDUCT POINTS TOTAL DEBUCT POINTS	
RURAL ROADS -		PDR = (100 - TDTAL MRR = (MAYS PSI) )	DEDUCT POINTS) / 4 5 3.0	- <u>24.05</u> - <u>15</u>
URBAN POADS +		PDR = (100 - TOTAL MRR = (MAYS PSI) )	DEDUCT POINTS) / 5	•
PAVEMENT CONDIT	TON RATING	≠ POR + RR		39.05
PEMARKS :				

01STRICT 03 CONTROL 244-01	PARI	зн Т	er <u>rebor</u>	ne	ROUTE	TION		20
1:1:-	ر ج	1.05 MT	LE <u>1.96</u>	5		CHAL CLA		
2478 19 Nov	. 85 RATE	D SY			*****	******		>======
DISTRESS			ERITY LEV MEDIUM		1	TENT LEV FREQ		DESUCT POINTS (SEE
TYPE	WEIGHT   FACTOR	WE	IGHT FACT	OR.	WE	IGHT FAC	702	86104)
BLEEDING	5	N/A	AGG/81T	FREE	<10%A	104-30%	>30%	
		.8	.8		.6	.9	1.0	0
840W-UP	5	<1/2" BUMP .4	1/2"-1" BUMP .6		'	2-4/MI .8	İ	0
LONGITUDINAL	10	<1/8"	1/8"-1"	>1"	÷		+	
CRACKING		. 2	.6	1.0		STA .8		2
PATCHING	10	SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE	1		-	
	·	.6	.8	1.0	.6	.8	1.0	O
PUMPING	10		STAIN		}	-		
	·		.7	. <b></b>	+			0
RAVELING	10		GREGATE L MOD. .6	SEVERE	1	20%-50%	-	0
RUTTING	10	<1/4"0	1/4"-3/4	'' >3.4''	<20%L	20%-50%	>50%	
.10 .10 .10	.10 .10	. 3	. 7	1.0	.6	.8	1.0	3
SETTLEMENT	10	NOTC. RIDE .4	DIS COMFORT			2-4/M1 .8	•	
SHATTERED	10		CRACKS S		+			0
SLAB	10		>1/8"W 8		1	AREAS .9	AREAS	. 0
DE-BONDING	5	<15Y >	:1"D & >15	SY >15Y		,	>50%	
		-3	.6 	1.0	.6 +	.8	1.0	0
TRANSERVSE CRACKING	(R) 10 (I) 5	<1/8" CRACK .2	1/8"-1"	> 1" 1.0		20%-50%	750%	
DEDUCT POINTS = 0		, = # = = = = =	*********		*****	*****		1 1.6 T FACTOR
						EDUCT PO		
RURAL ROADS -			R = (100 R = (MAYS	- TOTAL	DEDUCT	POINTS)		
URBAN ROADS -			R = (100 R = (MAYS			POINTS)	/ 5 <b>-</b>	
PAVEMENT CONDITIO	ON RATING .	PDR +	RR				•	38.35
PEM42KS :								

0:STRICT 03 control 241-0 LENGTA 12.2 DATE 19 NO	3 PART 01-30 SECT	104	'erreboi	nne	ROUTE	TION THAL CLA	LA	20
5476 19 NC	CO VC	.D EY Messess		2:78:53	*****	******	× = = = + 1	
DISTRE	WEIGHT	F OM	ERITY LEV MEDIUM IGHT FACT	HIGH	}		1	DESUCT POHNTS (SEE BELOW)
	1 70 70 1				+			
BESECING	5	N/A 1 .8	AGG/31T	BIT		105-305 .9	-	0
		, 			+	·		0
BLCW-UP	5		1/2"-1" BUMP .6	BUMP		2-4/#1		0
LONGITUDINAL	10	1 /8"	1/8"-1"		÷			
CRACKING	10	.2	.6		STA	STA .8		0
PATCHING	10	H   SM211	MEDIUM	LARCE	1 21021	109-209		<u>9</u>
1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 2	10		.8		)			
PUMPING	10				÷			Ω
FURFING	10		STAIN -7					
*************					+			Ω
RAVELING	10	SLIGHT	GREGATE L	SEVERE				
			.6	1.0	+	 	·	0
		<1/4"0	1/4"-3/1	'' >3.4''	<20%L	20%-50%	>50%	
.10 .15 .15	.15 .10	.3	-7	1.0	.6	.8	1.0	3
SETTLEMENT	10	RIDE	DIS- COMFORT					
		) .4 ++	.7	1.0	+	.ö	1.0	0
SHATTERED SLAB	10	CRACKS	CRACKS S >1/8"W F	PIECES	AREAS	AREAS	AREAS	
DE-SONDING	<b></b> 5		1"0 & >15					<u>.</u>
<i>52 501151114</i>	,	<15Y >	1"D & <15	Y >1SY	1	•		
70.005.005.5	(5)	+			+			! Q
TRANSERVSE Cracking	(R) 10 (1) 5	CRACK .2	1/8"-1"	> 1"		20%-50%		
*=>===========		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	******		.4	.0 ******	1.0	1.1.6.
DEDUCT POINTS =	DISTRESS W	EIGHT FA	CTOR X SE					FACTOR
						EDUCT PO Educt po		95.4
RURAL ROADS -			R = (100 R = (MAYS			POINTS) 3.0	/ 4 -	23.85 15
URBAN ROADS -			R = (100				/ 5 -	
		дR	R = (MAYS	121) X	4		-	+
PAVEMENT CONDIT	ION RATING .	POR +	RR				-	_38.85
PEMARKS :					<del></del>			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<del></del>	<del></del>					

	EMENT CONDI							A 20
DISTRICT	11-30 sect	104	EB		SUBSEC.	TION		0
12.2 19 Nov	C.S.	LOG MILE	3.1		FUNCT 1	DNAL CLAS	:5C	oll
	********	*****	=======	*******	******	******		*******
DISTRES	S	SEVER	RITY LEV Medium			TENT LEVI FRED	EXT	DECUCT POINTS
7425	WEIGHT FACTOR	WEI	GHT FACT	CR	WE	IGHT FACT	10R	(SEE BELC#)
BLEEDING	5	N/A	AGG/81T	FREE		105-308	>30%	
		.8		BIT		.9		0
					· 			0
810W-UP	5	<1/2" BUMP	1/2"-1" BUMP .6			.8		_
					+			0
LONGITUDINAL CRACKING	ب.    10	<1/8"	1/8"-1"	>1"		50-100': STA		
		.2		1.0	.4	.8	1.0	<u>.</u> 8
PATCHING	10	SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE	Į.	٠,		
		.6	.8	1.0	.6	.8	1.0	0
PUMPING	10	STAIN	STAIN	FAULT	<10%L	10%-25%	>25\$	
		-7	.7	1.0	.3	-7	1.0	0
RAVELING	10				<20%A	20%-50%	>50%	
		SLIGHT -3	MOD. .6		.5	.8	1.0	0
RUTTING	10	<1/4"0	1/4"-3/	.'' >3.4''	<20%L	20%-50%	>50%	 
.15 .10 .10	.10 .1	.3	. 7	1.0	.6	.8	1.0	3
SETTLEMENT	10	NOTE.			1/MI	2-4/MI	>4/81	
		RIDE .4	COMFORT		.6	.8	1.0	0
SHATTERED	10	TICHT						
SLAB						AREAS		0
ET COVOLNO		*			+			
DE-SONDING	5		"0 5 <1	SY >15Y	1	•		1
		.3	.6	1.0	.6 +	.8	1.0	0
TRANSERVSE CRACKING	(R) 10 (I) 5	<1/8" CRACK	1/8"-1"	> 1"	<20%L	20%-50%	>50%	
		.2	.6	1.0	.4	.8	1.0	0
DEDUCT POINTS =		EIGHT FAC	TOR X S	EVERITY	WEIGHT	X EXTENT	WEIGH	FACTOR
						ESUCT PO		
				100 -	TOTAL D	EDUCT PO	INTS =	96.2
RURAL ROADS -		PDR MRR	= (100 = (MAY!	- TOTAL S PSI) X	DEDUCT 5 3.3	POINTS)	/ 4 -	24.05 16.5
URBAN ROADS -						POINTS)	/ 5 =	
		MRR	( <del>-</del> (MAY)	S PSI) X	4		-	10.55
PAVEMENT CONDITI	ON RATING	= PDR + R	:A				-	40.55
PEMARKS :				<u> </u>				-
					<del></del>			+

-control -244_01	-30 SEGT	SH Terreboni		ROUTE SUBSECTION	00	20
12.2 19 No	C.S. <u>00 85</u> RATE	tos with $\frac{2.6}{2.6}$	<u> </u>	FUNCTIONAL CLA	.\$3 <u>.C</u> o.	<u> </u>
DISTRES	WEIGHT	SEVERITY LEV LOW MEDIUM WEIGHT FACT	HIGH	EXTENT LEV OCC FREQ WEIGHT FAC	EXT	DEDUCT POINTS (SEE BEUCH)
BUEEDING		K/A AGG/BIT	FREE	+		00000
·		.8 .8	1.0	.6 .9	ا د. ۱	0
8tC#=UP	5	<1/2" 1/2"-1" BUMP BUMP .4 .6		1/M1 2-4/M1		0
LONGITUDINAL CRACKING	10	<1/8" 1/3"-1"		STA STA		
PATCHING	10	SMALL MEDIUM		+		0
		.6 .8	1.0	.6 .8	1.0	0
PUMPING	10	STAIN STAIN				
RAVELING	10	.7 .7  AGGREGATE L SLIGHT MOD.	0SS	+		0
		.3 .6	1.0	.5 .8	1.0	0
RUTTING	10	<1/4"0 1/4"-3/4		Ì		
.10 .10 .10	.10 .15	.3 .7	1.0	.6 .8	1.0	3
SETTLEMENT	10	NOTC. DIS- RIDE COMFORT .4 .7				0
SHATTERED SLAB	10	TIGHT CRACKS S CRACKS >1/8"W P .6 .8	LAB IN TECES	> 2 2-5 AREAS AREAS .7 .9	AREAS	. 0
CE-BONDING	5	<1"D <1"D & >1S <1SY >1"D & <1S .3 .6	Y >15Y			
TRANSERVSE CRACKING	(R) 10 (I) 5	<1/8" 1/8"-1" CRACK	> 1"	<20%1 20%-50	\$ >50%	0
		C 32225555555555555555555555555555555555	**=====			1.12
DEDUCT POINTS =	DISTRESS W	EIGHT FACTOR X SE		WEIGHT X EXTENT TOTAL DEDUCT P TOTAL DEDUCT P	OINTS =	3.8
RURAL ROADS -		PDR = (100 MRR = (MAYS	- TOTAL	DEDUCT POINTS) 5 3.3	/ 4 -	
URBAN ROADS -		PDR - (100 MRR - (MAYS		DEDUCT POINTS)	/ 5 <b>-</b>	
PAVEMENT CONDITI	ON RATING	- PDR + RR			-	40.55
PEMARKS :						ļ
						<del> </del>

PAVEMENT CONDITION RATING FORM FOR COMPOSITE PAVEMENT CISTRICT O3 PARISH Terrebonne ROUTE LA CONTROL 244-01-30 SECTION EB SUBSECTION ON LENGTH 12.2 C.S. LOG MILE 1.46 FUNCTIONAL CLASS COLL CATE 19 Nov 85 RATED BY LA 20 LO HOV OU ARISO SI DISTRESS SEVERITY LEVEL EXTENT LEVEL LOW MEDIUM HIGH OCC FREQ EXT WEIGHT (SEE BELC+) WEIGHT FACTOR WEIGHT FACTOR FACTOR 5 | N/A AGG/BIT FREE | <10%A 10%+30% >30% BIT .8 .8 1 0 .6 .9 1.0 1.0 5 | <1/2" | 1/2"-1" | >1" | BUMP BUMP BUMP BUMP 1/M1 2-4/M1 >4/M1 8ಬಗ್ಗ .5 .8 1.0 1.0 .4 .6 LONGITUDINAL 10 7 <1/8" 1/8"-1" >1" <50' 50-100' >100' STA STA STA CRACKING .2 .6 1.0 _Ω___ _____ | SMALL MEDIUM LARGE | <10%L 10%-30% >30% PATCHING .6 .8 1.0 .6 .8 1.0 10 | STAIN STAIN FAULT | <10%L 10%-25% >25% - 7 .7 1.0 .3 .7 1.0 10 AGGREGATE LOSS RAVELING | <20%A 20%-50% >50% SLIGHT MOD. SEVERE .5 .8 1.0 .3 .6 1.0 ____ | <1/4"0 1/4"-3/4" >3.4"| <20%L 20%-50% >50% RUTTING 10 .05 .10 .15 .10 .10 .3 .7 1.0 .6 .8 1.0 NOTC. DIS- . DIP>6" | 1/M1 2-4/M1 >4/M1 RIDE COMFORT SETTLEMENT 10 .6 .8 1.0 .4 .7 1.0 1.0 SHATTERED 10 | TIGHT CRACKS SLAB IN | > 2 2-5 > 5 CRACKS >1/8"W PIECES AREAS AREAS AREAS .6 .8 1.0 .7 .9 1.0 DE-BONDING 5 | <1"D < 1"D & >1SY >1"D | <20%1 20%-50% >50% <15Y >1"0 & <15Y >15Y .3 .6 1.0 .6 .8 1.0 TRANSERVSE (R) 10 | <1/8" 1/8"-1" > 1" | <20%L 20%-50% >50% CRACK | CRACK CRACK .2 .6 1.0 .4 .8 1.0 DECUCT POINTS = DISTRESS WEIGHT FACTOR X SEVERITY WEIGHT X EXTENT WEIGHT FACTOR TOTAL DEDUCT POINTS # 3.4100 - TOTAL DECUCT FOINTS = 96.6 POR = (100 - TOTAL DEDUCT POINTS) /4 = 24.15RURAL ROADS - $MRR = (MAYS PSI) \times 5 \cdot 3.3$ POR = (100 - TOTAL DEDUCT POINTS) / 5 = URBAN ROADS + MRR = (MAYS PSI) X 4 **-** 40.65 PAVEMENT CONDITION RATING # PDR + RR REMARKS : __

CONTROL 244-01	-30 sect	SH Terrebonne	S	UBSECTION	.00	20
$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{LENSTA} & 12.2 \\ \text{DATE} & 19 \text{ Nov} \end{array}$	85 RATE	tog MILE 0.38	^[ ]	UNCTIONAL CLAS	3 CD	
DISTRESS		SEVERITY LEVEL LOW MEDIUM H	IGH	EXTENT LEVE OCC FREQ	£x7	
7485	WEIGHT FACTOR	WEIGHT FACTOR		WEIGHT FACT	08	(SEE BELC#)
SUBEDING	5		IT			*****
				.6 .9	+	0
BUCWAUP	5		טאף	.5 .8		0
LONGITUDINAL CRACKING	10	<1/8" 1/8"-1" .2 .6		STA STA	STA	
				.4 .8	+	0
PATCHING	10	SMALL MEDIUM LA	1	•		0
PUMPING	10	STAIN STAIN FA			+;	0
		.7 .7	1,0	.3 .7	1.0	Q
RAVELING	10	AGGREGATE LOSS SLIGHT MOD. SEV .3 .6	ERE	<20% 20%-50%	-	0
RUTTING	10	<1/4"0 1/4"-3/4" >				
.10 .10 .10 .	10.15	.3 .7	1.0	.6 .8	1.0	3
	10	NOTC. DIS- DIF RIDE COMFORT .4 .7	>6"	1/M1 2-4/M1	>4/MI	0
SHATTERED SLAB	10	TIGHT CRACKS SLAE CRACKS >1/8"W PIEC	B IN		> 5 AREAS	
DE-BONDING	5	<pre>&lt;1"0 &lt;1"0 &amp; &gt;1SY &gt; &lt;1SY &gt;1"0 &amp; &lt;1SY &gt; </pre>	ISY	<20%L 20%-50%	-	0
TRANSERVSE CRACKING	(R) 10 (1) 5	<1/8" 1/8"-1" >				
**********	****	.2 .6	1.0	.4 .8	1.0	.8
DECUCT POINTS =	DISTRESS W	EIGHT FACTOR X SEVER		EIGHT X EXTENT Otal deduct po		
RURAL ROADS -		100 - 7 100 - 7 100 - 7 100 - 7 100 - 7	TOTAL D			98.2 24.05 17.0
URBAN ROADS -			OTAL 0	DECUCT POINTS)	/ 5 =	
PAVEMENT CONDITE	ON RATING	•	, ^ -			41.05
REMARKS :						

PAVEMENT CONDITION RATING FORM FOR COMPOSITE PAVEMENT								
244-01-30	PARISH SECTION	Те	EB			LON		
12.2 19 Nov 85	C.S. 10	G MILE	0.06		FUNCTIO	NAL CLAS	5 <u>Co</u>	11
***************	*********	c====	RITY LEVE		**************************************	ENT LEVE		015 57
DISTRESS	10		HEDIUM					POINTS
TYPE WEI	TH2	WEIG	SHT FACTO	:R	WEI	GHT FACT	CP	(SEE BELC#)
BLEEDING	5   N/	A	AGG/BIT		<10%A	105-308	>30%	
		8	.8	1.0	.6	.9	1.0	0
810W-UP			 1/2"-1"		1/MI	2-4/81 >	-4/MI	
	BU	14P	8UMP .6	8UKP 1.0	.5	.8	1.0	0
***************************************					÷			
LONGITUDINAL 1 CRACKING	(10	/8"	1/8"-1"	>1		STA		
		2	.6	1.0	.4	.8	1.0	0
PATCHING	10 Sr	SALL	MEDIUM	LARGE	<10%L	10%-30%	>30%	
		. 6	.8	1.0	.6	.8	1.0	0
PUMPING	10   57	TAIN	STAIN	FAULT	<10%L	10%-25%	>25%	
		. 7	.7	1.0	.3	.7	1.0	0
RAVELING	10	AGG	REGATE L	 oss	+   <20%A	20%-50%	 >50%	+ <u>~</u> 
			мов. .6			. 8	1.0	
					+			Q
	İ		1/4"-3/4	-		_		
.15 .15 .20 .15	.10	.3 - <b></b>		1.0	.6	.8 	1.0	3
SETTLEMENT			DIS COMFORT	D16>6	1/41	2-4/MI	>4/41	İ
	,	.4	.7	1.0	.6	.8	1.0	0
•	II.		CRACKS S				-	
STYB		RACKS .6	>1/8"W P	1.0		_	AREAS 1.0	. 0
DE-BONDING	<del>;</del>	 וים < ו	3 0"1	Y >1"B	   <20%L	20%-50%	>50%	
	<	15Y >1	1"D & <15	Y >15Y	1	•		
		· 3	.0	1.0	+	.0	1.0	0
TRANSERVSE (R) CRACKING (1)	10 < C	1/8" BACK	1/8"-1"	> 1"	<20%L	20%-50%	>50%	
		.2	.6	1.0	.4	.8	1.0	2
DECUCT POINTS = DISTR								
					TOTAL D	ESUCT PO	1187S =	5
				100 -	TOTAL D	EDUCT PO	HNTS -	95.0
RURAL ROADS -		POF MRF	R = (100 R = (MAYS	- TOTAL ( PSI) X	5 3.	POINTS)	/ 4 -	23.75
URBAN ROADS -			001) = 5 R = (MAYS			POINTS)	/ 5 <b>-</b>	
PAVEMENT CONDITION RA	TING = P	DR + 8	R					40.75
PSMARKS :		_						