MODELS FOR ESTIMATING TREATMENT LIVES, PAVEMENT LIFE EXTENTION AND THE COST EFFECTINESS OF TREATMENTS ON FLEXIBLE PAVEMENTS

By

Jorge B. Sousa, Ph.D,
George Way, PE

December 20, 2007

Prepared For
California Department of Transportation
Office of Pavement Preservation
Division of Maintenance
5900 Folsom Blvd
and
California Pavement Preservation Center
California State University, Chico
Chico, CA 95929-0930
December 20, 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) employs a variety of pavement preservation treatments to maintain and preserve their network of paved highways. The primary purpose of the proactive pavement preservation program is to delay the need for costly pavement rehabilitation or reconstruction. History has shown that reducing such costly repairs is enhanced by preventive maintenance treatments sealing out moisture which adds to the structural integrity and endurance of almost every pavement and reduces the deleterious action of water.

Historically the degree of structural reinforcement of these thin maintenance treatments (less than one inch) has been difficult to estimate in a rational manner. The purpose of this study is to estimate the pavement treatment life and pavement life extension. In addition, this study is being conducted to help establish the cost effectiveness of pavement preservation treatments using the information on treatment lives and life extension associated with applying a given treatment. Life extension is defined as the time the treatment delays the need for rehabilitation. Treatment life does not necessarily equal life extension; it is often less depending when the treatment is placed.

This study is a continuation of a previous study entitled "CONSIDERATIONS FOR ESTIMATING PAVEMENT TREATMENT LIVES AND PAVEMENT LIFE EXTENTION ON FLEXIBLE PAVEMENTS," (Sousa 2007) and it is recommended that it be reviewed before reading this report. As a result of this previous study, several new objectives were recognized and are addressed in this report. For reasons of continuity, there is some overlap between this report and the previous study report. There were four study objectives. As best as practical, this report addresses each of the objectives listed as follows:

1- Develop tables (which can be readily used by practitioner) that estimate treatment lives and life extension for the 23 asphalt based treatments.

2- Develop a model to determine treatment duration as a function of asphalt treatment characteristics, pavement location, pavement condition and traffic for flexible pavements.

3- Determine the optimal time for treatment application and provide an assessment of cost effectiveness of each type of treatment in terms of its own duration and its contribution to pavement life extension.

4- Improve and, if possible provide validation, on the life extension tables for flexible pavements created in the previous research phase completed earlier in 2007.

The degree of difficulty in satisfactorily completing each objective was often referred to by the researchers as a mission impossible. Although there are many studies on structural pavement rehabilitation greater than one inch in thickness, comprehensive research on thin maintenance treatments is more difficult to obtain. In addition, little if any objective maintenance performance data and associated materials properties and aging were very hard to obtain in California. Even with these difficulties, the authors have compiled a new and innovative way at examining each of the study objectives. The authors were very ably assisted by Dr. Gary Hicks of Chico State University , Dr. Shakir Shatnawi of Caltrans, Dr. Kamil Kaloush of Arizona State University, and Dr. Jorge Pais of the University of Minho in Portugal,

From the sum total of the body of work reported on in this study, it was found that that the better asphalt treatments are those that have higher Treatment Performance Capacity (TPC), which simply indicates, what is intuitively known by most pavement engineers, that asphalt treatments perform better if they have more binder, are made with better binder and are thicker (i.e. more long lasting and more waterproofing).

A model was developed to relate asphalt treatment life function in terms of TPC, pavement condition, traffic level and location temperatures (actually only the reflective cracking temperature given by the difference between the Shell mean weighted average temperature and the lowest temperature representative of each region), for all asphalt based treatments. This model is able to provide estimates of the performance of 23 treatments, in three climatic zones, three pavement conditions levels and three traffic magnitudes (i.e. 621 observations) with only 4 variables, with a remarkably high R^2 of 0.84.

Using the TPC values for each treatment and the price of each treatment, the cost effectiveness for all treatments was developed (*simply dividing the TPC of a treatment by its cost per square yard*). The results indicate that there are huge differences in values between treatments currently used in California and that there **appears to exist a great opportunity for Caltrans to optimize (i.e. minimize) its annual budget by applying only treatments with highest cost-effectiveness at the correct time**.

Structural and reflective cracking analyses indicate that the optimum time to apply a treatment is when the pavement cracking levels are in the range of 1% to 2%. There are significant structural benefits (structural pavement life extension) when a pavement has a waterproofing treatment applied by the time it reaches 4 to 5% cracking. Preventive maintenance treatments, if applied at the correct time, with long lasting 100% waterproofing capabilities, can provide structural life extensions for the underlying pavement of about 4 years.

From these findings, it is recommended that prior to the application of a treatment that the cost effectiveness of each possible and available treatment in the region be made. It should be noted that all treatments investigated in this study contribute to pavement preservation. However, some appear to be more cost effective than others. **It is recommended that the treatment selected should be the one with the highest cost effectiveness in terms of TPC/$.** At this time, with the current price structure in the market, and based on the cost data provided to this project, it appears that CALTRANS should adopt a policy to use treatments with the highest cost effectiveness in terms of TPC/$ as soon as pavement cracking levels reach 1 or 2% levels.

Data are needed to determine the current allocation of maintenance funds for each type of treatment, or what percentage of area is covered with each kind of treatment each year and the annual maintenance budget of Caltrans. This will allow one to better quantify the costs effectiveness of alternative maintenance strategies.

It is further recommended that an investigation be made and quantified, from CALTRANS data, if available, the effect of water penetrating into the pavements in the four different climatic regions in California. Will this require a measure of the permeability of the pavements and FWD data at different cracking levels in a same pavement.

It is also recommended that an investigation be made to determine the relationship between the rate of crack percentage evolution (cracking change from 1% to 5%) as a function of the climatic region, traffic index and pavement type and or overlay.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Appendices

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) employs a variety of pavement preservation (preventive maintenance or corrective maintenance) treatments to maintain and preserve their network of paved highways as shown in Figure 1 (Maintenance 2003). The primary purpose of the proactive pavement preservation program is to delay the need for costly pavement rehabilitation or reconstruction.



Figure 1 - Pavement Condition vs. Life and Type of Work Required

The history of the use of these various maintenance treatments reaches back as far as 1949 (Hveem 1949) if not earlier. Hveem discussed the purpose of the seal coat, although his discussion can be applied to many different types of maintenance surface treatments. He noted the term "seal coat" was to seal the road surface; that is, to prevent surface water from penetrating the pavement or base. However, all highway engineers will recognize that a surface treatment of asphalt and screenings may be applied to a road to accomplish one or more of several distinct purposes. Distinct purposes enumerated for seal coats are as follows (Hveem 1949):

1. Seal the road to the entrance of moisture
2. Develop a non-skid surface on the existing road
3. Apply fresh coatings of aggregate which will enliven and provide an all weathered surface to improve wear resistance
4. Reinforce and build an adequate pavement surface

5. Provide new stripping between lanes.
6. Improve luminosity.

Hveem identified sealing out moisture as the primary reason for a seal coat application. Later he noted (Hveem 1950) that the structural integrity and endurance of most engineering works are jeopardized by the action of water. He went on to state that in its simplest form then, one of the major problems confronting the civil engineer is the necessity for guarding against or combating the deleterious effects arising from the action of water upon the materials of construction. Thus maintenance surface treatments need to be able to some degree to seal out water (see Figure 2).



Washington-Richmond road, 1919

NMAH, Archives Center, API Collection

Figure 2 - Effect of too much water in the roadway (API 2005)

1.2 Purpose of Study

Historically, thin pavement preservation surfacing less than one inch in thickness are considered to improve one or more of the distinct purposes enumerated by Hveem, but the degree of structural reinforcement of these thin treatments has been difficult to estimate. The purpose of this study is to estimate in a rational manner the pavement treatment life and the pavement life extension. In addition, this study is being conducted to help establish the cost effectiveness of pavement preservation treatments, information on treatment lives and life extension associated with applying a given treatment. Life extension is defined as the time the treatment delays the need for rehabilitation. Treatment life does not necessarily equal life extension; it is often less depending when the treatment is placed as shown in Figure 3.



Figure 3- Maintenance Treatment Lives (Hicks 2006)

1.3 Study Objectives

This study is a continuation of a previous study entitled “CONSIDERATIONS FOR ESTIMATING PAVEMENT TREATMENT LIVES AND PAVEMENT LIFE EXTENTION ON FLEXIBLE PAVEMENTS,” (Sousa 2007) and it is recommended that it be reviewed before reading this report. As a result of the previous study, several new objectives were identified and are addressed in this report. For reasons of clarification there is some overlap between this report and the previous study report.

As best as practical, this report addresses several study objectives listed as follows:

1- Develop tables (which can be readily used by practitioners) to estimate treatment lives and life extension for the 23 asphalt based treatments.

2- Develop a model to determine treatment duration function of asphalt treatment characteristics, pavement location, pavement condition and traffic for flexible pavements.

3- Determine optimal time for treatment application and provide an assessment of cost effectiveness of each type of treatment in terms of its own life and its contribution to pavement life extension.

4- Improve and, if possible provide validation, the life extension tables for flexible created in the previous research phase and completed in 2007.

Achieving all four rather ambitious study objectives is extremely difficult given the lack of objective data in general and in California in particular. The author's have relied on subjective data developed by the Pavement Preservation Task Group (PPTG) and data and numerous studies conducted in Arizona (Kaloush, Sousa, Way and Zborowski).

This report focuses on meeting the study objectives. An integral part of this is to develop estimates of pavement treatment life and life extension in flexible pavements which can readily be used by practitioners for a number of maintenance treatments in flexible pavements. The beginning point to address all the study objectives was a list of 30 Caltrans preservation treatments furnished to the authors by California Pavement Preservation Center, California State University, Chico shown in Table 1.

Table 1 shows the treatments that were considered for this study. In all 30 maintenance treatments were identified to be studied to estimate the treatment life. However, for this report life extension analysis was only conducted for flexible pavements. All the treatments involve the use of asphalt based materials and may be applied very thin like a fog or rejuvenating seal or as thick as a one inch HMA surfacing.

Furthermore, new tables representing the expected life of treatments in each of the major climate zones in California are included in this report. It was recognized that heavy traffic affects treatment lives more than light traffic. The proposed tables reflect the traffic index (TI) as used by Caltrans but they can be easily converted to the standard AASHTO Equivalent Single Axle Loads (ESAL's).The estimated life information compiled in this document is based on the collective experience of the Pavement Preservation Task Group (PPTG) to which the experience and best engineering judgment of a few experts in the industry were added.

Table 1- Maintenance Pavement Treatments Used by Caltrans (Flexible and Rigid Pavements)

	Maintenance Treatment		Maintenance Treatment		Maintenance Treatment
	Hot Mix Asphalt	14	Conventional HMA, 1 inch		Portland Cement Concrete (PCC)
1	HMA Crack sealing	15	Open Graded Asphalt Concrete (OGAC), 1 inch	24	PCC Crack sealing
2	HMA Crack filling	16	PBA HMA, 1 inch	25	PCC Diamond Grinding
				26	PCC Partial depth Spall Repair
3	Fog seals		Rubberized Asphalt Concrete (RAC)	27	PCC Full depth spall repair
4	Rejuvenator seals	17	RAC-G, Gap Graded, 1 inch	28	PCC Dowel Bar Retrofit
5	Scrub seals	18	RAC-O , Open Graded, 1 inch	30	PCC Random slab replacement
6	Slurry Seals	19	RAC-O (HB), Open Graded High Binder, 1 inch		
7	REAS slurry seal				
8	Micro-Surfacing		Bonded Wearing Course (BWC)		
9	PME chip seals	20	BWC-Open, 3/4 inch		
10	PMA chip seals	21	BWC-Gap, 3/4 inch		
11	AR chip seals	22	BWC-RAC-G, 3/4 inch		
		23	BWC-RAC-O, 3/4 inch		
12	Cape seals AR (slurry) 1/2 inch				
13	Cape Seals AR (micro) 3/4 inch				

As previously stated, the data used in this study still needs to be verified in California using actual performance data from the existing Caltrans performance data bases or pavement management systems. Nevertheless, an attempt is made in this report to verify the models as best as the limited data outside of California allows. Of course, the life of the treatment is highly dependent on the timing of the treatment, the traffic it experiences, and the climate it is placed in and these factors are addressed in the models as best as possible given the limited data and information.

The time of placement of the treatments can influence the performance of the treatment that is treatments placed on good pavements will last longer than treatments placed on bad pavements. Many times, a treatment is scheduled to be placed on a good pavement, but by the time it is actually placed, the condition of the pavement has deteriorated and this will affect the expected live of the treatment. The models developed in this study are limited by this observation of actual practice.

To the degree practical, the models in this report address the lives of the treatment as a function of the level of traffic and climate (coastal, valley, mountains, and desert) in which the treatment is placed.

2 STUDY APPROACH-ESTIMATING TREATMENT LIVES

2.1 Estimate of Treatment Lives

The prior study first focused on developing tables of the estimated treatment lives (Sousa 2007). The tables in Appendix A in that study show the estimated treatment life for the various treatments. These tables were first developed by the PPTG strategy selection committee, although the original tables provided ranges of average life. As part of this study, it was requested that the PPTG original tables be converted into the average and standard deviation of life for each treatment. The author's (with the assistance of Dr. Kamil Kaloush) made the requested conversion. The author's also considered that the treatment lives should adjusted for different climatic regions. The author's recommended that the asphalt PG grading regions (Figure 4) be used to identify treatment lives by climatic regions. It was decided that the treatment lives developed by the PPTG most appropriately fit into the Coastal and Valley areas (PG 64-10 and PG 64-16). Following this approach, tables were developed for the Mountainous (PG 64-28) and the Desert regions (PG 70-10). The Mountainous and Desert values represent the estimates of the treatment lives based on the experience of the author's and Dr. Kaloush, and like the Coastal and Valley regions represent a surrogate group of values based on engineering experience and judgment. This was done in lieu of real California performance data. In the future, is it hoped that the Caltrans pavement management system will provide definitive measures of treatment life for the various climate regions.



Figure 4- Climate Regions Proposed For California- Coastal, Valley, Mountain and Desert

The tables developed in the Sousa 2007 study take into consideration that the treatments are strongly affected by climate, traffic and pavement condition. It was considered important to try to evaluate their lives as a direct function of the treatment itself and these key factors.

2.2 How to Bring in the Effect of Climate in Life of Treatments?

The first step was to identify significant climate zones that affect the performance of the maintenance treatments. It was considered that the expected life of a treatment and life extension is influenced by the weather and to facilitate integration with other areas, it was decided to develop four tables of expected performance; one for each PG region in which California has been divided (Figure 4).

2.3 How to Bring in the Effect of Traffic in Life of Treatments?

It was recognized that traffic is also a key aspect that affects the life of maintenance strategies. However, the number of cars is not a key factor. The recognized factor that affects any treatment is indeed the effect of heavy traffic which is defined by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) as 18 kip Equivalent Single Axle Loads (ESAL's). Caltrans uses the Traffic Index which can be easily converted into ESAL's. Also, most structural analysis and reflective modeling programs require some input to calculate stress caused by actual loads derived from ESALS.

Likewise, the traffic volume and truck volume is incorporated to the degree it can be identified in three major traffic categories. Namely, Interstate which generally has a high truck percentage, non interstate divided routes (includes sections with four or more lanes that might not be divided) which has a lower percentage of trucks and non-interstate, non divided routes (essentially two lane highways) that have a lower traffic volume and lower truck percentage level of traffic. The traffic was divided into three categories as follows:

- Low TI < 6 ,
- Intermediate 6 < TI < 12,
- Heavy TI >12

2.4 How to Bring in the Effect of Existing Pavement Condition?

It was recognized that for treatment life and life extension to be meaningful, one must know the actual pavement condition at the time of the application of the treatment. Currently there is no easy way to derive information on treatment performance from the existing PMS data in California. Also, Performance Condition Index (PCI) used by many cities and counties in California by itself may not be descriptive enough to be of significant help in this area.

Since pavement preservation is a non-structural treatment, this means these treatments should only be used on pavements with low deflection values and low levels of distress. If high deflections (beyond a certain limit) are present, rehabilitation of the pavement will be needed. There is also a maximum cracking threshold before a certain treatment is applied. For pavement preservation, it is suggested that a maximum value of 5% cracking and a minimum Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of 70 be used as the limits for applying pavement preservation treatments (Zhou and Barrantees, 2007).

If the pavement is in poor condition, it can have structural problems. Therefore, pavement preservation should not be used as an option in these situations. In the tables, "poor condition" is identified along with the associated maintenance treatment option. This is done in order to develop treatment lives and life extensions that will demonstrate that preventive maintenance treatments are not cost effective in the late cycle of pavement life. When determining extended life benefits, it may be found that placing some pavement preservation treatments on pavements in poor condition is not cost effective.

In summary, the primary concern for preservation treatments is reflective cracking or raveling when the pavement is in good to medium condition and structural when the pavement is in poor condition. It could be either reflective cracking or structural in the medium condition.
It should be noted that extending structural pavement life treatments with surface distress oriented treatments such as raveling or bleeding are not directly addressed in this report.

Pavement preservation should preserve the structural integrity of the pavement so that it can perform for a longer time where structural integrity implies load carrying capacity of the pavement. For example, crack sealing may provide the benefits of minimizing water intrusion into the base and subgrade and prevent fines from accumulating in the crack.

However, when taking a more in depth look at what affects a treatment life, it was considered that cracking extent by itself may be the most significant aspect. The percent of cracking is an indication of the capacity of the existing pavement to be relatively impervious to water and the affect water has on the underlying layers. Also, the extent of cracking is an indication of the possible relative movement between the tips of the crack that have a strong effect on the life of the treatment. **Although the treatments considered in this report are not considered to add structural capacity to the pavement, they may to some degree reduce the amount of water that penetrates into the pavement, which can contribute to extending the pavement life**.

Treatment life is defined as the number of years a given treatment will serve its function (before another treatment is required). Treatment life is a function of the existing pavement condition and other factors such as traffic, climate, quality of materials and construction). Following are tentative definitions for the various categories in pavement condition;

- Good- Minor distress (< 5 % cracking). Expected life of 8-10 years or more
- Fair- minor to moderate distress (5-20% cracking). Expected life of 4-6 years
- Poor condition (>20 % cracking). Moderate to severe distress and with structural problems. Expected life of 1-3 years

2.5 How to Bring in the Intrinsic Maintenance Material Properties

Clearly if a good Pavement Management System (PMS) were available, it would be populated with adequate data so that the intrinsic properties of each treatment would not be needed because a simple multiple variable regression over all the data would give directly the life of each treatment. However, that data does not exist yet for most treatments and therefore it is necessary to use a modeling approach to bridge this gap. As such, the need to use some “models” in some cases to model or at least to relate and compare estimated lives from similar treatments arises.

It was felt that there was a need to present in a simple format a summary of the data of the key aspects that contribute to what is intrinsically valuable in a treatment. Generically, it can be considered that many aspects will or may contribute to the quality and durability of a flexible pavement treatment such as the following;

- Quantity of binder,
- Aging characteristics of the binder used in treatments
- Elastic characteristics of binder,
- Strain energy at break of the binder,
- Types of additives (none, polymer, rubber, others),
- Mix stiffness (if applicable)

2.6 Effect of Amount of Binder on treatment life

A preliminary summary research allowed the determination of the effective binder content available for each of the treatment as presented in Table 2. Some of the numbers were obtained from the MTAG reports while others were based on author’s experience and they were submitted for review to the Pavement Preservation task Group (PPTG). In this table, the average values of the amounts of binder were used in the treatments; while for emulsions, the residual binder content was used. It was also considered the use of tack coats add to the binder content available to each treatment.

Clearly one important aspect is also thickness of the treatment as it provides some indication of the degree of protection the treatment provides to the underlying layer and to itself.

Table 2 - Maintenance Treatment Thickness and Asphalt Content (Gallons per Square Yard) or Percent Asphalt in the Mix



Maintenance Treatment	Thickness of seal layer inch	Overall thickness including chips & mix inch	Asphalt/Oil G/sq. yd on surface	Overall Asphalt/Oil G/sq. yd on surface includes tack	Mix Percent asphalt by weight of aggregate
HMA Crack sealing	0.10	0.10	0.59	0.59	
HMA Crack filling	0.03	0.03	0.27	0.27	
Fog seals	0.01	0.01	0.07	0.07	
Rejuvenator seals	0.01	0.01	0.07	0.07	
Scrub seals	0.19	0.19	0.30	0.30	
Slurry Seals	0.19	0.19	0.30	0.30	
REAS slurry seal	0.19	0.19	0.30	0.30	
Micro-Surfacing	0.01	0.19	0.30	0.37	
PME chip seals	0.03	0.37	0.27	0.27	
PMA chip seals	0.03	0.37	0.27	0.27	
AR chip seals	0.10	0.37	0.59	0.59	
Cape seals AR (slurry) 1/2 inch	0.10	0.56	0.55	0.85	
Cape Seals AR (micro) 3/4 inch	0.10	0.85	0.55	0.97	
Conventional HMA, 1 inch	0.01	1.18	0.05	0.78	5.00
OGAC, 1 inch	0.01	1.18	0.05	0.81	6.00
PBA HMA, 1 inch	0.01	1.18	0.05	0.78	5.00
RAC-G, 1 inch	0.01	1.18	0.05	0.86	5.50
RAC-O , 1 inch	0.01	1.18	0.05	0.84	6.20
RAC-O (HB), 1 inch	0.01	1.18	0.05	1.12	8.50
BWC-Open, 3/4 inch	0.02	0.75	0.11	0.60	6.20
BWC-Gap, 3/4 inch	0.02	0.75	0.11	0.62	5.50
BWC-RAC-G, 3/4 inch	0.02	0.75	0.11	0.62	5.50
BWC-RAC-O, 3/4 inch	0.02	0.75	0.11	0.60	6.20

2.7 Type of Binder

Several types of binder are available for use in the various treatments. The quality of binder has been defined many different ways, such as resistance to aging, elastic recovery, stiffness and other. Clearly aging resistance is an important aspect, but specifications today are such that all binders show similar values by aging in the Rolling Thin Film Oven (RTFO) and Pressure Aging Vessel (PAV). One key aspect contributing to the longevity of a surface treatment, beyond binder quantity, is its capability to take strain and not to break. Limited data is available for many binders regarding the strain energy at the break point and as such the conclusions and numbers included in this section should be revised when more data is collected. However, Kaloush and others (Kaloush 2002, Kaloush 2003, Zborowski 2006) have reported data comparing the strain energy at the breaking point, for asphalt rubber (AR) binder and conventional binders. Also, relating this information to the fact that AR is known to take 5 times the strain (Green et.al. 1977) before breaking, and the results of four point flexural fatigue test where usually the ratio between fatigue live at the same strain level is 1 to 10 between conventional and AR binder mixes and 1 to 3 for polymer modified mixes in this study (Sousa 2000, 2003, 2006), the following ratios were adopted as shown in Table 3 (again subjected to further analysis).

Table 3 - Ratios of Strain Energy at Break

Binder type	RATIO OF STRAIN ENERGY AT BREAK OF MIXES (OR BINDER)
Conventional	1
Polymer/Other Modified Binder	1.5
Asphalt Rubber	5

2.8 Treatment Performance Capacity

To bring into a single parameter several of the key aspects related to the performance of a treatment in the previous report (Sousa 2007), the authors developed a conceptual measure of treatment effectiveness called the TREATMENT PERFORMANCE CAPACITY (TPC) and it is defined as follows;

"TREATMENT PERFORMANCE CAPACITY= (BINDER CONTENT PER METER SQUARE - LITER/M2) * (STRAIN ENERGY AT FRAILURE ratio) * THICKNESS OF TREATMENT (mm)"

Obviously a fog seal with a regular emulsion will have a much smaller number in terms of TPC than an AR-CHIP SEAL simply because it has less binder. Also an asphalt rubber treatment will show a better CAPACITY number (even if with the same binder content) because has a better STRAIN ENERGY AT FAILURE then regular binder.

The concept that this index is trying to capture is simple... more binder is better... better binder is also better… and thicker treatment is better in all cases in generic terms. Based upon these assumptions, **Error! Reference source not found.** was developed. Clearly having a binder that ages less is better, but this factor may be compounded or confounded with more binder which also promotes less aging.

A treatment with a **high performance capacity,** when placed under heavy traffic over a badly cracked pavement, can see that capacity being "drained" quite fast as compared when it is placed over a low traffic non-cracked pavement. Obviously a treatment with a **low performance capacity** will last even less under the same scenarios. **The TPC is inherent to each treatment. How long it takes to "consume" that capacity depends on the circumstances where the treatment is applied.**

Table 4 – Treatment Performance Capacity for several treatments used in California (mm.l/m2)



Treatment	TREATMENT PERFORMANCE CAPACITY
HMA Crack sealing	6.25
HMA Crack filling	0.81
Fog seals	0.08
Rejuvenator seals	0.08
Scrub seals	6.41
Slurry Seals	9.62
REAS slurry seal	32.06
Micro-Surfacing	8.08
PME chip seals	17.81
PMA chip seals	11.88
AR chip seals	128.25
Cape seals (slurry)	274.31
Cape Seals (micro)	473.00
Conventional HMA (30mm)	89.26
OGAC (30 mm)	92.12
PBA HMA (30mm)	89.26
RAC-G (30 mm)	487.78
RAC-O (30 mm)	474.90
RAC-O (HB) (30mm)	639.48
BWC-Open (19 mm)	78.31
BWC-GAP (19 mm)	80.17
BWC-RAC-G (19 mm)	267.24
BWC-RAC-O (19 mm)	261.04

2.9 Chapter Summary

This chapter has been included in this report as an extension of the work performed by Sousa 2007. In its essence introduces the concept that treatment lives are depended on traffic levels (as expressed by the TI), pavement condition (as explained by percent cracking level), weather effects explained by the region defined by the PG grade and some intrinsic qualities of the binder. These intrinsic qualities have been captured, for the mot part, by the TPC of the binder.

3 COST EFFECTIVENESS OF TREATMENTS

Cost effectiveness is defined in this report as a measure of the cost of the treatment in relation to its performance.

Given each treatment has a TPC; it is possible to couple this with the cost of the treatments and determine the cost effectiveness of each treatments. Each year CALTRANS establishes a budget for all maintenance treatments. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that one of the goals would be to maximize the TPC purchased each year. Some treatments should be more effective than others in a given situation. Table 5 presents typical costs of the various treatments (per square yard) provided by PPTG as a function of the size of the job.

Table 5– Average Price per square yard for treatments in California.



Aug 11 2007	AVERAGE		
	PRICE		
Maintenance Treatment	USD/sq. yd		
	Small	Medium	Large
HMA Crack sealing (10% - 15% cracked)	0.83	0.525	0.375
HMA Crack filling (10% - 15% cracked)	0.78	0.475	0.325
Fog seals	0.30	0.225	0.15
Rejuvenator seals	0.50	0.35	0.2
Scrub seals	2.15	2.15	2.15
Slurry Seals	2.25	2.1	1.8
REAS slurry seal	2.80	2.2	2
Micro-Surfacing	2.65	2.5	2.4
PME chip seals	3.25	2.5	1.9
PMA chip seals	3.25	2.5	2
AR chip seals	4.63	4.375	4.15
Cape seals AR (slurry) 1/2 inch	6.50	6.25	6
Cape Seals AR (micro) 3/4 inch	6.90	6.75	6.5
Conventional HMA, 1.2 inch	12.00	10	8
OGAC, 1.2 inch	12.00	10	8
PBA HMA, 1.2 inch	14.00	12	10
RAC-G, 1.2 inch	14.00	12	10
RAC-O , 1.2 inch	14.00	12	10
RAC-O (HB), 1 inch	15.00	13	11
BWC-Open, 3/4 inch	14.00	12	10
BWC-Gap, 3/4 inch	14.00	12	10
BWC-RAC-G, 3/4 inch	14.00	12	10
BWC-RAC-O, 3/4 inch	14.00	12	10

It has already been determined in the previous report (Sousa 2007), that there is a very good correlation (at times higher then 80%) between the TPC and expected treatment lives. Based on the above information, the cost effectiveness (TPC/$) of each treatment was determined by dividing the treatment's TPC by its cost. In Figure 5, these values, for all treatments, can be compared. It can be observed that there is a very wide range of cost effectiveness of treatments. Some are as low as **0.25** while some are close to **70.**

These values could be used as a criterion to help CALTRANS select its maintenance strategies. What this data is basically suggesting is that treatments with low TPC/$ should only be used in very special situations. Otherwise, other treatments can be purchased that are more cost effective. The data also indicates that generally the most cost effective treatments follow the concept... more binder is better... better binder is also better… and thicker treatment is better in all cases in generic terms. Asphalt rubber products generally have the best TPC/$ because they fit the general concept and associated underlying qualities to resist cracking and water intrusion.



Figure 5 – Cost effectiveness, measured in TPC/$, for California treatments function of job size.

Depending on what are the current maintenance strategies of CALTRANS, it appears that by maximizing treatments with asphalt rubber the potential for long term savings or increase pavement performance is very high.

Data are needed to determine what are the current allocation of money for each type of treatment, or what percentage of area is covered with each kind of treatment each year and the annual maintenance budget of Caltrans so that a more informed determination, quantifying the costs effectiveness of alternative maintenance strategies, can be made.

4 MODELING THE EFFECT OF TPC ON TREATMENT LIFE

Data from the Appendix A of the (Sousa 2007) report was used to further investigate the effect ot TPC in the life of a treatment.

4.1 General Effect of TPC on Treatment Life

From the analyis of the data presented in Figure 6, Figure 7 and Figure 8 for Coastal and Valley, Mountain and Desert regions respectively, it can be observed that the effect of TPC appears to drive the life of a pavement preservation treatment. For a given set of conditions, treatments with higher TPC appear to outperform in general those with lower TPC.



Figure 6 - Influence of TPC on Treatment Life for Coastal and Valley Regions



Figure 7 - Influence of TPC on Treatment Life for Mountain Region



Figure 8 - Influence of TPC on Treatment Life for Desert Region

4.2 Effect of Temperature

Treatment life is also strongly affected by environment. After several trials, it was determined that the temperature that best explained the observed effect was the difference between the weighted mean monthly air temperature (Shell 1985) and the minimum air temperature. Appendix B shows Shell procedure for computing the weighted mean annual air temperature and computed values for selected California cities. It is noteworthy to mention that in a totally unrelated project, the reflective cracking study done for the Rubber Pavements Association, Sousa also identified the difference in temperatures as having strong influence in the reflective cracking life of overlays (Sousa, 2001). Analysis of all temperature data as presented in Appendix B is summarized in Table 4.

It makes sense that as this temperature difference widens it indicates more overall tension (stress and strain) in the surface layers which leads to increase in the likelihood of reflective cracking.

Table 4 - Average Temperatures for the regions in California



	A	B	C	D	B-D	C-D
REGION	Maximum Air Temp. °C	Maximum 7 Day Average Air Temp. °C	**Mean** Annual Air Temp. °C (Shell Design)	**Minimum** Air Temp. °C	Max 7 DayAve - Min Air °C	RCT (Mean-Min) °C
Valley	38.8	35.3	16.2	-10.0	45.3	26.2
Coastal	38.1	32.7	17.3	-5.7	38.4	23.0
CV	38.5	34.0	16.8	-7.9	41.9	24.6
Mountain	36.1	33.0	11.2	-30.7	63.7	41.9
Desert	46.9	44.7	24.8	-9.1	53.8	33.9

For model calibration, the average of the temperatures and temperature differences (RCT) of Valley and Coastal regions shown in Table 4 were grouped together as the CV statistics since they are so similar.

4.3 Model Determination and Parameters

The statistical analysis used to develop the model to fit the treatment life results was performed using the *Nonlinear estimation* option of the *STATISTICA for Windows* software by Professor Jorge Pais, from the University of Minho, Portugal. This option allows the user to define a *specified regression* equation which is fitted in the existing data. The use of a suitable estimation method, in the case the *Rosenbrock and quasi-Newton estimation method* produced a precise estimation of the model parameters.

The model developed was based on the fact that the Treatment Life (LIFE) of a given pavement condition can be correlated with the TPC by a logarithmic equation:

$$LIFE = K1 \times \log(TPC) + \mathrm{K}2\,. \qquad [1]$$

The inclusion of the other independent variables (Temperature, PC, and TI), is applied in the K1 and K2 coefficients of the logarithmic equation.

Thus, the difficult job of this task is the finding of the equations which best define the influence of Reflective Cracking Temperature (RCT), Percent Cracking, Traffic Index in the logarithmic equation. Among the known equations, the parabolic seems to be the best which produced an interesting fit of the existing data, resulting in the following model:

$$LIFE = K1 \times \log(TPC) + \mathrm{K}2 \qquad [2]$$

Where:

$$K1 = \prod_{i=1}^{3}\left(a_{i1} + a_{i2} \times X_i + a_{i3} \times X_i^2\right) \qquad [3]$$

$$K2 = \prod_{i=1}^{3}\left(\mathrm{b}_{i1} + \mathrm{b}_{i2} \times X_i + \mathrm{b}_{i3} \times X_i^2\right) \qquad [4]$$

Where: aij and bij are coefficients given in Table 5.

Variables X are defined in Table 6.

Table 5 - Statistical coefficients for the life model (Equation 2 and 3) [R^2=0.844]

i	a_{i1}	a_{i2}	a_{i1}	b_{i2}	b_{i3}	b_{i3}
1	-1.029E+02	3.826E+00	-5.381E-02	-1.269E+02	-8.601E-01	3.199E-02
2	3.223E-02	-1.646E-03	3.354E-05	-8.063E-01	6.716E-02	-2.350E-03
3	-1.708E+00	9.926E-03	1.342E-03	7.147E-02	-3.076E-03	7.195E-05

Table 6 - Variables defining the pavement conditions in equation 2 and 3

i	X_I	*Minimum*	*Maximum*
1	RCT - Temperature defined by: Air Mean Monthly – Minimum Air (ºC)	20	45
2	PC – Percent Cracking	0	18
3	TI – Traffic Index	3	15

All variables show statistical significance and the correlation of the model is 0.84 (see Figure 9).



Figure 9 – Best fit between expert estimated treatment life and corresponding estimations from statistical model

Based on this new model, the expected analytically derived treatment lives of the four California regions is shown in Table 7 through Table 10. It can be observed that the values predicted for Costal and Valley are slighly different but valy more from Mountain and Desert regions due to temperature effects.

Table 7 – Model estimated treatment lives for Coastal Region (years) as a function of traffic and % cracking.



	Treatment Lives for Coastal Region (PG 64-10)								
	TI								
	5			8.50			13		
	Pavement Condition (cracking)								
Treatment	0	5	15	0	5	15	0	5	15
HMA Crack sealing	7.9	5.4	3.3	7.0	4.8	2.9	6.1	4.2	2.6
HMA Crack filling	5.9	3.8	2.4	5.1	3.3	2.1	4.4	2.9	1.8
Fog seals	3.5	2.0	1.3	2.9	1.6	1.0	2.4	1.4	0.9
Rejuvenator seals	3.5	2.0	1.3	2.9	1.6	1.0	2.4	1.4	0.9
Scrub seals	7.9	5.4	3.3	7.0	4.8	3.0	6.1	4.2	2.6
Slurry Seals	8.3	5.7	3.5	7.4	5.1	3.1	6.4	4.4	2.7
REAS slurry seal	9.5	6.6	4.1	8.5	5.9	3.7	7.4	5.2	3.2
Micro-Surfacing	8.1	5.6	3.4	7.2	5.0	3.1	6.3	4.3	2.7
PME chip seals	8.9	6.2	3.8	8.0	5.5	3.4	6.9	4.8	3.0
PMA chip seals	8.5	5.9	3.6	7.6	5.2	3.2	6.6	4.6	2.8
AR chip seals	10.8	7.7	4.7	9.8	6.9	4.3	8.6	6.1	3.7
AR Cape seals (slurry) 1/2in.	11.6	8.2	5.1	10.5	7.5	4.6	9.2	6.6	4.0
AR Cape Seals (micro) 3/4 in	12.1	8.7	5.3	11.0	7.9	4.8	9.6	6.9	4.2
Conventional HMA (30mm)	10.7	7.5	4.6	9.6	6.8	4.2	8.4	6.0	3.7
OGAC (30 mm)	10.7	7.6	4.6	9.6	6.8	4.2	8.4	6.0	3.7
PBA HMA (30mm)	10.7	7.5	4.6	9.6	6.8	4.2	8.4	6.0	3.7
RAC-G (30 mm)	12.3	8.8	5.4	11.2	8.0	4.9	9.8	7.0	4.3
RAC-O (30 mm)	12.3	8.8	5.4	11.2	8.0	4.9	9.8	7.0	4.3
RAC-O (HB) (30 mm)	12.6	9.0	5.5	11.4	8.2	5.0	10.0	7.2	4.4
BWC-Open (19 mm)	10.4	7.3	4.5	9.3	6.6	4.0	8.1	5.8	3.5
BWC-GAP (19 mm)	10.4	7.3	4.5	9.4	6.6	4.1	8.2	5.8	3.5
BWC-RAC-G (19 mm)	11.6	8.2	5.0	10.5	7.5	4.6	9.2	6.5	4.0
BWC-RAC-O (19 mm)	11.5	8.2	5.0	10.4	7.4	4.6	9.1	6.5	4.0

Table 8 - – Model estimated treatment lives for Valley Region (years) as a function of traffic and % cracking.

	Treatment Lives for Valley Region (PG 64-16)								
	TI								
	5			8.50			13		
	Pavement Condition (cracking)								
Treatment	0	5	15	0	5	15	0	5	15
HMA Crack sealing	**7.6**	**5.2**	**3.2**	**6.7**	**4.6**	**2.8**	**5.9**	**4.0**	**2.5**
HMA Crack filling	**5.8**	**3.8**	**2.3**	**5.0**	**3.3**	**2.0**	**4.3**	**2.8**	**1.7**
Fog seals	**3.6**	**2.1**	**1.3**	**3.0**	**1.7**	**1.1**	**2.5**	**1.4**	**0.9**
Rejuvenator seals	**3.6**	**2.1**	**1.3**	**3.0**	**1.7**	**1.1**	**2.5**	**1.4**	**0.9**
Scrub seals	**7.6**	**5.2**	**3.2**	**6.8**	**4.6**	**2.8**	**5.9**	**4.0**	**2.5**
Slurry Seals	**8.0**	**5.5**	**3.4**	**7.1**	**4.9**	**3.0**	**6.2**	**4.3**	**2.6**
REAS slurry seal	**9.1**	**6.3**	**3.9**	**8.1**	**5.7**	**3.5**	**7.1**	**4.9**	**3.0**
Micro-Surfacing	**7.8**	**5.4**	**3.3**	**7.0**	**4.8**	**2.9**	**6.1**	**4.2**	**2.6**
PME chip seals	**8.5**	**5.9**	**3.6**	**7.6**	**5.3**	**3.3**	**6.6**	**4.6**	**2.8**
PMA chip seals	**8.2**	**5.6**	**3.5**	**7.3**	**5.0**	**3.1**	**6.3**	**4.4**	**2.7**
AR chip seals	**10.3**	**7.3**	**4.5**	**9.3**	**6.6**	**4.0**	**8.1**	**5.7**	**3.5**
AR Cape seals (slurry)	**11.0**	**7.8**	**4.8**	**9.9**	**7.1**	**4.3**	**8.7**	**6.2**	**3.8**
AR Cape Seals (micro) 3/4	**11.5**	**8.2**	**5.0**	**10.4**	**7.4**	**4.6**	**9.1**	**6.5**	**4.0**
Conventional HMA (30mm)	**10.2**	**7.2**	**4.4**	**9.2**	**6.5**	**4.0**	**8.0**	**5.6**	**3.5**
OGAC (30 mm)	**10.2**	**7.2**	**4.4**	**9.2**	**6.5**	**4.0**	**8.0**	**5.7**	**3.5**
PBA HMA (30mm)	**10.2**	**7.2**	**4.4**	**9.2**	**6.5**	**4.0**	**8.0**	**5.6**	**3.5**
RAC-G (30 mm)	**11.7**	**8.3**	**5.1**	**10.6**	**7.6**	**4.6**	**9.3**	**6.6**	**4.1**
RAC-O (30 mm)	**11.7**	**8.3**	**5.1**	**10.6**	**7.5**	**4.6**	**9.2**	**6.6**	**4.0**
RAC-O (HB) (30 mm)	**11.9**	**8.5**	**5.2**	**10.8**	**7.7**	**4.7**	**9.5**	**6.8**	**4.2**
BWC-Open (19 mm)	**9.9**	**6.9**	**4.3**	**8.9**	**6.3**	**3.8**	**7.8**	**5.5**	**3.4**
BWC-GAP (19 mm)	**9.9**	**7.0**	**4.3**	**8.9**	**6.3**	**3.8**	**7.8**	**5.5**	**3.4**
BWC-RAC-G (19 mm)	**11.0**	**7.8**	**4.8**	**9.9**	**7.1**	**4.3**	**8.7**	**6.2**	**3.8**
BWC-RAC-O (19 mm)	**11.0**	**7.8**	**4.8**	**9.9**	**7.0**	**4.3**	**8.7**	**6.2**	**3.8**

Table 9 - Model estimated treatment lives for Mountain Region (years) as a function of traffic and % cracking.



	Treatment Lives for Mountain Region (PG 64-28)								
	TI								
	5			8.50			13		
	Pavement Condition (cracking)								
Treatment	0	5	15	0	5	15	0	5	15
HMA Crack sealing	**6.5**	**4.5**	**2.7**	**5.8**	**4.0**	**2.4**	**5.0**	**3.5**	**2.1**
HMA Crack filling	**4.8**	**3.1**	**1.9**	**4.2**	**2.7**	**1.7**	**3.6**	**2.4**	**1.5**
Fog seals	**2.8**	**1.6**	**1.0**	**2.3**	**1.3**	**0.8**	**1.9**	**1.1**	**0.7**
Rejuvenator seals	**2.8**	**1.6**	**1.0**	**2.3**	**1.3**	**0.8**	**1.9**	**1.1**	**0.7**
Scrub seals	**6.6**	**4.5**	**2.8**	**5.8**	**4.0**	**2.5**	**5.1**	**3.5**	**2.1**
Slurry Seals	**6.9**	**4.7**	**2.9**	**6.1**	**4.2**	**2.6**	**5.3**	**3.7**	**2.3**
REAS slurry seal	**7.9**	**5.5**	**3.4**	**7.1**	**5.0**	**3.1**	**6.2**	**4.3**	**2.7**
Micro-Surfacing	**6.7**	**4.6**	**2.8**	**6.0**	**4.1**	**2.5**	**5.2**	**3.6**	**2.2**
PME chip seals	**7.4**	**5.1**	**3.2**	**6.6**	**4.6**	**2.8**	**5.8**	**4.0**	**2.5**
PMA chip seals	**7.1**	**4.9**	**3.0**	**6.3**	**4.4**	**2.7**	**5.5**	**3.8**	**2.3**
AR chip seals	**9.1**	**6.4**	**3.9**	**8.2**	**5.8**	**3.6**	**7.2**	**5.1**	**3.1**
AR Cape seals (slurry)	**9.7**	**6.9**	**4.2**	**8.8**	**6.3**	**3.8**	**7.7**	**5.5**	**3.4**
AR Cape Seals (micro) 3/4	**10.2**	**7.3**	**4.5**	**9.2**	**6.6**	**4.1**	**8.1**	**5.8**	**3.5**
Conventional HMA (30mm)	**8.9**	**6.3**	**3.9**	**8.1**	**5.7**	**3.5**	**7.0**	**5.0**	**3.1**
OGAC (30 mm)	**9.0**	**6.3**	**3.9**	**8.1**	**5.7**	**3.5**	**7.1**	**5.0**	**3.1**
PBA HMA (30mm)	**8.9**	**6.3**	**3.9**	**8.1**	**5.7**	**3.5**	**7.0**	**5.0**	**3.1**
RAC-G (30 mm)	**10.4**	**7.4**	**4.5**	**9.4**	**6.7**	**4.1**	**8.2**	**5.9**	**3.6**
RAC-O (30 mm)	**10.3**	**7.4**	**4.5**	**9.4**	**6.7**	**4.1**	**8.2**	**5.9**	**3.6**
RAC-O (HB) (30 mm)	**10.6**	**7.6**	**4.6**	**9.6**	**6.9**	**4.2**	**8.4**	**6.1**	**3.7**
BWC-Open (19 mm)	**8.7**	**6.1**	**3.7**	**7.8**	**5.5**	**3.4**	**6.8**	**4.8**	**3.0**
BWC-GAP (19 mm)	**8.7**	**6.1**	**3.8**	**7.8**	**5.5**	**3.4**	**6.8**	**4.8**	**3.0**
BWC-RAC-G (19 mm)	**9.7**	**6.9**	**4.2**	**8.8**	**6.3**	**3.8**	**7.7**	**5.5**	**3.4**
BWC-RAC-O (19 mm)	**9.7**	**6.9**	**4.2**	**8.8**	**6.3**	**3.8**	**7.7**	**5.5**	**3.4**

Table 10 - Model estimated treatment lives for Desert Region (years) as a function of traffic and % cracking.



	Treatment Lives for Desert Region (PG 70-10)								
	TI								
	5			8.50			13		
	Pavement Condition (cracking)								
Treatment	0	5	15	0	5	15	0	5	15
HMA Crack sealing	**7.0**	**4.8**	**2.9**	**6.2**	**4.2**	**2.6**	**5.4**	**3.7**	**2.3**
HMA Crack filling	**5.4**	**3.5**	**2.2**	**4.7**	**3.1**	**1.9**	**4.1**	**2.6**	**1.6**
Fog seals	**3.5**	**2.1**	**1.3**	**2.9**	**1.7**	**1.1**	**2.5**	**1.4**	**0.9**
Rejuvenator seals	**3.5**	**2.1**	**1.3**	**2.9**	**1.7**	**1.1**	**2.5**	**1.4**	**0.9**
Scrub seals	**7.0**	**4.8**	**3.0**	**6.3**	**4.3**	**2.6**	**5.4**	**3.7**	**2.3**
Slurry Seals	**7.4**	**5.0**	**3.1**	**6.6**	**4.5**	**2.8**	**5.7**	**3.9**	**2.4**
REAS slurry seal	**8.3**	**5.8**	**3.6**	**7.5**	**5.2**	**3.2**	**6.5**	**4.5**	**2.8**
Micro-Surfacing	**7.2**	**4.9**	**3.0**	**6.4**	**4.4**	**2.7**	**5.6**	**3.8**	**2.4**
PME chip seals	**7.9**	**5.4**	**3.3**	**7.0**	**4.9**	**3.0**	**6.1**	**4.2**	**2.6**
PMA chip seals	**7.5**	**5.2**	**3.2**	**6.7**	**4.6**	**2.8**	**5.8**	**4.0**	**2.5**
AR chip seals	**9.4**	**6.6**	**4.1**	**8.5**	**6.0**	**3.7**	**7.4**	**5.2**	**3.2**
AR Cape seals (slurry)	**10.0**	**7.1**	**4.4**	**9.1**	**6.4**	**3.9**	**7.9**	**5.6**	**3.4**
AR Cape Seals (micro) 3/4	**10.5**	**7.4**	**4.6**	**9.5**	**6.7**	**4.1**	**8.3**	**5.9**	**3.6**
Conventional HMA (30mm)	**9.3**	**6.5**	**4.0**	**8.4**	**5.9**	**3.6**	**7.3**	**5.1**	**3.2**
OGAC (30 mm)	**9.3**	**6.5**	**4.0**	**8.4**	**5.9**	**3.6**	**7.3**	**5.2**	**3.2**
PBA HMA (30mm)	**9.3**	**6.5**	**4.0**	**8.4**	**5.9**	**3.6**	**7.3**	**5.1**	**3.2**
RAC-G (30 mm)	**10.6**	**7.6**	**4.6**	**9.6**	**6.9**	**4.2**	**8.4**	**6.0**	**3.7**
RAC-O (30 mm)	**10.6**	**7.6**	**4.6**	**9.6**	**6.9**	**4.2**	**8.4**	**6.0**	**3.7**
RAC-O (HB) (30 mm)	**10.9**	**7.7**	**4.7**	**9.8**	**7.0**	**4.3**	**8.6**	**6.2**	**3.8**
BWC-Open (19 mm)	**9.0**	**6.3**	**3.9**	**8.1**	**5.7**	**3.5**	**7.1**	**5.0**	**3.1**
BWC-GAP (19 mm)	**9.1**	**6.3**	**3.9**	**8.1**	**5.7**	**3.5**	**7.1**	**5.0**	**3.1**
BWC-RAC-G (19 mm)	**10.0**	**7.1**	**4.3**	**9.0**	**6.4**	**3.9**	**7.9**	**5.6**	**3.4**
BWC-RAC-O (19 mm)	**10.0**	**7.1**	**4.3**	**9.0**	**6.4**	**3.9**	**7.9**	**5.6**	**3.4**

5 PAVEMENT LIFE EXTENTION

Table 11 is reprinted from the previous report (Sousa 2007). It was derived by considering the following criteria:

1) a GOOD PAVEMENT with no cracks will last 12 years
2) a 100% waterproof treatment at any time will bring the moduli of the base and subbase back to its moduli when the pavement did not have any cracks

Table 11 - Increase in Treatment Structural Life due to Treatment in Years.

AC thickness (in.)	Condition	Pavement		Pavement layer moduli (MPa)				Fatigue of the asphalt				Na	Annual Traffic (ESALs)	Remaining Life (DO NOTHING) (years)	Increase in ESAL over the DO NOTHING at the corresponding cracking level and waterproofing capability	Increase in pavement Life due to treatment (years)	Total Life after treatment (years) assuming treatment last this long
		AC	AB	AC Layer (ν = 0.35)	AC material (ν = 0.35)	AB (ν = 0.35)	SUB (ν = 0.40)	ε_t	Vb	VFB	Shell						
		(m)						$*10e^{-6}$	(%)	(%)							
3	Good (0% cracks)	0.076	0.229	7710	7710	182	142	**184.2**	11.0	68.8	9.59E+05	**9.59E+05**	**7.99E+04**	12.00			
3	Fair (5% cracks)	0.076	0.229	6480	7710	166	132	**210.2**	11.0	68.8	4.96E+05	**4.96E+05**		6.20			
3	Poor (18% cracks)	0.076	0.229	3590	7710	149	124	**294.0**	11.0	68.8	9.26E+04	**9.26E+04**		1.16			
3	Fair with 100% water proof treatment	0.076	0.229	6480	7710	182	142	**201.2**	11.0	68.8	6.17E+05	**6.17E+05**			1.21E+05	1.52	7.72
3	Poor with 100% waterproof treatment	0.076	0.229	3590	7710	182	142	**263.8**	11.0	68.8	1.59E+05	**1.59E+05**			6.66E+04	0.83	1.99
3	Poor with 50% waterproof treatment	0.076	0.229	3590	7710	166	132	**277.8**	11.0	68.8	1.23E+05	**1.23E+05**			3.03E+04	0.38	1.54
3	Fair with 50% waterproof treament	0.076	0.229								\						
4	Good (0% cracks)	0.102	0.236	3870	3870	288	136	**173.9**	11.0	68.8	4.42E+06	**4.42E+06**	**3.69E+05**	12.00			
4	Fair (5% cracks)	0.102	0.236	3350	3870	230	128	**207.3**	11.0	68.8	1.84E+06	**1.84E+06**		4.99			
4	Poor (18% cracks)	0.102	0.236	2110	3870	175	124	**289.5**	11.0	68.8	3.46E+05	**3.46E+05**		0.94			
4	Fair with 100% water proof treatment	0.102	0.236	3350	3870	288	136	**184.3**	11.0	68.8	3.31E+06	**3.31E+06**			1.47E+06	3.99	8.98
4	Poor with 100% waterproof treatment	0.102	0.236	2110	3870	288	136	**216.8**	11.0	68.8	1.47E+06	**1.47E+06**			1.12E+06	3.05	3.98
4	Poor with 50% waterproof treatment	0.102	0.236	2110	3870	230	128	**249.3**	11.0	68.8	7.31E+05	**7.31E+05**			3.85E+05	1.04	1.98
4	Fair with 50% waterproof treament	0.102	0.236	3350	3870	259	132	**195.1**	11.0	68.8	2.49E+06	**2.49E+06**			6.51E+05	1.77	6.75
6	Good (0% cracks)	0.152	0.254	2940	2940	270	161	**147.8**	11.0	68.8	1.64E+07	**1.64E+07**	**1.36E+06**	12.00			
6	Fair (5% cracks)	0.152	0.254	2850	2940	217	142	**165.8**	11.0	68.8	9.21E+06	**9.21E+06**		6.76			
6	Poor (18% cracks)	0.152	0.254	1640	2940	165	135	**246.0**	11.0	68.8	1.28E+06	**1.28E+06**		0.94			
6	Fair with 100% water proof treatment	0.152	0.254	2850	2940	270	161	**150.0**	11.0	68.8	1.52E+07	**1.52E+07**			5.98E+06	4.39	11.15
6	Poor with 100% waterproof treatment	0.152	0.254	1640	2940	270	161	**191.0**	11.0	68.8	4.54E+06	**4.54E+06**			3.26E+06	2.39	3.33
6	Poor with 50% waterproof treatment	0.152	0.254	1640	2940	217	142	**215.9**	11.0	68.8	2.46E+06	**2.46E+06**			1.18E+06	0.86	1.80
6	Fair with 50% waterproof treament	0.152	0.254	2850	2940	244	152	**157.3**	11.0	68.8	1.20E+07	**1.20E+07**			2.77E+06	2.03	8.79
8	Good (0% cracks)	0.203	0.273	2640	2640	249	184	**120.0**	11.0	68.8	5.63E+07	**5.63E+07**	**4.69E+06**	12.00			
8	Fair (5% cracks)	0.203	0.273	2250	2640	174	175	**149.8**	11.0	68.8	1.86E+07	**1.86E+07**		3.96			
8	Poor (18% cracks)	0.203	0.273	1410	2640	125	170	**219.4**	11.0	68.8	2.75E+06	**2.75E+06**		0.59			
8	Fair with 100% water proof treatment	0.203	0.273	2250	2640	249	184	**130.2**	11.0	68.8	3.74E+07	**3.74E+07**			1.89E+07	4.02	7.98
8	Poor with 100% waterproof treatment	0.203	0.273	1410	2640	249	184	**160.8**	11.0	68.8	1.30E+07	**1.30E+07**			1.03E+07	2.19	2.78
8	Poor with 50% waterproof treatment	0.203	0.273	1410	2640	174	175	**191.6**	11.0	68.8	5.42E+06	**5.42E+06**			2.67E+06	0.57	1.16
8	Fair with 50% waterproof treament	0.203	0.273	2250	2640	212	180	**139.1**	11.0	68.8	2.69E+07	**2.69E+07**			8.33E+06	1.78	5.73
10	Good (0% cracks)	0.254	0.292	2760	2760	174	181	**102.2**	11.0	68.8	1.16E+08	**1.16E+08**	**9.66E+06**	12.00			
10	Fair (5% cracks)	0.254	0.292	2560	2760	119	160	**119.5**	11.0	68.8	5.30E+07	**5.30E+07**		5.49			
10	Poor (18% cracks)	0.254	0.292	1570	2760	94	150	**176.1**	11.0	68.8	7.63E+06	**7.63E+06**		0.79			
10	Fair with 100% water proof treatment	0.254	0.292	2560	2760	174	181	**107.1**	11.0	68.8	9.17E+07	**9.17E+07**			3.87E+07	4.00	9.49
10	Poor with 100% waterproof treatment	0.254	0.292	1570	2760	174	181	**142.8**	11.0	68.8	2.18E+07	**2.18E+07**			1.41E+07	1.46	2.25
10	Poor with 50% waterproof treatment	0.254	0.292	1570	2760	119	160	**163.7**	11.0	68.8	1.10E+07	**1.10E+07**			3.36E+06	0.35	1.14
10	Fair with 50% waterproof treament	0.254	0.292	2560	2760	147	171	**112.7**	11.0	68.8	7.11E+07	**7.11E+07**			1.81E+07	1.87	7.36

Figure 10 and 11 are also an extension of previous findings (Sousa 2007). They are based upon the concept that it is possible to determine the Increase in Number of Years a treatment will provide a function of waterproofing. This waterproofing capability of the treatment is a function of the level of cracking at the time of the treatment.



Figure 10 – Pavement Remaining Structural Life vs. Cracking Level (from Sousa 2007) based only on data at 4.5 and 18% cracking



Figure 11 - Pavement Remaining Structural Life vs. Cracking Level (based on data at 4.5% and 18% cracking and assumptions regarding remaining life at 0% cracking)

In the previous report (Sousa 2007), it was assumed that Figure 10 was correct. However, after further consideration it was recognized that Figure 11 may be a better representation of the actual pavement performance.

Considering Figure 11, it was assumed that GOOD PAVEMENTS with 0 % cracks will last 12 years. So the DO NOTHING line with 0% water proofing must connect to corresponding point in the graph (i.e. 0% cracking has 12 years remaining life).

Alternatively, one could consider that REMAINING LIFE FOR A GOOD PAVEMENT (with 0% cracks) is independent of the treatment applied to it in such early stages There is some rational for it. For example, if you do place a AR chip seal over a brand new pavement do you expect its structural life to change dramatically or if an extra coat of paint is applied on a house just after construction will that extra coat increase the life of the paint job?

The implications for the two sets of data interpretation lead to two very different pavement preservation strategies. Considering the first data interpretation, as shown in Figure 10, the structural life extension is shown in Figure 12.



Figure 12 – Structural Life Extension vs. Percent Cracking at Time of Treatment (based on data at 4.5% and 18.5% and extrapolated to 0%)

If one accepts the second data interpretation, as shown in Figure 11, then the data for its structural life extension can be seen in Figure 13.



Figure 13 - Structural Life Extension vs. Percent Cracking at Time of Treatment (based on data at 4.5% and 18.5% and assumptions at 0%)

To investigate which interpretation is closer to reality, additional deflection data was obtained from the ADOT data base (FWD 2002). In this case, Falling Weight Deflectometer (FWD) deflections were obtained from pavements with 1 and 2% cracking (see data APPENDIX A).

This data was also backcalculated to determine equivalent layer moduli for the average FWD measurements at those crack levels. Using the same approach as described in the previous report (Sousa 2007) the remaining life and life extensions for the 0, 50 and 100% water proofing scenarios was determined. The pavement remaining life was now determined as presenting in Table 12 and in Figure 14.



Figure 14 - Pavement Remaining Structural Life vs. Cracking Level (based on data at 1, 2, 4.5% and 18% cracking)

Table 12- Determination of remaining Life function of cracking level (0, 1, 2, 4.5 and 19.5%)

AC Thickness (in.)	% Waterproof	Pavement structure		Pavement layer moduli (MPa)				Fatigue of the asphalt layers				% Cracking	Annual Traffic ESALs	Remaining Life (years) DO NOTHING	Increase ESALS over the DO NOTHING for each treatment level	Increase Life Due to Treatment (years)	Total Life Due to Treatment (assuming it lasts this long)
		AC	AB	AC	AB	SUB	AC	ε_t	Vb	VFB							
		(m)		(ν = 0.35)	(ν = 0.35)	(ν = 0.40)	stiffness (MPa)	*10e^{-6}	(%)	(%)	Shell						
3		0.076	0.229	7710	182	142	7710	**184.2**	11	69	9.59E+05	0	79945.1	12			
3		0.076	0.229	7710	180	135	7710	**186.0**	11.0	68.8	9.14E+05	1.0		11.4			
3		0.076	0.229	6750	180	132	7710	**199.6**	11.0	68.8	6.42E+05	2.0		8.0			
3		0.076	0.229	6480	166	132	7710	**210.2**	11.0	68.8	4.96E+05	4.4		6.2			
3		0.076	0.229	3590	149	124	7710	**294.0**	11.0	68.8	9.26E+04	19.4		1.2			
3	100	0.076	0.229	7710	182	142	7710	**184.2**	11.0	68.8	9.59E+05	1.0			45529.9	0.6	12.0
3	100	0.076	0.229	6750	182	142	7710	**197.2**	11.0	68.8	6.82E+05	2.0			40037.2	0.5	8.5
3	100	0.076	0.229	6480	182	142	7710	**201.2**	11.0	68.8	6.17E+05	4.4			121250.3	1.5	7.7
3	100	0.076	0.229	3590	182	142	7710	**263.8**	11.0	68.8	1.59E+05	19.4			66622.5	0.8	2.0
3	50	0.076	0.229	7710	181	139	7710	**185.0**	11.0	68.8	9.39E+05	1.0			24966.1	0.3	11.7
3	50	0.076	0.229	6750	181	137	7710	**198.4**	11.0	68.8	6.62E+05	2.0			19655.4	0.2	8.3
3	50	0.076	0.229	6480	174	137	7710	**205.6**	11.0	68.8	5.54E+05	4.4			57995.5	0.7	6.9
3	50	0.076	0.229	3590	166	133	7710	**277.6**	11.0	68.8	1.23E+05	19.4			30786.8	0.4	1.5
4		0.102	0.236	3870	288	136	3870	**173.9**	11.0	68.8	4.42E+06	0.0	368604.1	12			
4		0.102	0.236	3850	286	135	3870	**175.0**	11.0	68.8	4.29E+06	1.0		11.6			
4		0.102	0.236	3800	271	130	3870	**181.3**	11.0	68.8	3.59E+06	2.0		9.7			
4		0.102	0.236	3350	230	128	3870	**207.3**	11.0	68.8	1.84E+06	4.4		5.0			
4		0.102	0.236	2110	175	124	3870	**289.5**	11.0	68.8	3.46E+05	19.4		0.9			
4	100	0.102	0.236	3850	288	136	3870	**174.3**	11.0	68.8	4.37E+06	1.0			86757.7	0.2	11.9
4	100	0.102	0.236	3800	288	136	3870	**175.2**	11.0	68.8	4.26E+06	2.0			670273.5	1.8	11.6
4	100	0.102	0.236	3350	288	136	3870	**184.3**	11.0	68.8	3.31E+06	4.4			1470793.9	4.0	9.0
4	100	0.102	0.236	2110	288	136	3870	**216.8**	11.0	68.8	1.47E+06	19.4			1122796.8	3.0	4.0
4	50	0.102	0.236	3850	287	136	3870	**174.6**	11.0	68.8	4.34E+06	1.0			49320.2	0.1	11.8
4	50	0.102	0.236	3800	280	133	3870	**178.0**	11.0	68.8	3.94E+06	2.0			345474.8	0.9	10.7
4	50	0.102	0.236	3350	259	132	3870	**195.1**	11.0	68.8	2.49E+06	4.4			651022.5	1.8	6.8
4	50	0.102	0.236	2110	232	130	3870	**247.8**	11.0	68.8	7.53E+05	19.4			406955.7	1.1	2.0
6		0.152	0.254	2940	270	161	2940	**147.8**	11.0	68.8	1.64E+07	0	1363140.1	12			
6		0.152	0.254	2940	270	159	2940	**147.9**	11.0	68.8	1.63E+07	1.0		12.0			
6		0.152	0.254	2940	270	154	2940	**148.4**	11.0	68.8	1.60E+07	2.0		11.8			
6		0.152	0.254	2850	217	142	2940	**165.8**	11.0	68.8	9.21E+06	4.4		6.8			
6		0.152	0.254	1640	165	135	2940	**246.0**	11.0	68.8	1.28E+06	19.4		0.9			
6	100	0.152	0.254	2940	270	161	2940	**147.8**	11.0	68.8	1.64E+07	1.0			55225.1	0.0	12.0
6	100	0.152	0.254	2940	270	161	2940	**147.8**	11.0	68.8	1.64E+07	2.0			328017.7	0.2	12.0
6	100	0.152	0.254	2850	270	161	2940	**150.0**	11.0	68.8	1.52E+07	4.4			5984666.3	4.4	11.1
6	100	0.152	0.254	1640	270	161	2940	**191.0**	11.0	68.8	4.54E+06	19.4			3258039.6	2.4	3.3
6	50	0.152	0.254	2940	270	160	2940	**147.9**	11.0	68.8	1.63E+07	1.0			0.0	0.0	12.0
6	50	0.152	0.254	2940	270	158	2940	**148.0**	11.0	68.8	1.62E+07	2.0			217791.1	0.2	11.9
6	50	0.152	0.254	2850	244	152	2940	**157.3**	11.0	68.8	1.20E+07	4.4			2771693.6	2.0	8.8
6	50	0.152	0.254	1640	218	147	2940	**214.9**	11.0	68.8	2.52E+06	19.4			1236551.5	0.9	1.8
8		0.203	0.273	2640	249	187	2640	120	11.0	68.8	5.67E+07	0	4728971.6	12			
8		0.203	0.273	2610	240	187	2640	**122.2**	11.0	68.8	5.14E+07	1.0		10.9			
8		0.203	0.273	2600	239	186	2640	**122.7**	11.0	68.8	5.04E+07	2.0		10.6			
8		0.203	0.273	2250	174	175	2640	**149.8**	11.0	68.8	1.86E+07	4.4		3.9			
8		0.203	0.273	1410	125	170	2640	**219.4**	11.0	68.8	2.75E+06	19.4		0.6			
8	100	0.203	0.273	2610	249	187	2640	**120.5**	11.0	68.8	5.51E+07	1.0			3728734.3	0.8	11.7
8	100	0.203	0.273	2600	249	187	2640	**120.8**	11.0	68.8	5.44E+07	2.0			4086268.7	0.9	11.5
8	100	0.203	0.273	2250	249	184	2640	**130.2**	11.0	68.8	3.74E+07	4.4			18862259.0	4.0	7.9
8	100	0.203	0.273	1410	249	184	2640	**160.8**	11.0	68.8	1.30E+07	19.4			10271183.4	2.2	2.8
8	50	0.203	0.273	2610	245	187	2640	**121.3**	11.0	68.8	5.33E+07	1.0			1934961.2	0.4	11.3
8	50	0.203	0.273	2600	244	187	2640	**121.7**	11.0	68.8	5.25E+07	2.0			2102934.3	0.4	11.1
8	50	0.203	0.273	2250	212	181	2640	**139.0**	11.0	68.8	2.70E+07	4.4			8423152.7	1.8	5.7
8	50	0.203	0.273	1410	187	179	2640	**185.3**	11.0	68.8	6.41E+06	19.4			3655415.5	0.8	1.4
10		0.254	0.292	2760	174	181	2760	102	11.0	68.8	1.16E+08	0	9661555.2	12			
10		0.254	0.292	2760	173	181	2760	**102.3**	11.0	68.8	1.15E+08	1.0		11.9			
10		0.254	0.292	2760	172	180	2760	**102.5**	11.0	68.8	1.14E+08	2.0		11.8			
10		0.254	0.292	2560	119	160	2760	**119.5**	11.0	68.8	5.30E+07	4.4		5.5			
10		0.254	0.292	1570	94	150	2760	**176.1**	11.0	68.8	7.63E+06	19.4		0.8			
10	100	0.254	0.292	2760	174	181	2760	**102.2**	11.0	68.8	1.16E+08	1.0			565553.4	0.1	12.0
10	100	0.254	0.292	2760	174	181	2760	**102.2**	11.0	68.8	1.16E+08	2.0			1686760.7	0.2	12.0
10	100	0.254	0.292	2560	174	181	2760	**107.1**	11.0	68.8	9.17E+07	4.4			38690221.2	4.0	9.5
10	100	0.254	0.292	1570	174	181	2760	**142.8**	11.0	68.8	2.18E+07	19.4			14136325.8	1.5	2.3
10	50	0.254	0.292	2760	174	181	2760	**102.2**	11.0	68.8	1.16E+08	1.0			565553.4	0.1	12.0
10	50	0.254	0.292	2760	173	181	2760	**102.3**	11.0	68.8	1.15E+08	2.0			1121207.3	0.1	11.9
10	50	0.254	0.292	2560	147	171	2760	**112.7**	11.0	68.8	7.11E+07	4.4			18054097.9	1.9	7.4
10	50	0.254	0.292	1570	134	166	2760	**157.3**	11.0	68.8	1.34E+07	19.4			5789840.4	0.6	1.4

From this data the Pavement Life Extension for treatments with 50% and 100% waterproofing capability preservation treatments can be derived and is presented in Figure 15.



Figure 15 - Structural Life Extension vs. Percent Cracking at Time of Treatment (based on data at 1, 2, 4.5% and 18.5%)

This graph implies that there is no reason for applying much in the way of preservation treatments in the early stages of a pavement life (before cracks develop) but rather there is really an optimum time for pavement preservation which is between the time the pavement is 4 to 8 % cracked, depending on whether it is a 50% waterproof treatment or a 100% waterproofing treatment.

Actually, this finding is to some extent based on the function selected to best fit the data. If the data are studied more closely, it can be observed that a big drop in remaining life is reached when the pavement exhibits 2 to 5% cracking. This is probably due to the fact that at this stage the pavement structure weakens from the water “damaging” the base and subbase (See Figure 16).



Figure 16 - Pavement Remaining Structural Life vs. Cracking Level (based on data at 1, 2, 4.5% and 18% cracking) (no best fit)

Looking at the FWD deflections (Figure 17) of the seventh geophone, DF7, which is indicative of subgrade support (or lack of support), reveals some of the damage process as a function of cracking level.



Figure 17 - FWD deflections for DF7

It can clearly be observed that most of the lost of strength occurs when the cracking increases from 1 or 2% to about 4.5%. After that the rate of loss of strength with cracking level is not as severe. This is probably due to the fact that when cracking levels reach this magnitude water penetration to some degree reaches levels that do affect the base, subbase and subgrade moduli. As such this is the crucial point where pavement preservation strategies must intervene by sealing the pavement to prevent water intrusion. Conversely, Figure 18 (based on actual values from the analyses not best fit computations) demonstrates the huge benefits of making sure that the pavement is sealed before cracking levels reach 3 to 5%.

This analysis also indicates that the pavement should be sealed as cracking develops. Structural cracks will indeed occur as a pavement ages. Pavement preservation treatments, in order to extend structural pavement life must act to prevent water from penetrating the pavement as soon as 1 to 2% cracking is reached. Pavement preservation may be delayed but should not be delayed beyond 3 to 5 % cracking because by then weaker foundations have accelerated the loss of the pavement flexural fatigue life due to increased deformability (deflection) of the structure of the pavement.



Figure 18 - Structural Life Increase function of cracking level for several pavement thicknesses (using 100% waterproof treatments).

It was interesting to note that the Structural life increase for all pavement thickness as very similar (function of % cracking at time of treatment for all asphalt concrete layer thickness except for the 3 in. section. To investigate the reason of this “abnormality”, the evolution of back calculated AC layer moduli function of pavement thickness of investigated and presented in Figure 19. It is noticeable that the back calculated moduli for the 3 in thick pavements is much higher then for all other pavements. This probably due to the fact that in a thin AC layer the effect of aging on the top layer has a much marked effect on the overall back calculated layer moduli then in the thicker pavements. As such, it is speculated that due to aging of the relatively thin asphalt concrete layer some capability of recuperating structural life is lost. It is well recognized that stiffer binders exhibit in general lower fatigue lives at the same strain levels then softer binder.



Figure 19 - Effect of thickness on the back calculated moduli of the AC layer

After taking special care to minimize all back calculation errors the FWD values for the 8 and 10 inch thick pavements was redone and the layer moduli evolution with cracking levels investigated. The variations are presented in Figure 20 and Figure 21. It is clear the as cracking evolves the layer moduli of subbase and base decrease. A sharper decrease can be observed between 2 and 5% cracking levels. It should be noted that even thicker pavements exhibit aging with time. As can be observed in Figure 20, before the AC layer moduli is severely decreased by more extensive cracking it increases due to aging, until the cracking levels reaches 2%. This further validates the findings that preventive maintenance activities should take place before cracking levels reach 1 or 2% levels to maximize structural pavement life extension.



Figure 20 - Variation of sub base and base moduli of 8 in. and 10 in. AC thick pavements with percent cracking levels.



Figure 21 - Variation of AC moduli with cracking level on 8 in. and 10 in. AC thick pavements.

6 AGING AND HEALING OF TREATMENTS

6.1 Effect on reflective cracking

The model proposed by the authors was initially developed for RPA and presented at the Transportation Research Board annual meeting in 2002 (Sousa 2002). The model was also evaluated for the determination of the life of each treatment and as such to give a closer insight to life extension taking into consideration reflective cracking through the treatment.

An example of the proposed approach is described below. Figure 22 describes the relationships obtained for overlay of an average GOOD pavement for a TI of 12 in the Coastal Region. For the same zone it was computed the TPC of four treatments that were used to develop those relationships in Arizona namely 1 and 2 inch thick layers of conventional mix, and 1 and 2 inch thick layers of Asphalt Rubber concrete (gap graded). For those four hypothetical overlays the TPC versus the number of predicted traffic for 10% cracking was related and presented in Figure 23. It should be noted the good relationship between TPC and number of reflective cracking ESALS.

It was initially expected that this correlation would yield, directly for each region and each pavement condition the number of ESALs a treatment would resist in reflective cracking.



Region	COASTAL			
Pavement Condition	GOOD			
ESAL	1.16E+08		TI=	12.047
Pavement	10	in		

% cracking at end of design life (min. >1 max 10)	**10**
Maximum 7 Day Ave Air Temp (C) =	**32.7**
Mean Monthly Air Temp (C) (Shell Design) =	**17.3**
Minimum Air Temp (C)=	**-5.7**
AC Cracked Moduli (MPa) (@Tmm) =	**2560**
AC Cracked Thickness (cm) =	**25.4**
Granular Layer Moduli (MPa) =	**119**
Granular Layer Thickness (cm) =	**29.2**
Subgrade Moduli (MPa) =	**160**

OVERLAY DESIGN CHART
REFLECTIVE CRACKING
developed by:
Dr. Jorge B. Sousa, Prof. Jorge Pais, Dr. Rachid Saim, George Way, Dick Stubstad

jmbsousa@aol.com
(contact for further info)
Dr. Jorge B. Sousa
(note: enter values on column C)

Figure 22 - Reflective Cracking predictions for GOOD pavements in COASTAL region



Figure 23 - Relationship for TPC and Reflective Cracking ESALS to reach 10% cracking on a COASTAL zone over a GOOD pavement

However, as the model was extended to all the treatments (with TPC varying from 0.07 to 600), it was realized that the predictions were EXTREMELY off the mark. It was found that the lower the TPC the higher the “error” (see Figure 24). Note that the pink line in this figure is the same line as in Figure 23. Two major conclusions can be derived from the graph. Life of the treatment is a function of TPC. However the capability to resist reflective cracking for lower TPC treatments is in reality much higher than predicted by the reflective cracking model. However, that difference is a direct function of the TPC. This is attributed to the fact that the model is not able to predict the healing factor of treatments that last a short time (in actual years) but that can take higher number of ESALS while they do not age and become brittle.



Figure 24 - Comparison between the "actual" treatment lives as per expert opinion and predictions given by the reflective cracking model function of TPC

Actually it was found that there was a very clear relationship, for each region and for each pavement type, between the value predicted using the TPC determined reflective cracking ESALS and the ESALS computed using the number of years the experts expected a treatment to last.

As it can be observed in Figure 25 the reflective cracking model relationship is undeniable. Actually if this relationship is used the reflective cracking model, developed for RPA, can actually be used to predict the reflective cracking life of each treatment based only on its TPC, location and type of pavement where it is being placed. This empirical-mechanistic approach could replace the statistical model present in this report (see Chapter 4.3) with a similar R^2. The kind of predictive capability of this model is presented in Figure 26.



Figure 25 - Relationship between Ratio to Actual ESALS and Reflective Cracking ESALS predicted based on the TPC of the treatments



Figure 26 - Comparison between actual (expert based) and predicted (model and TPC) years a treatment lasts

What this exercise clearly demonstrates is that low TPC treatments actually do not have much resistance to reflective cracking. However, experts and observation clearly show that in the first year or so they do perform. What is probably happening is that during the early stages, cracks develop but heal rapidly. As soon as the material ages, the healing capability is lost and cracks develop. The model developed for RPA does not take account healing/aging and therefore it does not capture this aspect however it appears to be very directly correlated with the TPC of a treatment.

The evidence that the life of thinner pavements is affected by something else other then just traffic is clearly recognized in Figure 27. This relationship was obtained from averages of 41514 FWD tests done over many types of pavements designed by ADOT. Pavements thinner then 5 in. (in AC layer thickness) follow design criteria that can take clearly much less traffic then project values (dashed blue line) from design criteria followed for thicker pavements. Yet all pavements are expect to last (if they have 0% cracking) about 12 years. As such this is a clear recognition (evidence) that aging affects severely the expected life of thinner pavements (and by inference with magnified effects of treatments with lower TPC).



Figure 27 - Traffic Levels function of AC layer thickness in pavements designed by ADOT

6.2 Effect of binder aging and TPC on cracking levels

To investigate further into the effect of aging on the cracking tendency of preservation treatments, cracking data was extracted from both the Arizona Pavement Management system (PMS 2004) and from various Arizona studies (Way 1976, 1979, 1980). Considerable data from Arizona cracking inventory and research studies was analyzed and normalized and is summarized in Figure 28 and Table 1Table 13. All the various treatments were normalized to have an ending percent cracking of roughly 12 percent. The treatments include flush coat, seal coat. ACFC (no rubber), 1 inch HMA, 2 inch HMA, AR SAM, ARFC and ARAC at 1.7 inch. The data for AR SAM was stopped at 12 years because virtually all of the projects were overlaid by then. They were overlaid not because they needed the overlay due to cracking but rather to improve the ride or as part of planned reconstruction.

Table 13 - Cracking and Viscosity function of age (years) for several treatments shows cracking levels and binder viscosity levels function of age. Most of the data comes from the reflective cracking study Minnetonka East back in the 1970's (Way 1976, 1979) as well as other ADOT asphalt aging (Way 1980) and seal coat studies (Peters 1979) and City of Phoenix asphalt rubber research (Schnormeier 1985). For each treatment cracking type and curve, there is a corresponding estimate of the 77 °F (25 °C) micro-viscosity in mega-poise. These measurements were taken with the Shell sliding plate micro-viscometer. Micro-viscosity is a measure of the binder stiffness in the temperature zone that is critical for cracking of all types to occur, reflective and fatigue. Figure 28 presents the general trend of cracking propagation with time. To further understand the cause effects related to crack propagation the general trend relating cracking levels with binder viscosity is presented in Figure 29. A R^2 of 64% is indicative of the importance of aging binder viscosity in cracking levels.

Table 13 - Cracking and Viscosity function of age (years) for several treatments



Treatment	Age Years	Asphalt Viscosity 77 F Mega Poise	% Crk	Treatment	Age Years	Asphalt Viscosity 77 F Mega Poise	% Crk
Flush/Fog Emulsion 0.1	1	65	12	AR SAM	1	0.6	0
				(with rubber)	2	0.75	0
Seal Coat .375 in	1	28	2		3	0.88	0.6
	2	35	7		4	1.16	1.5
	3	60	9		5	0.78	2.2
	4	65	11.5		6	0.91	2.5
					7	1	2.9
0.5" OGFC (No rubber)	1	7	3		8	1.1	3.2
	2	10	5		9	1.2	3.5
	3	20	7.6		10	1.3	3.8
	4	21	9.2		11	1.4	4
	5	23	12		12	1.5	4.5
1" HMA	1	7	1				
	2	10	3.5	ARFC	1	0.6	0
	3	20	4.6	(with rubber)	2	0.75	0
	4	21	6		3	0.88	0
	5	23	8		4	1.16	1
	6	25	12		5	0.78	1
					6	0.91	2
2" HMA	1	7	0.6		7	1	2
	2	10	2		8	1.1	2.5
	3	20	4		9	1.2	2.6
	4	21	5		10	1.3	3
	5	23	7		11	1.4	3.5
	6	25	8		12	1.5	4
	7	33	9		13	1.6	4
	8	60	11		14	1.7	4
	9	90	12.4		15	1.8	4.5

To more directly demonstrate the effect of aging on cracking level the crack rate was determined as a function of the binder viscosity (see Figure 30). So as the treatment ages, it looses the ability to heal and cracks develop allowing water to penetrate into the pavement.



Figure 28 - Cracking levels for several treatments (note data is for several zones and traffic levels)



Figure 29 - Effect of Binder Viscosity on % cracking



Figure 30 - Rate of % Cracking increase per year function of Binder Viscosity

The rate of aging is to some extent dependent on TPC as expected. Higher TPC treatments lead to lower rates of aging as shown in Table 14 - TPC for several treatments in the aging study. It is noteworthy to mention that AR binders have lower rates of aging for the same TPC levels as shown in Figure 31.

Table 14 - TPC for several treatments in the aging study

	Thickness Inch	Binder Gals/SY	Thickness (mm)	Binder L/m2	Strain at Break Ratio	TPC mm.l/m2	Max Air Temp F	Shell MMAT F	Min Air Temp F	Traffic (*1000)/year
Flush Coat**	0.01	0.070	0.245	0.317	1.000	0.078	116.0	69.0	8.0	2179.9
Seal Coat	0.38	0.270	9.188	1.222	1.000	11.231	107.5	65.8	0.8	243.3
ACFC no rubber**	0.50	0.440	12.250	1.992	1.000	24.402	99.3	54.9	-11.2	244.5
HMA 1 Inch	1.00	0.780	24.500	3.531	1.000	86.517	114.1	69.0	6.0	219.0
HMA 2 Inch	2.00	1.510	49.000	6.836	1.000	334.975	112.2	69.1	4.4	352.0
AR SAM	0.38	0.590	9.310	2.671	5.000	124.340	106.0	63.8	-0.6	1392.0
ARFC	0.50	1.120	12.250	5.071	5.000	310.573	110.2	67.6	2.1	3361.1
ARAC	1.7	1.800	41.650	8.149	5.000	1697.057	104.0	59.9	-6.5	1,737.5



Figure 31 - Average Rate of Aging function of the TPC of each treatment

Figure 32 clearly shows that even for those unrelated treatments (from Figure 28); the TPC plays a major role in the cracking rate increase. This rate was determined as the slope of the best-fit line, in Figure 28, for each treatment up to 10% cracking. Table 14 shows that the weather conditions were these treatments were placed is quite different, even the traffic over them is different, yet, TPC is capable of capturing most of the performance behavior (about 76%).



Figure 32 - Effect of TPC on the rate of cracking (% cracking/year) for several treatments

6.3 Chapter Summary

The research presented in this chapter identifies that reflective cracking through treatments (and treatment life) are controlled by three major factors (beyond the cracking level of the underlying pavement) namely:

a) Traffic levels,
b) Treatment capability to resists aging (function of the region where it is placed),
c) Treatment capability to heal once a crack has developed (function of the region where it is placed).

It was interesting to identify that one of the major aspects controlling factors b) and c) is the TPC of a treatment. To a high TPC corresponds generally high resistance to aging.

7 DISCUSSION

7.1 Strain Energy at Break Ratio

One of the components that have helped the TPC to capture rather well the treatment performance is the Strain Energy at Break Ratio. The rational for its introduction into the formula was to bring in the "quality" of the binder that cannot be explained only by its quantity. Several have in the past developed many methods to measure these properties using the Dynamic Shear Rheometer (DSR), Elastic Recovery, Aging methods and many others. Strains at failure and Total fracture energy have been used and the later appears to be better correlated with performance. Table 15 shows some examples of Strain of Energy at Break Ratio for various mixes. Clearly not all conventional binder has identical values amongst each other and clearly not all Polymer Modified Binder (PMB) are identical in this regard either. However the data indicted that some difference in the "quality" of the binders are affecting performance.

Table 15 - TPC for several treatments in the aging study



Static Creep Test

Mix	Target AV%	Temp °F	σ_3 (psi)	σ_d (psi)	Axial Flow Time (sec)	Axial Strain @ failure (%)	Creep Modulus @ failure (psi)	Inst. Compl. D_O x10^{-3} (1/psi)	Intercept a x10^{-3} (1/psi)	Slope m	STRAIN AT FAILURE RATIO
AR-ACFC	18	130	10	120	2	4.24	2,550	0.076	0.207	0.55	6.42
ARAC	11	130	10	120	3	6.15	1,570	0.08	0.27	0.82	9.32
SRB PG64-22	7	130	10	120	8	0.66	21,780	0.008	0.014	0.59	1.00

THERMAL CRACKING

Mixture	Va %	AC %	Rubber %	Vbeff %	VMA %	VFA %	Pen 25 Tank 0.1mm	Total Fracture Energy [kN*mm]		STRAIN AT FAILURE RATIO
								Meas.	Predict.	
Salt River 3/4" PG64-22	7	4.2	0	9	15.998	56.286	54	26.5	25.6	1.89
Salt River Base PG64-22	7.5	4.55	0	8.58	16.073	53.401	54	26.3	27.6	
Bidahouchi 3/4" PG64-22	6.6	4.9	0	9.89	16.468	60.044	54	28	25.3	
Bidahouchi Base PG64-22	7.8	5.25	0	10.46	18.274	57.242	54	33.1	33.6	
								Average	28.0	
Salt River 3/4" PG70-10	7.2	4.3	0	9	16.216	55.517	26	15.6	14.6	1.00
Salt River Base PG70-10	7.3	4.25	0	8.89	16.162	54.997	26	11.1	15	
								Average	14.8	
Two Guns ARAC	8.1	7	20	12.52	20.618	60.715	34.7	77.4	77.6	5.24
Two Guns AR-ACFC	17.9	9.4	20	15.11	33.005	45.766	34.7	57.3	57.3	3.87

In Figure 33 data from flexural fatigue tests indicate the AR binder does perform better, at least by a factor of 10 (Kaloush 2003). Clearly the amount of binder can capture some of those increases but not all of it. Also as shown in Figure 34 the data from ALF-FHWA (Qi 2006) and the analyses reported in Sousa 2006 demonstrated that AR binder out performed all other binders in the study in terms of reflective cracking resistance.



Figure 33 – Comparison of flexural fatigue lives under strain control for conventional and asphalt rubber binder.



Figure 34 – ALF-FHWA data relating number of passes and cracking level for three pavements with the same thickness (10 cm control- conventional, 10cm SBSLGL4- PMB binder and CR-AZL1- with 5 cm of asphalt rubber binder over 5 cm of conventional.

Figure 35 shows the strain energy at break ratio of 5 for AR binder against 1.5 for PMB and 1 for conventional in order to help address the “extra quality” question.



Figure 35 - Influence of TPC on Treatment Life for Coastal and Valley Regions for POOR Pavements

Table 16 – Influence of the value of the STRAIN ENERGY AT BREAK RATIO (SEBR) on the R^2 of the correlation between predicted life and expert estimated life (for POOR pavements in the COAST and VALLEY Regions.

	A	B	C	D
SEBR - AR	**5.0**	**5.0**	**5.0**	**5.0**
SEBR - PMB	**1.5**	**2.0**	**5.0**	**1.0**
TI<6	0.7386	0.7157	0.6233	0.7650
12>TI>6	0.5792	0.5588	0.4795	0.6033
TI>12	0.5035	0.4800	0.3948	0.5329

It can be observed in Table 16 (see columns A, B and C) that with the assumption that the Strain Energy at Break Ratio is 1.5 the R^2 is higher than if it is assumed to be 2 or even 5. Interestingly enough for the case of POOR pavements a better R^2 is obtained with the assumption that the strain energy at break ratio is 1.0 (just like the one used for conventional materials). This appears to indicate that over badly cracked pavement PMB materials do not out-perform conventional materials. Nevertheless for the overall maximization for the R^2 of the regression a value of 1.5 was found to yield better correlations when FAIR and GOOD pavements are considered and thus was selected for this study. In addition the ALF experiment (Qi 2006) also showed some cracking improvement with a PMB albeit it was not as great as that for AR.

7.2 Optimum time for treatments

The determination of the optimum time for overlay is essential when it is necessary to optimize budgets while guarantying acceptable levels of road serviceability. In this report it was determined that treatments with high Treatment Performance Capacity (TPC) will outperform treatments with low TPC in every pavement condition and region. Treatments with low TPC will not last as long and will age faster and thus be more prone to cracking and consequently allow more water to penetrate into the pavement structure (if it is already cracked).

As a pavement is subjected to traffic and aging factors it will go through several stages of degradation. During a first phase the pavement structure is intact and the pavement surface layers will age (become more hard and brittle) while consuming fatigue life. As the fatigue life reaches the end of its capability the pavement sections with lower compaction levels and least amounts of asphalt will first exhibit cracking which will allow water to penetrate into the pavement. As the water penetrates into the asphalt structure, aggregate base and subgrade it will reduce their moduli and will cause a “softer” foundation to induce higher strains in the asphalt layers leading to accelerated fatigue damage.

If at any point in time a treatment is placed on the pavement to the extent it is waterproofing it will lead to reversal of the softening of the base and subbase thus promoting a more sound foundation and leading to an increase in pavement life. However the treatment itself is subject to aging. As it ages and is subjected to traffic loads it will also crack and allow water to penetrate again into the base and subgrade.

If a treatment that has a low TPC is applied while the pavement has no cracks it is likely that it will age before it can perform its function. It is possible to conceive that a treatment with a low TPC may last 3 years and that treatment is placed when a pavement as 0% or 1% cracked. By the time the pavement develops 4 or 5% cracks (when water does start to seriously affect subgrade moduli) the treatment is already wasted (too brittle and prone to cracking to actually be effective.) In this sense this was a premature treatment.

However if a high TPC treatment is placed instead it may be able to function well at the outset of the cracking thus providing some water penetration mitigation and extending the pavement life. In this case some of the capabilities of the treatment were “wasted” but because it was a long lasting treatment by the time the pavement needed the treatment it still had performance capacities enough left to perform most of its function.

The treatment may be placed after the pavement reaches 10 or 12% cracking. By that time structural damage has reached such an extent that even if a 100% water proof treatment is placed with high TPC there is little opportunity to recover from all the lost.

Data appear to indicate that the maximum beneficial effects of a high TPC treatment are obtained when the treatment is placed as soon as it reaches a cracking level of 1 or 2%. At the most such treatment should be placed before the pavement reaches 4 to 5 % so that the highest benefits in terms of pavement life extension can be derived. In this case a structural life extension can reach 3 years.

Low TPC treatments should be placed very close to the time the pavement reaches 3 or 4% cracking to ensure that they are at their peak of performance when they are most needed.

There is no great benefit in delaying application of treatments past 4% cracking. From that point on for each percent cracking level reached structural life extension is always less even for very high TPC treatments.

It was not possible from the available data to determine how much time it takes for a pavement at the 1 or 2% level to deteriorate to the 4 or 5% level (function of region, pavement and traffic). This clearly would help CALTRANS in the definition of trigger values to plan interventions for the years ahead. This aspect has been noted in the recommendations for further research.

Preventive maintenance strategies based on the concepts collected in this report should follow an approach similar to this:

A) Determine when a pavement reaches 1 to 2 % cracking and apply the treatment. It is noteworthy to consider that if treatment trigger values are set at higher values, (say 5%) it is very likely that by the time treatments are actually performed the pavement has already further deteriorate to 7 or 8% levels. Also at these levels the pavement structural layers experience accelerated rates of damage affecting the AC layers due to the much higher strain/deformation levels existing when the pavement is at 4 to 5% cracking levels).

B) Apply the treatment with the most cost effective TPC/$ (see Figure 5) depending on what type of road it is.

C) If delayed maintenance is require all efforts show be made so that maintenance takes place before cracking levels reach 4% (i.e. pavements should be sealed form water penetration BEFORE they reach 4 to 5% cracking levels)

7.3 Cost effectiveness of treatments

At the time of application of the treatment evaluation of the cost effectiveness of each possible and available treatment in the region should be made. The treatment selected should be the one with the highest cost effectiveness in terms of TPC/$. At this time, with the current price structure in the market, and based on the cost data provided to this project, it appears that CALTRANS should adopt a policy to use preferentially the treatments with the highest cost effectiveness in terms of TPC/$ as soon as pavement cracking levels reaches 1 to 2% levels.

8 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Conclusions

This research made clear that better treatments are those that have higher Treatment Performance Capacity (TPC), which indicates, what is intuitively known from all pavement engineers, that treatments perform better if they have more binder, are made with better binder and are thicker (i.e. more long lasting and more waterproofing).

A model was developed to relate treatment life function in terms of TPC, pavement condition, traffic level and location temperatures (actually only the reflective cracking temperature given by the difference between the Shell mean weighted average temperature and the lowest temperature representative of each region), for all asphalt based treatments. This model is able to explain the performance of 23 treatments, in 3 climatic zones, three pavement conditions levels and three traffic magnitudes (i.e. 621 observations) with only 4 variables, with a remarkably high R^2 of 0.84.

Using the TPC values for each treatment and the price of each treatment a cost effectiveness table for all treatments was developed (*simply dividing the TPC of a treatment by its cost per square yard*). Actually the concept to adopt is to start evaluating how much TPC /square yard does CALTRANS get for each 1 USD spent in a given treatment. The results indicate that there are huge differences in values between treatments currently used in California and that there **appears to exist a great opportunity for Caltrans to optimize (i.e. minimize) its annual budget by applying only treatments with highest cost-effectiveness at the correct time**.

Structural and reflective cracking analyses indicate that the optimum time to apply a treatment is when the pavement cracking levels are in the range of 1% to 2%. There are significant structural benefits (structural pavement life extension) when a pavement has a waterproofing treatment applied by the time it reaches 4 to 5% cracking. Preventive maintenance treatments, if applied at the correct time, with long lasting 100% waterproofing capabilities, can provide structural life extensions for the underlying pavement of about 4 years.

8.2 Recommendations

It is recommended that at the time of application of a treatment evaluation of the cost effectiveness of each possible and available treatment in the region should be made. It is recommended that the treatment selected should be the one with the highest cost effectiveness in terms of TPC/$. At this time, with the current price structure in the market, and based on the cost data provided to this project, it appears that CALTRANS should adopt a policy to use treatments with the highest cost effectiveness in terms of TPC/$ as soon as pavement cracking levels reach 1 or 2% levels.

Data are needed to determine what are the current allocation of money for each type of treatment, or what percentage of area is covered with each kind of treatment each year and the annual maintenance budget of Caltrans so that a more informed determination, quantifying the costs effectiveness of alternative maintenance strategies, can be made.

It is further recommended that an investigation be made and quantified, from CALTRANS data, if available, the effect of water penetrating in the pavements in the four different climatic regions in California.

It is also recommended that an investigation be made to determine the relationship between the rates of crack evolution (cracking change from 1% to 5%) as a function of the climatic region, traffic index and pavement type and or overlay.

9 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks Dr. Gary Hicks and Dr. Shakir Shatnawi for their assistance on this project. In addition, thanks go to Dr. Kamil Kaloush of Arizona State University who assisted in reviewing the project and assembling data and Dr. Jorge Pais of the University of Minho, Portugal who helped with the modeling.

10 REFERENCES

Cedergren, H.R., Arman, J.A., and O'Brien, K.H. (1973). *Development of Guidelines for the Design of Subsurface drainage Systems for Highway Pavement Structural Sections.* FHWA-RD-73-14. Federal Highway Administration, Washington, DC.

Cedergren, H.R. (1974). *Drainage of Highway and Airfield Pavements*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.

Cedergren, H.R. (1994). "America's Pavements: World's Longest Bathtubs," *Civil Engineering,* American Society of Civil Engineering, September, pp. 56-58.

Christopher, B.R. and V.C. McGuffey (1997). *NCHRP Synthesis of Highway Practice 239: Pavement Subsurface Drainage Systems.* TRB, National Research Council, Washington,

FWD, "Falling Weight Deflectometer Deflections," Arizona DOT FWD Data Base, 2002

Green, E. L. and William J. Tolonen, "The Chemical and Physical Properties of Asphalt-Rubber Mixtures," Arizona Department of Transportation, ADOT-RS-14(162), July, 1977.

Hicks, R. G. and Rob Marsh, "Pavement Preservation Sub-Group on Strategy Selection & Evaluation," Power Point Presentation, April 25, 2006.

Hveem, F. N., Lovering, W.R., and G.B. Sherman, "The Design of Seal Coats and Surface Treatments," State of California Department of Public Works Division or Highways, Materials and Research Department, 1950.

Hveem, F.N. (1950)). "WATER IN HIGHWAY SUBGRADES AND FOUNDATIONS," State of California Department of Public Works Division or Highways, Materials and Research Department, Prepared for National Research Council
American Geophysical Union, South Pacific Meeting, Sections of Hydrology and Meteorology, University of California, Davis, California, February 3 and 4, 1950.

Kaloush, K., Witczak, M., Way, G., Zborowski, A., Abojaradeh, M., and Sotil, A., "Performance Evaluation of Arizona Asphalt Rubber Mixtures Using Advanced Dynamic Material Characterization Tests", Final Report Submitted to FNF Construction and the Arizona Department of Transportation, July 2002.

Kaloush, K., Zborowski, A., Sotil, A., Abojaradeh, M., and Way G. “Material Characteristics of Asphalt Rubber Mixtures”. Proceedings Asphalt Rubber 2003 Conference, ISBN 85-903997-1-0, p129-145, Brasilia, Brazil, December 2003.

Maintenance, “Maintenance Technical Advisory Guide (TAG),” Caltrans, Office of Pavement Preservation, Division of Maintenance, October, 2003.

Irwin, L. H., “MODCOMP5,” Cornell University Local Roads Program, October, 1999.

Peters, Rowan and David Stephens, “Properties of Asphalts in Seal Coat Emulsions Field Test Status Report,” Arizona DOT, Presented at Annual Asphalt Emulsion Manufacturers Association Meeting, San Francisco, California, March 1979.

PMS, “Arizona Pavement Management System Cracking Data,” Arizona DOT, 2004.

Qi, Xicheng, Aroon Shenoy, Ghazi Al-Khateeb, Terry Arnold, Nelson Gibson, Jack Youcheff and Tom Harman, “Laboratory Characterization and Full-scale Accelerated Performance Testing of Crumb Rubber Asphalts And Other Modified Asphalt Systems,” Proceedings of the Asphalt Rubber 2006 Conference, Pages 39-65, Palm Springs, California, October 25-27, 2006, ISBN 962-405-091-0.

Schnormeier, Russell, “Fifteen-Year Pavement Condition History of Asphalt Rubber Membranes,” City of Phoenix, Arizona, 1985.

Shell, “1985 Addendum to 1978 Shell Pavement Design Manual,” Shell International Petroleum Company, Limited, London, 1985.

Sousa, Jorge, Jorge C. Pais and Rachid Saim, “The Effect of Mode of Loading on the Comparison Between Asphalt Rubber and Traditional Hot Mixes Laboratory Performance,” Proceedings of the Asphalt Rubber 2000 Conference, Pages 259-272, Vilamoura, Portugal, November 14-17, 2000, ISBN 972-95240-9-2.

Sousa, Jorge, Jorge C. Pais, Rachid Saim, George Way, and Richard N. Stubstad, “Development of a Mechanistic Overlay Design Method Based on Reflective Cracking Concepts,” Rubber Pavements Association, Tempe, Arizona, July, 2001.

Sousa, Jorge, Jorge C. Pais, George B. Way, Rachid Saim and Richard N. Stubstad, “A Mechanistic-Empirical Overlay design Method for Reflective Cracking,” Transportation Research Record 1809, TRB National Research Council, Washington D.C., 2002, pp. 209-217.

Sousa, Jorge, Jorge C. Pais and George B. Way, “A Mechanistic-Empirical Based Overlay Design Method for Reflective Cracking,” Proceedings of the Asphalt Rubber 2003 Conference, Pages 85-110, Brasilia, Brazil, December 1-4, 2003,
ISBN 85-903997-1-0.

Sousa, Jorge, George B. Way, Shakir Shatnawi and Catia Dantas, "Asphalt Rubber in New Pavement Design and Construction," Proceedings of the Asphalt Rubber 2006 Conference, Pages 67-98, Palm Springs, California, October 25-27, 2006, ISBN 962-405-091-0.

Sousa, Jorge, George B. Way, "Considerations for Estimating Pavement Treatment Lives and Pavement Life Extension on Flexible Pavement", Report for California Department of Transportation and California Pavement Preservation Center, August 22, 2007

Way, George, "Prevention of Refection Cracking in Arizona Minnetonka-East (A Case Study)," Arizona DOT, Report Number 11 HPR-1-13(224), May, 1976.

Way, George, "Prevention of Refection Cracking Minnetonka-East," Arizona DOT, Report Number 1979GWI, August, 1979.

Way, George, "Prevention of Reflective Cracking in Arizona," TRB, National Academy of Sciences, TRB, National Academy of Sciences, Transportation Research Record 756, pp. 29-32, 1980.

Way, George, "Environmental Factor Determination from In-Place Temperature and Moisture Measurements Under Arizona Pavements," Arizona DOT, Report Number FHWA/AZ 80/157, September, 1980.

Zborowski, Aleksander and Kamil E. Kaloush "Predictive Equations to Evaluate Thermal Fracture of Asphalt Rubber Mixtures", Pages 177-192, Proceedings of the Asphalt Rubber 2006 Conference, ISBN 962-405-091-0.

APPENDIX A

FWD DEFLECTIONS (Average from 41514 FWD tests recorded in ADOT data base)



Figure A-1 – Relationship between the average deflections measured by the 1st sensor of the FWD and the AC layer thickness function of pavement condition.



Figure A-2 – Relationship between the average deflections measured by the 2nd sensor of the FWD and the AC layer thickness function of pavement condition.



Figure A-3 – Relationship between the average deflections measured by the 3rd sensor of the FWD and the AC layer thickness function of pavement condition.



Figure A-4 – Relationship between the average deflections measured by the 4th sensor of the FWD and the AC layer thickness function of pavement condition.



Figure A-5 – Relationship between the average deflections measured by the 5th sensor of the FWD and the AC layer thickness function of pavement condition.



Figure A-6 – Relationship between the average deflections measured by the 6th sensor of the FWD and the AC layer thickness function of pavement condition.



Figure A-7 – Relationship between the average deflections measured by the 7th sensor of the FWD and the AC layer thickness function of pavement condition.

APPENDIX B

Temperature Determinations for each PG region in California

Shell Method for determining weighted mean annual air temperature (w-MAAT)

Variations in ambient temperature generally have no significant effect on the moduli of unbound materials but strongly influence the asphalt properties. A procedure has been developed by Shell (1) to derive, for design purposes, a "weighted"" mean annual air temperature (w-MAAT) from mean monthly air temperatures (MMAT) for a given location (climate). MMAT values are readily available from meteorological publications.

The w-MAAT is related to an effective asphalt temperature and thus an effective asphalt modulus. The term “weighted mean annual air temperature” means that the effects on design of daily and monthly variations in the temperatures in the pavement have been taken into account. These effects cannot be allowed for simply by taking the arithmetic mean temperature.

The w-MAAT is obtained from the MMAT values by means of the temperature weighting curve in Figure B-1. For each MMAT value a weighting factor is derived from this curve; and, from the arithmetic mean value of these factors, the effective MMAT or w-MAAT is derived from the same curve. Figure B-2 is used to carry out this procedure, with the resultant w-MAAT is shown on Figure B- 2. Example results for the w-MMAT and the lowest recorded temperature are shown in Table B-1 for selected California cities.

(1) Shell International Petroleum Company Limited, “Shell pavement design manual-asphalt pavements and overlays for road traffic,” 1978



Figure B-1- Shell temperature weighting curve



Table 3.3 Determination of weighted air temperature (Worksheet B)

Month	MMAT, C	Chart W: Weighting Factor	
January	8	0.21	
February	8	0.21	
March	12	0.36	
April	16	0.62	
May	19	0.93	
June	22	1.40	
July	26	2.35	
August	28	3.00	
September	22	1.40	
October	19	0.93	
November	12	0.36	
December	6	0.16	
Total of weighting factor		11.93	
Average weighting factor		11.93/12 months= About 1.0	
Chart W: w-MAAT, C at 1.0 is 19.5, about 20			
Answer w-MAAT is 20 C			

Figure B-2- Example of Shell calculation to obtain weighted mean annual air temperature w-MAAT

Table B-1- Shell w-MAAT for selected California cities

	California Temp sites	PG Grade	Low Min	Seven Day High Avg	High Max	w-MAAT
		Desert				
1	El Centro	PG70-10	-7.8	44.7	46.8	25.0
2	Blythe	PG70-10	-6.7	45.4	48.1	25.0
3	Needles	PG70-10	-6.7	45.7	48.1	29.0
4	Barstow	PG70-10	-12.2	42.0	44.4	20.0
5	Baker	PG70-10	-9.4	45.6	47.6	25.0
6	Indio	PG70-10	-10.6	44.7	46.3	25.0
7	Twentynine Palms	PG70-10	-12.2	43.6	45.9	23.0
8	Palm Springs	PG70-10	-5	45.6	47.7	25.0
9	Brawley	PG70-10	-11.7	44.7	47.2	26.0
		Coastal				
1	San Diego	PG64-10	-1.7	28.9	36.3	18.0
2	Los Angeles	PG64-10	-1.1	29.7	36.4	18.0
3	Santa Maria	PG64-10	-6.1	28.4	35.6	15.0
4	Salinas	PG64-10	-7.8	28.3	35.8	15.0
5	San Jose	PG64-10	-7.2	33.1	37.4	17.0
6	San Francisco	PG64-10	-4.4	27.8	33.0	15.0
7	Sacramento	PG64-10	-8.3	37.7	42.2	18.0
8	Fresno	PG64-10	-7.8	40.0	42.7	20.0
9	Bakersfield	PG64-10	-7.2	40.7	43.7	20.0

		Coastal				
1	San Diego	PG64-10	-1.7	28.9	36.3	18.0
2	Los Angeles	PG64-10	-1.1	29.7	36.4	18.0
3	Santa Maria	PG64-10	-6.1	28.4	35.6	15.0
4	Salinas	PG64-10	-7.8	28.3	35.8	15.0
5	San Jose	PG64-10	-7.2	33.1	37.4	17.0
6	San Francisco	PG64-10	-4.4	27.8	33.0	15.0
7	Sacramento	PG64-10	-8.3	37.7	42.2	18.0
8	Fresno	PG64-10	-7.8	40.0	42.7	20.0
9	Bakersfield	PG64-10	-7.2	40.7	43.7	20.0

APPENDIX C

Reflective Cracking Model applied for some selected regions and pavement conditions



Region	COASTAL AND VALLEY		
Pavement Condition	GOOD		
ESAL	1.16E+08	TI=	12.047
Pavement	10 in		

% cracking at end of design life (min. >1 max 10)	10
Maximum 7 Day Ave Air Temp (C) =	34.8
Mean Monthly Air Temp (C) (Shell Design) =	16.8
Minimum Air Temp (C)=	-7.9
AC Cracked Moduli (MPa) (@Tmm) =	2760
AC Cracked Thickness (cm) =	25.4
Granular Layer Moduli (MPa) =	174
Granular Layer Thickness (cm) =	29.2
Subgrade Moduli (MPa) =	181

OVERLAY DESIGN CHART
REFLECTIVE CRACKING
developed by:
Dr. Jorge B. Sousa, Prof. Jorge Pais, Dr. Rachid Saim, George Way, Dick Stubstad

jmbsousa@aol.com
(contact for further info)
Dr. Jorge B. Sousa
(note: enter values on column C)

Figure C1 - Reflective Cracking predictions for GOOD 10 in. pavements in COASTAL and Valley region



Figure C2 - Relationship for TPC and Reflective Cracking ESALS to reach 10% cracking on COASTAL and VALLEY zone over a GOOD 10 in. pavement



Figure C3 - Relationship between Ratio to Actual ESALS and Reflective Cracking ESALS predicted based on the TPC of the treatments (COSTAL VALLEY region – Good 10 in. pavement).



Figure C4 - Comparison between actual (expert based) and predicted (model and TPC) years a treatment lasts (COSTAL VALLEY Region – GOOD 10 in. pavement)



Region	COASTAL AND VALLEY		
Pavement Condition	FAIR		
ESAL	1.63E+07	TI=	9.54017
Pavement	6 in		

% cracking at end of design life (min. >1 max 10)	10
Maximum 7 Day Ave Air Temp (C) =	34.8
Mean Monthly Air Temp (C) (Shell Design) =	16.8
Minimum Air Temp (C)=	-7.9
AC Cracked Moduli (MPa) (@Tmm) =	2850
AC Cracked Thickness (cm) =	15.2
Granular Layer Moduli (MPa) =	217
Granular Layer Thickness (cm) =	25.4
Subgrade Moduli (MPa) =	142

OVERLAY DESIGN CHART
REFLECTIVE CRACKING
developed by:
Dr. Jorge B. Sousa, Prof. Jorge Pais, Dr. Rachid Saim, George Way, Dick Stubstad

jmbsousa@aol.com
(contact for further info)
Dr. Jorge B. Sousa
(note: enter values on column C)

Figure C5 - Reflective Cracking predictions for FAIR 6 in. pavements in COASTAL and Valley region



Figure C6 - Relationship for TPC and Reflective Cracking ESALS to reach 10% cracking on COASTAL and VALLEY zone over a FAIR 6 in. pavement.



Figure C7 - Relationship between Ratio to Actual ESALS and Reflective Cracking ESALS predicted based on the TPC of the treatments (COSTAL-VALLEY region –FAIR 6 in. pavement).



Figure C8 - Comparison between actual (expert based) and predicted (model and TPC) years a treatment lasts (COSTAL VALLEY Region- FAIR 6 in. pavement)



Region	DESERT			
Pavement Condition	POOR			
ESAL	9.59E+06		TI=	8.95505
Pavement	3	in		

% cracking at end of design life (min. >1 max 10)	10
Maximum 7 Day Ave Air Temp (C) =	44.7
Mean Monthly Air Temp (C) (Shell Design) =	24.8
Minimum Air Temp (C)=	-9.5
AC Cracked Moduli (MPa) (@Tmm) =	3590
AC Cracked Thickness (cm) =	7.6
Granular Layer Moduli (MPa) =	149
Granular Layer Thickness (cm) =	22.9
Subgrade Moduli (MPa) =	124

OVERLAY DESIGN CHART
REFLECTIVE CRACKING
developed by:
Dr. Jorge B. Sousa, Prof. Jorge Pais, Dr. Rachid Saim, George Way, Dick Stubstad

jmbsousa@aol.com
(contact for further info)
Dr. Jorge B. Sousa
(note: enter values on column C)

Figure C9 - Reflective Cracking predictions for POOR 3 in. pavements in DESERT region



Figure C10 - Relationship for TPC and Reflective Cracking ESALS to reach 10% cracking on DESERT region over a POOR 3 in. pavement.



Figure C11 - Relationship between Ratio to Actual ESALS and Reflective Cracking ESALS predicted based on the TPC of the treatments (DESERT region –POOR 3 in. pavement).



Figure C12 - Comparison between actual (expert based) and predicted (model and TPC) years a treatment lasts (DESERT region- POOR 3 in. pavement.