

# Experimental Feature Report

---

**Post Construction Report**  
**In-House Experimental Feature**

## **EVALUATION OF TRINIDAD LAKE ASPHALT OVERLAY PERFORMANCE**

**Contract 6441**  
**SR-16**  
**Tacoma Narrows Bridge – Eastbound**  
**MP 7.28 to 8.41**



# Experimental Feature Report

---

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |  |                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                   |  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 1. REPORT NO.<br><b>WA-RD 710.1</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |  | 2. GOVERNMENT ACCESSION NO.                         |                                                                                                                                                                          | 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NO.                                        |  |
| 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE<br><b>Evaluation of Trinidad Lake Asphalt Overlay Performance</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |  |                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                          | 5. REPORT DATE<br><b>September 2008</b>                           |  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |  |                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                          | 6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION CODE<br><b>In-House</b>                |  |
| 7. AUTHOR(S)<br><b>Mark Russell, Jeff S. Uhlmeyer, Keith Anderson and Jim Weston</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |  |                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                          | 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NO.                             |  |
| 9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS<br><b>Washington State Department of Transportation<br/>Materials Laboratory, MS-47365<br/>Olympia, WA 98504-7365</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |  |                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                          | 10. WORK UNIT NO.                                                 |  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |  |                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                          | 11. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.                                         |  |
| 12. SPONSORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS<br><b>Washington State Department of Transportation<br/>Transportation Building, MS 47372<br/>Olympia, Washington 98504-7372<br/>Project Manager: Kim Willoughby, 360-705-7978</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |  |                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                          | 13. TYPE OF REPORT AND PERIOD COVERED<br><b>Post-Construction</b> |  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |  |                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                          | 14. SPONSORING AGENCY CODE                                        |  |
| 15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |  |                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                   |  |
| 16. ABSTRACT<br><p>Construction of the new Tacoma Narrows Bridge (TNB) included a steel orthotropic bridge deck. The higher flexibility of an orthotropic deck causes pavement placed upon it to fatigue and crack more quickly than pavement placed on a normal roadway. The HMA overlay placed on the new bridge incorporated Trinidad Lake Asphalt (TLA) to help resist the stresses of an orthotropic deck. The basis of this report is to evaluate the short and long-term performance of the HMA overlay with TLA binder used on the TNB. This report provides background information on orthotropic bridge deck overlay construction practices and documents the construction of the overlay on the TNB. Annual summary reports over the next five years will document any changes in the performance of the overlay. A final report will summarize performance characteristics and future recommendations for use of this process.</p> |  |                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                   |  |
| 17. KEY WORDS<br><b>Tacoma Narrows Bridge, Trinidad Lake Asphalt, orthotropic bridge deck</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |  |                                                     | 18. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT<br><b>No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22616</b> |                                                                   |  |
| 19. SECURITY CLASSIF. (of this report)<br><b>None</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |  | 20. SECURITY CLASSIF. (of this page)<br><b>None</b> |                                                                                                                                                                          | 21. NO. OF PAGES<br><b>47</b>                                     |  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |  |                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                          | 22. PRICE                                                         |  |

## **DISCLAIMER**

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

# Experimental Feature Report

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                               |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Introduction.....                                             | 1  |
| Orthotropic Bridge Deck.....                                  | 2  |
| Pavement Properties.....                                      | 3  |
| Paving Systems .....                                          | 4  |
| Mastic Asphalt .....                                          | 4  |
| Hot Mix Asphalt .....                                         | 4  |
| Epoxy Asphalt.....                                            | 5  |
| Tacoma Narrows Bridge Overlay Design.....                     | 5  |
| Three Part Bridge Deck Waterproofing Membrane System.....     | 5  |
| Base Course .....                                             | 6  |
| Top Course.....                                               | 8  |
| Tacoma Narrow Bridge Overlay Construction .....               | 9  |
| Membrane Placement.....                                       | 9  |
| Paving Equipment.....                                         | 10 |
| Calibration Strips .....                                      | 12 |
| Calibration Strip Requirements.....                           | 12 |
| Calibration Strip Setup.....                                  | 13 |
| Calibration Strip Paving.....                                 | 14 |
| TNB HMA Paving.....                                           | 15 |
| HMA Placement.....                                            | 15 |
| Temperature Differentials.....                                | 19 |
| Compaction .....                                              | 20 |
| Testing.....                                                  | 22 |
| Gradation and Asphalt Content.....                            | 23 |
| Compaction Testing.....                                       | 24 |
| Appearance of Finished Mat.....                               | 25 |
| Streaks in Pavement.....                                      | 25 |
| Flushing.....                                                 | 26 |
| Indentations in Base Course.....                              | 27 |
| Post Paving.....                                              | 28 |
| Indentations in Completed Overlay .....                       | 28 |
| Spill at West Tower .....                                     | 29 |
| Conclusions and Recommendations .....                         | 30 |
| Overlay Construction.....                                     | 30 |
| Mix Design.....                                               | 30 |
| Density .....                                                 | 31 |
| Appearance of the Mat.....                                    | 32 |
| Construction Damage to Overlay.....                           | 32 |
| References.....                                               | 33 |
| Appendix A - Gradation and Asphalt Content Test Results ..... | 34 |
| Appendix B – Compaction Test Results.....                     | 38 |

# Experimental Feature Report

---

## LIST OF TABLES

|                                                                       |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 1. Base course gradation and asphalt content requirements. .... | 6  |
| Table 2. Base course mix design testing. ....                         | 7  |
| Table 3. Top course gradation and asphalt content requirements. ....  | 8  |
| Table 4. Roller descriptions. ....                                    | 12 |
| Table 5.. Calibration strip construction dates. ....                  | 14 |
| Table 6. Roller speeds on base course. ....                           | 21 |
| Table 7. Roller speed on top course. ....                             | 22 |
| Table 8. Base course gradation and asphalt content test results. .... | 23 |
| Table 9. Top course gradation and asphalt content test results. ....  | 24 |
| Table 10. Compaction test results. ....                               | 25 |
| Table 11. Core density results. ....                                  | 25 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

|                                                                                           |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Figure 1. Tacoma Narrows Bridge vicinity map. ....                                        | 1  |
| Figure 2 Schematic of an orthotropic deck with closed ribs. ....                          | 2  |
| Figure 3. Blastrac 2-4800 DH shotblaster. ....                                            | 9  |
| Figure 4. Steel deck after shotblasting. ....                                             | 9  |
| Figure 5. Applying acrylic based prime coat bonding layer. ....                           | 10 |
| Figure 6. Applying methyl methacrylate isolation layer. ....                              | 10 |
| Figure 7. Damage to adhesion layer. ....                                                  | 10 |
| Figure 8. Repairing adhesion layer. ....                                                  | 10 |
| Figure 9. Ingersoll-Rand/Blaw Knox PF-4410 paver. ....                                    | 11 |
| Figure 10. Terex/Cedarapids CR662RM RoadMix transfer vehicle. ....                        | 11 |
| Figure 11. Missing chains on MMK retrofit on Ingersoll-Rand Blaw-Knox PF-4410 paver. .... | 11 |
| Figure 12. Missing chains on MMK retrofit. ....                                           | 11 |
| Figure 13. Calibration strip looking south. ....                                          | 14 |
| Figure 14. Simulated orthotropic bridge deck. ....                                        | 14 |
| Figure 15. Base course paving sequence. ....                                              | 15 |
| Figure 16. Mix pickup area immediately after rolling. ....                                | 16 |
| Figure 17. Raking in mix to repair pickup area. ....                                      | 16 |
| Figure 18. Area of mix pickup after completion of rolling. ....                           | 16 |
| Figure 19. Area of mix pickup prior to the next days paving. ....                         | 16 |
| Figure 20. Applying water to prevent damage to adhesion layer. ....                       | 17 |
| Figure 21. Adhesion layer damaged by track. ....                                          | 17 |
| Figure 22. Water being removed prior to paving. ....                                      | 18 |
| Figure 23. Area removed near scupper due to water damage. ....                            | 18 |
| Figure 24. Adhesion layer repaired. ....                                                  | 18 |
| Figure 25. Repaired pavement. ....                                                        | 18 |

# Experimental Feature Report

---

|                                                                   |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Figure 26. Top course paving sequence.....                        | 19 |
| Figure 27. Temperature differential of 47°F in top course. ....   | 20 |
| Figure 28. Warmer center in base course.....                      | 20 |
| Figure 29. Mat with cooler center recorded on June 20. ....       | 20 |
| Figure 30. Mat with uniform temperature recorded on June 22. .... | 20 |
| Figure 31. Steaks in base course on lane one.....                 | 26 |
| Figure 32. Streaks in top course on lane one. ....                | 26 |
| Figure 33. Streaks in top course on lanes four and five.....      | 26 |
| Figure 34. Streak left by screed extension. ....                  | 26 |
| Figure 35. Flushing in lane one immediately after paving. ....    | 27 |
| Figure 36. Flushing in lane one several days after paving.....    | 27 |
| Figure 37. Indentation in base course left by equipment tire..... | 27 |
| Figure 38. Repairing indentation. ....                            | 27 |
| Figure 39. Tire indentation near west end. ....                   | 28 |
| Figure 40. Indentation left by Demag crane pad.....               | 28 |
| Figure 41. Indentation with crack near midspan.....               | 28 |
| Figure 42. Possible repaired area. ....                           | 28 |
| Figure 43. Solvent spill. ....                                    | 29 |
| Figure 44. Damaged pavement removed from lane 2 and 3. ....       | 29 |
| Figure 45. Repairing isolation layer.....                         | 29 |
| Figure 46. Repairing base course.....                             | 29 |
| Figure 47. Replacing top course. ....                             | 30 |
| Figure 48. Finished patch.....                                    | 30 |

## Introduction


The opening of the second Tacoma Narrows Bridge (TNB) in July of 2007 marked the use of two transportation technologies new to the State of Washington. The new bridge is the first in the state constructed with a steel orthotropic deck in place of a traditional concrete deck. Large bridges in other parts of the world routinely incorporate orthotropic decks to reduce weight and lower cost. The drawback is the higher flexibility of the steel deck causes pavement placed upon it to fatigue and crack more quickly than pavement placed on a normal roadway. This leads to the second new technology, Trinidad Lake Asphalt (TLA), which was added to the hot mix asphalt (HMA) overlay on the new bridge. TLA is a naturally occurring asphalt binder used to increase the durability and stability necessary for a pavement to withstand the stresses on an orthotropic deck. This report is part of a project to evaluate the short and long-term performance of the HMA overlay with TLA binder used on the TNB. This report provides background information on orthotropic bridge deck overlay construction practices and documents the construction of the overlay on the TNB. Annual summary reports over the next five years will document any changes in the performance of the overlay. A final report will summarize performance characteristics and future recommendations for use of this process.



**Figure 1.** Tacoma Narrows Bridge vicinity map.

## Orthotropic Bridge Deck

The word orthotropic is derived from the words orthogonal anisotropic, meaning different elastic properties in perpendicular directions. An orthotropic bridge deck is one in which a steel deck plate is supported by longitudinal ribs and transverse crossbeams (1). The different geometries of the ribs and crossbeams give the deck different flexural stiffness in the transverse and longitudinal directions making it orthotropic. Figure 1 is a schematic of a section of an orthotropic bridge deck.



**Figure 2** Schematic of an orthotropic deck with closed ribs.

The primary advantage of an orthotropic bridge deck is that it is lighter than a traditional concrete deck which reduces the total dead load carried by the rest of the structure. The reduced dead load allows the towers, cables, and other supporting members to be smaller reducing overall cost. The reduction in dead load comes at a price. Deflections due to traffic loading in the relatively thin steel deck plate are much greater than on a concrete deck. The greater deflections translate into higher strains in the pavement which leads to reduced life due to fatigue in traditional HMA overlays.



## Pavement Properties

Pavements most often used on orthotropic bridge decks can be divided into three main categories. They include mastic asphalt, HMA with a modified binder and epoxy asphalt. Regardless of the type of system used, the pavement should be designed for the following properties (2):

**Lightweight** – The pavement has to be lightweight or the primary reason for choosing an orthotropic bridge deck, lower dead load, will be negated.

**Impervious** – Water has to be kept away from the steel deck in order to prevent corrosion.

**Stable** – The pavement needs to be able to resist plastic flow in order to prevent rutting and shoving.

**Flexible** – The pavement must be flexible in order to resist fatigue cracking due to the higher strains inherent with an orthotropic deck.

**Skid Resistant** – Enough friction must be provided by the pavement to prevent skidding.

**Durable** – The pavement must be able to stand up to the environmental conditions it is exposed to.

**Smooth-riding** – A smooth driving surface must be provided by the pavement.

To attain these properties the typical deck overlay system consists of four layers: the bonding layer, the isolation layer, the adhesion layer, and the wearing course. According to Medani the purpose of these layers are as follows (3):

**Bonding layer** - Binds the overlay system to the steel deck. It must provide a strong bond and protect the steel against corrosion.

**Isolation layer** - Transfers the loads from the wearing course to the much stiffer steel deck. To do this it must be flexible and resistant to fatigue. It must also be able to keep moisture from reaching the steel.

**Adhesion layer** - Binds the wearing course to the layers below.

**Wearing course** – The wearing course needs to be able to sustain traffic loads and provide a smooth and safe driving surface.

## Paving Systems

### ***Mastic Asphalt***

Mastic asphalt has been successfully used on many orthotropic bridge decks in Europe. It is durable and provides a long service life on orthotropic decks. Mastic asphalt is impermeable to moisture and provides a good bond with other layers. However, it has a poor skid resistance, has a higher tendency toward plastic deformation and is more difficult to apply (3, 4).

Mastic asphalt consists of an asphalt and aggregate mixture with overfilled voids so that the aggregate is suspended within the pavement. The lack of aggregate on aggregate contact requires that the binder provide the stability instead of the aggregate. This calls for binders that are stiffer than normally used with hot mix asphalt to provide additional stability. TLA is often added to increase the stability of the binder.

A mastic asphalt overlay system was used on the Forth, Severn and Humber bridges in the United Kingdom. The bonding layer consisted of a zinc primer applied directly to the steel deck plate followed by a 0.02 to 0.04 inch thick elastomeric adhesive. A 0.12 inch layer of rubberized asphalt applied on top of the elastomeric adhesive served as the isolation layer. Mastic asphalt acted as both the adhesion layer and wearing course bringing the total thickness of the surfacing to about 1.6 inches (5).

### ***Hot Mix Asphalt***

HMA has been used in both France and the United States. In order to perform satisfactorily on orthotropic bridge decks, modified binders are necessary to increase fatigue resistance. HMA has been used alone or in combination with an underlying course of mastic asphalt. It has the advantage of rapid placement with conventional paving equipment but is subject to fatigue cracking when used with unmodified binders. Modifiers used on orthotropic bridge decks include styrene butadiene styrene (SBS) and ethyl vinyl acetate (3).

The Millau Viaduct in France is a recent example of the use of HMA on an orthotropic bridge deck. A bonding layer consisting of a bituminous primer followed by a 0.12 inch

# Experimental Feature Report

---

bituminous sealing sheet acted as the isolation layer. The wearing course consisted of 2.4 inches of HMA with an SBS modified binder (6).

## ***Epoxy Asphalt***

Epoxy asphalt has been used in the USA, Canada and China. Epoxy asphalt is essentially an HMA mixture with the asphalt replaced by a two part epoxy resin. Epoxy asphalt has the advantage of easy placement with conventional paving equipment allowing it to be placed quickly and achieve a better ride quality than mastic asphalt. It is very stable, resists cracking and bonds well to the underlying layer. Its one disadvantage is its cure time which is dependant on temperature. If conditions are good it can cure within a few hours, however, cooler temperature can extend the cure time which can result in cracking if traffic is allowed on the surface too early (4, 5). A two inch epoxy asphalt overlay was placed on the San Mateo – Hayward Bridge in California in 1969. The overlay is performing well with only a few fatigue cracks visible as of 2002 (7).

## **Tacoma Narrows Bridge Overlay Design**

An HMA with a modified binder was chosen to pave the orthotropic deck on the TNB. The system consists of five layers with the first three, the bonding, isolation and adhesion layers, comprising of a bridge deck waterproofing membrane system manufactured by Stirling Lloyd. The HMA overlay made up the remaining two layers, the bottom layer or base course consisting of a sand HMA and the top layer or top course consisting of a dense graded HMA.

## ***Three Part Bridge Deck Waterproofing Membrane System***

Sterling Lloyd's Eliminator<sup>®</sup> three part bridge deck waterproofing system was used to bond the overlay to the deck and to protect the steel. The first layer consisted of a rust inhibiting acrylic-based prime coat. The specifications required that the prime coat achieve bond strength of 290 psi in order to secure the overlay to the steel. The second layer was two applications of a methyl methacrylate waterproofing membrane spray applied 50 mils thick resulting in a total of

# Experimental Feature Report

---

thickness 100 mils. A polymer modified bituminous hot melt adhesive applied by hand with squeegees at a rate of 25 – 35 square feet per gallon made up the final layer.

## Base Course

The base course consists of a No. 4 nominal maximum aggregate size (NMAS) gradation HMA with a binder made up of a blend of PG 64-22 asphalt, TLA and SBS polymer. The polymer was to be added to the PG 64-22 binder at a rate of 3.0 percent but was changed to 1.5 percent at the request of the asphalt supplier, U.S. Oil. Testing by U.S. Oil indicated the asphalt could not be produced with 3.0 percent SBS polymer (8). The final blend consisted of 60 percent of the polymer modified PG 64-22 asphalt and 40 percent TLA.

The project specification require the mix to achieve an air void content of 0.5 to 1.0 percent after 75 blows in a six inch Marshall mold. Table 1 shows the gradation and asphalt content for the base course.

| Table 1. Base course gradation and asphalt content requirements. |                 |              |                  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
| Sieve                                                            | Percent Passing |              |                  |
|                                                                  | Control Points  | Proposed Mix | Tolerance Limits |
| 3/8                                                              | 100             | 100.0        | 93-100           |
| No. 4                                                            | 95-100          | 98           | 91-100           |
| No. 8                                                            | 71-79           | 77           | 73-81            |
| No. 16                                                           | 59-67           | 52           | 48-56            |
| No. 30                                                           | 47-55           | 35           | 31-39            |
| No. 50                                                           | 25-35           | 24           | 20-28            |
| No. 100                                                          | 14-22           | 17           | 15-19            |
| No. 200                                                          | 12-16           | 12.1         | 10.1-14.1        |
| Binder %                                                         | 10.0-11.2       | 10.8         | 10.5-11.1        |

The second column lists the control points from the original specifications. The control points represent the allowable range when developing the gradation for the mix design. The third column shows the proposed mix design. The proposed gradation was developed from tests of aggregate from pit site B-333. The gradation results from pit B-333 did not fall within the control points for the No. 16, No. 30 and No. 50 sieves so the specifications were revised to

## Experimental Feature Report

---

accommodate the new gradation. The fourth column shows the tolerance limits based on the new gradation which represent the range in which the production gradation results must fall to be within specification.

In addition to gradation requirements, aggregates used for TLA had to meet the following requirements:

- Natural sand is not allowed.
- The minimum sand equivalent (SE) is 40.
- A minimum of two fractured faces on 97% of the aggregates retained on the U.S. No. 4 sieve and above.
- The uncompacted void ratio shall be at least 45%.

**Table 2. Base course mix design testing.**

| Mix Property           | Mix Testing |       |       | Approved Mix Design |
|------------------------|-------------|-------|-------|---------------------|
| P <sub>b</sub>         | 10.0        | 10.5  | 11.0  | 10.8                |
| Percent V <sub>a</sub> | 2.3         | 1.9   | 1.5   | 1.7                 |
| Percent VMA            | 18.6        | 19.4  | 19.9  | 19.7                |
| Percent VFA            | 87.7        | 90.2  | 92.5  | 91.6                |
| Dust/Asphalt           | 1.519       | 1.407 | 1.342 | 1.368               |
| P <sub>be</sub>        | 7.966       | 8.602 | 9.016 | 8.850               |
| G <sub>mm</sub>        | 2.379       | 2.358 | 2.349 | 2.353               |
| G <sub>mb</sub>        | 2.324       | 2.314 | 2.314 | 2.314               |
| G <sub>se</sub>        | 2.710       | 2.701 | 2.708 | 2.705               |
| Stability (lbs)        | 6990        | 6395  | 6395  | 6395                |
| Flow (0.01")           | 29          | 37    | 45    | 41                  |

The proposed gradation was combined with 10.0, 10.5 and 11.0 percent binder and tested for mix properties which are shown in Table 2. The specified 0.5 to 1.0 air void content could not be achieved using the proposed gradation without increasing the asphalt content beyond the allowed limit. A revision to the specification to allow the greater air voids was approved. The binder content chosen for the production mix was 10.8 percent. The fifth column shows the estimated properties for the 10.8 percent binder content.

# Experimental Feature Report

---

## Top Course

The top course consisted of a ½ inch NMAAS gradation with a binder made up of a blend of PG 64-22 asphalt, TLA and SBS polymer. The polymer was to be added to the PG 64-22 binder at a rate of 3.0 percent but was changed to 1.5 percent for the same reason as the base course binder. The final blend consisted of 75 percent of the polymer modified PG 64-22 asphalt and 25 percent TLA. The project specification required the mix to be designed to achieve an air void content of 3.0 to 5.0 percent after 75 blows in a six inch Marshall mold. Table 3 shows the gradation and asphalt content for the top course.

| Table 3. Top course gradation and asphalt content requirements. |                 |               |                   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                                                                 | Percent Passing |               |                   |
| Sieve                                                           | Control Points  | Proposed Mix* | Tolerance Limits* |
| 3/4                                                             | 100             | 100           | 100               |
| 1/2                                                             | 95-100          | 95            | 88-100            |
| 3/8                                                             | 76-86           | 87            | 80-94             |
| No. 4                                                           | 45-57           | 53            | 46-60             |
| No. 8                                                           | 41-49           | 43            | 39-47             |
| No. 16                                                          | -               | 33            | 29-37             |
| No. 30                                                          | 29-35           | 26            | 22-30             |
| No. 50                                                          | 16-22           | 20            | 16-24             |
| No. 100                                                         | 9-13            | 14            | 12-16             |
| No. 200                                                         | 5-9             | 8.1           | 6.1-10.1          |
| Binder %                                                        | 5.0-5.6         | 5.6           | 5.3-5.9           |

\*From CTL production test reports

The aggregate for the top course must also meet the same additional requirements as the base course. The proposed JMF for the top course did not fall within the control points for the 3/8, No. 30 and No. 100 sieves. Apparently this change was also approved resulting in the JMF and tolerance limits which are outside the control points but no documentation of the change is available. Testing performed in developing the mix design was not available for the wearing course.

## Tacoma Narrow Bridge Overlay Construction

### *Membrane Placement*

Overlay construction began by placing the three part deck protection membrane system. To prepare the surface for membrane application the steel deck plate was shot blasted to a near white surface. Shot blasting was accomplished with a Blastrac 2-4800 DH shot blaster. Membrane application proceeded with roller application of the prime coat followed by spraying two coats of the methyl methacrylate waterproofing membrane. Completion of the membrane system consisted of spreading the polymer modified bituminous hot melt adhesive over the methacrylate waterproofing membrane with squeegees.

In many places the polymer modified bituminous hot melt adhesive had been damaged by equipment. Repair of these areas consisted of applying additional polymer modified bituminous hot melt adhesive the morning of the paving. Before paving, the area to be paved was cleaned of debris by hand broom.



**Figure 3.** Blastrac 2-4800 DH shotblaster.



**Figure 4.** Steel deck after shotblasting.

## Experimental Feature Report

---



**Figure 5.** Applying acrylic based prime coat bonding layer.



**Figure 6.** Applying methyl methacrylate isolation layer.



**Figure 7.** Damage to adhesion layer.



**Figure 8.** Repairing adhesion layer.

### ***Paving Equipment***

Paving was accomplished using an Ingersoll-Rand/Blaw-Knox PF-4410 paver (Woodworth equipment number 703) and a Terex/Cedarapids CR 662RM Road Mix transfer vehicle. Inspection of the paver revealed that it was missing a section of the mix management kit (MMK). The MMK is a retrofit which consists of a series of chains that help to contain the mix in front of the screed in order to prevent segregation. Without the MMK retrofit, less mix is distributed to the area in front of the gear box which can leave a segregated streak in the center of the mat. It is not clear if the missing section contributed to the streaks in the mat (See Streaks in Pavement). From June 21 onward, the paver was replaced by another Blaw-Knox PF-4410 paver (Woodworth equipment number 710) which had an intact retrofit kit.



## Experimental Feature Report

---



**Figure 9.** Ingersoll-Rand/Blaw Knox PF-4410 paver.



**Figure 10.** Terex/Cedarapids CR662RM RoadMix transfer vehicle.



**Figure 11.** Missing chains on MMK retrofit on Ingersoll-Rand Blaw-Knox PF-4410 paver.



**Figure 12.** Missing chains on MMK retrofit.

The mix was delivered using single unit (no trailer) end dumps with the loads tightly tarped. The mix was end dumped directly into the transfer vehicle.

Different combinations of rollers were used on each pass. All rollers were used in static mode only. The roller models used on one or more paving passes are listed in Table 4.

# Experimental Feature Report

---

**Table 4. Roller descriptions.**

| <b>Manufacturer</b> | <b>Model</b> | <b>Type</b>           | <b>Weight (lb)</b> | <b>Width (in)</b> |
|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Ingersoll-Rand      | D-24         | Double Drum Vibratory | 5,000              | 48                |
| Ingersoll-Rand      | DD-28HF      | Double Drum Vibratory | 6,000              | 48                |
| Ingersoll-Rand      | DD-31HF      | Double Drum Vibratory | 7,000              | 48                |
| Ingersoll-Rand      | DD-110HF     | Double Drum Vibratory | 25,000             | 78                |
| Ingersoll-Rand      | DD-130       | Double Drum Vibratory | 28,000             | 84                |

The rollers can be divided by size and weight into two categories. The model D-24, DD-28HF and DD-31HF with weights of 5,000 to 7,000 lbs and approximately 48 inch drums are the smaller rollers. The model DD-110HF and DD-130 with weights of 25,000 and 28,000 lbs and 78 and 84 inch drums are the larger rollers. The Contractor used the rollers within each category interchangeably but did not substitute a large roller for a small roller after establishing their pattern.

## ***Calibration Strips***

Prior to actual paving on the bridge, calibration strips were paved at Woodworth and Company's asphalt plant facility in Lakewood, WA. The purpose of the calibration strips was to calibrate the nuclear density gauges and to show that the contractor's methods and equipment could achieve the required results. At least one calibration strip was specified for both the base course and top course, but more could be required if the Engineer determined that they were necessary.

## **Calibration Strip Requirements**

The calibration strip was required to consist of a 5/8 inch thick steel plate at least 10 feet wide and 20 feet long to simulate an orthotropic bridge deck. Preparation of the plate was to be identical to the actual bridge deck consisting of sand blasting the steel to a near white condition then applying the three component waterproofing deck seal.

# Experimental Feature Report

---

Calibration of the nuclear density gauges involved taking density readings in five locations on the plate after each lift. Readings were to be taken for the following conditions:

- When the plate is at least 16 inches off the ground.
- Over a simulated orthotropic rib.

Cores were taken from the simulated orthotropic bridge deck at each of the five gauge reading locations to determine the bulk specific gravity of the HMA. The bulk specific gravity of the core divided by the average gauge reading determined the correlation factor for the gauge. The steps were repeated for the top course.

## Calibration Strip Setup

The simulated bridge deck was made out of six 5/8 inch thick steel plates eight feet wide by twenty feet long. The plates were butted together to form a 24 feet wide by 40 feet long simulated orthotropic bridge deck. Woodworth and Company constructed a 25 foot wide HMA over crushed rock roadway on both sides of the simulated bridge deck. The roadway extended approximately 250 feet ahead of the bridge deck and approximately 100 feet beyond. The calibration strip ran in a more or less north and south direction with paving on all calibration strips starting at the south end. To simulate the bridge deck, the steel plates were placed over an approximately two foot deep pit and supported by timber blocking. Blocking consisted of 4 X 6's placed longitudinally at 17.5 inch spacing. The 4 X 6's rested on 8 X 10 transverse beams spaced at 3 feet 7-5/8 inches. Supporting the beams were four 10 X 24 timbers resting on the bottom of the pit. The steel plates were coated with the waterproofing deck seal as required but simulated ribs were not used.

# Experimental Feature Report

---



**Figure 13.** Calibration strip looking south.



**Figure 14.** Simulated orthotropic bridge deck.

## Calibration Strip Paving

A total of five calibration strips were constructed. Paving on all of the strips started at the south end and proceeded north on the westernmost half of the strip. The transfer vehicle and the truck operated in the eastern side of the strip while paving the west half of the strip. After paving the western half of the strip the paving train reversed direction and paved the eastern side of the strip with the transfer vehicle and truck operating in the same lane as the paver. Delivery trucks carried partial loads with tight tarps except on the first strip where loose tarps were used. Trucks were driven on local roads for about 30 minutes to simulate the haul to the bridge. A CSS-1 tack coat was placed between all lifts of HMA. No tack coat was applied over the steel plates prior to the first lift. Each strip took 10 to 30 minutes to pave in both directions. Table 5 shows the date and course paved for each calibration strip.

**Table 5. Calibration strip construction dates.**


| Strip No. | Date         | Course |
|-----------|--------------|--------|
| 1         | May 25, 2007 | Base   |
| 2         | May 25, 2007 | Top    |
| 3         | May 29, 2007 | Base   |
| 4         | May 29, 2007 | Top    |
| 5         | May 31, 2007 | Base   |

# Experimental Feature Report

## TNB HMA Paving

### HMA Placement

HMA placement on the TNB began on June 1, 2007 with paving of the job control strip for the base course. The purpose of the job control strip is to verify that the equipment and methods achieve the desired compaction and level of quality to allow paving to go into full production. One control strip is required for the base course and one for the top course. Additional control strips are required if the job mix formula changes or if there is a change in material. Figure 14 shows the base course paving sequence.



**Figure 15.** Base course paving sequence.

During placement of the job control strip for the base course the large rollers began picking up mix from the newly laid mat. Pickup occurred between 300 and 700 feet from the west end of the bridge. The mix had to be removed from the roller drums before the roller could continue, delaying the compaction operation. Voids left in the mat were repaired by carrying mix back to the damaged area in shovels and a wheelbarrow. Despite the repair efforts voids and open areas remained in the mat. The voids were more or less centered about 6.5 feet from the



## Experimental Feature Report

---

face of the barrier. The problem ceased when the large rollers were removed from the paving operation and replaced by smaller rollers.



**Figure 16.** Mix pickup area immediately after rolling.



**Figure 17.** Raking in mix to repair pickup area.



**Figure 18.** Area of mix pickup after completion of rolling.



**Figure 19.** Area of mix pickup prior to the next days paving.

An additional short section of base course was paved on June 7<sup>th</sup>. This section was not formally designated a job control strip but it served to verify that a satisfactory level of quality could be achieved and base course placement went into full production on June 8<sup>th</sup>.

During placement of the base course the Contractor applied water using hand held sprayers ahead of truck tires and vehicle tracks in order to prevent damage to the polymer modified bituminous hot melt adhesive. One area of tack coat incurred damaged by the track on the Terex transfer vehicle. The area may have been more susceptible to damage since it had

## Experimental Feature Report

---

been repaired earlier in the day. Otherwise this method appeared successful in preventing damage.



**Figure 20.** Applying water to prevent damage to adhesion layer.



**Figure 21.** Adhesion layer damaged by track.

After completing paving the base course in Lane 2 at the west end of the bridge the Contractor turned the paving train around and began paving eastbound in Lane 3. A water truck sprayed water on Lane 2 to cool it enough to allow trucks which were delivering mix to pave Lane 3 to drive on Lane 2. At this time Lane 1 had only been paved to within about 250 feet of the east end of the bridge which left the bridge drains two inches higher than the current grade. The water flowed to the east end of the bridge and accumulated adjacent to the barrier in Lane 1 since it could not get into the bridge drains. After completion of paving Lane 3 the contractor proceeded to pave the remaining base course in the east end of Lane 1. The contractor attempted to remove the excess water that had accumulated in Lane 1 using leaf blowers prior to paving, but water was still present near the curb and over parts of the lane during paving.

Portions of the base course and tack layer were affected by the water and had to be removed around the bridge scuppers. The repair consisted of reapplying the bonding layer and replacing the base course material at the end of the next days paving.

## Experimental Feature Report

---



**Figure 22.** Water being removed prior to paving.



**Figure 23.** Area removed near scupper due to water damage.



**Figure 24.** Adhesion layer repaired.




**Figure 25.** Repaired pavement.

After completion of placing base course in Lanes 1 through 5, the Contractor switched over to placement of the top course. Base and top course on the Pedestrian Lane were placed later after completion of all of the other paving on the bridge. A CSS-1 tack coat was placed between the base and top courses using a distributor truck. Figure 25 shows the sequence of paving the top course.



# Experimental Feature Report



**Figure 26.** Top course paving sequence.

## Temperature Differentials


Infrared imaging was used during HMA placement to check for differences in temperature that could lead to potential density differentials. The imaging revealed temperature differentials ranging from 10°F to more than 40°F. Temperature differentials can lead to areas of inadequate compaction in the mat. They are usually caused by mix inside the haul vehicle cooling on the outside of the load faster than in the center. If the mix is not remixed before it passes through the paver, areas of cooler mix will be present in the mat. Temperature differentials on the TNB appeared as longitudinal streaks as opposed to periodic cooler patches which are usually associated with end dumping directly into the paver.

Thermal imaging revealed three identifiable patterns of temperature differentials across the pavement surface during top course paving. The most common pattern is a warmer streak down the center of the mat flanked by cooler streaks on each side. Temperature differentials were greatest with this pattern some being over 40°F. A second pattern with the cooler streak in the center is also apparent on some of the images. Most of the temperature differentials were


## Experimental Feature Report

---


within about 15°F in this pattern. Uniform temperature was seen across the mat on a few occasions.




**Figure 27.** Temperature differential of 47°F in top course.



**Figure 28.** Warmer center in base course.



**Figure 29.** Mat with cooler center recorded on June 20.



**Figure 30.** Mat with uniform temperature recorded on June 22.

## Compaction

Compaction of the base course began on the control strip with a small roller as the breakdown roller followed by two large rollers as intermediate rollers and a second small roller as the finish roller. This pattern lasted for about the first 2.5 hours of base course placement at which time the larger rollers were removed due to the problems with them picking up parts of the mat. The remainder of the base course was compacted using only the small rollers.

## Experimental Feature Report

---

The remainder of Lane 1 as well as the base course on Lanes 2, 3 and 5 were compacted using four of the small rollers. The arrangement generally consisted of a breakdown roller operating from within several feet of the screed to about 100 feet behind the paver. Two small rollers worked the intermediate position between about 100 and 300 feet behind the paver. The finish roller worked the section approximately 200 feet beyond the area covered by the intermediate rollers. The spacing of the rollers tended to increase as the speed of the paver increased.

A fifth small roller was used during paving of Lanes 2 and 3 to compact the joint between the lane being paved and the previously paved lane. The roller operated back and forth on the joint within about 40 feet of the paver. Most of the roller operated on the cold side of the joint with only about six inches of the drum on hot side.

Five small rollers were used to compact the base course in Lane 4. Two worked side by side as breakdown rollers within 100 feet of the paver and two others worked as intermediate rollers from 100 to 450 feet behind the paver. The fifth roller stayed from 450 to 650 feet behind the paver to finish the mat.

Roller speeds were measured several times during placement of the base course. Time and distance were measured from the time the roller stopped to change direction until it stopped again at the end of the pass. Table 6 shows the range of roller speeds recorded.

| Table 6. Roller speeds on base course. |             |
|----------------------------------------|-------------|
| Roller                                 | Speed (fps) |
| Breakdown                              | 7-9         |
| Intermediate (Closest to Paver)        | 4-5         |
| Intermediate (Farthest from Paver)     | 8-11        |
| Finish                                 | 7-10        |
| Joint                                  | 4           |

Two roller arrangements were used to compact the top course. On Lanes 1 and 5 a large roller and small roller worked together near the paver as breakdown rollers. The small roller

## Experimental Feature Report

---

compacted the mix near the barrier with the large roller compacting the rest of the mat. Breakdown rolling occurred within about 200 feet of the paver with the rollers coming within several feet of the screed on their forward pass. Intermediate rolling was accomplished by a large roller which operated from about 200 to 400 feet behind the paver. Two small rollers finished the pavement with a 250 to 500 foot gap between them and the intermediate roller.

Breakdown rolling on Lanes 2, 3 and 4 consisted of a large roller operating from within several feet of the screed to about 200 feet back. A second large roller operated between 200 and 400 feet behind the paver. Three small rollers followed with the last being about 1000 feet behind the paver. A sixth small roller compacted the joint between the lane being paved and the previously paved lane (this was the joint between Lane 2 and 3 when Lane 3 was being paved). The roller worked with only about six inches of the drum on the new mat as before. Table 7 gives the range of roller speeds recorded during placement of the top course.

| Table 7. Roller speed on top course. |             |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| Roller                               | Speed (fps) |
| Large Breakdown                      | 4-8         |
| Small Breakdown                      | 4           |
| Large Intermediate                   | 4-7         |
| Small Intermediate                   | 8-11        |
| Finish                               | 5-11        |
| Joint                                | 6-8         |

### Testing

Testing during HMA placement consisted of gradation, asphalt content and density. Construction Testing Laboratories, Inc. (CTL) provided the quality control testing and Professional Service Industries, Inc. (PSI) provided quality assurance testing. WSDOT's testing was informational.

# Experimental Feature Report

---

## Gradation and Asphalt Content

Tables 8 and 9 show the average gradation and asphalt content test results. The average results represent a total of 32 tests by CTL, two tests by PSI four tests by WSDOT on the base course and 24 tests by CTL, four tests by PSI and three tests by WSDOT on the top course.

| Table 8. Base course gradation and asphalt content test results. |      |                  |       |       |       |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Sieve                                                            | JMF  | Tolerance Limits | CTL   | PSI   | WSDOT |
| 3/8                                                              | 100  | 100              | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| #4                                                               | 98   | 91-100           | 99.3  | 98.9  | 99.0  |
| #8                                                               | 77   | 73-81            | 79.8  | 76.5  | 78.5  |
| #16                                                              | 52   | 48-56            | 53.7  | 50.4  | 52.8  |
| #30                                                              | 35   | 31-39            | 37.2  | 34.6  | 36.5  |
| #50                                                              | 24   | 20-28            | 25.7  | 23.2  | 26.0  |
| #100                                                             | 17   | 15-19            | 18.6  | 16.1  | 18.5  |
| #200                                                             | 12.1 | 10.1-14.1        | 13.5  | 11.2  | 13.3  |
| % Asphalt                                                        | 10.8 | 10.5-11.1        | 10.8  | 11.2  | 11.0  |

## Experimental Feature Report

---

**Table 9. Top course gradation and asphalt content test results.**

| Sieve     | JMF | Tolerance Limits | CTL   | PSI   | WSDOT |
|-----------|-----|------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| 3/4       | 100 | 100              | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1/2       | 95  | 88-100           | 94.3  | 94.9  | 96.0  |
| 3/8       | 87  | 80-94            | 86.2  | 87.7  | 86.2  |
| #4        | 53  | 46-60            | 56.3  | 57.8  | 56.3  |
| #8        | 43  | 39-47            | 44.6  | 45.7  | 44.6  |
| #16       | 33  | 29-37            | 33.9  | 34.6  | 33.9  |
| #30       | 26  | 22-30            | 26.7  | 26.9  | 26.7  |
| #50       | 20  | 16-24            | 20.0  | 20.1  | 21.0  |
| #100      | 14  | 12-16            | 14.6  | 14.3  | 15.0  |
| #200      | 8.1 | 6.1-10.1         | 9.2   | 9.2   | 9.9   |
| % Asphalt | 5.6 | 5.3-5.9          | 5.5   | 5.7   | 6.0   |

All of the average gradation results were within the tolerance bands during construction. Based on CTL's test results, ten out of 32 base course gradation samples were outside the tolerance limits on at least one sieve. Only one sieve was outside of tolerance limits for twenty four top course gradation samples tested by CTL.

Base course asphalt content was out of specification on several tests. Most of the out of specification results were near the start of paving and were above the upper tolerance band. All of the top course asphalt content test results were within the tolerance limits. Individual asphalt content and gradation test results can be found in Appendix A.

### Compaction Testing

Table 10 summarizes the average density results. The results for CTL, PSI and WSDOT did not meet the target value for the base course compaction. The average density value for WSDOT was the only one to meet the target minimum for top course compaction. Individual compaction test results are included in Appendix B.

## Experimental Feature Report

---

**Table 10. Compaction test results.**

| Testing Entity | Base Course Compaction | Base Course Standard Deviation | Top Course Compaction | Top Course Standard Deviation |
|----------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| CTL            | 94.4                   | 1.72                           | 93.4                  | 1.26                          |
| PSI            | na                     | na                             | 93.7                  | 0.95                          |
| WSDOT          | 95.4                   | 1.51                           | 95.3                  | 1.93                          |
| Target         | <b>97.0</b>            | na                             | <b>94.0</b>           | na                            |

Density test results from cores taken from the top course in Lane 1 are shown in Table 11. CTL's density results for Lane 1 averaged 92.3 percent which correlates well with the average core density of 92.9 percent.

**Table 11. Core density results.**

| Core No. | Percent of Maximum Density |
|----------|----------------------------|
| 1        | 92.5                       |
| 2        | 93.5                       |
| 3        | 93.8                       |
| 4        | 91.8                       |
| 5        | 92.9                       |
| Average  | 92.9                       |

### ***Appearance of Finished Mat***

#### **Streaks in Pavement**

Both lifts in all lanes displayed some level of visible streaking after paving. Some of the streaks appear to be located at the screed extensions while others seem to be associated with cool streaks in the mat visible on the infrared photographs. It was not clear if the streaks are superficial or represent defects in the mat.



# Experimental Feature Report

---



**Figure 31.** Steaks in base course on lane one.



**Figure 32.** Streaks in top course on lane one.



**Figure 33.** Streaks in top course on lanes four and five.



**Figure 34.** Streak left by screed extension.

## Flushing

Slight flushing occurred after placement of the job control strip. Flushing appeared to be isolated to the section between 3.5 feet from the face of barrier to the edge of the paved lane at 10.5 feet. The flushing seems to correspond to high asphalt content test results on Lane 1.

# Experimental Feature Report

---



**Figure 35.** Flushing in lane one immediately after paving.



**Figure 36.** Flushing in lane one several days after paving.

## Indentations in Base Course

There were many areas where tires from equipment sitting on the bridge left indentations in the base course. These areas were repaired by heating with a weed burner and reshaping before placing the next lift.



**Figure 37.** Indentation in base course left by equipment tire.



**Figure 38.** Repairing indentation.

# Experimental Feature Report

---

## Post Paving

### *Indentations in Completed Overlay*

An inspection on July 9<sup>th</sup> revealed that there were many indentations in the top course caused by construction activities. Some of the indentations were clearly due to equipment tires or the outrigger supports for a 300 ton Demag crane while the cause of others could not be identified. Cracks were associated with some of the indentations where the mix appeared to have been sheared by the object causing the indentation.



**Figure 39.** Tire indentation near west end.



**Figure 40.** Indentation left by Demag crane pad.



**Figure 41.** Indentation with crack near midspan.



**Figure 42.** Possible repaired area.



# Experimental Feature Report

---

## ***Spill at West Tower***

Solvent spilled from the west tower onto the completed overlay in Lanes 2 and 3 which required the pavement to be removed and replaced. Repair included rotomilling the damaged pavement, repairing the three layer membrane system and repaving with conventional asphalt.



**Figure 43.** Solvent spill.



**Figure 44.** Damaged pavement removed from lane 2 and 3.



**Figure 45.** Repairing isolation layer.



**Figure 46.** Repairing base course.

# Experimental Feature Report

---



**Figure 47.** Replacing top course.



**Figure 48.** Finished patch.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

At the time of writing this report it is too early for any determinations as to the long term performance of the overlay on the TNB. The performance of the overlay and future recommendations regarding the use of TLA will be in the final report at the conclusion of this study. However some preliminary conclusions and recommendations based on the experience gained in constructing the overlay are listed below.

### ***Overlay Construction***

TLA modified HMA proved to be an efficient way to place an overlay on an orthotropic bridge deck. It allowed the overlay to be placed using conventional equipment and methods. Once the contractor became familiar with working with the new material, placement proceeded as efficiently as conventional HMA.

### ***Mix Design***

The design documents specify restrictive values for air voids and tight control points for gradation. It is not clear how these values were determined but it can be assumed they were chosen in order to produce a mix that will achieve the desired longevity on an orthotropic deck. During the mix design process the specifications for both the air voids and gradation

## Experimental Feature Report

---

requirements were changed to allow use of the available materials. It is not clear how these changes may affect the performance of the pavement. Prior to constructing future overlays, more investigation into the reasoning behind the mix design specification should occur in order to determine the consequences of changing the requirements.

### ***Density***

The target of 97 percent of maximum theoretical density for the base course and 94 percent of theoretical maximum density for the top course were difficult to attain leading to many failing tests. Ninety six percent of base course density tests and 63.5 percent of top course density tests did not meet the target. Adequate density is important in making a pavement impermeable to moisture and higher densities also tend to make a pavement more fatigue resistant. It is unclear if the low densities will affect the HMA performance on the TNB, however, additional investigation into the density requirements should be conducted.

Future overlays of this kind should review the density requirements to determine if the high density targets are necessary and if they are attainable. The performance of the existing overlay may give evidence as to whether lower densities are adequate. If the overlay performs adequately the densities achieved on the existing overlay could be used as a basis for future overlays. Otherwise more mix testing would be necessary to determine if the density requirements may be lowered.

If it is determined that the higher densities are required, procedures need to be put into place to ensure the densities are met. Although calibration strips were constructed to show that the Contractor could achieve the desired results, the densities during actual paving on the bridge did not consistently achieve the targets. This is likely due to the differences in construction at the calibration strip site and at the bridge. The calibration strip is only 40 feet long which allowed better control of roller passes and less cooling time prior to completion of rolling than on the bridge. Paving speeds on the first two calibration strips which were used to verify that the equipment could achieve the desired results ranged between 7 and 13 feet per minute. Paving on the bridge was much faster ranging between 27 to 36 feet per minute which may have affected the Contractor's ability to obtain the target densities. If this type of overlay is used in the future,

## Experimental Feature Report

---

the compaction equipment lay down temperature, and paving speed necessary to meet density requirements established by the test sections should be closely followed during actual paving to ensure compaction is achieved.

### ***Appearance of the Mat***

The finished top course looked more open than other ½ inch HMA pavements. It is not clear if this is just the perception of the viewer or an actual problem with the mat; however, there were several factors that could lead to an open mat. These include the picking up of individual rocks by the rollers, temperature differentials in the mat and the streaks in the mat that may be due to faulty paver operations including the damaged MMK retrofit. Another possibility is that the depth of the top course may have affected the mix quality. The minimum recommended thickness of an HMA layer is three times the NMA with four times the NMA being preferred. The minimum recommended thickness allows the aggregate to properly orient itself during compaction. The top course was placed at a depth of 1-1/4 inches; only 2.5 times the NMA, which may have contributed to the open mat. It is recommended that either a smaller NMA be used to achieve the minimum requirement of three times the thickness or increasing the top course to a minimum of 1 ½ inches if this type of overlay is used in the future.

### ***Construction Damage to Overlay***

Numerous indentations, cracks and spills were present on the mat after it was complete. Most if not all of these can be attributed to the construction activities occurring on the bridge after placement of the overlay. Some of the damaged areas were superficial but many required repair by methods which likely will affect the performance of the pavement. In order to avoid this type of damage in the future, paving should not begin until work on or above the bridge deck is complete.



## References

- (1) Gurney, T. Fatigue of Steel Bridge Decks. Transportation Research Laboratory: Department of Transport. HMSO Publication Center, London 1992.
- (2) Fondriest, F. F. and M. J. Snyder. Research on and Paving Practices for Wearing Surfaces on Orthotropic Steel Bridge Decks. In Highway Research Record No. 155. HRB, National Research Council, Washington D.C., 1967, p. 21-60.
- (3) Medani, T. O. Asphalt Surfacing Applied to Orthotropic Steel Bridge Decks: A Literature Review. Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands, 2001.
- (4) Hicks, R. G., Dussek, I. J., Seim, C., Asphalt Surfaces on Steel Bridge Decks. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 1740, National Research council, Washington D.C., 2000, pp 135-142.
- (5) Smith, J. W., Asphalt Paving for Steel Bridge Decks. Journal of Association of Asphalt Paving Technologists, Vol. 56, 1987, pp. 555-572.
- (6) Olard, F., B. Hertier, F. Loup, and S. Kraft. New French Standard Test Method for the Design of Surfacing on Steel Deck Bridges: Case Study of the Millau Viaduct. Road Materials and Pavement Design, Vol. 6, No. 4, 2005, pp 515-531.
- (7) Seim, C., Ingham, T., Influence of wearing Surfacing on Performance of Orthotropic Steel Plate Decks. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 1892, National Research Council, Washington D.C., 2004, pp. 98-106.
- (8) DeVol, J. (WSDOT Bituminous Engineer). Personal Communication, May 28, 2008.

### **Appendix A**

### **Gradation and Asphalt Content Test Results**

# Experimental Feature Report

**Table A1. CTL base course gradation and asphalt content test results.**

|           | Sieve / Percent Passing |          |           |           |         |         |           |             |              |
|-----------|-------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Test Date | 3/8"                    | #4       | #8        | #16       | #30     | #50     | #100      | #200        | % Asph.      |
| JMF       | 100                     | 98       | 77        | 52        | 35      | 24      | 17        | 12.1        | 10.8         |
| Tolerance | 100                     | 91 - 100 | 73 - 81   | 48 - 56   | 31 - 39 | 20 - 28 | 15 - 19   | 10.1-14.1   | 10.5 - 11.1  |
| 6/1/2007  | 100                     | 99       | 80        | 54        | 38      | 27      | <b>20</b> | <b>14.3</b> | <b>11.30</b> |
| 6/1/2007  | 100                     | 99       | 81        | 55        | 38      | 26      | 19        | 13.5        | <b>11.35</b> |
| 6/1/2007  | 100                     | 99       | 80        | 54        | 37      | 26      | 18        | 12.8        | <b>11.24</b> |
| 6/7/2007  | 100                     | 100      | 81        | 54        | 37      | 25      | 18        | 13.3        | 10.75        |
| 6/7/2007  | 100                     | 99       | 81        | 55        | 38      | 27      | <b>20</b> | <b>14.4</b> | <b>12.02</b> |
| 6/7/2007  | 100                     | 99       | 78        | 52        | 36      | 25      | 18        | 13.4        | 10.94        |
| 6/7/2007  | 100                     | 100      | 81        | 54        | 37      | 25      | 18        | 13.5        | 10.85        |
| 6/7/2007  | 100                     | 100      | <b>82</b> | 55        | 38      | 26      | 19        | 13.6        | 11.05        |
| 6/7/2007  | 100                     | 99       | 81        | 55        | 38      | 26      | 19        | <b>14.2</b> | 11.05        |
| 6/7/2007  | 100                     | 100      | 81        | 55        | 38      | 26      | 19        | 13.8        | 10.82        |
| 6/7/2007  | 100                     | 99       | 79        | 53        | 36      | 25      | 18        | 13.0        | 10.52        |
| 6/8/2007  | 100                     | 98       | 74        | 50        | 35      | 25      | 18        | 13.1        | 10.51        |
| 6/8/2007  | 100                     | 98       | 74        | 50        | 35      | 25      | 18        | 13.4        | 10.66        |
| 6/8/2007  | 100                     | 98       | 75        | 51        | 36      | 25      | 19        | 13.5        | 10.64        |
| 6/8/2007  | 100                     | 98       | 76        | 52        | 36      | 25      | 18        | 13.4        | 10.65        |
| 6/8/2007  | 100                     | 98       | 76        | 51        | 36      | 25      | 18        | 13.0        | 10.67        |
| 6/8/2007  | 100                     | 99       | 78        | 53        | 37      | 26      | 19        | 13.6        | 10.63        |
| 6/8/2007  | 100                     | 99       | 80        | 54        | 38      | 27      | <b>20</b> | <b>14.7</b> | 10.57        |
| 6/8/2007  | 100                     | 99       | 81        | 55        | 38      | 27      | 19        | <b>14.3</b> | 10.62        |
| 6/8/2007  | 100                     | 100      | <b>83</b> | 56        | 39      | 27      | <b>20</b> | <b>14.6</b> | 10.87        |
| 6/19/2007 | 100                     | 100      | 79        | 51        | 35      | 24      | 17        | 12.2        | <b>11.15</b> |
| 6/19/2007 | 100                     | 100      | 80        | 53        | 36      | 25      | 18        | 13.2        | 11.04        |
| 6/19/2007 | 100                     | 100      | 81        | 54        | 37      | 25      | 17        | 12.3        | <b>11.14</b> |
| 6/19/2007 | 100                     | 100      | 80        | 53        | 36      | 24      | 17        | 12.1        | 10.89        |
| 6/19/2007 | 100                     | 100      | 81        | 54        | 38      | 26      | 19        | 13.9        | 10.60        |
| 6/19/2007 | 100                     | 100      | <b>82</b> | 55        | 38      | 26      | 19        | 13.6        | 10.76        |
| 6/19/2007 | 100                     | 100      | 80        | 54        | 38      | 26      | 19        | 13.5        | 10.61        |
| 6/19/2007 | 100                     | 100      | <b>82</b> | 54        | 38      | 26      | 19        | 13.2        | <b>10.00</b> |
| 6/19/2007 | 100                     | 100      | 81        | 55        | 38      | 27      | 19        | 13.7        | 10.72        |
| 6/30/2007 | 100                     | 100      | <b>84</b> | <b>57</b> | 39      | 26      | 19        | 13.5        | 10.87        |
| 6/30/2007 | 100                     | 97       | 81        | 55        | 38      | 25      | 17        | 13.8        | 10.71        |
| 6/30/2007 | 100                     | 100      | 81        | 54        | 39      | 27      | 19        | 13.9        | 10.55        |
| Average   | 100.0                   | 99.3     | 79.8      | 53.7      | 37.2    | 25.7    | 18.6      | 13.5        | 10.84        |
| Std Dev.  | 0.00                    | 0.85     | 2.46      | 1.70      | 1.18    | 0.89    | 0.88      | 0.63        | 0.35         |

Out of tolerance values are shown in bold.

# Experimental Feature Report

**Table A2. PSI base course gradation and asphalt content test results.**

|           | Sieve / Percent Passing |          |         |         |         |         |         |           |              |
|-----------|-------------------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|--------------|
| Test Date | 3/8"                    | #4       | #8      | #16     | #30     | #50     | #100    | #200      | % Asph.      |
| JMF       | 100                     | 98       | 77      | 52      | 35      | 24      | 17      | 12.1      | 10.8         |
| Tolerance | 100                     | 91 - 100 | 73 - 81 | 48 - 56 | 31 - 39 | 20 - 28 | 15 - 19 | 10.1-14.1 | 10.5 - 11.1  |
| 6/8/2007  | 100.0                   | 97.9     | 74.4    | 50.1    | 34.8    | 23.8    | 16.7    | 11.4      | <b>11.22</b> |
| 6/19/2007 | 100.0                   | 99.8     | 78.6    | 50.7    | 34.3    | 22.5    | 15.5    | 11        | <b>11.23</b> |
| Average   | 100.0                   | 98.9     | 76.5    | 50.4    | 34.6    | 23.2    | 16.1    | 11.2      | <b>11.2</b>  |
| Std Dev.  | 0.00                    | 1.34     | 2.97    | 0.42    | 0.35    | 0.92    | 0.85    | 0.28      | 0.01         |

Out of tolerance values are shown in red.

**Table A3. WSDOT base course gradation and asphalt content test results.**

|           | Sieve / Percent Passing |          |         |         |         |         |         |           |              |
|-----------|-------------------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|--------------|
| Test Date | 3/8"                    | #4       | #8      | #16     | #30     | #50     | #100    | #200      | % Asph.      |
| JMF       | 100                     | 98       | 77      | 52      | 35      | 24      | 17      | 12.1      | 10.8         |
| Tolerance | 100                     | 91 - 100 | 73 - 81 | 48 - 56 | 31 - 39 | 20 - 28 | 15 - 19 | 10.1-14.1 | 10.5 - 11.1  |
| 6/1/2007  | 100                     | 99       | 80      | 54      | 38      | 27      | 19      | 13.9      | <b>11.64</b> |
| 6/8/2007  | 100                     | 98       | 74      | 50      | 35      | 25      | 18      | 12.8      | 10.63        |
| 6/8/2007  | 100                     | 99       | 81      | 55      | 38      | 27      | 19      | 13.6      | 10.83        |
| 6/19/2007 | 100                     | 100      | 79      | 52      | 35      | 25      | 18      | 12.9      | 11.09        |
| Average   | 100.0                   | 99.0     | 78.5    | 52.8    | 36.5    | 26.0    | 18.5    | 13.3      | 11.0         |
| Std Dev.  | 0.00                    | 0.82     | 3.11    | 2.22    | 1.73    | 1.15    | 0.58    | 0.54      | 0.44         |

Out of tolerance values are shown in red.

**Table A4. CTL top course gradation and asphalt content test reports.**

|           | Sieve / Percent Passing |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |            |           |
|-----------|-------------------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------|-----------|
| Test Date | 3/4"                    | 1/2"     | 3/8"    | #4      | #8      | #16     | #30     | #50     | #100    | #200       | % Asph.   |
| JMF       | 100                     | 95       | 87      | 53      | 43      | 33      | 26      | 20      | 14      | 8.1        | 5.6       |
| Tolerance | 100                     | 88 - 100 | 80 - 94 | 46 - 60 | 39 - 47 | 29 - 37 | 22 - 30 | 16 - 24 | 12 - 16 | 6.1 - 10.1 | 5.3 - 5.9 |
| 6/20/2007 | 100                     | 92       | 84      | 49      | 41      | 32      | 25      | 19      | 14      | 9.2        | 5.35      |
| 6/20/2007 | 100                     | 93       | 85      | 58      | 43      | 32      | 25      | 18      | 13      | 8.5        | 5.52      |
| 6/20/2007 | 100                     | 97       | 89      | 59      | 44      | 33      | 26      | 19      | 14      | 9.3        | 5.71      |
| 6/20/2007 | 100                     | 93       | 84      | 55      | 43      | 32      | 26      | 19      | 14      | 9.0        | 5.58      |
| 6/21/2007 | 100                     | 92       | 86      | 57      | 44      | 33      | 26      | 19      | 14      | 9.2        | 5.54      |
| 6/21/2007 | 100                     | 96       | 87      | 61      | 46      | 35      | 28      | 21      | 15      | 9.1        | 5.56      |
| 6/21/2007 | 100                     | 95       | 88      | 58      | 46      | 35      | 28      | 21      | 16      | 9.8        | 5.45      |
| 6/21/2007 | 100                     | 93       | 85      | 55      | 44      | 34      | 26      | 20      | 14      | 9.0        | 5.50      |
| 6/21/2007 | 100                     | 93       | 85      | 55      | 45      | 35      | 28      | 21      | 16      | 9.9        | 5.44      |
| 6/21/2007 | 100                     | 94       | 86      | 55      | 45      | 35      | 27      | 21      | 15      | 9.4        | 5.41      |
| 6/21/2007 | 100                     | 95       | 87      | 58      | 46      | 35      | 27      | 20      | 15      | 9.3        | 5.57      |
| 6/21/2007 | 100                     | 97       | 89      | 60      | 47      | 36      | 28      | 21      | 15      | 9.5        | 5.78      |
| 6/21/2007 | 100                     | 96       | 86      | 56      | 45      | 35      | 27      | 21      | 15      | 9.5        | 5.54      |
| 6/22/2007 | 100                     | 95       | 86      | 57      | 46      | 35      | 28      | 21      | 15      | 10.0       | 5.61      |

# Experimental Feature Report

|           |       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|-----------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 6/22/2007 | 100   | 95   | 88   | 57   | 45   | 34   | 27   | 21   | 15   | 9.7  | 5.62 |
| 6/22/2007 | 100   | 94   | 87   | 56   | 46   | 35   | 28   | 21   | 16   | 9.9  | 5.49 |
| 6/22/2007 | 100   | 95   | 87   | 56   | 45   | 35   | 27   | 21   | 15   | 8.1  | 5.57 |
| 6/22/2007 | 100   | 94   | 87   | 55   | 45   | 34   | 27   | 20   | 15   | 9.7  | 5.53 |
| 6/22/2007 | 100   | 92   | 83   | 55   | 44   | 33   | 26   | 20   | 14   | 9.0  | 5.47 |
| 6/22/2007 | 100   | 94   | 86   | 55   | 44   | 34   | 27   | 21   | 15   | 9.5  | 5.43 |
| 6/22/2007 | 100   | 96   | 86   | 55   | 43   | 32   | 25   | 19   | 14   | 9.2  | 5.44 |
| 6/30/2007 | 100   | 94   | 84   | 57   | 45   | 34   | 26   | 19   | 14   | 9.2  | 5.69 |
| 6/30/2007 | 100   | 95   | 86   | 58   | 45   | 34   | 26   | 19   | 14   | 8.7  | 5.72 |
| 6/30/2007 | 100   | 94   | 86   | 55   | 45   | 34   | 27   | 20   | 14   | 8.1  | 5.64 |
| Average   | 100.0 | 94.3 | 86.2 | 56.3 | 44.6 | 33.9 | 26.7 | 20.0 | 14.6 | 9.2  | 5.5  |
| Std Dev.  | 0.00  | 1.48 | 1.52 | 2.31 | 1.28 | 1.13 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 0.69 | 0.51 | 0.11 |

**Table A5. PSI top course gradation and asphalt content test results.**

|           | Sieve / Percent Passing |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |            |           |
|-----------|-------------------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------|-----------|
| Test Date | 3/4"                    | 1/2"     | 3/8"    | #4      | #8      | #16     | #30     | #50     | #100    | #200       | % Asph.   |
| JMF       | 100                     | 95       | 87      | 53      | 43      | 33      | 26      | 20      | 14      | 8.1        | 5.6       |
| Tolerance | 100                     | 88 - 100 | 80 - 94 | 46 - 60 | 39 - 47 | 29 - 37 | 22 - 30 | 16 - 24 | 12 - 16 | 6.1 - 10.1 | 5.3 - 5.9 |
| 6/20/2007 | 100.0                   | 93.3     | 84.9    | 52.1    | 43.3    | 32.7    | 25.8    | 19.4    | 14.1    | 9.3        | 5.69      |
| 6/20/2007 | 100.0                   | 95.2     | 87.7    | 59.3    | 45.9    | 34.4    | 26.8    | 20.0    | 14.1    | 8.9        | 5.74      |
| 6/21/2007 | 100.0                   | 95.6     | 89.7    | 59.6    | 46.9    | 34.7    | 26.6    | 19.5    | 13.8    | 9.0        | 5.89      |
| 6/22/2007 | 100.0                   | 95.4     | 88.6    | 60.0    | 46.6    | 36.6    | 28.5    | 21.3    | 15.1    | 9.6        | 5.60      |
| Average   | 100.0                   | 94.9     | 87.7    | 57.8    | 45.7    | 34.6    | 26.9    | 20.1    | 14.3    | 9.2        | 5.7       |
| Std Dev.  | 0.00                    | 1.06     | 2.05    | 3.78    | 1.64    | 1.60    | 1.14    | 0.87    | 0.57    | 0.32       | 0.12      |

**Table A6. WSDOT top course gradation and asphalt content test results.**

|           | Sieve / Percent Passing |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |            |           |
|-----------|-------------------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------|-----------|
| Test Date | 3/4"                    | 1/2"     | 3/8"    | #4      | #8      | #16     | #30     | #50     | #100    | #200       | % Asph.   |
| JMF       | 100                     | 95       | 87      | 53      | 43      | 33      | 26      | 20      | 14      | 8.1        | 5.6       |
| Tolerance | 100                     | 88 - 100 | 80 - 94 | 46 - 60 | 39 - 47 | 29 - 37 | 22 - 30 | 16 - 24 | 12 - 16 | 6.1 - 10.1 | 5.3 - 5.9 |
| 6/20/2007 | 100                     | 95       | 87      | 54      | 45      | 34      | 27      | 21      | 15      | 10.0       | 5.84      |
| 6/21/2007 | 100                     | 96       | 88      | 61      | 46      | 30      | 26      | 20      | 14      | 9.4        | 5.99      |
| 6/22/2007 | 100                     | 97       | 89      | 59      | 47      | 36      | 28      | 22      | 16      | 10.2       | 6.18      |
| Average   | 100.0                   | 96.0     | 88.0    | 58.0    | 46.0    | 33.3    | 27.0    | 21.0    | 15.0    | 9.9        | 6.0       |
| Std Dev.  | 0.00                    | 1.00     | 1.00    | 3.61    | 1.00    | 3.06    | 1.00    | 1.00    | 1.00    | 0.42       | 0.17      |

### **Appendix B**

### **Compaction Test Results**



# Experimental Feature Report

---

**Table B1. CTL base compaction test results.**

| Date           | Lane        | Percent of Maximum Density |             |             |             |             |
|----------------|-------------|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                |             | Test 1                     | Test 2      | Test 3      | Test 4      | Test 5      |
| 6/30/2007      | Ped         | <b>92.0</b>                | <b>94.6</b> | <b>96.5</b> | <b>94.3</b> | <b>94.7</b> |
| 6/30/2007      | Ped         | <b>94.4</b>                | <b>92.2</b> | <b>95.6</b> | <b>93.8</b> | <b>92.5</b> |
| 6/30/2007      | Ped         | <b>95.0</b>                | <b>93.8</b> | <b>94.4</b> | <b>96.3</b> | <b>93.4</b> |
| 6/30/2007      | Ped         | <b>95.9</b>                | 98.7        | <b>93.1</b> | <b>94.9</b> | <b>93.8</b> |
| 6/30/2007      | Ped         | <b>91.3</b>                | <b>94.6</b> | <b>96.8</b> | <b>92.2</b> | <b>95.7</b> |
| <b>Average</b> | <b>94.4</b> | <b>Std. Dev.</b>           | <b>1.72</b> | Target      | 97.0        |             |

Test results that did meet minimum target density are displayed in bold.

**Table B2. WSDOT base course compaction test results.**

| Date           | Lane        | Percent of Maximum Density |             |             |             |             |
|----------------|-------------|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                |             | Test 1                     | Test 2      | Test 3      | Test 4      | Test 5      |
| 6/8/2007       | 2           | <b>93.7</b>                | <b>94.6</b> | <b>95.5</b> | <b>96.3</b> | <b>94.4</b> |
| 6/8/2007       | 3           | <b>96.1</b>                | <b>96.6</b> | <b>96.4</b> | <b>96.1</b> | <b>95.7</b> |
| 6/19/2007      | 5           | <b>94.1</b>                | <b>95.9</b> | <b>95.8</b> | <b>96.1</b> | 99.2        |
| 6/19/2007      | 4           | <b>95.7</b>                | <b>95.4</b> | <b>96.4</b> | <b>96.9</b> | <b>96.2</b> |
| 6/30/2007      | Ped         | <b>94.7</b>                | <b>95.0</b> | <b>90.8</b> | <b>94.0</b> | <b>94.4</b> |
| <b>Average</b> | <b>95.4</b> | <b>Std. Dev.</b>           | <b>1.51</b> | Target      | 97.0        |             |

Test results that did meet minimum target density are displayed in bold.

**Table B3. CTL top course compaction test results.**

| Date      | Lane | Percent of Maximum Density |             |             |             |             |
|-----------|------|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|           |      | Test 1                     | Test 2      | Test 3      | Test 4      | Test 5      |
| 6/20/2007 | 1    | <b>92.3</b>                | <b>91.8</b> | <b>91.0</b> | <b>91.5</b> | <b>93.2</b> |
| 6/20/2007 | 1    | <b>93.3</b>                | <b>93.4</b> | <b>93.5</b> | <b>92.5</b> | <b>92.0</b> |
| 6/20/2007 | 1    | <b>93.7</b>                | <b>92.7</b> | <b>92.7</b> | <b>92.5</b> | <b>90.3</b> |
| 6/20/2007 | 1    | <b>92.5</b>                | 94.4        | <b>92.9</b> | <b>92.1</b> | <b>92.6</b> |
| 6/20/2007 | 1    | <b>91.4</b>                | <b>90.9</b> | <b>90.9</b> | <b>91.2</b> | <b>92.5</b> |
| 6/21/2007 | 5    | <b>93.6</b>                | <b>93.2</b> | 94.4        | 94.2        | 94.6        |
| 6/21/2007 | 5    | 94.1                       | 94.1        | <b>93.0</b> | <b>93.3</b> | <b>93.9</b> |
| 6/21/2007 | 5    | <b>93.7</b>                | <b>93.7</b> | <b>93.7</b> | 94.7        | 94.8        |
| 6/21/2007 | 5    | 94.0                       | 94.0        | 94.1        | <b>93.5</b> | 95.9        |
| 6/21/2007 | 5    | <b>93.9</b>                | 94.2        | 94.3        | 94.1        | 94.9        |
| 6/21/2007 | 4    | <b>93.9</b>                | 94.3        | 94.0        | 95.6        | 94.8        |
| 6/21/2007 | 4    | 94.1                       | <b>91.8</b> | <b>92.3</b> | <b>91.1</b> | <b>92.1</b> |
| 6/21/2007 | 4    | <b>92.9</b>                | <b>92.3</b> | 94.9        | 94.1        | 94.7        |
| 6/21/2007 | 4    | <b>92.5</b>                | <b>93.3</b> | <b>92.0</b> | <b>93.7</b> | 94.2        |
| 6/21/2007 | 4    | <b>92.5</b>                | <b>93.5</b> | <b>92.3</b> | <b>93.8</b> | 94.5        |
| 6/22/2007 | 2    | <b>92.1</b>                | <b>93.1</b> | <b>92.5</b> | <b>91.8</b> | 94.6        |

# Experimental Feature Report

---

|                |             |                  |             |             |             |             |
|----------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 6/22/2007      | 2           | <b>93.8</b>      | <b>92.4</b> | <b>93.3</b> | <b>93.5</b> | <b>93.8</b> |
| 6/22/2007      | 2           | <b>91.9</b>      | <b>91.6</b> | <b>93.7</b> | <b>93.2</b> | <b>93.3</b> |
| 6/22/2007      | 2           | 94.6             | <b>93.0</b> | <b>93.3</b> | 94.6        | <b>93.6</b> |
| 6/22/2007      | 2           | <b>93.1</b>      | <b>92.2</b> | 94.5        | <b>93.2</b> | <b>92.6</b> |
| 6/22/2007      | 3           | <b>92.6</b>      | <b>93.2</b> | <b>93.4</b> | <b>93.6</b> | <b>93.5</b> |
| 6/22/2007      | 3           | <b>93.3</b>      | <b>93.9</b> | <b>93.3</b> | <b>93.1</b> | 94.0        |
| 6/22/2007      | 3           | 94.1             | <b>93.1</b> | <b>93.7</b> | <b>92.9</b> | <b>92.9</b> |
| 6/22/2007      | 3           | <b>93.9</b>      | <b>93.8</b> | <b>93.0</b> | <b>93.6</b> | <b>93.1</b> |
| 6/22/2007      | 3           | <b>92.9</b>      | <b>92.2</b> | <b>93.0</b> | 94.6        | <b>90.2</b> |
| 6/30/2007      | Ped         | <b>92.0</b>      | 96.0        | <b>92.7</b> | <b>93.9</b> | 97.3        |
| 6/30/2007      | Ped         | <b>92.8</b>      | <b>93.6</b> | 95.6        | 96.6        | 94.4        |
| 6/30/2007      | Ped         | 95.6             | 95.7        | <b>92.9</b> | <b>92.6</b> | 95.9        |
| 6/30/2007      | Ped         | <b>93.0</b>      | <b>92.7</b> | <b>93.9</b> | <b>93.2</b> | <b>91.8</b> |
| 6/30/2007      | Ped         | <b>93.4</b>      | 96.5        | 97.0        | 95.2        | 95.7        |
| <b>Average</b> | <b>93.4</b> | <b>Std. Dev.</b> | <b>1.26</b> | Target      | 94.0        |             |

Test results that did meet minimum target density are displayed in bold.

**Table B4. PSI top course compaction test results.**

| Date           | Lane        | Percent of Maximum Density |             |             |             |             |
|----------------|-------------|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                |             | Test 1                     | Test 2      | Test 3      | Test 4      | Test 5      |
| 6/20/2007      | 1           | <b>93.6</b>                | 94.2        | 94.5        | <b>93.5</b> | <b>93.6</b> |
| 6/20/2007      | 1           | 95.4                       | 94.5        | 94.1        | 94.8        | <b>92.6</b> |
| 6/20/2007      | 1           | 95.9                       | 94.1        | <b>92.3</b> | <b>93.7</b> | <b>92.7</b> |
| 6/20/2007      | 1           | <b>92.9</b>                | 94.5        | <b>93.4</b> | <b>93.1</b> | <b>93.5</b> |
| 6/20/2007      | 1           | <b>93</b>                  | <b>93.7</b> | <b>92.1</b> | <b>92.4</b> | <b>93.9</b> |
| <b>Average</b> | <b>93.7</b> | <b>Std. Dev.</b>           | <b>0.95</b> | Target      | 94.0        |             |

Test results that did meet minimum target density are displayed in bold.

**Table B5. WSDOT top course compaction test results.**

| Date           | Lane        | Percent of Maximum Density |             |             |        |             |
|----------------|-------------|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------|-------------|
|                |             | Test 1                     | Test 2      | Test 3      | Test 4 | Test 5      |
| 6/21/2007      | 5           | 96.3                       | 96.8        | 96.6        | 96.2   | 96.2        |
| 6/21/2007      | 4           | 97.7                       | 97.7        | 95.9        | 95.4   | <b>92.5</b> |
| 6/22/2007      | 2           | <b>92.2</b>                | <b>93.0</b> | <b>93.5</b> | 95.3   | <b>91.7</b> |
| 6/22/2007      | 3           | 96.1                       | 96.0        | 94.6        | 94.4   | 95.1        |
| 6/30/2007      | Ped         | 96.3                       | <b>91.4</b> | 97.4        | 98.2   | 96.0        |
| <b>Average</b> | <b>95.3</b> | <b>Std. Dev.</b>           | <b>1.93</b> | Target      | 94.0   |             |

Test results that did meet minimum target density are displayed in bold.