

# **PROFILE ANALYSIS OF THE LTPP SPS-1 SITE IN ARIZONA**

---

**STEVEN M. KARAMIHAS**





**Technical Report Documentation Page**

1. Report No. UMTRI-2007-16		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Profile Analysis of the LTPP SPS-1 Site in Arizona				5. Report Date May 2007	
				6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s) Steven M. Karamihas				8. Performing Organization Report No. UMTRI-2007-16	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address The University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute 2901 Baxter Road Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109				10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
				11. Contract or Grant No. N004327	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Nichols Consulting Engineers 1885 S. Arlington Ave., Suite 111 Reno, Nevada 89509				13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report Dec. 2002 – May 2007	
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes					
16. Abstract This report characterizes the longitudinal profiles of sixteen pavement sections within the Arizona Specific Pavement Studies 1 project throughout their service life. This project was built and monitored as part of the Long-Term Pavement Performance Study. Road profile measurements were collected on this site about once per year since the winter after it was opened to traffic. This study analyzed the profiles in detail by calculating their roughness values, examining the spatial distribution of roughness within them, viewing them with post-processing filters, and examining their spectral properties. These analyses provided details about the roughness characteristics of the road and provided a basis for quantifying and explaining the changes in roughness with time, as well as linking profile properties to each section's maintenance history and observations of surface distress.					
17. Key Word road roughness, longitudinal profile, International Roughness Index, LTPP, pavement testing, asphalt pavement				18. Distribution Statement Unlimited	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified		20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified		21. No. of Pages 70	22. Price



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

MAIN REPORT.....	1
Introduction .....	1
Profile Data Synchronization.....	2
Data Extraction .....	2
Cross Correlation.....	3
Synchronization.....	4
Longitudinal Distance Measurement.....	4
Data Quality Screening.....	6
Summary Roughness Values.....	15
Profile Analysis Tools .....	24
Summary Roughness Values.....	24
Power Spectral Density Plots.....	24
Filtered Profile Plots.....	27
Roughness Profile .....	29
Distress Surveys and Maintenance Records .....	31
Detailed Observations .....	31
Summary .....	31
References .....	36
APPENDIX A: ROUGHNESS VALUES .....	38
References .....	44
APPENDIX B: DETAILED OBSERVATIONS.....	45
Section 0113 .....	45
Section 0114.....	48
Section 0115.....	50
Section 0116.....	52
Section 0117.....	53
Section 0118.....	55
Section 0119.....	56
Section 0120.....	58
Section 0121.....	59
Section 0122.....	61
Section 0123.....	62
Section 0124.....	64
Section 0160.....	65
Section 0161.....	66
Section 0162.....	67
Section 0163.....	68

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Consistency in longitudinal distance measurement .....	5
Figure 2. IRI progression, section 0113.....	15
Figure 3. IRI progression, section 0115.....	16
Figure 4. IRI progression, section 0114.....	17
Figure 5. IRI progression, section 0116.....	17
Figure 6. IRI progression, section 0117.....	18
Figure 7. IRI progression, section 0118.....	18
Figure 8. IRI progression, section 0119.....	19
Figure 9. IRI progression, section 0120.....	19
Figure 10. IRI progression, section 0121.....	20
Figure 11. IRI progression, section 0122.....	20
Figure 12. IRI progression, section 0123.....	21
Figure 13. IRI progression, section 0124.....	21
Figure 14. IRI progression, section 0160.....	22
Figure 15. IRI progression, section 0161.....	22
Figure 16. IRI progression, section 0162.....	23
Figure 17. IRI progression, section 0163.....	23
Figure 18. PSD of section 0124 profile, right side.....	25
Figure 19. PSD of section 0117 profile, left side.....	26
Figure 20. Raw profiles of section 0122.....	27
Figure 21. Filtered profile of section 0122.....	28
Figure 22. Medium wavelength profiles of section 0122. ....	29
Figure 23. Roughness profile of section 0160, 25-ft baselength.....	30
Figure 24. Roughness profile of section 0122, 10-ft baselength.....	30
Figure 25. Summary of IRI ranges.....	34
Figure A-1. Comparison of HRI to MRI.....	39

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Arizona SPS-1 Site Structural Factors. ....	1
Table 2. Profile Measurement Visits of the SPS-1 Site.....	2
Table 3. Seasonal Visits of Sections 0113 and 0114.....	3
Table 4. Selected Repeats, Section 0113. ....	7
Table 5. Selected Repeats, Section 0114. ....	8
Table 6. Selected Repeats, Section 0115. ....	8
Table 7. Selected Repeats, Section 0116. ....	9
Table 8. Selected Repeats, Section 0117. ....	9
Table 9. Selected Repeats, Section 0118. ....	9
Table 10. Selected Repeats, Section 0119. ....	10
Table 11. Selected Repeats, Section 0120. ....	10
Table 12. Selected Repeats, Section 0121. ....	10
Table 13. Selected Repeats, Section 0122. ....	11
Table 14. Selected Repeats, Section 0123. ....	11
Table 15. Selected Repeats, Section 0124. ....	11
Table 16. Selected Repeats, Section 0160. ....	12
Table 17. Selected Repeats, Section 0161. ....	12
Table 18. Selected Repeats, Section 0162. ....	12
Table 19. Selected Repeats, Section 0163. ....	13
Table A-1. Roughness Values.....	39

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The author of this report would like to thank the Arizona Department of Transportation for their support of this work. The author would also like to thank Kevin Senn and Nathan Andress for Nichols Consulting Engineers for their valuable assistance. They provided a very well organized data set, comprehensive information about the SPS-1 site, answered several questions about the site, and made a great number suggestions for editorial and technical improvements to this report. In addition, the author would like to thank Larry Scofield for providing the original direction for the work.

## INTRODUCTION

This report provides the results of profile and roughness analyses for the Long-Term Pavement Performance (LTPP) Specific Pavement Studies 1 (SPS-1) site in Arizona. SPS-1 sites were designed for the study of flexible pavement structural factors, including drainage, base type and thickness, and asphalt surface thickness. (*I*)

The test pavements were constructed on northbound U.S. Highway 93 in Mohave County, Arizona from October 1992 through August 1993. The site extends from Milepost 52.61 to 49.48. Twelve sections were constructed as part of the standard experiment. These sections have the same properties as the standard twelve sections on the SPS-1 sites throughout the LTPP study. This SPS-1 site also included four supplemental test sections designed by the Arizona Department of Transportation.

Table 1 summarizes the structural design of the test sections. Section 0113 through 0124 make up a standard matrix of structural factors. Section 0160 was included as an approach to a weigh-in-motion scale, and as a Portland cement concrete alternative. Section 0161 provided an alternative to a design with more top layer thickness than was standard in Arizona. Section 0162 provided a pavement with no prepared base, and section 0163 provided a comparison to roller compacted concrete. The construction report provides more detail on the layout and structural properties of the site. (*I*)

**Table 1. Arizona SPS-1 Site Structural Factors.**

Section	Layer Thickness (in)			Layer Type		
	Layer 1	Layer 2	Layer 3	Layer 1	Layer 2	Layer 3
0113	4	8	—	AC	AB	—
0114	7	12	—	AC	AB	—
0115	7	8	—	AC	BTB	—
0116	4	12	—	AC	BTB	—
0117	7	4	4	AC	BTB	AB
0118	4	8	4	AC	BTB	AB
0119	7	4	4	AC	PBTB	AB
0120	4	4	8	AC	PBTB	AB
0121	4	4	12	AC	BTB	AB
0122	4	4	4	AC	BTB	PBTB
0123	7	8	4	AC	BTB	PBTB
0124	7	12	4	AC	BTB	PBTB
0160	10	4	—	PCC	AB	—
0161	5	4	—	AC	AB	—
0162	7	—	—	AC	—	—
0163	1	15	—	ACFC	RCC	—

AB	—	Aggregate Base	AC	—	Asphalt Concrete
ACFC	—	Asphalt Concrete Friction Course	BTB	—	Bituminous Treated Base
PBTB	—	Permeable Bituminous Treated Base	PCC	—	Portland Cement Concrete
RCC	—	Roller Compacted Concrete			

This report seeks to characterize the surface roughness of these sections throughout their service life, and link the observations to records of pavement distress and its

development. Road profile measurements were collected on this site about once per year since the winter after it was opened to traffic. This study analyzed the profiles in detail by calculating their roughness values, examining the spatial distribution of roughness within them, viewing them with post-processing filters, and examining their spectral properties. These analyses provided details about the roughness characteristics of the road and provided a basis for quantifying and explaining the changes in roughness with time.

## PROFILE DATA SYNCHRONIZATION

Profile data were collected over the entire Arizona SPS-1 site on thirteen dates, listed in Table 2. Raw profile data were available for all thirteen visits. In each visit, a minimum of seven repeat profile measurements were made.

**Table 2. Profile Measurement Visits of the SPS-1 Site.**

Visit	Date	Time	Repeats	Sections
01	27-Jan-1994	13:44	7	0113-0124, 0160-0163
02	27-Feb-1995	12:45	9	0113-0124, 0160-0163
03	23-Jan-1997	09:54-11:47	9	0113-0124, 0160-0163
04	08-Apr-1998	13:50-15:02	7	0113-0124, 0160-0163
05	04-Dec-1998	10:40-11:46	7	0113-0124, 0160-0163
06	17-Nov-1999	09:26-10:32	7	0113-0124, 0160-0163
07	19-Dec-2000	11:26-12:54	9	0113-0124, 0160-0163
08	06-Nov-2001	11:25-12:44	9	0113-0124, 0160-0163
09	20-Feb-2002	10:41-12:21	9	0113-0124, 0160-0163
10	02-Mar-2003	14:30-16:25	9	0113-0124, 0160-0163
11	10-Mar-2004	11:29-13:34	9	0113-0124, 0160-0163
12	15-Mar-2005	13:42-16:02	9	0113-0124, 0160-0163
13	27-Mar-2006	12:43-15:02	9	0113-0124, 0160-0163

Profile data were also collected on sixteen additional dates over sections 0113 and 0114 as part of the seasonal monitoring program. Table 3 lists the dates and times of these visits. These visits cover four seasons in 1998, and twelve seasons in a row starting in the winter of 2001. Visits S01 and S02 included section 0114 only. The rest covered both sections. Note that visits S02 and S10 occurred on dates that were very close to conventional visits 04 and 10, respectively.

### Data Extraction

Profiles of individual test sections were extracted directly from the raw measurements. This was done for two reasons. First, profiles were collected in visits 03 through 09 and S01 through S07 at a 0.98 in sample interval and in visits 10 through 13 and S08 through S14 at a sample interval of about 0.77 in. These data appeared in the database after the application of an 11.8-in moving average and decimation to a sample interval of 5.91 in. The raw data contained the more detailed profiles. Second, this study depended on consistency of the profile starting and ending points with the construction layout, and consistency of the section limits with time. In particular, a previous quality check revealed that some profiles were shifted. (2)

**Table 3. Seasonal Visits of Sections 0113 and 0114.**

Visit	Date	Repeats	Time	
			Section 0113	Section 0114
S01	14-Jan-1998	7	—	16:37-16:57
S02	07-Apr-1998	7	—	14:43-15:20
S03	08-Jul-1998	7	09:31-10:02	09:31-10:02
S04	01-Oct-1998	7	09:28-10:02	09:28-10:02
S05	10-Dec-2001	9	14:18-14:55	14:18-14:55
S06	23-Jan-2002	9	11:46-12:47	11:44-12:40
S07	14-Mar-2002	9	11:45-12:39	11:43-12:37
S08	11-Oct-2002	9	15:51-16:24	14:56-15:41
S09	18-Dec-2002	9	13:39-14:08	13:16-13:37
S10	10-Mar-2003	9	12:55-13:16	12:35-12:53
S11	09-Aug-2003	9	22:53-23:19	22:25-22:45
S12	23-Nov-2003	9	13:38-14:29	13:43-14:27
S13	17-Dec-2003	9	15:11-15:58	15:08-15:56
S14	22-Apr-2004	9	15:52-16:36	15:51-16:34
S15	15-Jul-2004	9	21:37-22:25	21:35-22:23
S16	08-Sep-2004	9	08:49-09:31	08:47-09:29

The raw data were used to synchronize all of the profiles to each other through their entire history. Three clues were available for this purpose: (1) the site layout from the construction report, (2) event markers in the raw profiles from the start and end of each section, and (3) automated searching for the longitudinal offset between repeat measurements.

### Cross Correlation

Searching for the longitudinal offset between repeat profile measurements that provides the best agreement between them is a helpful way to refine their synchronization. This can be done by inspecting filtered profile plots, but it is very time consuming. Visual assessment is also somewhat subjective when two profiles do not agree well, which is often the case when measurements are made several years apart. An automated procedure, rather than visual inspection, was used for finding the longitudinal offset between measurements.

The procedure is based on a customized version of cross correlation. (3) In this procedure, a “basis” measurement is designated that is considered to have the correct longitudinal positioning. A “candidate” profile is then searched for the longitudinal offset that provides the highest cross correlation to the basis measurement. A high level of cross correlation requires a good match of profile shape, the location of isolated rough spots, and overall roughness level. Therefore, the correlation level is often only high when the two measurements are synchronized. When the optimal offset is found, a profile is extracted from the candidate measurement with the proper overall length and endpoint positions. For the rest of this discussion, this process will be referred to as *automated synchronization*.

For this application, cross correlation was performed after the IRI filter was applied to the profiles, rather than using the un-filtered profiles. This helped assign the proper weighting to relevant profile features. In particular, it increased the weighting of short-

wavelength roughness that may be linked to pavement distress. This enhanced the effectiveness of the automated synchronization procedure. The long-wavelength content within the IRI output helped ensure that the longitudinal positioning was nearly correct, and the short-wavelength content was able to leverage profile features at isolated rough spots to fine-tune the positioning.

## **Synchronization**

Profiles of individual test sections were extracted from the raw measurements using the following steps:

1. Establish a basis measurement for each section from visit 08.

This was done using the event markers from a raw measurement. The fifth repeat measurement was used for this purpose. Event markers appeared at the start and end of every section. The locations of the event markers were compared to the layout provided in the construction report. (1) No inconsistencies were found between the event markers and the construction report.

All of the sections were assumed to begin at the appropriate event marker and continue for 500 ft.

2. Automatically synchronize the other eight repeats from visit 08 to the basis set.
3. Automatically synchronize the measurements from the previous visit to the current basis set.
4. Designate the previous visit as the current visit.
5. Replace the basis set with a new set of synchronized measurements from the first repeat of the current visit.
6. Repeat steps 3 through 5 until visit 01 is complete.

Data for visits 09 through 13 were provided after visits 01 through 08 were synchronized. Visits 09 through 13 were synchronized using steps 3 through 6, but going forward in time.


Some seasonal measurements appeared in a profile that only covered the section of interest. In these cases, automated synchronization was used simply as a way of verifying that the proper road segment was contained within each profile. These measurements were consistently lined up with a high degree of precision. Other seasonal measurements included some additional profile upstream of the segment of interest, or covered a large area that included both sections 0113 and 0114. In these cases, the seasonal measurements were synchronized to a basis measurement from a regular visit of the same year.

## **Longitudinal Distance Measurement**

The basis set of profile measurements for visit 08, established in step 1, above, was set using the event markers in one raw profile measurement (the fifth repeat). The other eight repeats from visit 08 were automatically synchronized to the basis set. When the

longitudinal placement of the individual sections within each measurement were compared to the layout within the basis set, the slope of the linear fit ranged from 1.0000 to 1.0004. Thus, the longitudinal distance measurement for the nine profile measurements of visit 08 was consistent within 0.04 percent. This is a very high level of agreement in longitudinal distance measurement.

Figure 1 shows the disagreement in longitudinal distance measurement for each visit using the original basis set as a reference. In the figure, a range of disagreement for each visit exists because up to nine repeat profile measurements were made. The variation between repeat measurements within a visit appears as the width of each bar in the figure. Note that two separate bars are presented for visits 11 and 13. This is because the profile measurements from those visits covered the site in two parts. This included the first seven sections in a leading (L) set of measurements and the other nine in a trailing (T) set of measurements.



**Figure 1. Consistency in longitudinal distance measurement.**

Since the longitudinal distance measurement was based on the rotation of a drive wheel, the variations were most likely caused by variations in speed, lateral wander, and tire inflation pressure. (4) If tire inflation pressure were the dominant cause, the disagreement would grow more positive with each successive repeat measurement as the tire heated up and tire pressure increased. This is because the tire rolling radius would increase, and the profiler would register less wheel rotation for the same travel distance. This appeared to be the case for visits 03 through 08, but the effect was never greater than 0.05 percent of the overall distance. Note that the field procedures require the operator to warm up the tire prior to the measurements. That accounts for the high level of agreement within each of visits 03 through 11.

The variation between visits in Figure 1 is caused by differences in distance measurement instrument calibration. The longitudinal distance measured by a profiler is not true horizontal distance. It always includes some additional component because the profiler must travel up and down the undulations in the road. This component can be minimized by calibrating the profiler to true horizontal distance. However, if a profiler operates on a road with grade changes and roughness that are not similar to the site used for longitudinal distance measurement calibration, some error will exist. Tire inflation pressure and tread wear must also be close to the level that existed during calibration for consistent results.

Modest inconsistency in longitudinal distance measurement between visits is not critical as long as the profiles of individual sections are extracted using event markers rather than longitudinal distance from the start of each profile measurement. A high level of inconsistency, however, could interfere with comparisons between profile features and distress surveys. Errors in profile index values, such as the IRI, are also roughly of the same order as errors in longitudinal distance measurement. (4) Figure 1 shows that longitudinal distance was measured with a high level of agreement throughout all thirteen visits.

## **DATA QUALITY SCREENING**

Data quality screening was performed to select five repeat profile measurements from each visit of each section. The five measurements among the group of available runs were selected which exhibited the best agreement with each other. In this case, agreement between any two profile measurements was judged by cross correlating them after applying the IRI filter. The details of this method are described elsewhere. (3) In this method, the IRI filter is applied to the profiles, then the output signals are compared rather than the overall index. High correlation by this method requires that the overall roughness is in agreement, as well as the details of the profile shape that affect the IRI. The IRI filter was applied before correlation in this case for several reasons:

- Direct correlation of un-filtered profiles places a premium on very long wavelength content, but ignores much of the contribution of short wavelength content.
- Correlation of IRI filter output emphasizes profile features in (approximate) proportion to their effect on the overall roughness.
- Correlation of IRI filter output provides a good trade-off between emphasizing localized rough features at distressed areas in the pavement and placing too much weight on the very short-duration, narrow features (spikes) that are not likely to agree between measurements. This is because the IRI filter amplifies short wavelength content, but attenuates macrotexture, megatexture, and spikes.
- A relationship has been demonstrated between the cross correlation level of IRI filter output and the expected agreement in overall IRI. (3)

Note that this method was performed with a special provision for correcting modest longitudinal distance measurement errors.

Each comparison between profiles produced a single value that summarized their level of agreement. When nine repeat profile measurements were available, they produced a total of thirty-six correlation values. Any subgroup of five measurements could be summarized

by averaging the relevant ten correlation values. The subgroup that produced the highest average was selected, and the other repeats were excluded from most of the analyses discussed in the rest of this report. Since the number of available profiles ranged from six to nine, the number of measurements that were excluded ranged from one to four. Tables 4 through 19 list the selected repeats for each visit of each section, and the composite correlation level produced by them.

**Table 4. Selected Repeats, Section 0113.**

Visit	Repeat Numbers					Composite Correlation
01	2	4	5	6	7	0.958
02	2	3	4	6	8	0.962
03	3	4	5	6	9	0.969
04	1	2	3	4	6	0.931
05	2	3	4	5	6	0.959
06	1	2	3	4	6	0.960
07	1	3	4	8	9	0.963
08	3	4	6	7	9	0.950
09	2	3	5	6	7	0.942
10	1	3	4	5	6	0.925
11	1	2	3	5	7	0.975
12	1	2	4	7	9	0.952
13	3	4	5	6	9	0.954
S03	2	3	4	5	6	0.959
S04	1	2	4	6	7	0.967
S05	1	3	4	5	9	0.950
S06	1	5	6	8	9	0.951
S07	3	4	5	8	9	0.976
S08	5	6	7	8	9	0.966
S09	3	4	6	8	9	0.955
S10	1	3	5	7	8	0.946
S11	1	3	4	6	7	0.975
S12	2	3	4	8	9	0.969
S13	2	3	4	8	9	0.968
S14	4	5	6	7	8	0.969
S15	3	5	6	7	8	0.972
S16	3	4	7	8	9	0.980

**Table 5. Selected Repeats, Section 0114.**

Visit	Repeat Numbers					Composite Correlation
01	1	2	3	4	5	0.864
02	2	3	4	6	7	0.943
03	1	2	4	7	9	0.920
04	1	2	4	6	7	0.841
05	2	3	4	6	7	0.890
06	2	3	4	6	7	0.925
07	1	2	5	6	9	0.927
08	2	4	5	6	9	0.909
09	2	3	4	7	9	0.911
10	1	2	3	4	5	0.911
11	1	2	4	5	6	0.946
12	3	4	5	8	9	0.945
13	1	2	4	5	7	0.941
S01	2	3	4	5	7	0.850
S02	1	2	4	6	7	0.874
S03	1	2	5	6	7	0.901
S04	1	2	4	5	6	0.896
S05	2	3	4	5	6	0.941
S06	2	4	5	6	8	0.946
S07	1	2	4	7	8	0.940
S08	2	3	5	7	9	0.934
S09	3	5	6	7	9	0.889
S10	1	3	6	8	9	0.917
S11	3	4	6	8	9	0.962
S12	1	2	3	5	6	0.936
S13	1	2	6	8	9	0.957
S14	1	2	4	5	9	0.938
S15	3	4	5	6	7	0.950
S16	3	4	5	7	8	0.970

**Table 6. Selected Repeats, Section 0115.**

Visit	Repeat Numbers					Composite Correlation
01	1	3	5	6	7	0.824
02	1	3	5	6	7	0.953
03	4	5	6	7	8	0.890
04	1	2	4	5	6	0.890
05	1	4	5	6	7	0.917
06	2	3	4	5	7	0.923
07	2	3	4	5	8	0.934
08	3	4	5	7	9	0.898
09	1	2	5	7	9	0.917
10	1	2	4	5	8	0.696
11	4	5	6	7	8	0.736
12	1	2	3	7	8	0.561
13	2	3	6	8	9	0.791

**Table 7. Selected Repeats, Section 0116.**

Visit	Repeat Numbers					Composite Correlation
01	1	2	3	4	7	0.881
02	2	3	4	5	8	0.915
03	1	2	3	6	7	0.907
04	2	3	5	6	7	0.868
05	1	2	3	6	7	0.896
06	1	3	4	6	7	0.911
07	1	2	3	5	8	0.911
08	2	3	4	5	7	0.794
09	2	5	6	7	9	0.949
10	1	2	3	6	7	0.911
11	3	5	6	7	9	0.949
12	3	5	6	8	9	0.960
13	5	6	7	8	9	0.970

**Table 8. Selected Repeats, Section 0117.**

Visit	Repeat Numbers					Composite Correlation
01	1	3	4	5	6	0.815
02	1	2	3	8	9	0.921
03	5	6	7	8	9	0.889
04	2	3	5	6	7	0.898
05	1	2	3	5	7	0.909
06	1	3	4	5	7	0.915
07	2	3	4	6	7	0.934
08	4	5	6	7	9	0.898
09	1	2	3	5	9	0.894
10	1	2	3	4	5	0.705
11	2	3	5	8	9	0.787
12	3	5	7	8	9	0.616
13	3	4	6	8	9	0.754

**Table 9. Selected Repeats, Section 0118.**

Visit	Repeat Numbers					Composite Correlation
01	1	4	5	6	7	0.712
02	2	5	7	8	9	0.930
03	2	3	5	7	8	0.911
04	1	3	5	6	7	0.890
05	1	2	3	4	6	0.902
06	2	3	5	6	7	0.865
07	2	4	5	7	9	0.892
08	1	2	5	7	9	0.757
09	1	2	4	5	9	0.748
10	2	3	4	6	7	0.944
11	2	4	5	7	8	0.920
12	2	5	6	7	9	0.930
13	1	4	6	7	9	0.950

**Table 10. Selected Repeats, Section 0119.**

Visit	Repeat Numbers					Composite Correlation
01	1	3	4	5	7	0.870
02	2	4	7	8	9	0.924
03	2	3	5	6	9	0.923
04	1	2	3	5	6	0.733
05	2	3	4	5	6	0.769
06	2	3	5	6	7	0.861
07	1	4	6	7	9	0.820
08	2	3	4	5	6	0.850
09	2	3	5	6	9	0.868
10	2	3	5	7	8	0.819
11	1	3	5	6	7	0.674
12	1	3	5	6	7	0.687
13	1	4	6	7	9	0.585

**Table 11. Selected Repeats, Section 0120.**

Visit	Repeat Numbers					Composite Correlation
01	2	3	4	5	6	0.904
02	2	3	7	8	9	0.958
03	2	5	6	7	8	0.937
04	1	2	3	4	7	0.922
05	1	2	3	5	7	0.943
06	1	2	4	5	7	0.921
07	1	3	6	7	8	0.964
08	2	5	6	7	9	0.964
09	1	3	4	7	9	0.960
10	1	2	5	8	9	0.961
11	1	2	4	6	8	0.960
12	3	4	5	6	8	0.945
13	5	6	7	8	9	0.956

**Table 12. Selected Repeats, Section 0121.**

Visit	Repeat Numbers					Composite Correlation
01	1	3	4	5	6	0.930
02	4	5	6	7	8	0.951
03	1	2	3	5	9	0.922
04	2	3	4	6	7	0.900
05	2	4	5	6	7	0.927
06	1	2	4	5	7	0.940
07	1	2	4	5	7	0.926
08	4	5	6	7	9	0.938
09	1	3	4	6	7	0.893
10	3	5	6	7	9	0.951
11	5	6	7	8	9	0.936
12	1	5	7	8	9	0.895
13	1	4	6	7	9	0.954

**Table 13. Selected Repeats, Section 0122.**

Visit	Repeat Numbers					Composite Correlation
01	2	3	4	5	7	0.936
02	2	3	4	6	7	0.955
03	2	4	6	8	9	0.948
04	1	2	3	4	6	0.911
05	2	3	5	6	7	0.945
06	1	2	3	5	7	0.941
07	1	3	5	7	8	0.962
08	3	4	5	6	9	0.958
09	2	4	5	6	7	0.965
10	1	4	6	8	9	0.948
11	2	4	6	7	8	0.941
12	3	5	7	8	9	0.920
13	1	3	5	6	9	0.961

**Table 14. Selected Repeats, Section 0123.**

Visit	Repeat Numbers					Composite Correlation
01	1	3	4	5	7	0.885
02	2	3	5	6	8	0.942
03	3	4	5	7	8	0.899
04	2	4	5	6	7	0.894
05	1	2	3	5	7	0.926
06	2	3	4	6	7	0.888
07	4	6	7	8	9	0.850
08	3	4	5	6	9	0.842
09	2	5	6	7	9	0.911
10	1	2	3	7	8	0.810
11	1	2	3	5	8	0.632
12	1	4	7	8	9	0.646
13	1	2	5	8	9	0.650

**Table 15. Selected Repeats, Section 0124.**

Visit	Repeat Numbers					Composite Correlation
01	1	3	4	5	6	0.833
02	1	3	4	7	9	0.928
03	2	4	5	8	9	0.884
04	1	2	3	6	7	0.809
05	1	3	4	5	7	0.908
06	1	2	4	5	7	0.894
07	2	4	5	7	8	0.855
08	1	2	7	8	9	0.812
09	1	3	4	5	9	0.833
10	1	5	7	8	9	0.758
11	1	4	6	7	9	0.720
12	1	2	3	8	9	0.430
13	1	2	4	5	8	0.656

**Table 16. Selected Repeats, Section 0160.**

Visit	Repeat Numbers					Composite Correlation
01	3	4	5	6	7	0.624
02	1	2	4	6	7	0.955
03	2	3	5	6	8	0.976
04	2	3	4	5	6	0.953
05	1	2	3	4	6	0.966
06	1	2	3	4	7	0.977
07	3	5	6	8	9	0.986
08	4	5	6	7	8	0.985
09	2	3	5	6	9	0.978
10	1	2	4	6	7	0.965
11	3	4	5	6	8	0.968
12	2	4	6	7	9	0.969
13	1	2	3	4	6	0.981

**Table 17. Selected Repeats, Section 0161.**

Visit	Repeat Numbers					Composite Correlation
01	2	3	4	5	7	0.947
02	1	2	7	8	9	0.954
03	1	3	5	7	8	0.968
04	1	2	3	5	7	0.932
05	1	2	4	6	7	0.963
06	1	4	5	6	7	0.969
07	3	4	5	8	9	0.976
08	1	2	3	4	9	0.962
09	1	2	3	5	6	0.971
10	1	2	4	6	8	0.954
11	1	4	5	7	8	0.962
12	1	6	7	8	9	0.958
13	1	3	4	5	7	0.974

**Table 18. Selected Repeats, Section 0162.**

Visit	Repeat Numbers					Composite Correlation
01	1	3	4	5	7	0.958
02	1	2	3	6	9	0.971
03	1	2	3	7	8	0.974
04	1	2	3	4	6	0.966
05	2	3	4	5	6	0.971
06	1	2	5	6	7	0.973
07	1	2	3	4	6	0.980
08	1	4	5	6	9	0.981
09	1	3	4	5	9	0.986
10	3	4	6	7	9	0.963
11	1	4	5	6	9	0.962
12	3	4	6	7	8	0.957
13	2	3	4	6	7	0.955

**Table 19. Selected Repeats, Section 0163.**

Visit	Repeat Numbers					Composite Correlation
01	2	3	4	6	7	0.839
02	1	2	3	4	5	0.966
03	4	5	7	8	9	0.968
04	1	2	4	6	7	0.958
05	1	3	4	5	7	0.971
06	1	2	4	5	7	0.975
07	1	5	7	8	9	0.977
08	2	4	5	8	9	0.978
09	1	2	3	4	5	0.969
10	2	5	7	8	9	0.949
11	2	5	6	7	9	0.918
12	2	4	5	7	9	0.906
13	3	5	7	8	9	0.902

The process described above for selecting five repeat measurements from a larger group is similar to the practice within LTPP, except that it is based on composite agreement in profile, rather than the overall index value. The correlation levels listed in Tables 4 through 19 provide an appraisal of the agreement between profile measurements for each visit of each section. When two profiles produce a correlation level above 0.82, their IRI values are expected to agree within 10 percent most (95 percent) of the time. Above this threshold, the agreement between profiles is usually acceptable for studying the influence of distresses on profile. When two profiles produce a correlation level above 0.92, they are expected to agree within 5 percent most of the time. Above this threshold, the agreement between profiles is good. Correlation above 0.92 often depends on consistent lateral tracking of the profile, and may be very difficult to achieve on highly distressed surfaces. Note that the IRI values provided in this report will be the average of five observations, which will tighten the tolerance even further.

Overall, the majority of the groups of measurements listed in Tables 4 through 19 exhibited excellent correlation, and most of them exhibited good correlation. Any group of repeat measurements that produced a composite correlation level below 0.82 was investigated using filtered plots, and they are discussed here.

Section 0114, Visit 04: Spikes (downward then upward) appeared in some repeat measurements of the right side profiles with a regular spacing of 25 ft over some of the second half of the section. They did not correspond to anything recorded in the distress surveys.

Section 0115, Visit 01: Correlation was diminished by disagreement in the severity of roughness at a distressed area between 280 ft and 295 ft from the section start.

Section 0115, Visits 10 through 13: Upward and downward spikes that were scattered throughout the profiles and did not appear in the same locations in multiple repeats diminished the correlation. Correlation was severely diminished in the right side profiles by longitudinal cracking.

Section 0116, Visit 08: Correlation was diminished by disagreement in the severity and placement of very deep narrow dips about 138 ft and 170 ft from the start of the section and bumps about 237 ft from the start of the section.

Section 0117, Visit 01: Correlation was diminished by short wavelength “chatter”.

Section 0117, Visits 10 through 13: Correlation was poor because of gross disagreement in the short wavelength content of the right side profiles over longitudinal cracks (many sealed) and raveling on the right side.

Section 0118, Visit 01: Several of the measurements appeared to have included erroneous content caused by lost lock. (2)

Section 0118, Visit 08 and 09: Correlation was diminished by the appearance of dense patches of narrow dips in the right side profile, particularly from 205 ft to 280 ft into the section. It is likely that these are areas where the profile was not measured consistently over longitudinal cracks. Correlation was also diminished by disagreement in the measurement of narrow bumps within the left profile of the section.

Section 0119, Visits 04, 05, and 07: Measurements from these visits include dense patches of downward spikes. In each visit, the contaminated areas are the same, but the content within them is not correlated. It is likely that these are areas where the profile was not measured consistently over longitudinal cracks.

Section 0119, Visit 10 through 13: Correlation was diminished by uncorrelated short wavelength content, particularly on the right side, and small upward spikes in the profiles. This content was most likely caused by inconsistent measurement of profile over sealed longitudinal cracks.

Section 0123, Visit 10 through 13: Correlation was diminished by uncorrelated short wavelength content on the right side, including dense areas of narrow bumps and dips. This content was most likely caused by inconsistent measurement of profile over sealed longitudinal cracks.

Section 0124, Visits 04 and 08: Correlation was diminished by short wavelength “chatter” in the right side profiles.

Section 0124, Visit 09: Correlation was diminished by disagreement in short wavelength content in the right side profiles and some narrow downward spikes in the left side profiles.

Section 0124, Visits 10 through 13: Correlation was diminished by gross disagreement in short wavelength content in the right side profiles, including large extraneous narrow bumps throughout some of the repeats. This content was most likely caused by inconsistent measurement of profile over sealed longitudinal cracks.


Section 0160, Visit 01: Correlation was critically low because of extremely large upward spikes in the profiles of the right side.

## SUMMARY ROUGHNESS VALUES


Figures 2 through 17 show the left and right IRI values for each pavement section over their monitoring period. For most of the sections, this includes twenty-six summary IRI values; two per visit over thirteen visits. Sections 0113 and 0114 include several extra IRI values from the seasonal visits. (See Table 3.) The figures show the IRI values versus time in years. In this case, “years” refers from the number of years between the measurement date and the date that the site was opened to traffic, which was August 1, 1993. Fractions of a year are estimated to the nearest day.

To supplement the plots, Appendix A lists the IRI, Half-car Roughness Index (HRI), and Ride Number (RN) of each section for each visit. These roughness values are the average of the five repeat measurements selected in the data quality screening. Keep in mind that these are not necessarily the same five repeat measurements selected for the LTPP Level E database. Appendix A also provides the standard deviation of IRI over the five repeat measurements. This helps identify erratic roughness values that are the result of transverse variations in profile caused by surface distresses.

Figures 2 through 17 provide a snapshot of the roughness history of each pavement section. The remainder of this report is devoted to characterizing the profile content that made up the roughness, and explaining the profile features that contributed to roughness progression.



**Figure 2. IRI progression, section 0113.**



**Figure 3. IRI progression, section 0115.**




Figure 4. IRI progression, section 0114.




Figure 5. IRI progression, section 0116.




Figure 6. IRI progression, section 0117.




Figure 7. IRI progression, section 0118.




Figure 8. IRI progression, section 0119.




Figure 9. IRI progression, section 0120.




Figure 10. IRI progression, section 0121.




Figure 11. IRI progression, section 0122.




Figure 12. IRI progression, section 0123.




Figure 13. IRI progression, section 0124.




Figure 14. IRI progression, section 0160.




Figure 15. IRI progression, section 0161.




Figure 16. IRI progression, section 0162.




Figure 17. IRI progression, section 0163.

## **PROFILE ANALYSIS TOOLS**

This section of the report describes analysis techniques that were used to study the profile characteristics of each pavement section, and their change with time. These tools help study roughness, roughness distribution, and roughness progression of each section, including concentrated roughness that may be linked to pavement distress. The discussion of each analysis and plotting method is rather brief. However, some examples are provided, and all of the methods listed here are described in detail elsewhere. (5)

### **Summary Roughness Values**

Left IRI, right IRI, Mean Roughness Index (MRI), HRI, and RN values were calculated. Appendix A reports the average value of each index for each visit of each section. The discussion of roughness in this report emphasizes the left and right IRI. Nevertheless, comparing the progression of HRI and RN to that of the MRI provides additional information about the type of roughness that is changing. For example, a low HRI value relative to MRI indicates roughness that exists on only one side of the lane. Further, aggressive degradation of RN without a commensurate growth in MRI signifies that the developing roughness is biased toward short wavelength content.


### **Power Spectral Density Plots**

A power spectral density (PSD) plot of an elevation profile shows the distribution of its content within each waveband. An elevation profile PSD is displayed as mean square elevation versus wave number, which is the inverse of wavelength. A profile PSD plot is generated by performing a Fourier transform on a profile. The value of the PSD in each waveband is derived from the Fourier coefficients, and represents the contribution to the overall mean square of the profile in that band.

Often, the wavebands used in a PSD plot are given a uniform spacing on a log scale. In this research, PSDs were typically displayed using twelve bands per octave. In other words, the center of each waveband was a factor of  $2^{1/12}$  larger than the waveband to its left on the plot and a factor of  $2^{1/12}$  smaller than the waveband to its right. This spacing provided enough detail to search for roughness that was isolated at a given wavelength, but enough averaging to eliminate spurious content that is common when PSDs are displayed using a linear wave-number scale. PSD plots were also calculated from the slope profile, rather than the elevation profile. This aided in the interpretation of the plots, because the content of a slope PSD typically covers fewer orders of magnitude than an elevation PSD.

The PSD plots provided a very useful breakdown of the content within a profile. In particular, the plots reveal: (1) cases in which significant roughness is concentrated within a given waveband, (2) the type of content that dominates the profile (e.g., long, medium, or short wavelength), (3) the effectiveness of maintenance in eliminating roughness over each waveband, (4) the type of roughness that increases with time, and (5) the type of roughness that is stable with time.

Figure 18 shows the PSD of the right profile for section 0124 during visits 03 and 08. This plot includes several noteworthy features:



**Figure 18. PSD of section 0124 profile, right side.**


- The plot shows the PSD of slope, rather than elevation. Thus, the vertical axis has units of  $\text{slope}^2/(\text{cycles}/\text{ft})$ , as opposed to  $\text{elevation}^2/(\text{cycles}/\text{ft})$ .
- The plot covers a range of wave numbers from 0.01 cycles/ft to 1 cycles/ft. This is the range that affects IRI most.
- The spectral content within the profiles for wavelengths longer than 10 ft (i.e., wave numbers below 0.1 cycles/ft) did not change significantly with time between visit 03 and 08.
- The spectral content for wavelengths shorter than 10 ft increased between visits 03 and 08. In this case, the increase was caused by the presence of cracking in several areas of the section in visit 08. Several of the pavement sections behaved this way, and an increase in spectral content for shorter wavelengths often accompanied an increase in cracking.
- The spectral content of the profiles in both visits was biased toward longer wavelengths (i.e., lower wave numbers) in visit 03. Note that without the logarithmic vertical scaling, the long wavelength content would appear even more dominant. A skew in content toward longer wavelengths is a common property of smooth full-depth asphalt pavement.

Each of the final three observations listed above provide important information about the nature of the roughness on section 0124 and its progression. However, the PSD provides no information about where the roughness exists within a section. Further, if the roughness within a profile is concentrated in a single location, the PSD plot may provide misleading

information. The filtered profile plots and the roughness profiles, discussed below, provide a more complete assessment of the roughness on a given pavement.

The PSD plot also provides insight into the filtering practices of the profiler that made the measurements. Figure 19 shows the PSD of the left profile for section 0117 during visits 09 and 10 over the maximum range allowed by the section length and sample interval. This plot includes several noteworthy features:


- The spectral content differs for very long wavelengths (low wave numbers). This is not caused by a change in the shape of the section. Rather, it is the result of a change in profiler, and an associated change in the high-pass filtering methods. (6)
- The spectral content shows a decreasing trend at very short wavelengths (high wave numbers). This is an artifact of the low-pass filtering applied at the time of the measurement, which is a combination of digital filtering and height sensor footprint. (7)
- The PSD plot for visit 09 includes a spike at a wave number of about 2.2 cycles/ft, and at double that value. This is also an artifact of the measurement process, but the source is not clear. The spikes were present in all of the measurements made by this profiler, which includes all of the measurements made in visits 03 through 09. However, the spikes did not occur at the same wave number in each visit, or in each repeat measurement within a given visit. The wave number where the left-most spike occurred ranged from about 1.62 cycles/ft to 2.80 cycles/ft. A similar effect was present in the profile used in visits 01 and 02, and the spikes occurred from about 0.40 cycles/ft to 0.42 cycles/ft.



**Figure 19. PSD of section 0117 profile, left side.**


### Filtered Profile Plots

A simple way to learn about the type of roughness that exists within a profile is to view the trace. However, certain key details of the profile are often not as obvious in a raw profile trace as they may be after the profile is filtered. For example, Figure 20 shows the left raw profile trace for three visits of section 0122. The plot shows that the long wavelength content, or the trend, in each plot is quite consistent with time. However, a narrow dip appears about 309 ft from the start of the section which is much more severe in visit 06 because the profile tracked directly over it.



**Figure 20. Raw profiles of section 0122.**

Although the raw profile plots in Figure 20 provide very useful information about the nature of the roughness on section 0122, a filtered plot may provide a more detailed look at short-duration features of interest, such as the dip at 309 ft. Figure 21 shows a small segment of the profile after it has been high-pass filtered. In this case, a moving average (smoothing) filter with a baselength of 20 ft was applied to the profile, and the result was subtracted from the raw profile. Without the filter, the large changes in elevation along the profile may have masked the dip in visits 07 and 08, such that they may have been ignored. When the profile is filtered, the dip and its shape are much easier to evaluate.



**Figure 21. Filtered profile of section 0122.**

Three types of filtered plots were inspected for every visit of every section:

Long Wavelength: This is a plot of profile smoothed with a baselength of 25 ft and anti-smoothed with a baselength of 125 ft.

Medium Wavelength: This is a plot of profile smoothed with a baselength of 5 ft and anti-smoothed with a baselength of 25 ft.

Short Wavelength: This is a plot of profile smoothed with a baselength of 1 ft and anti-smoothed with a baselength of 5 ft.


These filters were used to screen the profiles for changes with time and special features of interest. The terms “long”, “medium”, and “short” are relative, and in this case pertain to the relevant portions of the waveband that affects the IRI. The long wavelength portion of the profile was typically very stable with time. However, the long wavelength profile plots of every section changed somewhat between visit 09 and 10. This was not caused by a change in the surface characteristics of the section. Rather, it was caused by a change in profiler make, and the associated change in filtering practices.

The medium wavelength plots provided a view of the features in a profile that were likely to have a strong effect on the IRI, and may change with time. The short wavelength elevation plots also typically progressed with time, but only affected the IRI through localized roughness or major changes in content with time. However, the short wavelength elevation plots helped identify and track the progression of narrow dips and other short-duration features that may have been linked to distress.

Most of the features of interest within the SPS-1 project were narrow bumps and dips. Thus, after their location was identified using the short wavelength plots, the progression in their size and shape was evaluated using an anti-smoothing filter with a baselength of 20 ft, as shown in Figure 21.

Filtered profile plots also helped to characterize the effects of maintenance operations. For example, a slurry seal was applied to nine of the sections on the SPS-1 site in May 2002 (between visit 09 and 10). In most cases, this caused a complete change to the short wavelength profile plots and a significant change to the medium wavelength profile plots. Figure 22 shows an example of the change in the medium wavelength content on section

0122. Local peaks and troughs occur in roughly the same place before and after the slurry seal, but the shape and severity of bumps and dips are heavily altered. This, and the submerging of narrow dips at cracks under the seal, is the source of the change in roughness that occurred after the slurry seal.




**Figure 22. Medium wavelength profiles of section 0122.**

### **Roughness Profile**

A roughness profile provides a continuous report of road roughness using a given segment length. (8) Instead of summarizing the roughness by providing the IRI for an entire pavement section, the roughness profile shows the details of how IRI varies with distance along the section. It does this by displaying the IRI of every possible segment of given baselength along the pavement, using a sliding window.


A roughness profile displays the spatial distribution of roughness within a profile. As such, it can be used to distinguish road sections with uniform roughness from sections with roughness levels that change over their length. Further, the roughness profile can pinpoint locations with concentrated roughness, and provide an estimate of the contribution of a given road disturbance to the overall IRI.

Figure 23 shows an example of a roughness profile for visit 08 of section 0160. The roughness profile was generated using a baselength of 25 ft. That means that every point in the plot shows the IRI of a 25-ft long segment of road, starting 12.5 ft upstream and ending 12.5 ft downstream. The plot shows several areas of elevated roughness over the first 400 ft. The smoothest 100 ft segment appears from 400 ft to 500 ft from the start of the section, but it is no smoother than the areas between isolated rough spots over the first 400 ft. Note that isolated roughness is absent over the last 100 ft of the section because it was diamond ground to smooth the section for an approach to a weigh-in-motion scale just downstream of the section.



**Figure 23. Roughness profile of section 0160, 25-ft baselength.**

Figure 24 shows how a roughness profile can help find and quantify isolated roughness. The figure shows the roughness profile of section 0122 using a 10 ft baselength for visits 06, 07 and 08. With a 10 ft baselength, isolated roughness is easy to identify. In visit 06, the peak roughness at the dip is about 755 in/mi. In the same location, the roughness is 88 in/mi. This is a difference of 667 in/mi over 10 ft. Since that value represents the roughness over just one fiftieth of the segment, it suggests that the single dip contributes about 13 in/mi to the overall IRI of the section. This is most of the difference between the IRI in visits 06 and 07.



**Figure 24. Roughness profile of section 0122, 10-ft baselength.**

## **Distress Surveys and Maintenance Records**

Once the analysis and plotting described above were completed, all of the observations were compared to the manual distress surveys performed on each section. Manual distress surveys were available for each section starting in 1994, and covering a visit nearly every year for the rest of the monitoring history. These were performed using LTPP protocols by technicians certified to perform distress surveys. The surveys provided a means of relating profile features to known distresses.

For this SPS-1 project, two observations were common. First, narrow dips that did not always increase in severity with time over portions of the wheel path with longitudinal cracking. The “hit or miss” nature of profiling a narrow track over longitudinal cracks often meant that the roughness was not measured consistently among consecutive visits. Many of the dips were much wider than the crack itself, which indicated sunken pavement near the cracks. Second, narrow bumps appeared over sealed longitudinal cracks that added to roughness. In a few cases, roughness was also found at transverse cracks.

Observations of changes in profile properties were also compared to maintenance records. In particular, sealing of cracks affected the presence and shape of narrow dips on some sections, and the application of a slurry seal affected the short and medium content within the profiles as described above, as well as the overall roughness.

## **DETAILED OBSERVATIONS**

Appendix B reports key observations from the roughness index progression, PSD plots, filtered profile plots, roughness profiles and distress surveys. In many cases, similar behavior was noted for multiple sections. Those observations are repeated under the heading of every section where it is appropriate. However, changes in profile properties with time that were caused by changes in profiler make or model are not discussed in Appendix B.

## **SUMMARY**

This section provides a summary of important observations from each section within the Arizona SPS-1 site. Several observations within this report were common to more than one pavement section, as described below. This section of the report, in conjunction with the roughness progression plots (Figures 2 through 17), provides the essential information about each pavement section. The interested reader is encouraged to read the entire report if data handling, data quality control, and great detail about the profile properties are of interest.

A slurry seal coat was applied to sections 0113, 0114, 0116, 0118, 0120, 0121, 0122, 0161 and 0162 in May 2002. The seal coat modified the short wavelength content of the profiles significantly on all of these sections. Often, the net result was temporary smoothing of narrow dips that appeared at transverse and longitudinal cracks. On many of the sections, the medium wavelength content of the profiles was also altered. This usually meant that high and low points within the medium wavelength profile plots occurred in roughly the same places, but with altered shape and severity.

On most of the sections where a seal coat was placed, the IRI changed significantly. Usually, the left side profiles were very smooth before the seal coat and became slightly

rougher afterward. However, in many cases the right side profiles became smoother after the seal coat. This is because the right side profiles often included a higher level of narrow dips caused by cracking that was submerged after the seal coat was placed.

Placement of the seal coat also improved the relationship between the right and left profiles by eliminating narrow dips and uncorrelated short wavelength content. This is demonstrated by the fact that the difference between the HRI and MRI always reduced after the seal coat was placed. On average, the percentage difference between HRI and MRI reduced by 6.6 percent after the seal coat was placed.

On sections 0113, 0118, 0122 and 0162 a bump appeared in the location where the seal coat operation had stopped and restarted. This usually was rough enough to register as localized roughness in the left side of the lane.

A seam existed at a longitudinal construction joint along the right side of the lane over the entire project. Longitudinal cracking developed there on many of the test sections. However, with the exception of section 0119, the cracking usually did not contribute aggressively to the roughness until after the application of sealant in either May 2001 or April 2002. Sections 0115, 0117, 0118, 0119, 0123 and 0124 were affected most by the sealed longitudinal cracks. (Note that most of these sections did not receive a slurry seal coat.)

The additional roughness caused by sealed longitudinal cracks usually appeared as narrow bumps and dips that were not consistent in size, shape, or location between repeat measurements. The “hit or miss” nature of the roughness was caused by slight changes in lateral positioning of the profiler in each measurement, and some lateral wander of the cracks themselves. In most cases, the bumps and dips caused the roughness of the right side profiles to increase aggressively during the last three profiling visits. In section 0117 and 0124, raveling also contributed to roughness in the right side of the lane. An important feature of the increase in roughness with these causes is that it overestimates the probable degradation in ride quality felt by the user, since much of the influence of raveling and longitudinal cracking is enveloped by vehicle tires.

Many other profile features were found that affected the roughness of these test sections, such as transverse cracking (sections 0113, 0121, 0161 and 0163), potholes (0163), and rough patching (0116). The end of this report describes the most noteworthy features of each test section that affected the roughness or the roughness progression.

The change in profiler make in late 2002 affected the long wavelength content of the profiles on every test section. This is because the newer profiler used a high-pass filter that eliminated a little more of the profile content than the previous device. This had no probable effect on the measurement of localized roughness or the study of narrow bumps and dips caused by distresses. However, it did confound the study of the true effect caused by the slurry seal coat, since the device change and application of the seal coat both occurred between visits 09 and 10.

One other minor device effect within the profiles was peaks in the PSD plots with no pavement-related explanation. In visits 01 and 02 (measured by the K.J. Law DNC 690) most PSD plots from the left side included a strong peak at a wavelength of 2.5 ft. In visits

03 through 09 (K.J. Law T-6600) all profiles from the left and right side included a peak in their spectral content at a wavelength somewhere between 0.35 and 0.7 ft and another at a wavelength of double the first.


The rest of this report provides a summary of the most important observations made about each test section. The summaries are extracted from Appendix B, which provides detailed notes about each section. To help provide context for the summary statements below, Figure 25 shows the range of left and right IRI for each section. Note that the highest IRI value for some of the sections did not occur in the final visit. (See Appendix A or Figures 2 through 17.)

Section 0113: A bump appeared 157 ft from the start of the section on the left side throughout the profile monitoring history, but it did not correspond to any observed distress. After the application of a slurry seal in May 2002, the bump was much longer. A severe bump appeared on the left side at a seam between slurry seal applications 175 ft from the start of the section. This was detected in all visits after May 2002. The right side of section 0113 was significantly rougher between November 2001 and March 2002 than it was over the rest of the profile monitoring history. The most significant contributors to this was two sunken areas of pavement between 350 ft and 400 ft from the start of the section with several narrow dips within them. Photographs of the surface show slightly sunken pavement and alligator cracking in these areas. Secondary contributions came from several narrow dips at transverse cracks. All of these features were much less rough after the application of a slurry seal coat.

Section 0114: The left side of this section was extremely smooth until the application of a slurry seal coat in May 2002. Afterward, the roughness had increased in the wavelength range from 2 to 10 ft, but the overall roughness was still low. The right side of the section included some localized roughness at a narrow dip 456 ft from the start of the section that was about 1 ft wide and up to 0.6 in deep. This appeared in only two of the visits before the slurry seal coat was applied. Afterward, only a minor disturbance was found there. All distress surveys after 1996 show significant cracking there.

Sections 0113 and 0114: The profiles from visit S16 underestimated longitudinal distance by about 1 percent.

Section 0115: This section was very smooth on the left side throughout the entire monitoring period, and was smooth on the right side through the first ten visits. The roughness increased very aggressively on the right side over the last three visits because of longitudinal cracking. By the final visit the average IRI was 225 in/mi. However, the profile measurements of the right side were not very consistent with each other in the last three visits. This was because the profiler used height sensors with a narrow footprint and wandered above the cracks.



**Figure 25. Summary of IRI ranges.**

Section 0116: This section remained smooth over the entire monitoring period, with the exception of three small areas. In all three cases, deep dips appeared in the profiles that added significant roughness to the section. In August 2001 patches were placed over all three dips, but the patches were often at least as rough as the dips they replaced. One patch on the right side of the lane from 150 to 170 ft from the start of the section was so rough that it temporarily added more than 25 in/mi to the roughness of the entire section.

Section 0117: The roughness of this section was affected most by longitudinal cracking and raveling along the right side of the lane, which usually appeared as poorly correlated areas of narrow dips. Crack sealing in both May 2001 and April 2002 actually increased the roughness by introducing narrow bumps to the profile. In the visits after crack sealing, the right side profiles included long areas of high short wavelength roughness that was not always well repeated between measurements. This content was most prevalent in the last third of the section.

Section 0118: The right side profiles from this section included significant roughness caused by erratic measurement of longitudinal cracking in two visits just after crack sealing was performed in May 2001. The left side profiles included two areas of localized roughness after the placement of the slurry seal. One of them is a bump in the location where the seal coat operation had stopped and restarted.

Section 0119: The left side profiles remained smooth overall over the monitoring period, although the effect of longitudinal cracking began to appear in the later visits. The right side of the lane included significant longitudinal cracking that eventually extended along the entire section. The right side profiles were often poorly repeated and grew in roughness erratically because of “hit or miss” detection of dips along the cracks. The profile measurements taken after the crack sealing was performed in April 2002 were even rougher, and included dense areas of both bumps and dips that were not well repeated.

Section 0120: The profiles of this section were not affected directly by distress. However, they did include two areas of localized roughness. The first was caused by a dip nearly 0.5 in deep extended from 10 ft ahead of the start of the section to 40 ft after the start of the section on both sides of the lane. The second was caused by a slope break on the left side about 380 ft from the start of the section.

Section 0121: This section included several narrow bumps in the left and right side profiles starting in March 2003 that corresponded to locations where transverse cracks were recorded. Before the application of a slurry seal in May 2002, the right side profiles included a bump about 0.25 in high from 330 to 350 ft from the start of the section that added about 3 in/mi to its roughness.

Section 0122: A deep, narrow dip was detected in the left side profiles in some visits (06, 08 and 09) at a pothole. In visit 06, it added up to 14 in/mi to the overall roughness of the section. It was patched in February 2001, and no localized roughness appeared there afterward. A bump appeared in the profiles 175 ft from the start of the section where the slurry seal operation was stopped then restarted in May 2002. The bump was severe enough to cause a peak in the roughness profile of 180 in/mi on the left side.

Section 0123: This section remained very smooth on the left side. On the right side, an erratic trend in roughness was caused throughout the earlier visits by inconsistent measurement of a long dip about 320 ft from the start of the section. Erratic profile measurement and aggressive development of roughness on the right side was caused in the later visits by sealed longitudinal cracking that extended over most of the section. The effect was much more pronounced after crack sealing.

Section 0124: This section remained very smooth on the left side, although the roughness in the last 50 ft of the section increased in the later visits due to raveling. On the right side, erratic profile measurement and aggressive development of roughness on the right side was caused in the later visits by sealed longitudinal cracking that extended over most of the section. The effect seemed to be exacerbated by crack sealing.

Section 0160: A significant portion of the roughness was caused by slab curl, which was significantly more severe in November 1999 than in other visits. The last 100 ft of the section was much smoother than the rest, because it was diamond ground.

Section 0161: Placement of a slurry seal between visit 09 and 10 smoothed the short and medium wavelength content of the profiles somewhat over most of the section. The smoothing was most significant on the left side profile from 90 to 150 ft from the start of the section. On the right side, a patch was placed 485 ft from the start of the section in August 2001 (after visit 08). This caused an abrupt downward step at this location which contributed 15-18 in/mi to the overall roughness of the section in the later visits. Deep (0.1 to 0.4 in) narrow dips appeared at the locations of six transverse cracks on the left side in the later visits, and were most severe in the last profiling visit.

Section 0162: The profiles of this section did not contain any localized roughness and did not change much over the first nine visits. PSD plots of the left side profiles show significant content in the profiles isolated between wavelengths of 26 and 29 ft. The application of a slurry seal coat reduced the roughness significantly on both sides of the lane between visit 09 and 10. A bump 0.4 inches high appeared in the last 10 ft of the section on both sides in the last four profiling visits. Photographs of the section show that this was a seam at the end of the seal coat. The roughness there adds 5 to 11 in/mi to the overall IRI of the section.

Section 0163: This section included a long dip over the last 100 ft. The section was roughest over the last 50 ft, and the roughness there grew the most aggressively with time. This occurred because of several cracks that caused narrow dips in the profile on both sides. The most severe narrow dips appeared in the left side profiles 450 and 475 ft from the start of the section. These correspond to locations where a distress survey in May 2001 observed small potholes. Several other narrow dips were observed in the profile in the locations of transverse cracks. Together, these dips did cause an increase in roughness with time after visit 03, particularly on the right side.

## REFERENCES

1. Nichols Consulting Engineers, Chtd, "Construction Report on Site 040100." (1992) 467 p.
2. Evans, L. D. and A. Eltahan, "LTPP Profile Variability" *Federal Highway Administration Report FHWA-RD-00-113* (2000) 178 p.

3. Karamihas, S. M., “Development of Cross Correlation for Objective Comparison of Profiles.” *International Journal of Vehicle Design*, Vol. 36, Nos. 2/3 (2004) pp. 173-193.
4. Karamihas, S. M., et. al., “Guidelines for Longitudinal Pavement Profile Measurement.” *National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 454* (1999) 81 p.
5. Sayers, M. W. and S. M. Karamihas, “Interpretation of Road Roughness Profile Data.” *Federal Highway Administration Report FHWA/RD-96/101* (1996) 177 p.
6. Perera, R. W. and S. D. Kohn, “Quantification of Smoothness Index Differences Related to LTPP Equipment Type.” *Federal Highway Administration Report FHWA-HRT-05-054* (2005).
7. Karamihas, S. M., “Critical Profiler Accuracy Requirements.” *University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute Report UMTRI-2005-24* (2005) 115 p.
8. Sayers, M. W., “Profiles of Roughness.” *Transportation Research Record 1260* (1990) pp. 106-111.

## Appendix A: Roughness Values


This appendix lists the left International Roughness Index (IRI), right IRI, mean roughness index (MRI), Half-car Roughness Index (HRI), and Ride Number (RN) values for each visit of each section. The roughness values are the average for five repeat runs. The five runs were selected from a group of as many as nine by automated comparison of profiles, as described in the main report. Values of standard deviation are also provided for left and right IRI to reveal cases of high variability among the five measurements. However, the screening procedure used to select five repeats usually helped reduce the level of scatter.

The discussion of roughness in the main report emphasizes the left and right IRI. Nevertheless, the other indexes do provide useful additional information. MRI is simply the average of the left and right IRI value. HRI is calculated by converting the IRI filter into a half-car model. (1) This is done by collapsing the left and right profile into a single profile in which each point is the average of the corresponding left and right elevation. The IRI filter is then applied to the resulting signal. The HRI is very similar to the IRI, except that side to side deviations in profile are eliminated. The result is that the HRI value for a pair of profiles will always be lower than the corresponding MRI value. Comparing the HRI and MRI value provides a crude indication of the significance of roll (i.e., side by side variation in profile) to the overall roughness. When HRI is low compared to MRI, roll is significant. This is common among asphalt pavements. (2) Certain types of pavement distress, such as longitudinal cracking, may also cause significant differences between HRI and MRI.

Figure A-1 compares the HRI to MRI for all of the profile measurements that are covered in this appendix. This includes 1190 pairs of roughness values. The figure shows a best fit line with a zero intercept and a line of equality. The slope of the line is 0.849. This is typical for asphalt pavement.

RN has shown a closer relationship to road user opinion than the other indexes. (3) As such, it may help distinguish the segments from each other by ride quality. Further, the effect on RN may help quantify the impact of that distress on ride when a particular type of distress dominates the roughness of a section. In particular, a very low RN value coupled with moderate IRI values indicates a high level of short wavelength roughness, and potential sensitivity to narrow dips and measurement errors caused by coarse surface texture.

Table A-1 provides the roughness values. The tables also list the date of each measurement, and the time in years since the site was opened to traffic.



**Figure A-1. Comparison of HRI to MRI.**

**Table A-1. Roughness Values.**

Section	Date	Years	Left IRI (in/mi)		Right IRI (in/mi)		MRI (in/mi)	HRI (in/mi)	RN
			Ave	St Dev	Ave	St Dev			
0113	27-Jan-94	0.49	78	0.8	72	1.5	75	61	3.71
0113	27-Feb-95	1.57	79	0.7	69	0.4	74	61	3.77
0113	23-Jan-97	3.48	75	0.9	75	0.3	75	61	3.68
0113	08-Apr-98	4.68	76	1.9	80	1.8	78	63	3.52
0113	08-Jul-98	4.93	73	0.8	83	1.8	78	64	3.59
0113	01-Oct-98	5.17	75	0.4	83	0.9	79	66	3.57
0113	04-Dec-98	5.34	74	0.8	82	1.3	78	65	3.59
0113	17-Nov-99	6.29	75	0.7	100	1.7	87	72	3.58
0113	19-Dec-00	7.38	76	0.9	104	2.0	90	74	3.46
0113	06-Nov-01	8.27	79	0.8	140	2.3	109	89	2.85
0113	10-Dec-01	8.36	80	0.9	129	2.8	105	85	3.03
0113	23-Jan-02	8.48	82	0.6	113	3.1	98	80	3.15
0113	20-Feb-02	8.56	78	0.9	137	3.1	108	87	3.02
0113	14-Mar-02	8.62	82	1.0	125	1.5	104	84	3.08
0113	11-Oct-02	9.19	77	1.2	84	0.5	81	74	3.51
0113	18-Dec-02	9.38	77	1.0	84	0.6	80	74	3.49
0113	02-Mar-03	9.58	74	0.9	97	4.8	85	78	3.36
0113	10-Mar-03	9.60	78	0.6	88	3.5	83	75	3.42
0113	09-Aug-03	10.02	78	0.4	83	0.6	80	74	3.44
0113	23-Nov-03	10.31	79	0.8	85	0.8	82	75	3.41
0113	17-Dec-03	10.38	78	0.9	85	1.2	82	75	3.38
0113	10-Mar-04	10.61	80	0.6	86	0.4	83	76	3.37
0113	22-Apr-04	10.72	80	1.1	88	1.3	84	77	3.39
0113	15-Jul-04	10.95	81	0.9	89	1.2	85	77	3.37
0113	08-Sep-04	11.10	81	0.4	87	0.5	84	77	3.37
0113	15-Mar-05	11.62	83	0.3	91	1.2	87	78	3.30
0113	27-Mar-06	12.65	84	1.0	100	0.7	92	82	3.06

**Table A-1. Roughness Values.**

Section	Date	Years	Left IRI (in/mi)		Right IRI (in/mi)		MRI (in/mi)	HRI (in/mi)	RN
			Ave	St Dev	Ave	St Dev			
0114	27-Jan-94	0.49	37	1.8	48	1.1	42	34	4.19
0114	27-Feb-95	1.57	41	0.3	49	0.7	45	36	4.20
0114	23-Jan-97	3.48	40	0.5	54	0.8	47	38	4.11
0114	14-Jan-98	4.45	42	0.8	55	1.4	49	38	3.79
0114	07-Apr-98	4.68	44	1.1	57	1.6	51	40	3.70
0114	08-Apr-98	4.68	43	1.4	55	0.8	49	39	3.76
0114	08-Jul-98	4.93	41	0.6	57	0.4	49	39	3.95
0114	01-Oct-98	5.17	41	0.7	57	0.6	49	39	3.96
0114	04-Dec-98	5.34	41	0.7	57	1.2	49	39	3.93
0114	17-Nov-99	6.29	42	0.5	63	1.1	53	44	3.93
0114	19-Dec-00	7.38	45	0.5	67	0.7	56	47	3.62
0114	06-Nov-01	8.27	45	0.5	63	0.8	54	45	3.93
0114	10-Dec-01	8.36	45	0.5	64	0.6	54	45	3.96
0114	23-Jan-02	8.48	46	0.5	64	0.6	55	45	3.95
0114	20-Feb-02	8.56	46	0.5	68	1.8	57	47	3.75
0114	14-Mar-02	8.62	46	0.6	66	1.4	56	46	3.92
0114	11-Oct-02	9.19	57	0.6	55	0.7	56	49	3.85
0114	18-Dec-02	9.38	59	2.1	55	1.0	57	49	3.83
0114	02-Mar-03	9.58	65	0.7	59	0.9	62	53	3.68
0114	10-Mar-03	9.60	62	0.6	58	1.2	60	51	3.76
0114	09-Aug-03	10.02	58	0.5	54	0.4	56	50	3.89
0114	23-Nov-03	10.31	62	0.4	56	0.9	59	51	3.82
0114	17-Dec-03	10.38	59	0.4	56	0.8	57	51	3.87
0114	10-Mar-04	10.61	59	0.5	56	0.4	58	52	3.85
0114	22-Apr-04	10.72	60	0.7	57	0.3	58	51	3.86
0114	15-Jul-04	10.95	59	1.1	55	0.5	57	50	3.87
0114	08-Sep-04	11.10	58	0.1	55	0.6	56	51	3.87
0114	15-Mar-05	11.62	63	1.1	61	0.9	62	53	3.72
0114	27-Mar-06	12.65	60	0.3	57	0.8	58	52	3.74
0115	27-Jan-94	0.49	39	0.4	46	2.1	43	36	4.22
0115	27-Feb-95	1.57	38	0.2	47	0.6	42	36	4.28
0115	23-Jan-97	3.48	39	1.0	48	0.9	43	36	4.19
0115	08-Apr-98	4.68	41	0.5	50	0.9	45	38	4.00
0115	04-Dec-98	5.34	39	0.4	49	0.6	44	37	4.09
0115	17-Nov-99	6.29	37	0.5	50	0.8	44	37	4.18
0115	19-Dec-00	7.38	38	0.5	51	0.6	44	37	4.18
0115	06-Nov-01	8.27	38	0.5	65	1.2	51	42	3.89
0115	20-Feb-02	8.56	38	0.7	67	2.0	53	43	3.84
0115	02-Mar-03	9.58	41	3.3	50	4.0	46	39	3.88
0115	10-Mar-04	10.61	41	0.4	84	12.1	62	51	3.41
0115	15-Mar-05	11.62	46	1.0	142	40.5	94	80	2.86
0115	27-Mar-06	12.65	49	0.2	225	6.7	137	120	2.37
0116	27-Jan-94	0.49	34	0.5	53	0.9	44	34	4.13
0116	27-Feb-95	1.57	38	0.9	52	0.5	45	33	4.15
0116	23-Jan-97	3.48	35	0.4	57	0.9	46	34	4.08
0116	08-Apr-98	4.68	37	0.3	58	1.9	47	36	3.82
0116	04-Dec-98	5.34	34	1.0	59	1.6	46	35	3.93
0116	17-Nov-99	6.29	34	0.5	61	0.8	48	37	4.07
0116	19-Dec-00	7.38	34	0.3	60	1.8	47	36	4.06
0116	06-Nov-01	8.27	46	4.5	65	1.3	55	44	3.18

**Table A-1. Roughness Values.**

Section	Date	Years	Left IRI (in/mi)		Right IRI (in/mi)		MRI (in/mi)	HRI (in/mi)	RN
			Ave	St Dev	Ave	St Dev			
0116	20-Feb-02	8.56	45	0.9	105	0.9	75	62	2.99
0116	02-Mar-03	9.58	52	1.2	57	2.0	55	43	3.85
0116	10-Mar-04	10.61	61	0.4	60	0.7	60	47	3.73
0116	15-Mar-05	11.62	57	0.9	61	0.4	59	46	3.79
0116	27-Mar-06	12.65	65	0.5	64	0.6	64	50	3.59
0117	27-Jan-94	0.49	35	1.6	47	2.1	41	33	4.16
0117	27-Feb-95	1.57	33	0.5	47	0.9	40	31	4.18
0117	23-Jan-97	3.48	35	1.2	50	0.1	42	33	4.06
0117	08-Apr-98	4.68	36	0.7	51	0.7	43	34	3.93
0117	04-Dec-98	5.34	36	0.8	49	0.7	42	33	4.00
0117	17-Nov-99	6.29	34	0.6	49	0.7	41	32	4.11
0117	19-Dec-00	7.38	34	0.4	50	0.5	42	33	4.11
0117	06-Nov-01	8.27	34	0.3	61	2.3	47	38	4.00
0117	20-Feb-02	8.56	34	0.8	64	0.8	49	39	3.97
0117	02-Mar-03	9.58	34	0.9	89	7.2	61	50	3.49
0117	10-Mar-04	10.61	39	0.9	54	2.1	47	38	3.78
0117	15-Mar-05	11.62	40	0.7	124	19.6	82	69	2.92
0117	27-Mar-06	12.65	44	0.5	107	5.3	76	63	2.94
0118	27-Jan-94	0.49	37	1.4	66	2.1	51	40	4.03
0118	27-Feb-95	1.57	34	0.6	64	0.6	49	38	4.12
0118	23-Jan-97	3.48	35	0.6	74	0.4	54	42	3.93
0118	08-Apr-98	4.68	37	0.9	70	1.3	53	40	3.87
0118	04-Dec-98	5.34	35	0.8	72	1.6	53	41	3.93
0118	17-Nov-99	6.29	38	1.0	73	2.4	55	43	3.85
0118	19-Dec-00	7.38	37	0.8	78	1.7	58	45	3.71
0118	06-Nov-01	8.27	38	0.9	101	3.4	69	55	3.35
0118	20-Feb-02	8.56	38	0.5	107	5.9	73	59	3.20
0118	02-Mar-03	9.58	52	1.0	67	0.6	60	51	3.77
0118	10-Mar-04	10.61	53	0.7	78	3.1	65	58	3.67
0118	15-Mar-05	11.62	56	1.6	65	1.4	61	52	3.78
0118	27-Mar-06	12.65	57	1.0	69	1.1	63	55	3.75
0119	27-Jan-94	0.49	39	0.6	77	2.4	58	47	3.96
0119	27-Feb-95	1.57	42	0.5	65	1.4	53	44	4.09
0119	23-Jan-97	3.48	43	0.4	72	1.9	58	46	3.96
0119	08-Apr-98	4.68	45	0.9	92	10.2	68	55	3.39
0119	04-Dec-98	5.34	44	0.4	82	5.1	63	51	3.59
0119	17-Nov-99	6.29	44	1.2	74	5.7	59	47	3.80
0119	19-Dec-00	7.38	43	0.6	78	3.8	61	49	3.64
0119	06-Nov-01	8.27	44	0.8	107	1.7	76	62	3.40
0119	20-Feb-02	8.56	45	0.9	92	6.6	68	55	3.58
0119	02-Mar-03	9.58	49	1.5	70	1.6	60	47	3.58
0119	10-Mar-04	10.61	47	1.0	98	13.1	73	58	3.22
0119	15-Mar-05	11.62	50	1.2	116	3.0	83	67	2.95
0119	27-Mar-06	12.65	56	2.8	131	4.7	94	75	2.62
0120	27-Jan-94	0.49	52	0.8	64	1.1	58	48	4.04
0120	27-Feb-95	1.57	54	0.7	62	0.3	58	49	4.11
0120	23-Jan-97	3.48	55	1.1	72	0.8	64	53	3.96
0120	08-Apr-98	4.68	57	0.7	73	1.2	65	55	3.84
0120	04-Dec-98	5.34	57	0.4	69	0.8	63	54	3.93
0120	17-Nov-99	6.29	60	0.7	75	0.6	68	56	3.87

**Table A-1. Roughness Values.**

Section	Date	Years	Left IRI (in/mi)		Right IRI (in/mi)		MRI (in/mi)	HRI (in/mi)	RN
			Ave	St Dev	Ave	St Dev			
0120	19-Dec-00	7.38	59	0.1	76	0.7	68	56	3.93
0120	06-Nov-01	8.27	60	0.6	73	0.3	66	56	3.92
0120	20-Feb-02	8.56	62	0.7	77	0.5	69	58	3.88
0120	02-Mar-03	9.58	67	0.6	64	0.5	65	61	3.94
0120	10-Mar-04	10.61	67	0.8	66	0.8	66	60	3.92
0120	15-Mar-05	11.62	68	0.7	65	0.7	66	61	3.88
0120	27-Mar-06	12.65	69	0.6	66	0.8	68	61	3.83
0121	27-Jan-94	0.49	35	0.4	60	0.8	47	37	4.20
0121	27-Feb-95	1.57	35	0.2	58	0.8	47	37	4.24
0121	23-Jan-97	3.48	37	0.3	60	1.0	48	38	4.12
0121	08-Apr-98	4.68	39	1.3	62	1.0	51	39	3.93
0121	04-Dec-98	5.34	38	0.8	59	0.4	49	38	4.04
0121	17-Nov-99	6.29	39	0.3	63	0.5	51	40	4.09
0121	19-Dec-00	7.38	37	0.5	61	1.1	49	39	4.09
0121	06-Nov-01	8.27	38	0.5	61	0.3	49	39	4.06
0121	20-Feb-02	8.56	38	0.3	67	2.6	52	42	3.90
0121	02-Mar-03	9.58	51	0.7	62	0.8	56	49	3.81
0121	10-Mar-04	10.61	49	0.3	68	1.7	59	49	3.72
0121	15-Mar-05	11.62	49	0.8	68	1.6	58	50	3.72
0121	27-Mar-06	12.65	49	0.6	68	0.6	58	49	3.69
0122	27-Jan-94	0.49	41	0.4	78	0.6	60	49	4.09
0122	27-Feb-95	1.57	40	0.8	77	0.5	59	49	4.16
0122	23-Jan-97	3.48	45	0.7	82	0.5	64	52	4.03
0122	08-Apr-98	4.68	43	0.8	81	1.5	62	51	3.84
0122	04-Dec-98	5.34	44	0.5	81	0.9	63	51	3.93
0122	17-Nov-99	6.29	58	0.9	88	0.8	73	61	2.91
0122	19-Dec-00	7.38	47	0.6	87	0.5	67	54	4.01
0122	06-Nov-01	8.27	45	0.6	85	1.1	65	53	3.93
0122	20-Feb-02	8.56	48	0.7	87	0.4	67	54	3.78
0122	02-Mar-03	9.58	64	0.3	69	1.3	67	58	3.80
0122	10-Mar-04	10.61	65	0.4	79	2.0	72	63	3.74
0122	15-Mar-05	11.62	64	1.2	72	1.7	68	60	3.81
0122	27-Mar-06	12.65	66	0.6	77	0.9	71	63	3.76
0123	27-Jan-94	0.49	38	0.6	53	0.6	45	38	4.15
0123	27-Feb-95	1.57	38	0.8	49	0.6	43	37	4.21
0123	23-Jan-97	3.48	39	0.2	58	1.3	49	40	4.06
0123	08-Apr-98	4.68	40	1.0	55	0.8	48	40	3.90
0123	04-Dec-98	5.34	40	0.5	55	0.3	47	39	4.00
0123	17-Nov-99	6.29	39	0.7	60	1.5	50	43	4.03
0123	19-Dec-00	7.38	39	0.5	62	3.1	51	43	3.93
0123	06-Nov-01	8.27	39	0.2	68	7.9	54	45	3.89
0123	20-Feb-02	8.56	39	0.5	59	2.1	49	42	4.02
0123	02-Mar-03	9.58	39	0.6	52	2.5	46	37	3.90
0123	10-Mar-04	10.61	39	0.7	97	30.5	68	56	3.35
0123	15-Mar-05	11.62	42	0.8	115	19.0	79	65	3.08
0123	27-Mar-06	12.65	47	0.9	134	14.2	91	75	2.76
0124	27-Jan-94	0.49	33	0.9	38	0.5	36	28	4.25
0124	27-Feb-95	1.57	31	0.6	37	0.5	34	27	4.29
0124	23-Jan-97	3.48	34	0.8	41	0.3	37	28	4.23
0124	08-Apr-98	4.68	33	0.5	43	1.8	38	29	3.98

**Table A-1. Roughness Values.**

Section	Date	Years	Left IRI (in/mi)		Right IRI (in/mi)		MRI (in/mi)	HRI (in/mi)	RN
			Ave	St Dev	Ave	St Dev			
0124	04-Dec-98	5.34	33	0.5	42	1.0	37	29	4.07
0124	17-Nov-99	6.29	34	0.7	43	0.4	38	30	4.18
0124	19-Dec-00	7.38	33	0.6	45	1.6	39	31	4.16
0124	06-Nov-01	8.27	33	0.8	56	3.9	45	36	3.94
0124	20-Feb-02	8.56	34	0.3	66	1.5	50	38	3.75
0124	02-Mar-03	9.58	43	2.3	69	2.6	56	44	3.28
0124	10-Mar-04	10.61	34	0.4	112	15.5	73	62	3.25
0124	15-Mar-05	11.62	46	4.8	125	18.2	86	68	2.75
0124	27-Mar-06	12.65	42	0.9	148	14.7	95	79	2.88
0160	27-Jan-94	0.49	88	1.6	122	28.3	105	90	2.75
0160	27-Feb-95	1.57	91	1.3	95	0.9	93	78	3.47
0160	23-Jan-97	3.48	95	0.9	103	1.2	99	85	3.36
0160	08-Apr-98	4.68	101	1.9	102	1.2	102	86	3.36
0160	04-Dec-98	5.34	98	0.8	105	1.0	102	88	3.38
0160	17-Nov-99	6.29	116	2.3	121	1.4	119	108	3.28
0160	19-Dec-00	7.38	107	0.2	112	1.1	109	99	3.34
0160	06-Nov-01	8.27	103	1.1	110	0.7	107	95	3.36
0160	20-Feb-02	8.56	100	1.1	109	1.3	105	93	3.40
0160	02-Mar-03	9.58	99	0.7	110	1.1	104	91	3.24
0160	10-Mar-04	10.61	105	1.1	111	0.8	108	95	3.26
0160	15-Mar-05	11.62	101	0.7	108	0.7	104	92	3.28
0160	27-Mar-06	12.65	104	0.5	112	0.8	108	95	3.24
0161	27-Jan-94	0.49	75	0.7	75	2.4	75	65	3.83
0161	27-Feb-95	1.57	77	0.5	71	1.3	74	64	3.92
0161	23-Jan-97	3.48	75	0.8	80	0.5	77	67	3.78
0161	08-Apr-98	4.68	77	0.6	74	1.1	75	64	3.72
0161	04-Dec-98	5.34	76	0.7	72	1.3	74	63	3.76
0161	17-Nov-99	6.29	74	0.9	81	0.9	78	66	3.76
0161	19-Dec-00	7.38	75	0.5	83	0.4	79	68	3.77
0161	06-Nov-01	8.27	76	0.6	84	1.6	80	68	3.73
0161	20-Feb-02	8.56	74	0.6	110	0.5	92	79	3.18
0161	02-Mar-03	9.58	62	0.5	87	2.6	75	70	3.48
0161	10-Mar-04	10.61	71	0.7	79	1.3	75	69	3.49
0161	15-Mar-05	11.62	69	0.7	84	1.1	76	70	3.34
0161	27-Mar-06	12.65	72	0.7	87	0.2	80	73	3.17
0162	27-Jan-94	0.49	69	1.2	87	1.1	78	67	3.84
0162	27-Feb-95	1.57	69	0.4	84	0.7	77	66	3.90
0162	23-Jan-97	3.48	72	0.4	89	0.5	81	69	3.79
0162	08-Apr-98	4.68	72	0.5	88	0.6	80	69	3.71
0162	04-Dec-98	5.34	72	0.6	88	0.9	80	68	3.75
0162	17-Nov-99	6.29	71	0.6	92	0.8	82	69	3.75
0162	19-Dec-00	7.38	70	0.3	92	0.8	81	69	3.76
0162	06-Nov-01	8.27	71	0.4	91	0.5	81	70	3.78
0162	20-Feb-02	8.56	70	0.3	92	0.4	81	69	3.76
0162	02-Mar-03	9.58	66	0.7	79	0.7	73	65	3.72
0162	10-Mar-04	10.61	75	1.2	81	1.0	78	71	3.63
0162	15-Mar-05	11.62	73	1.1	78	0.9	76	69	3.66
0162	27-Mar-06	12.65	75	0.8	80	0.5	77	71	3.62

**Table A-1. Roughness Values.**

Section	Date	Years	Left IRI (in/mi)		Right IRI (in/mi)		MRI (in/mi)	HRI (in/mi)	RN
			Ave	St Dev	Ave	St Dev			
0163	27-Jan-94	0.49	74	2.3	65	1.1	69	61	4.11
0163	27-Feb-95	1.57	60	0.8	73	0.8	66	60	4.13
0163	23-Jan-97	3.48	61	0.7	86	1.4	74	65	3.68
0163	08-Apr-98	4.68	72	0.6	106	1.7	89	79	3.45
0163	04-Dec-98	5.34	67	0.6	101	1.2	84	74	3.38
0163	17-Nov-99	6.29	72	0.7	110	0.5	91	79	3.17
0163	19-Dec-00	7.38	72	0.3	113	1.2	93	80	3.11
0163	06-Nov-01	8.27	79	0.9	126	0.6	103	90	2.94
0163	20-Feb-02	8.56	78	1.2	127	0.7	103	89	2.84
0163	02-Mar-03	9.58	75	1.0	127	3.7	101	85	2.76
0163	10-Mar-04	10.61	74	1.2	110	3.3	92	78	3.01
0163	15-Mar-05	11.62	81	1.3	133	2.4	107	90	2.58
0163	27-Mar-06	12.65	83	2.2	114	3.4	98	81	2.79

**REFERENCES**

1. Sayers, M.W., "Two Quarter-Car Models for Defining Road Roughness: IRI and HRI." *Transportation Research Record 1215* (1989) pp 165-172.
2. Karamihas, S. M., Gillespie, T.D., and S.M. Riley, "Axle Tramp Contribution to the Dynamic Wheel Loads of a Heavy Truck." *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Heavy Vehicle Weights and Dimensions*, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Ed. C. B. Winkler. (1995) pp. 425-434.
3. Sayers, M. W. and S. M. Karamihas, "Estimation of Rideability by Analyzing Road Profile." *Transportation Research Record 1536* (1996) pp 110-116.

## Appendix B: Detailed Observations

This appendix provides detailed observations from the roughness trend, profiles and distress surveys of each section within the Arizona SPS-1 project. Observations regarding profile features are made using power spectral density (PSD) plots, filtered elevation profile plots, and roughness profiles. Each section is discussed individually. Sections 0113 and 0114 are discussed one side (left and right) at a time, since the high number of visits caused the discussions to be somewhat long.

Typically, roughness profiles provided the most information about the location of features that affected the IRI most, including areas of localized roughness. In this appendix, roughness profiles were made using a baselength of 25 ft unless otherwise specified. An area is considered to have localized roughness when the roughness profile (with a baselength of 25 ft) reaches a peak value that is greater than 2.5 times the average IRI for the whole section. This usually prompted more careful examination of the filtered elevation profiles.

The PSD plots were less informative, since none of the profiles were dominated by periodic content.

### Section 0113

Roughness: The HRI was 17 to 19 percent lower than the MRI for visits 01 through 09 and seasonal visits S03 through S07. These “earlier” visits include all of those on or before May 2002. During the “later” visits, which include visits 10 through 13 and seasonal visits S08 through S16, the HRI was 8 to 11 percent lower than the MRI. This is an unusually low difference for the SPS-1 project. The similarity between the HRI and MRI indicates that more profile features exist on both sides along this section than is typical for an SPS-1 pavement section.

#### *Section 0113, Left Side*

Roughness: The IRI ranged from 73 to 84 in/mi over the monitoring period.

PSD Plots: The spectral content was fairly consistent over all of the visits, and was similar to white noise slope. In addition, the PSD plots were very consistent over a group of visits including 01 through 09 and seasonal visits S03 through S07. The PSD plots were also consistent over seasonal visits S08 through S16. While profiles from the two groups of visits include roughly the same spectral distribution, the details of the plots in the earlier visits are not always similar to the later visits. This may be the result of a change in profiler make. Note that visit 10 was not as consistent with the later group of visits as they were with each other.

#### Filtered Profiles:

Long Wavelengths: The long wavelength content was consistent with time.

Medium Wavelengths: The medium wavelength profile plots were consistent over about half of the section. In the areas that were 170 to 280 ft and 340 to 450 ft from the start of the section, and particularly a bump 195 ft from the start of the section, the profile changed gradually. The change was greatest between visits 06 and 07.

Longitudinal distance measurement in seasonal visit S16 was not consistent with other visits, such that profiles in visit S16 estimated the longitudinal distance between features as about 1.1 percent shorter than in other visits.

Short Wavelengths: A bump appeared 157 ft from the start of the section that was about 3 ft long and 0.25 in high in visits 01 through 09 and S03 through S07. In the rest of the visits, the bump was approximately the same height, but more than 10 ft long. In visits 10 through 13 and seasonal visits S08 through S16, the profile rises up to 0.4 in over 2 ft of profile starting 170 ft from the start of the section then lowers about 0.2 in afterward. In all visits, an area of high short wavelength content appeared from 190 to 230 ft from the start of the section.

Roughness Profiles: A peak value of 156-173 in/mi appeared in the roughness profiles 157 ft from the start of the section in visits 01 through 09 and seasonal visits S03 through S07. An equally rough area appeared about 200 ft from the start of the section by visit 09, but its roughness had grown gradually with time. In visits 10 through 13 and seasonal visits S08 through S16, the areas of localized roughness from the earlier visits were gone. However, all of the roughness profiles from the later visits included a peak value of up to 300 in/mi about 165 ft from the start of the section.

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: The bump 195 ft from the start of the section is near some transverse cracking that was present in March 2002 and February 2003, but not present in October 2002. The cracking there was probably temporarily obscured by a slurry seal that was applied in May 2002. The distress surveys do not explain the bump 157 ft from the start of the section, although a diagonal crack cuts across the left side of the lane near that location.

In the later visits, a seam appeared between seal coat applications 175 ft from the start of the section. This was most likely the cause of the severe localized roughness there. Note that the short and medium wavelength content changed significantly in shape (but not roughness) in the part of the section after the seam, but not before.

#### *Section 0113, Right Side*

Roughness: The IRI followed an increasing trend with time from 72 to 100 in/mi, with the exception of a set of values from 100 to 140 in/mi in the seven visits between November 1999 and March 2002. This included values that ranged from 113 to 149 in/mi over less than eight months.

PSD Plots: The spectral content showed that the changes in roughness with time typically took place in the short wavelength range, and was most likely caused by the

presence or absence of narrow bumps or dips in the profiles. The level of spectral content in the short wavelength range (< 5 ft) usually followed the same trend between visits as the IRI.

Filtered Profiles: Evaluation of filtered plots in the long, medium, and short wavelength ranges showed that the features of greatest interest were usually narrow dips. These were best inspected using a simple high-pass filter, or by viewing plots of raw profile.

In visit 06, three dips about 2 ft long and 0.1 in deep appeared 354, 378, and 397.5 ft from the start of the section. By visit 07, these dips were deeper, and secondary dips appeared near them. In visits 08, 09, and S05 the areas from 354 to 367 ft and the range from 374 to 380.5 ft were about 0.2 in beneath the surrounding pavement, and included several narrow dips 0.1 in to more than 1 in deep. In addition, narrow dips greater than 0.1 in deep appeared 167, 186, 188, 238.5, 252, 269, 284, 303.5, 313, 317, 345.5, 393.5, 394, 397, 406.5, 413.5, 488, and 494 ft. Visits S06 and S07 included dips in the same locations, except the dips in the depressed areas were not as severe.

In visit S08 and later, dips were found in some of the same locations as in previous visits, but they were not nearly as deep or long, and were not measured as consistently among repeat measurements from the same visit. Two rough areas, including sharp changes in slope, appeared 162 to 173 ft and 373 to 378 ft from the start of the section. However, the sunken areas between 350 and 400 ft from the start of the section were much smoother than in the earlier visits, and did not include as many narrow dips.

At most locations, the shape and depth of the narrow dips was measured consistently within each set of repeats.

Roughness Profiles: Very short interval (10 ft) roughness profiles show that increases in roughness between visits usually correspond to the appearance of the narrow dips described above. The most severe localized roughness on the right side of this section was observed in visits 08, 09 and S05 from 355 to 386 ft from the start of the section. In visit 08, this area alone contributed 30 in/mi to the roughness of the entire section.

Roughness profiles show similarities between visits, and are consistent in consecutive visits except where new dips appear in the elevation profiles, with one exception. The roughness profiles in seasonal visit S08 were significantly different than that of seasonal visit S07. In visit S08 all of the areas of localized roughness in visit S07 were eliminated or heavily modified. Two areas of localized roughness appeared in visit S08; 162 to 173 ft and 373 to 378 ft from the start of the section. These were not at narrow dips. Rather, they were in locations of transitions between broader bumps and dips that included large changes in elevation over short distances.

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: The major change in roughness, roughness distribution, and the elimination of the narrow dip listed above for visits 08, 09 and

S05 correspond to the placement of a slurry seal in May 2002. The dips listed for the visits prior to the slurry seal appear near locations where transverse cracks were noted in a distress survey in November 2001. In most cases, the dips correspond to transverse cracks that run from a longitudinal crack on the right side of the lane to the right edge of the lane. The “sunken” areas listed above correspond to large areas of cracking noted in the survey.

The reduction in IRI from 126 in/mi in visit S07 to 85 in/mi in visit S08 corresponds to the date of the slurry seal, and to a reduction in cracking observed during distress surveys. However, the two areas of localized roughness in the group of visits after the slurry seal are in positions where cracking was noted, as were many of the narrow dips.

### **Section 0114**

Roughness: The HRI was 15 to 21 percent lower than the MRI for visits 01 through 09 and seasonal visits S03 through S07. These “earlier” visits include all of those on or before May 2002. During the “later” visits, which include visits 10 through 13 and seasonal visits S08 through S16, the HRI was 10 to 15 percent lower than the MRI. This is an unusually low difference for the SPS-1 project. The similarity between the HRI and MRI indicates that most profile features along this section exist on both sides.

#### *Section 0114, Left Side*

Roughness: The IRI exhibited an increasing trend with time, and ranged from 37 to 46 in/mi in the earlier visits that led up to March 2002. In the visits after March 2002, the IRI ranged from 57 to 65 in/mi.

PSD: The PSD plots were consistent in the “earlier” visits from 01 to seasonal visit S07. The PSD plots of most visits after S07 were also consistent with each other. The increase in roughness in the later visits occurred primarily in the wavelength range from 2 to 10 ft.

Filtered Profiles: Evaluation of filtered plots in the long, medium, and short wavelength ranges showed that the features of greatest interest were usually in the short wavelength range. These were studied using a simple high-pass filter with a baselength of 20 ft.

No significantly rough features were found in the earlier visits (before seasonal visit S08).

A noteworthy property of the elevation profile plots was the change that occurred between visit S07 and S08. Profiles from the later visits had very little similarity to the earlier visits in the short wavelength range, and in the medium wavelength range local highs and lows often occurred in the same place, but individual features did not have the same shape or severity.

Roughness Profiles: No significant localized roughness was found in the visits before S08. The modest increase in roughness between visits 01 and visit S07 took place primarily between 70 and 140 ft from the start of the section.

In visits S08 and later, the first 170 ft of the section was rougher than the rest of the section. The roughness was caused primarily by localized features, usually narrow dips that were not reproduced completely between visits. An area of localized roughness also appeared in visit 12 only that was caused by a series of three dips from 105 to 120 ft from the start of the section.

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: Very little distress appeared on the left side. In addition, the elevated roughness in the first third of the section is not explained by recorded distress. Further, transverse cracks that appeared in the distress surveys rarely had an obvious effect on the profiles.

The major change in profile features and changeover in the locations of rough spots between visits S07 and S08 corresponds to the application of a slurry seal in May 2002.

#### *Section 0114, Right Side*

Roughness: The IRI exhibited an increasing trend with time, and ranged from 48 to 68 in/mi in the earlier visits. In the later visits the IRI held somewhat steady, with values that ranged from 54 to 61 in/mi.

PSD Plots: The PSD plots were consistent from visit S08 on. In the earlier visits, the PSD plots were consistent for wavelengths above 7 ft. For wavelengths shorter than 7 ft, the PSD plots were typically consistent within each visit, but not among visits. Further, the changes did not follow a consistent trend with time. For example, visits 04, S01 and S02 have higher content in the range of wavelengths below 3 ft than previous visits 01 through 03 and later visits 05, S03 and S04. The roughest visits, 07 and 09, included content higher than the other visits in the range of wavelengths from 1 to 10 ft.

Filtered Profiles: Evaluation of filtered plots in the long, medium, and short wavelength ranges showed that the features of greatest interest were usually in the short wavelength range. These were studied using a simple high-pass filter with a baselength of 20 ft.

Very few rough features were found in the visits leading up to seasonal visit S07. The area 220 to 280 ft from the start of the section included rougher short wavelength “chatter” than in the rest of the section starting in visit 06. A dip first appeared 455 ft from the start of the section in visit 06 that was about 1 ft long and 0.15 in deep. It was very deep (0.4 to 0.6 in) in visits 07 and 09, but not in others. In visits 08, S05 and S06, a small bump appeared about 208 ft from the start of the section.

In visit 04 and seasonal visit S02, a narrow dip followed by a narrow bump appeared 299 ft from the start of the section, and every 25 ft through the end of the section. These “spikes” have roughly the same shape as the spikes that occur at the start

and end of the section in some measurements, which are caused by pavement markings. Without the additional roughness caused by these spikes, the trend in roughness with time would have followed a more consistent pattern.

The later visits, starting with S08, included a narrow bump up to 0.1 in high 91 ft from the start of the section. In some visits, a minor disturbance in the profile was found 455 ft from the start of the section. Several very narrow dips and some bumps also appeared 300 to 400 ft from the start of the section in later visits, but they were not measured very consistently.

The most noteworthy property of the elevation profile plots was the tremendous change that occurred between visits S07 and S08. Profiles from the later visits had very little similarity to the earlier visits in the short and medium wavelength range, and were less similar than expected in the long wavelength range.

Roughness Profiles: No significant localized roughness was found in the later visits (S08 and afterward). The most severe localized roughness occurred in visits 07 and 09. In visit 07, a dip 456 ft from the start of the section was severe enough to explain the increase in overall roughness compared to the previous visit. This is because the dip there was much deeper ( $> 0.4$  in). In visit 09, the area from 240 to 260 ft from that start of the section was rougher than in other visits. Again, this accounted for much of the increase in roughness compared to the previous (and subsequent) visit.

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: Nothing in the distress surveys accounts for the spikes that appeared 25 ft apart in some visits. The elevated roughness in the early visits from 220 to 280 ft from the start of the section corresponds to large areas of cracking noted in the distress surveys, particularly in November 2001 and March 2002. The cracking was absent in October 2002 and later.

Cracking was recorded on the right side of the lane near 456 ft from the start of the section in every distress survey taken in 1996 through 2005.

The major change in profile features and changeover in the locations of rough spots between visits S07 and S08 corresponds to the application of a slurry seal in May 2002.

## **Section 0115**

Roughness: The IRI of the left side ranged from 37 to 41 in/mi over the first eleven visits, and rose to 49 in/mi by visit 13. The IRI of the right side ranged from 46 to 51 in/mi over the ten visits, with the exception of elevated roughness ( $\sim 70$  in/mi) in visits 08 and 09. The IRI then increased very aggressively to 225 in/mi by visit 13. The HRI was 12 to 18 percent lower than the MRI.

PSD Plots: The roughness of this section was skewed toward long wavelength content. On the left side, the spectral content was very consistent throughout the monitoring period in the range of wavelengths from 2 to 100 ft. However, visits 10 through 13 included progressively higher content for wavelengths shorter than 5 ft. (This was caused by spikes in the profiles.) On the right side, the spectral content was also consistent with time in the first ten visits, except for elevated content in the range

shorter than 10 ft in visits 08 and 09. In visits 12 and 13, the spectral content was much higher than in previous visits over the entire range.

#### Filtered Profiles:

Long Wavelengths: With the exception of the device effect, the long wavelength content was very consistent with time.

Medium Wavelengths: The medium wavelength content was consistent over visits 01 through 10 on the left side, and no features stood out as very rough. Over visits 10 through 13 the peaks and valleys in the medium wavelength profiles became progressively more severe. On the right side, the medium wavelength content was fairly consistent over the first seven visits. Afterward, the medium wavelength roughness increased in the second half of the section. It did not begin to increase in the first half until visit 12.

Short Wavelengths: Narrow bumps, 1 to 1.5 ft long and 0 to 0.1 in high, appeared 233.5 and 245 ft from the start of the section on the left side in visit 10 only. Their shape and severity was not consistent throughout the repeat measurements. Repeat 1 from visit 10 also included a series of narrow bumps from 102 to 114 ft into the section. These were probably caused by sensor error. Several narrow dips appeared throughout the profiles from visits 10 through 13. These dips rarely appeared in more than one repeat measurement at a given location.

On the right side, a small bump appeared in visit 10 with a downward step of about 0.1 in. This was 264 ft from the start of the section. Bumps up to 0.15 in high also appeared at 292 and 346 ft. In visits 08 and 09, there was a significant increase in the short-wavelength roughness on the right side in the second half of the section. However, with the exception of the features cited above, the profiles from visit 10 were similar to those of visit 07. Since the repeat measurements in each of the visits are consistent with each other, this is not attributed to measurement error. Instead, the contrast between visits 08 through 09 and the others is attributed to differences in lateral tracking of the profiler.

Visits 11 through 13 all included areas of extreme short wavelength roughness. These usually appeared as a dense series of narrow dips that were not well correlated between repeat measurements. The most extreme content appeared in visit 13 in the ranges from 16 to 45 ft and 300 to 335 ft from the start of the section.

Roughness Profiles: On the left side, the roughness profile was very consistent with time over most of the section. Between visits 09 and 10 the roughness doubled in the range from 230 to 255 ft from the start of the section. On the right side, the transition into the section included some severe localized roughness. The roughness on the right side was consistent throughout the life of the section in the first half, and much higher, but spread out fairly uniformly, in the second half for visits 08 and 09. The later visits (10 through 13) included severe localized roughness on the right

side in some areas, including an area of the roughness profile from 300 to 350 ft from the start of the section with a peak value over 800 in/mi.

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: On the left side, the localized roughness mentioned above appeared in locations where longitudinal cracks were found. However, longitudinal cracks appeared in other locations or in other visits without the same type of roughness. On the right side, significant longitudinal cracking first appeared in the second half of the section in visit 07, and became more significant in later visits. By visit 10, longitudinal cracking extended over most of the section. During all visits, most of the cracks were sealed. The elevated roughness in visits 08 and 09 was measured because the profiler passed directly over the longitudinal cracking, and the lack of elevated roughness in visits 07 and 10 was caused by tracking of the profiler over a different lateral position.

## **Section 0116**

Roughness: The IRI of the left side ranged from 35 to 38 in/mi in visits 01 through 07, increased to 46 in/mi by visit 08, then increased gradually to 65 in/mi by visit 13. The IRI of the right side followed a gradually increasing trend from 53 to 64 in/mi, with the exception of much higher roughness (105 in/mi) in visit 09. The HRI was 18 to 27 percent lower than the MRI. This range includes higher values than most of the other SPS-1 sections.

PSD Plots: The roughness of this section was skewed toward long wavelength content in the earlier visits. On both sides, the spectral content was very consistent from visits 01 through 07 for wavelengths greater than 4 ft. However, the content on the left side at wavelengths shorter than 15 ft was much higher in visits 08 and later than in the earlier visits. The content on the right side increased slightly for wavelengths shorter than 5 ft in visit 08, showed a major increase for wavelengths shorter than 100 ft in visit 09, and returned to content like visit 07 in visit 10.

### Filtered Profiles:

Long Wavelengths: The long wavelength content was not very consistent in visits 07 through 10 on the left side, because of the influence of severe localized roughness. On the right side, the profile was consistent with time with the exception of a severe feature about one third of the way into the section in visit 09.

Inspection of profile plots in the long, medium, and short wavelength ranges helped locate features of interest, but they were characterized best using a simple anti-smoothing filter with a baselength of 50 ft

Left Side: The profiles were consistent in shape and severity of roughness through visit 07. In visit 08, a severe dip (1.5 ft long and 0.8-1.0 in deep) appeared about 225 ft from the start of the section. In some of the repeat measurements, less severe dips were also present 228 and 231 ft from the start of the section. In visit 09, a very rough area appeared from 219 to 234 ft into the section. This area included an upward step more than 0.2 in high at the leading end and a downward step of more

than 0.2 in at the trailing end. Visits 08 and 09 had profiles that were similar to older visits over the rest of the section. This rough area was still present in visits 10 through 13, but it had “sunk” to 0.25 in below the surrounding pavement.

Right Side: The profiles were consistent in shape and severity of roughness through visit 06. In visit 07, a dip (0.5 ft long and 0.10-0.35 in deep) appeared about 137 ft from the start of the section and a dip (about 0.05 in deep) appeared about 168 ft from the start of the section. In visit 08, the dip at 137 ft had increased in depth to about 0.4 in, and a new dip appeared at 170 ft that was up to 0.2 in deep. In visit 09 the dips were not present, but two areas of significant roughness appeared from 131 to 145 ft into the section and 149 to 172 ft into the section. The second rough area was elevated 0.75 in above the surrounding pavement. The profiles of visits 10 through 13 were similar to each other, but they were not very similar to those of previous visits in the medium and short wavelength ranges, and did not include the isolated rough areas from visits 07 through 09.

Roughness Profiles: On the left side, the roughness profile was very consistent through visit 07. In visit 08 the narrow dip caused extreme localized roughness that added 7 to 14 in/mi to its overall roughness. The rough area that replaced it in visits 09 and later added a similar amount to the overall roughness of the section, but the roughness was not nearly as isolated. An area of localized roughness also appears on both sides of the section that is centered 140 ft from the start of the section.

On the right side, the roughness level was fairly consistent through visit 07. In visit 08, the dip at 137 ft appeared to add 0-5 in/mi to the roughness of the whole section, depending on which repeat measurement was inspected. The area from 131 to 145 ft in visit 09 was equally rough. However, the area from 149 to 172 ft caused extreme roughness in visit 09, such that it was responsible for increasing the roughness of the whole section by more than 25 in/mi, with the most extreme roughness on the trailing edge. (This was the location of a 0.75 in downward step in the profile.) Visit 10 had very little relationship to previous visits. In visits 10 through 13, the area from 134 to 157 ft had much higher roughness than the rest of the section.

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: On the left side, the deep dip found in visit 08 appeared in a location at which cracking was recorded during distress surveys on two prior dates. Photos of the section after visit 09 show that the localized roughness that replaced the dip is a patched area. The boundaries of the patched area listed in the distress survey roughly correspond to the boundaries of the rough area in the profile. On the right side, the dip found 137 ft into the section in visits 07 and 08 appeared in a location at which cracking was recorded in the distress survey between those visits. The rough areas found in visits 09 through 13 occur over ranges of the section at which the distress survey and photographs taken in April 2002, show patched pavement.

## **Section 0117**

Roughness: The IRI of the left side ranged from 33 to 44 in/mi over the monitoring period, and was increasing the most rapidly in the last three visits. The IRI of the

right side ranged from 47 to 51 in/mi in visits 01 through 07, then increased erratically to a final value of 107 in/mi in visit 13. The peak value of 124 in/mi occurred in visit 12. The HRI was 15 to 23 percent lower than the MRI.

PSD Plots: The spectral content was similar to white noise slope through the range of interest. The spectral content on the left side was consistent in visits 01 through 09 in the range of wavelengths from 1 to 100 ft. In visits 10 through 13, the content for wavelengths of 5 ft and shorter increased. On the right side, the spectral content was consistent in visits 01 through 07, except that visits 04 and 05 were rougher in the wavelength range below 2 ft. In visit 08 and 09, the content was slightly higher for the wavelength range below 10 ft. Visits 10 through 13, the roughness increased significantly for wavelengths shorter than 10 ft.

#### Filtered Profiles:

On the left side, the filtered plots for long and medium wavelength content were consistent over the first twelve visits. The short wavelength plots were consistent over the first nine visits, but profiles from the rest of the visits included an increasing number of extraneous narrow dips.

On the right side, the features of interest were best viewed by filtering the profiles to include the short wavelength range. During the first seven visits, only a few features stood out: (1) a bump about 1 ft long and up to 0.1 in high that appeared 28 ft from the start of the section and was only present in some of the repeat measurements, (2) a bump about 1 ft long and less than 0.1 in high that appeared 151 ft from the start of the section, (3) a dip about 2.5 ft long and 0.1 in deep that appeared 416 ft from the start of the section.

In visits 08 and 09, additional roughness was found 40 to 65 ft, 210 to 245 ft, and 340 to 350 ft from the start of the section. These areas included several shallow bumps that were about 0.05 in high. The shape and placement of the bumps was often poorly correlated among repeat measurements. In visit 10, the rough areas had expanded to cover more than half of the section. However, the visits afterward only included this type of roughness 100 to 150 ft, 330 to 360 ft and 400 to 460 ft from the start of the section.

Roughness Profiles: On the left side, the roughness profiles were fairly consistent over the monitoring period. The roughness was also distributed evenly throughout the section.

On the right side, the roughness was evenly distributed along the section in visits 01 through 07, with the exception of concentrated roughness at the dip 416 ft from the section start. In visits 08 and 09, localized roughness also appeared 64, 126, 225 (visit 08 only) and 350 ft from the start of the section.

Visit 10 was much rougher than previous visits, and the roughness profiles were very erratic and poorly repeated. In visits 11 through 13, extreme localized roughness was found wherever the profiles included the patches of bumps and dips described above.

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: Distress measurements did not record anything in the locations of the rough short wavelength features noted for the right side in visits 01 through 07. In visits 08 through 10, the rough areas with shallow bumps within the profile all occurred where longitudinal cracks were recorded. Further, photographs of the surface in March 2002 and April 2003 show that (roughly) the areas of elevated roughness appear where longitudinal cracks were sealed. Note that crack sealing was performed in May 2001 (before visit 08) and April 2002 (between visit 09 and 10). The additional locations that were sealed in April 2002 explain the expansion of the rough areas between visit 09 and 10. Distress surveys from April 2003 and later record longitudinal cracking and raveling over the majority of the section on the right side.

## **Section 0118**

Roughness: The IRI of the left side held steady in the range from 34 to 38 in/mi in visits 01 through 09, then increased from 52 to 57 in/mi in visits 10 through 13. The IRI of the right side changed erratically between 64 to 78 in/mi, with the exception of values over 100 in/mi in visits 08 and 09. The HRI was 19 to 25 percent lower than the MRI in the first nine visits, then 12 to 15 percent lower in visits 10 through 13.

PSD Plots: The spectral content of the left side was very consistent in visits 01 through 09. In visits 10 through 13, the content was higher over much of the range relevant to the IRI. On the right side, the spectral content in visits 01, 02, 03, 06, and 10 through 13 was similar to white noise slope over the valid range of the profilers. In visits 04, 05, and 07 the content was higher for wavelengths below 2 ft. In visits 08 and 09, content was significantly higher than in all other visits for wavelengths below 10 ft.

### Filtered Profiles:

Inspection of profile plots in the long, medium, and short wavelength ranges helped locate features of interest, but they were characterized best using a simple anti-smoothing filter with a baselength of 50 ft.

Left Side: The profiles were very consistent throughout visits 01 through 09. Over the first 300 ft of the visit 10 profile measurements, features often appeared in the same locations and with similar severity as in previous visits, but different shape. The last third of the section included two new features that were very rough in visits 10 through 13. First, the profile was elevated an average of 0.15 in above the surrounding pavement from 333 to 341 ft into the section, including a rise of 0.3 in over 3 ft at the leading edge. Second, the profile was elevated 0.15 in above the surrounding pavement from 402 to 420 ft into the section.

Right Side: Filtered profiles in the medium and long wavelength ranges were consistent in visits 01 through 09, and somewhat consistent through visit 10. In visit 06, narrow dips appeared in two of the repeat measurements from 407 to 410 ft from the start of the section. Profiles of visit 07 included a large number of narrow dips appeared that were typically 0.1 to 0.2 in deep, and up to 0.4 in deep, from 212 to 213 ft, 223 to 226 ft, 240 to 249 ft, 265 ft, 277 to 279 ft, 399.5 ft, 403 to 407 ft,

422 ft, 429 ft, and 442 ft from the start of the section. These dips often appeared in more than one, but not all repeats. In visit 08, dense areas of narrow dips 0.2 to 0.4 in deep appeared that were not very well correlated between repeats from 170 to 175 ft, 208 to 262 ft, 273 to 278 ft, 405 to 406 ft, and 414 to 442 ft from the start of the section. The same type of dips appeared in visit 09. The most severe dips appeared 97 to 106 ft, 170 to 175 ft, 206 to 264 ft, and 399 to 410 ft from the start of the section. Very few dips appeared in the profiles from visits 10 through 13. Visits 10 through 13 included some narrow bumps up to 0.2 in high between 400 and 415 ft from the start of the section.

Roughness Profiles: The left side profiles were roughest near the two elevated areas described above. The localized roughness caused by these two features accounts for all of the increase in roughness between visits 09 and 10.

The right side roughness profiles were not very consistent between visits, or among repeat measurements within a given visit. Over visits 01 through 07, minor localized roughness could be found at the locations of the dips listed above, but no area stood out as much rougher than the rest of the section. Visit 08 included a high level of localized roughness, particularly 210 to 270 ft from the start of the section. This was also the case in visit 09, with the addition of extreme localized roughness 174 ft from the start of the section in three of the five repeat measurements. The roughness profiles in visits 10 through 13 were not at all similar to those of previous visits, including a major reduction in overall roughness. The roughness profiles from visits 10 through 13 were also much more consistent among the repeat measurements.

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: The distress survey from November 2005 notes that the slurry seal placed in May 2005 was stopped and restarted between 330 and 340 ft from the start of the section. This bump was there in visits 10 through 13.

The elevated roughness on the right side of the section in visits 08 and 09 were caused by wide longitudinal cracks that were not measured very consistently between repeat measurements. Note that May 2001 (between visits 07 and 08) is the earliest distress survey where a significant amount of longitudinal cracking was recorded. The maintenance record also shows that the cracks were sealed in May 2001.

The change in short and medium wavelength profile plots between visits 09 and 10 is attributed to the placement of a slurry seal coat over the entire section.

## **Section 0119**

Roughness: The IRI of the left side increased from 39 to 56 in/mi over the monitoring period. The IRI of the right side ranged erratically 65 to 131 in/mi, although the highest values occurred in the last two visits. The HRI was 18 to 21 percent lower than the MRI.

PSD Plots: On the left side, the spectral content is consistent with time, with the exception of growth in content for wavelengths below 5 ft in the last four visits. On

the right side, PSD plots were not consistent among repeat in visits 04 through 07, 09 and 11. Spectral content development did not follow a consistent pattern with time for wavelengths shorter than 20 ft.

Filtered Profiles: On the left side, the profiles were very consistent in the long and medium wavelength range throughout the monitoring history. No significant short wavelength features were found in visits 01 through 09. In visits 10 through 13, a high level of chatter occurred in the form of hit or miss bumps and dips (i.e., bumps and dips that are found only in some repeats, but have the same shape when they are found).

On the right side, the profiles were not consistent with time in the medium and short wavelength range, nor were they consistent among repeats within the same visit in many areas. Profiles from visit 04 included short wavelength chatter throughout the section that was not present in visit 03. In addition, a dense area of narrow dips appeared from 430 to 480 ft from the start of the section. These dips were also detected in visit 05 in some of the repeat measurements, and included dips up to 0.3 in deep. In visits 06, 07 and 09 dense areas of narrow dips appeared from 325 to 375 ft and 480 ft to beyond 500 ft from the start of the section in most of the repeat measurements. In visits 09 and 10, short wavelength roughness was also found that was not well correlated among repeat measurements, but much of the content had transitioned from patches of narrow dips to isolated narrow bumps up to 0.15 in high. In visits 11 through 13, profiles from most of the last two thirds of the section were dominated by narrow bumps and dips that were poorly correlated between repeat measurements.

Roughness Profiles: The roughness profiles on the left side were consistent over the first ten visits, with the exception of two areas of localized roughness that only appeared in visit 10. These areas were 409 ft from the start of the section and over the last 10 ft of the section. Although they were not consistent in severity among the five repeat measurements, the roughness at these locations accounts for most of the 5 in/mi increase in roughness from visit 09 to visit 10. The increase in roughness between visits 12 and 13 was caused by localized roughness about 284 and 344 ft from the start of the section, even though it was only detected in some of the repeat measurements.

The roughness profile on the right side was not very consistent with time over the last 200 ft of the section, and was often not consistent among repeat measurements from the same visit. An area of localized roughness occurred in visit 04 from 460 ft to 480 ft from the start of the section that was much more severe than others for that visit in three of the repeat measurements. In those three repeats, that area accounted for up to 20 in/mi of additional roughness over the others. This was also detected in only one of the measurements for visit 05. (Note that the “hit or miss” nature of the roughness in this location explains the high standard deviation for the IRI listed in Appendix A.) The roughness profile in visit 04 was similar to that of visit 03 over the first 350 ft of the section. Visit 07 contained localized roughness from 355 to 370 ft from the start of the section, and in the last 10 ft of the section, but the roughness was not well correlated among the repeat measurements. Visits 08 and 09

were very rough over the last 200 ft of the section, but not much rougher than visit 03 over the first 300 ft. Visit 10, on the other hand, was very similar to visit 03. In visits 10 through 13, the roughness profiles included significant localized content and were rarely well repeated, except over the first 100 ft of the section.

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: The dense patches of narrow dips found in the right side profiles in visits 04 through 08 correspond to locations where longitudinal cracking was noted. However, several areas of longitudinal cracking were noted in distress surveys that did not cause additional roughness within the profile. (Note that by visit 08, longitudinal cracking had extended over most of the section on the right side.) The lack of consistency in the measurement of profile on the right side of this section is a result of the “hit or miss” nature of profiling a section with longitudinal cracking in the profiler’s path. Photos from the distress survey in May 2001 show that the longitudinal cracking wanders from a location that is farther from the center of the lane than the likely path of the profiler over the first half of the section to a location closer to the edge of the lane, where the profiler sensors are likely to pass, in the second half of the section. The “upward” nature of the chatter in the profiles from visits 09 through 13 was a result of crack sealing that was performed just before visit 09.

## **Section 0120**

Roughness: The IRI of the left side increased steadily from 53 to 69 in/mi over the monitoring period. The IRI of the right side followed an increasing trend from 64 to 79 in/mi over visits 01 through 09. In visits 10 through 13, the IRI had decreased to 64-66 in/mi. The HRI was 14 to 17 percent lower than the MRI in visits 01 through 09, and was 7 to 10 percent lower in visits 10 through 13.

PSD Plots: On the left side, the spectral content was consistent over the monitoring period for the range of wavelengths above about 5 ft, but increased modestly with time for wavelengths below 5 ft. On the right side, the spectral content in visits 01 and 02 was consistent, but the content for wavelengths below 10 ft had increased by visit 03. The spectral content of visits 03 through 09 was consistent, except for elevated content for wavelengths below 2 ft in visits 04 and 05. Compared to visit 09, the content in visits 10 through 13 was slightly reduced over the entire range from 2 ft to 50 ft.

Filtered Profiles: Very few rough features stood out. An exception was a narrow (< 1 ft long) bump 136 ft from the start of the section that appeared on the left side in several of the visits, but rarely in all five repeats within a visit. The filtered profiles were consistent over more of the section for the first nine visits. In visit 10, the short wavelength profile plots had changed significantly from those of visit 09. The medium wavelength plots showed bumps and dips in most of the same locations, but the shape or severity was often modified somewhat. Medium and short wavelength content was very consistent during visits 10 through 13.

Roughness Profiles: The roughness profiles included an area of concentrated roughness on both sides of the lane at the start of the section, where a dip nearly 0.5 in deep

extended from 10 ft ahead of the start of the section to 40 ft after the start of the section.

A slope break appeared on the left side 380 ft from the start of the section. In this location, the profile transitioned from an aggressive downward trend to a flat area. Note that the severity of this area increased with time, as a bump at the start of the downward slope increased in height. The change in roughness at this area accounted for about half of the change in roughness of the entire section over visits 01 through 09. This was not nearly as severe on the right side.

On the right side, an area of localized roughness was detected on the trailing end of a long bump. After the roughness at the start of the section, this was the most severe localized roughness on the right side.

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: Very little roughness was found on this section that could be linked to distress. The slope break 380 ft from the start of the section was not caused by distress, but a transverse crack was recorded there (after that area had become rough) in April 2002 and later. A slurry seal was applied to this section in May 2002. This affected the profile of the section much less than other sections.

## **Section 0121**

Roughness: The IRI of the left side ranged from 35 to 39 in/mi in visits 01 through 09, then held steady between 49 and 51 in/mi in visits 10 through 13. The IRI of the right side increased somewhat erratically from 60 to 68 in/mi. The HRI was 21 to 24 percent lower than the MRI in visits 01 through 09, and was 13 to 17 percent lower in visits 10 through 13. Whatever caused the aggressive change in roughness between visit 09 and visit 10 on the left side also improved the relationship between the left and right profile.

PSD Plots: On the left side, the spectral content was consistent from visits 01 through 09, and included some roughness concentrated at a wavelength of about 32 ft. Visits 10 through 13 were consistent with each other, rougher than the earlier visits for wavelengths less than 20 ft, and included some roughness concentrated a wavelength of about 7 ft. The spectral content of the right side was very consistent over visits 01 through 08, with the exception that visits 04 and 05 were a little rougher for wavelengths below 3 ft. In visit 09 the roughness in the range below 10 ft had increased significantly compared to previous visits, but this content reduced somewhat in visit 10. The additional roughness in visits 11 through 13 compared to visit 10 appeared in the range of wavelength shorter than 5 ft.

### Filtered Profiles:

Long Wavelengths: The long wavelength profile plots were very consistent with time.

Medium Wavelengths: On both sides, the medium wavelength profile plots were very consistent over the first 09 visits. In visits 10 through 13, the medium

wavelength profile plots were somewhat different than in previous visits, in that the shape and severity of bumps and dips had changed.

Short Wavelengths: On the left side, the profiles were very consistent over visits 01 through 09. In visits 10 through 13, the profiles contained several bumps up to 2 ft long and between 0.04 and 0.15 in high. These bumps were found 22.6, 40.5, 65.1, 75.6, 88.4, 116.5, 153.4, 230.7, 236.2, 244.1, 268.0, 287.3, 295.4, 414.9, and 478.9 ft from the start of the section.

On the right side, the profiles were very consistent over visits 01 through 08. In visit 09, the profiles contained several narrow (0.5-1.0 ft long) dips ranging from 0.1 to 0.5 in deep. These dips were found 45.5, 72.5, 100 (0.5 in deep), 199, 273, 351, and 479.5 ft from the start of the section. In visits 11 through 13, several narrow bumps appeared throughout the section. The most severe of them appeared 179.1, 351.8, 433.1, 434.2, 447.3 and 456.7 ft from the start of the section.

On both sides, the short wavelength profile plots in visits 10 through 13 were not very similar to those of previous visits, even in locations where the bumps and dips listed above did not appear.

Roughness Profiles: The left side profiles were roughest in the first 120 ft of the section, and the distribution of roughness was similar over the first nine visits. The roughness profiles from visits 10 through 13 showed localized roughness in the locations of most of the bumps listed above.

A roughness profile of the right side revealed a high level of roughness about 350 ft from the start of the section. Unfiltered plots showed that this was caused by a bump in the right side profile about 0.25 in high ranging from 330 to 350 ft from the start of the section. The dips in visit 09 only added modestly to the roughness of the section, with one exception. The dip 100 ft from the start of the section added up to 3 in/mi to the overall roughness of the section, depending on which repeat measurement was inspected. (In one of the measurements, the dip was not even detected.)

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: Distress measurements show transverse cracks in the location of 13 of the 15 bumps listed for the left side profiles of visit 10, and all but one of the bumps listed for the right in visits 11 through 13. Note that most of the transverse cracks were present in visit 09, but the corresponding bumps did not appear in the profiles. Distress measurements showed transverse cracks in only 3 of the 7 dips listed for the right side profiles of visit 09. However, no distress was noted 100 ft from the start of the section, where the dip that caused the most roughness was found.

The change in short and medium wavelength profile plots between visits 09 and 10 is attributed to the placement of a slurry seal coat over the entire section in May 2002.

## Section 0122

Roughness: The IRI of the left side increased from 41 to 48 in/mi over the first nine visits, with an outlying value of 58 in/mi in visit 06. In visits 10 through 13, the IRI held between 64 and 66 in/mi. The IRI of the right side ranged from 78 to 87 in/mi over visits 01 through 09 with an increasing trend, then decreased to 69 in/mi in visit 10 and changed erratically afterward. The HRI was 16 to 20 percent lower than the MRI in the first nine visits, then 11 to 13 percent lower afterward.

PSD Plots: On the left side, the profiles included some isolated content at a wavelength of about 40 ft in all visits. Visit 06 included extra roughness at all wavelengths below 20 ft compared to the previous and subsequent visits. Visits 10 through 13 included higher content in the wavelength range above 4 ft when compared to the earlier visits.

On the right side, the spectral content in visits 06 and 10 is much higher than in other visits for wavelengths shorter than 20 ft. The rest of the visits have consistent content for wavelengths shorter than 10 ft, and follow a distinct trend of getting rougher with time for wavelengths shorter than 10 ft. In particular, visit 08 is rougher than visit 07 for wavelengths shorter than 5 ft, and visit 08 is rougher than visit 09 for wavelengths shorter than 10 ft.

### Filtered Profiles:

The long and medium wavelength profile plots were very consistent in visits 01 through 09 and in visits 11 through 13. However, the short and medium wavelength profile plots changed considerably between visits 09 and 10.

Left Side: In visit 06, a dip 1 ft long and 1.3 in deep appeared 391 ft from the start of the section. It did not appear in visit 07, but it did in visit 08 (0.25 in deep) and 09 (0.45 in deep). After visit 09, it did not appear again. Short wavelength profiles from visits 10 through 13 included a bump more than 0.25 in high that ranged from 174 to 176 ft from the start of the section.

Right Side: Three short wavelength features stood out over the background roughness in visits 10 through 13. First, an area 174 to 176 ft from the start of the section was elevated about 0.2 in from the surrounding pavement. This included an abrupt upward step at the start and an abrupt downward step at the end. Second, a dip appeared 31 ft from the start of the section that was about 2 ft long and up to 0.15 in deep. Third, a bump appeared 391 ft from the start of the section.

Roughness Profiles: On the left side, the roughness profiles of visits 01 through 09 were consistent over most of the section. The exception was at the dip 309 ft from the start of the section. This was roughest in visit 06, and added 11.5 to 14 in/mi to the overall roughness of the section. (This is most of the difference between the roughness of visit 06 and visits 05 and 07.) In visit 09, the dip was also somewhat rough, and added about 3 in/mi to the roughness of the entire section. Another minor area of localized roughness also appeared 418 ft from the start of the section. (This was caused by a dip 20 ft long and about 0.2 in deep. This is not the type of

feature that is likely to appear in a distress survey or a photograph.) The roughest feature on the left side in visits 10 through 13 was the bump 175 ft from the start of the section. This caused a peak in the roughness profile of about 180 in/mi, and added about 7 in/mi to the overall roughness of the section.

On the right side, the roughness profile was fairly consistent over the first nine visits. The roughness was evenly distributed across the section, and changes in roughness with time were not isolated to a given location. The roughness profiles of visits 10 through 13 were not similar to those of the earlier visits in most locations.

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: The dip on the left side 309 ft from the start of the section is in a location where raveling and a small pothole was listed in the February 1999 distress survey. The distressed area appeared to get larger in later surveys, but the pothole was patched in February 2001. The rough features that appeared 174 to 176 ft from the start of the section in visits 10 through 13 was a location where the placement of a slurry seal stopped then restarted. This seam only caused significant roughness on the left side. The slurry seal also significantly altered the short and medium wavelength content in the profile.

### **Section 0123**

Roughness: The IRI of the left side ranged from 38 to 42 in/mi over the first twelve visits, then increased to 47 in/mi in visit 13. The IRI of the right side fluctuated erratically with time, and covered a range from 49 to 68 in/mi over the first ten visits, then increased to 134 in/mi by visit 13. The HRI was 14 to 18 percent lower than the MRI.

PSD Plots: On the left side, the spectral content was consistent in the range from 2 to 50 ft over visits 01 through 09. However, while the PSD of visit 10 profiles exhibited a similar roughness level in each broad wavelength range, the details of the plots were not as similar to the other nine visits as they were to each other. In visits 11 through 13, the content below 10 ft increased steadily. Slightly elevated content appeared near a wavelength of 13 to 14 ft in all PSD plots from the left side.

On the right side, the spectral content was consistent over the first ten visits in the wavelength range from 2 to 50 ft, so long as the PSD plot with the least roughness was selected for each visit. The PSD plots for visits 07 and 08 were not very consistent among the repeat measurements. In visits 10 through 13, the content below 20 ft grew aggressively.

Filtered Profiles: On the left side, the short wavelength content of the profiles in visits 10 through 13 was somewhat different in shape than the other visits, but not different in roughness level. Otherwise, the left side profiles were quite consistent over the monitoring period in the long, medium, and short wavelength range. One exception was the appearance of a bump about 2 ft long and up to 0.15 in high that was 327 ft from the start of the section in visits 11 through 13.

Inspection of filtered plots of the right side profiles revealed several unusual features:

A dip about 8 ft long appears 320 ft from the section start. It exists in all visits, but its depth varies up to 0.2 in deep.

Visit 03 is rougher than visits 01, 02, and 04 over the range from 270 ft to 350 ft into the section.

A dip exists in visit 03 that is 280 ft from the start of the section, and did not appear in any of the other visits.

Visit 07 includes an area from 200 to 280 ft from the start of the section that is not very consistent in its medium and short wavelength content. The profiles are very consistent over the rest of the section.

Repeat 9 from visit 08 is much rougher than the others in the area from 200 to 280 ft from the start of the section. Repeats 5, 6 and 7 of visit 08 are consistent with each other and with the profiles in visit 07.

Visit 10 profiles included narrow bumps about 0.1 in high 62 and 182 ft from the start of the section.

Visit 11 through 13 profiles all included several large areas of spurious bumps and dips. These appeared throughout the entire section, but rarely appeared in all five repeats within a visit, or with the same shape in any two repeats.

Roughness Profiles: The roughness of the left side profiles was evenly distributed across the section, and very consistent among the first ten visits. In visits 11 through 13, the roughness was slightly higher than the rest of the section 300 to 350 ft from the start.

The roughest area of the section on the right side was from 210 to 320 ft from the start, but often by only a small margin. The exception was that in visits 03 and 06 though 09 a severe area of localized roughness appeared near 320 ft from the start. The roughness at this location was not measured very consistently, and short interval roughness profiles show that it contributed up to 6 in/mi to the overall roughness. Much of the erratic trend in roughness over time on the right side of this section can be attributed to the contribution, or lack thereof, to roughness of the dip at this location. In visit 10 less severe localized roughness also appeared 64 and 185 ft from the start of the section in some of the repeat measurements. The short interval roughness report also showed that the distribution of roughness in visit 10 was not very similar to that of the previous visits.

Roughness profiles in visits 11 through 13 became progressively dominated by localized roughness that was not well correlated among repeat measurements.

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: Distress surveys showed longitudinal cracking on the right side, which was first recorded before visit 05, and covered much of the length of the section by visit 07. The distress record does not include anything to explain the dip that appears 320 ft from the start of the section, but this may be caused by roughness that is not associated with surface distress. Distress measurements that took place after visit 10 show a severe area of cracking to explain

the localized roughness that appeared 64 ft from the start of the section, but nothing unusual 185 ft from the start of the section.

Crack sealing was performed between visits 07 and 08, and between visits 09 and 10. This may explain the lack of a relationship between the roughness profiles in visits 09 and 10.

## **Section 0124**

Roughness: The IRI of the left side ranged from 31 to 34 in/mi in visits 01 through 09 and 11, and ranged from 42 to 46 in/mi in visits 10, 12 and 13. The IRI of the right side increased slowly at first, then at an increasing rate from 38 in/mi in visit 01 to 148 in/mi in visit 13. The HRI was 17 to 25 percent lower than the MRI.

PSD Plots: On both sides, the roughness was distributed (relatively) evenly across the measured wavelength range. On the left side, the spectral content was very consistent from visits 01 through 09. In visits 10 through 13, the content for wavelengths shorter than 10 ft increased. On the right side, the content was consistent throughout the first nine visits for wavelengths above 10 ft. Content for wavelengths shorter than 10 ft grew gradually over visits 07 through 10, and aggressively afterward.

### Filtered Profiles:

Long Wavelengths: The long wavelength content was very consistent with time.

Medium Wavelengths: On the left side, the profile was very consistent in visits 01 through 09, but became slightly rougher afterward. On the right side, the medium wavelength content increased steadily after visit 07. The profiles in visit 10 were somewhat different in shape to visit 09 on both sides. In visits 11 through 13, the profiles included much more roughness in the medium wavelength range, and repeat measurements did not agree well.

Short Wavelengths: On the left side, the short wavelength profiles were consistent in their roughness level for visits 01 through 09. In visits 10 through 13, the overall content level was higher, and the last 50 ft of the section included some narrow bumps about 1 ft long and more than 0.125 in high. Profiles of the right side did not include any excessive short wavelength content or localized roughness in visits 01 through 06. In visit 07, an area with a high density of dips appeared from 272 to 286 ft from the start of the section. In visits 08 through 10 several areas, covering about half of the section, included closely-spaced bumps up to 0.125 in high and 1-3 ft long. In visits 11 through 13, the same type of content covered most of the section. These bumps often appeared in the same location in multiple repeats within the same visit, but did not necessarily appear in the same place in more than one visit.

Roughness Profiles: On the left side, the roughness profile was very consistent through visit 09. In visit 10, an area of localized roughness appeared 70 ft from the start of the section that accounted for up to 3 in/mi of roughness beyond that of visit 09. The last 50 ft of the section was also significantly rougher in visits 10 through 13 than in previous visits. On the right side, significant localized roughness appeared

about 410 ft from the start of the section in visits 06 and 07, but not in later visits. In visits 08 and 09, short interval (10 ft) roughness profiles showed that localized roughness existed throughout the section, but the location and severity was not consistent among repeat measurements. Roughness profiles in visits 11 through 13 became progressively dominated by localized roughness that was not well correlated among repeat measurements.

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: The rough area (~410 ft) found in visits 06 and 07 corresponds to an area of significant cracking recorded in a distress survey from January 2000. This did not register in later visits because of crack sealing that was performed in May 2001. The inconsistent measurement of localized roughness in visits 08 and 09 is attributed to sealed longitudinal cracks, which may not have been detected in the same location in each measurement because of the lateral placement of the profiler. The localized roughness found 245 ft from the start of the section in visit 10 did not correspond to anything noted in the distress survey that followed. It is not clear why the short interval roughness profile was so much more consistent in visit 10 than in visits 08 and 09. It is suspected that this was merely a product of more consistent lateral tracking of the profiler. The rough area in the last 50 ft of the section on the left side for the later visits was caused by longitudinal cracking and raveling. The rough, uncorrelated content on the right side in visits 11 through 13 was caused by sealed longitudinal cracking.

## **Section 0160**

Roughness: The IRI of the left side ranged from 88 to 116 in/mi and the IRI of the right side ranged from 95 to 122 in/mi. The roughness did not follow a systematic trend with time. The HRI was 9 to 16 percent lower than the MRI. This is a lesser difference than most of the other sections, but a higher difference than on many Portland cement concrete pavements.

PSD Plots: The spectral content of profile slope was relatively uniform across the measured range. The PSD plots for all visits were similar, with the exception of some content that was concentrated at wavelengths near 15 ft. The periodic content was highest in profiles from visit 06, and elevated in visit 07. On the left side, some periodic content also exists at a wavelength of 8.5 ft.

### Filtered Profiles:

Long Wavelengths: The long wavelength profile plots were less consistent with time than on other sections.

Medium Wavelengths: The changes in roughness with time were the most obvious in the medium wavelength profile plots. The plots show that significant roughness was caused by upward curl of 15-ft long slabs, and that the curl was most severe in visits 06 and 07.

Short Wavelengths: On the left side, the short wavelength content within the profiles was much smoother in the last 100 ft of the section than in the first 400 ft. On the right side, the profiles in repeats 3, 4, and 5 of visit 01 included several very

large narrow spikes. The correct IRI for visit 01 is closer to the average of the other two repeats, which is roughly 98 in/mi.

Roughness Profiles: The last 100 ft of the section was half as rough as the first 400 ft. The roughness distribution of the left side were consistent over visits 01 through 05, and over visits 06 through 13. In visits 01 through 05, a short interval (10 ft) roughness profile showed several areas of localized roughness on the left side. The most severe appeared 43, 121-125, 221, and 306 ft from the start of the section. In visits 06 through 13, severe localized roughness appeared 46, 125, 221, and 389 ft from the start of the section. The roughness distribution of the right side was fairly consistent over visits 01 through 13. On the right side, the most severe localized roughness appeared 391 ft from the start of the section.

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: The localized roughness cited above corresponds to profile features other than cracking or high roughness at joints. As such, they do not correspond directly to items recorded in the distress surveys. The photos provided with the distress surveys show that (roughly) the last 100 ft of the section was diamond ground.

## **Section 0161**

Roughness: The IRI of the left side ranged from 69 to 77 in/mi over the 13 visits except for a value of 62 in/mi in visit 10. The IRI of the right side fluctuated between 71 and 87 in/mi over the thirteen visits except for a value of 100 in/mi in visit 09. The MRI was 16 to 18 percent higher than the HRI in visit 01 through 09, but only 7 to 9 percent higher in visits 10 through 13. The transition corresponds to the application of a slurry seal coat in May 2002.

PSD Plots: On the left side, the PSD plots were very consistent in over all visits except 10 in the wavelength range from 2 to 100 ft. In visit 10, the spectral content was reduced somewhat from 2.5 to 25 ft. On the right side, the PSD plots were fairly consistent from visit 01 to visit 08, with the exception of elevated content in visit 04 and 05 for wavelengths below 2 ft. The PSD of the right side was significantly higher in visit 09 than in visit 08 at wavelengths below 100 ft. Over the range from 1 to 100 ft, the PSD of visits 10 through 13 were higher than in visit 08, but lower than visit 09.

### Filtered Profiles:

Left Side: With the exception of the device effect, profiles filtered to show long wavelength content were consistent with time. Profiles filtered to show medium and short wavelength content were also consistent in visits 01 through 09. In visit 10, the medium wavelength profile plots showed features in the same location in visits 09 and 10, but the features were often not as rough in visit 10. The area from 90 to 150 ft from the start of the section included a higher level of short wavelength roughness than the rest of the section in visits 01 through 09. In visit 10, this area had become smoother. However, narrow dips began to appear in other locations that grew in number and severity with time. By visit 13, narrow dips from 0.1 to 0.4 in deep appeared 23.5, 119, 158.5, 204, 232.5 and 353.2 ft from the start of the section.

Right Side: Filtered profiles in the long, medium, and short wavelength range were somewhat consistent in visits 01 through 08. In visit 09, an abrupt downward step appears 485 ft from the start of the section this is about 1 in deep. In visits 10 through 13, a less severe (0.75 in) downward step appears in the same location. This corresponds to the location where a full depth patch was placed. The date of the patch was listed as August 2001, although no evidence of it is found until after visit 08. Over the rest of the section, profiles filtered to show short wavelength content are not as rough starting in visit 10.

Both Sides: The decrease in short wavelength roughness between visit 09 and 10 is attributed to the placement of a slurry seal coat in May 2002.

Roughness Profiles: The left side roughness profiles showed that the area from 90 to 150 ft from the start of the section was rougher than the rest in visits 01 through 09. This area was no rougher than the rest of the section in visit 10, but grew in roughness afterward. The narrow dips listed above for the left side profiles did not stand out as severe localized roughness in visits 11 through 13, but they did increase the roughness of the overall section somewhat.

The right side roughness profiles were consistent from visits 01 through 08, and the roughness was evenly distributed along the section. In visit 09, an extreme area of localized roughness appeared in the location of the downward step that contributed 21 to 23 in/mi to the overall roughness of the section. Over the rest of the section, the roughness distribution of visit 09 was similar to that of visit 08. In visits 10 through 13, the first 480 ft of the section was smoother than in past visits. However, the downward step 485 ft from the start contributed 15 to 18 in/mi to the overall roughness of the section.

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: Very little cracking was noted in the distress surveys for the left side of this section until April 2002. In April 2002 transverse cracking was recorded in all four locations where narrow spikes were evident in the profiles. These appeared 158.5, 204, 232.5 and 353.2 ft from the start of the section. In later distress surveys, transverse cracks were also recorded 23.5 and 119 ft from the start of the section.

No distress was listed in May 2001 in the last 15 ft of the section. However, in April 2002 the distress survey shows a patched area that extends over the last 13 ft of the section. This patch must have been present before visit 09. The reduction in medium and short wavelength roughness between visit 09 and visit 10 may have been caused by the application of a slurry seal coat in May 2002.

## **Section 0162**

Roughness: The IRI of the left side ranged from 66 to 75 in/mi, and was lowest in visit 10. The IRI of the right side ranged from 78 to 92 in/mi, and was lowest in visit 12. The MRI was 16 to 18 percent higher than the HRI in visit 01 through 09, but only 9 to 11 percent higher in visits 10 through 13. The transition corresponds to the application of a slurry seal coat in May 2002.

PSD Plots: On the left side, the PSD plots were very consistent in visits 01 through 09, and in visits 11 through 13. In visit 10, the content was lower in the wavelength range from 2 to 10 ft than in other visits. In all visits, significant content was concentrated around wavelengths from 26 to 29 ft. On the right side, the spectral distribution was consistent for wavelengths from 2 to 50 ft in visits 03 through 13. Visits 04 and 05 included elevated content compared to other visits for wavelengths shorter than 2 ft.

Filtered Profiles: With the exception of the device effect, profiles filtered to show long wavelength content were consistent with time. Profiles filtered to show medium and short wavelength content were also consistent in visits 01 through 09 and in visits 10 through 13. Between visit 09 and 10, the medium and short wavelength profile plots showed roughness in the same location and with similar severity as in previous visits, but with slightly different shape. On the right side, some areas showed a visible reduction in short wavelength roughness from visit 09 to visit 10.

A bump appears in both the left and right profiles in visits 11 through 13 over the last 10 ft of the section. It was up to 0.4 in high, and it was followed by a slight drop off beyond the end of the section.

Roughness Profiles: The left side roughness profiles showed no concentrated roughness, and were very consistent over the first nine visits. The right side roughness profiles were also very consistent with time in the first nine visits, but the roughness was not as consistent across the section. A short interval (10 ft) roughness profile demonstrated that the section was rougher over much of the section in visit 09 than in visit 10. In visits 10 through 13, a peak in the roughness profile appeared on the left side (170-240 in/mi) and the right side (235-305 in/mi) at the end of the section.

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: Very little cracking was noted in the distress surveys for this section. A slurry seal coat was applied to this section in May 2002. This may explain the reduction in short wavelength roughness between visit 09 and visit 10. Photos from April 2005 and March 2006 show a seam where the seal coat terminates just beyond the end of the section. This is probably the cause of the roughness at the end of the section noted above for visits 10 through 13.

### **Section 0163**

Roughness: The IRI of the left side ranged from 61 to 83 in/mi over the monitoring period, but did not show a consistent trend with time. The IRI of the right side increased aggressively from 65 to 126 in/mi over visits 01 through 08, held steady over the next two visits, then fluctuated significantly afterward. The MRI was 11 to 15 percent higher than the MRI in visits 01 through 08. Afterward, the gap between MRI and HRI grew steadily to 21 percent.

PSD Plots: On the left side, the spectral distribution was consistent in visits 01 through 09. In visit 10, the content for wavelengths from about 5 to 50 ft decreased. However, the content for wavelengths below 5 ft increased progressively after visit

09. Much of the content for wavelengths below 50 ft approximated white noise slope.

On the right side, the spectral distribution was consistent in visits 01 through 03. Visits 04 and 05 exhibited elevated content for wavelengths below 2 ft. Visits 06 through 09 exhibited elevated content for wavelengths from 2 to 5 ft, but reduced content for wavelengths below 2 ft. Visits 10 and 12 included the highest content for wavelengths under 5 ft. Visits 11 and 13 included slightly lower content than visit 10 and 12 for all wavelengths lower than 20 ft.

#### Filtered Profiles:

Inspection of profile plots in the long, medium, and short wavelength ranges helped locate features of interest, but they were characterized best using a simple anti-smoothing filter with a baselength of 50 ft.

Left Side: With the exception of the device effect, profiles filtered to show long wavelength content were consistent with time. Profiles filtered to show medium wavelength content were consistent in visits 03 through 09. In all visits, an area with five narrow dips appeared from 450 to 475 ft from the start of the section. These dips grew in severity with time. The most severe dip was at 475 ft, and grew in depth gradually to a maximum depth of 0.65 in. This appears at the lowest point within a very long (> 100 ft), deep dip at the end of the section. A dip 451 ft from the start of the section also grew in severity with time to 0.3 in deep. Both dips were about 2 ft long. After visit 10, a dip up to 0.4 in deep appeared about 10 ft from the start of the section, but it was not visible in the majority of the repeat measurements.

Right Side: With the exception of the device effect, plots filtered to show long wavelength content were consistent with time. However, the growth in roughness over the first ten visits was obvious in profiles filtered to show medium wavelength content.

Narrow dips (2-3 ft long) appeared throughout the section starting in visit 03, and usually grew in severity over time. The most severe dips (> 0.25 in deep) appeared 15, 225, 252, 273, 308, 472, and 475 ft from the start of the section. Less severe dips (0.10-0.25 in deep) appeared 40, 67, 111, 126, 171, 180, 191, 210, 218, 237, 265, 286, 297, 340, 388, 431, and 448 ft from the start of the section. Several narrow (> 0.5 ft long) bumps up to 0.15 in high also appeared throughout the profiles. The bumps and dips were usually very consistent in location, shape, and severity among the repeat measurements within each visit. Over visits 03 through 10, they generally progressed in severity with time. However, the most severe dips were significantly less severe in visits 11 and 13 than in visits 10 and 12.

Roughness Profiles: Severe localized roughness appeared on the left side over the last 70 ft of the section, with peak roughness levels of up to 350 in/mi by the later visits. Very short interval (10 ft) roughness profiles showed that the roughness near 475 ft from the start of the section increased significantly throughout the first ten visits, and that the change in roughness at this location caused an increase in roughness of the entire section of about 7 in/mi.

On the right side, the last 50 ft was much rougher than the rest of the section, particularly in the first nine visits. Short interval (10 ft) roughness profiles show localized roughness in the locations of the most severe dips listed above. At these locations, the localized roughness usually first appears in visits 03 through 06, and grows in severity with time. Most of the decrease in roughness in visits 11 and 13 compared to 10 and 12 occurs between 210 and 360 ft from the start of the section, and is attributed to the reduced severity of the narrow dips.

Distress Surveys and Maintenance History: Transverse cracking near the five dips in the left side profiles noted above was first recorded between visits 06 and 07 (January 2000). A distress survey prior to visit 08 (May 2002) showed transverse cracks in the locations of all five dips. That distress survey also cited potholes in the left side of the lane near 450 and 475 ft from the start of the section. However, these potholes were patched in February 2001.

The May 2002 distress survey also listed transverse cracks in the location of all of the dips listed above for the right side profiles, with one exception. The longitudinal locations of the dips within the profiles matched the cracks in the survey best using a location that was about 3 ft from the lane edge. Note that several transverse cracks appeared in the distress survey with no corresponding dip in the profile.

Most of the narrow bumps found in the right side profiles in visits 10 through 13 correspond to locations where transverse cracking was recorded in April 2005. However, a bump does not appear at the location of every crack.

The long dip in the last 100 ft of the section appears clearly in a photo (MDP040163A200107.jpg). This is certainly considered a rough feature by passing vehicles.