# THIN ASPHALT OVERLAYS FOR PAVEMENT PRESERVATION







## Acknowledgement

Kent Hansen, P.E. Director of Engineering National Asphalt Pavement Association

Matthew Corrigan Federal Highway Administration





# Why Thin Asphalt Overlays?

- Shift from new construction to renewal and preservation
- Functional improvements for safety and smoothness needed more than structural improvements – Perpetual Pavements

### Material improvements

- Binders Superpave and Polymers
- SMA, OGFC, Ultra-Thin Bonded and Dense-Graded
- Superpave mix design
- Warm Mix
- Reclaimed Asphalt Pavement (RAP)
- Roofing Shingles



### Thin Asphalt Overlays are Popular





## **Benefits of Thin Asphalt Overlays**

- Long service, low lifecycle cost
- Maintain grade and slope
- Handles heavy traffic
- Smooth surface
- Seal the surface
- No loose stones
- Minimize dust

Minimize traffic delays

- No curing time
- Low noise generation
- No binder runoff
- Can be recycled
- Can use in stage construction
- Easy to maintain
- Restore skid resistance



# Topics

- Project Selection
- Materials Selection and Mix Design
- Construction and Quality Control
- Performance
- Conclusions







# **Project Selection**

### **Avoid Projects Needing Structural Rehabilitation!!**



## **Basic Evaluation**

- Visual Survey
- Structural Assessment
  - No structural improvement required
- Drainage Evaluation
  - What changes are needed
- Functional Evaluation
  - Ride quality
  - Skid resistance
- Discussion with Maintenance Personnel



# Visual Survey

- Part of a good Pavement Management System.
- Get good, current projectspecific data
- Need to know:
  - Type of distress
  - Extent
  - Severity
- Visit the site and validate
   data.





# **Types of Distress**

#### Raveling

- Longitudinal Cracking (not in wheelpath)
- Longitudinal Cracking (in wheelpath)
- Transverse Cracking
- Alligator Cracking
- Rutting





# Raveling



FP<sup>2</sup>



## Longitudinal Cracking (not in wheelpath)







## Longitudinal Cracking (wheelpath)





**Temporary Fix for Minor Distress** 

# **Transverse Cracking**







# **Alligator (Fatigue) Cracking**





**Temporary Fix for Minor Distress** 

## **Rutting or Shoving**





### Surface Failure – Milling Required

![](_page_15_Picture_4.jpeg)

**Severe Structural Failure** 

### **Ride Quality and Skid Resistance**

![](_page_16_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Rough Surfaces Should be Milled

### Skid Problems can be Milled, but not Required

![](_page_16_Picture_5.jpeg)

## Noise can be Reduced

**NCAT Noise Trailer** 

![](_page_17_Figure_2.jpeg)

Noise Level, dB(A)

# **Drainage Evaluation**

![](_page_18_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

Information Series 128

U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration

![](_page_19_Picture_3.jpeg)

NATIONAL ASPHALT PAVEMENT ASSOCIATION

HIMA Pavement Mix Type Selection Guide

Π

![](_page_19_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_0.jpeg)

## If a Thin Overlay is the Answer...

### Select

- Surface Preparation
  - Distresses
  - Roughness
  - Considerations for Curb Reveal and Drainage
- Materials
  - Traffic
  - Availability
  - Climate
- Thickness
  - NMAS
  - Geometrics

![](_page_21_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_14.jpeg)

# **Surface Preparation**

	Mill	Fill Cracks with Mix	Clean and <u>Tack</u>	
Raveling			<b>~</b>	
Long. Crack – not in w.p.	<b>*</b>	<b>*</b>		
Long. Crack - w.p.	<b>*</b>	<b>~</b>	$\checkmark$	
Transverse Crack	<	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
Alligator Crack	~		$\checkmark$	
Rutting	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	

NATIONAL ASPHALT PAVEMENT ASSOCIATION

![](_page_22_Picture_2.jpeg)

# Materials & Mi

 Materials Selection
 Mix Design for Dense-Graded Mixes
 Other Mix Types

![](_page_23_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_4.jpeg)

### Materials Selection – Aggregate

- Thin overlays need small NMAS
  - Thin overlays < 1.5 inches thick</p>
  - Aggregate size between 4.75 and 12.5 mm NMAS
  - Ratio of lift thickness to NMAS range 3:1 to 5:1
- Quality
  - LA Abrasion: 35-48 maximum
  - Sodium Sulfate: 10-16 maximum
  - CA Fractured Faces (does not apply to 4.75 mm)
    - 2 or More: 80-90
    - 1: 10-100
  - Sand Equivalent: 28-60
  - FA Angularity (Un-compacted Voids): 40-45

![](_page_24_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_14.jpeg)

## **Example Gradations**

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_2.jpeg)

## Materials Selection - Binder

- Most specifications use PG system for climate and traffic
  - Minnesota Unmodified binder
  - Ohio Polymer modified PG 76-22
  - New Jersey PG 76-22 for high performance mix, AR used
  - North Carolina depends upon traffic level

![](_page_26_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_7.jpeg)

# Materials Selection - RAP

- Small NMAS mixes should contain fine RAP
- RAP or shingles will help
  - Stabilize cost by reducing added asphalt and added aggregate
  - Prevent rutting
  - Prevent scuffing
- Use maximum allowable while maintaining gradation and volumetrics

![](_page_27_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_8.jpeg)

# Mix Design

- Laboratory Compaction
  - Low Volume 50 gyrations in MD and GA
  - Medium Volume 60 to 75 in MD, NY, AL
  - High Volume 60 (AL) to 125 (UT)
  - Needs to be enough for interlock without fracturing aggregate
- Volumetrics
  - Void Requirements Mixes are relatively impermeable
  - VMA Should increase as NMAS decreases
  - Asphalt Content Should depend on Voids and VMA

![](_page_28_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_11.jpeg)

# Mix Design Requirements

NMAS	<b>12.5</b> 1	mm	<b>9.5</b> :	mm	6.3 mm		<b>4.75 mm</b>	
State	AL	NC	NV	UT	NY	MD	GA	OH
Comp. Level	60			50-125	75	50/65	50	50/75
Design Voids			3-6	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0-7.0	3.5
% VMA	15.5 min		12-22		16 min			15 min
% VFA				70-80	70-78		50-80	
% AC	5.5 min	4.6-5.6				5.0-8.0	6.0-7.5	6.4 min

![](_page_29_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_3.jpeg)

## Permeability

![](_page_30_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_2.jpeg)

# Construction & Quality Control

Construction
 Production
 Paving
 Quality Control

![](_page_31_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_4.jpeg)

### Aggregate

- Proper stockpiles
  - Slope and Pave
  - Cover, if needed
- Moisture content
- Plant operations
  - Slower because
    - More time to coat
    - Higher moisture content
    - Thicker aggregate veil
  - Aggregate moisture management
  - Warm mix can help

![](_page_32_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_14.jpeg)

### RAP – Process for size and consistency

Max size < NMAS</p>

### Storage and Loading

- Follow normal best practices
- Warm Mix
  - Increase haul distance
  - Pave at cooler temperatures
  - Achieve density at lower temperatures
  - Extend paving season
  - Pave over crack sealer

![](_page_33_Picture_11.jpeg)

#### Warm Mix

- Increase haul distance
- Pave at cooler temperatures
- Achieve density at lower temperatures
- Extend paving season
- Pave over crack sealer

![](_page_34_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_8.jpeg)

# Warm Mix

![](_page_35_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Figure_1.jpeg)

## **Construction – Paving Surface Preparation**

### Milling

- Remove defects
- Roughen surface
- Improve smoothness
- Provide RAP
- May eliminate need for tack
- Size machinery properly
- Tack
  - Emulsion or hot asphalt
  - Polymer emulsion or unmodified
  - Rate: 0.10 to 0.15 gal/sy (undiluted emulsion)

![](_page_37_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_13.jpeg)

## **Construction - Paving Surface Preparation**

#### Tack

- Emulsion or hot asphalt
- Polymer emulsion or unmodified
- Rate: 0.10 to 0.15 gal/sy (undiluted emulsion)

![](_page_38_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_7.jpeg)

## Construction - Paving Placement and Compaction

### Paving

- Best to move continuously
- MTV or windrow can help
- Cooling can be an issue
  - 1" cools 2X faster than 1.5"
- Warm mix
- Compaction
  - Seal voids & increase stability
  - Low permeability
  - No vibratory on < 1"</p>

![](_page_39_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Picture_12.jpeg)

# Construction - Paving Placement and Compaction

### Ultra-Thin Bonded Overlay

![](_page_40_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Picture_4.jpeg)

# Quality Control - Plant

#### Aggregate

- Gradation
- Moisture Content
- Mix Volumetrics
  - Air Voids
  - VMA
  - Asphalt Content
  - Gradation

![](_page_41_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Picture_11.jpeg)

# Quality Control - Field

### Field Density

- Thin-lift NDT gauges OK for > 1" mat
- Cores may not be representative
- Permeability not as big an issue
- Ride Quality
  - Depends on
    - Condition of existing pavement
    - Surface preparation
    - Overlay thickness
  - Specification should be based on existing condition

![](_page_42_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Picture_12.jpeg)

# Performance

Immediate Benefits
Pavement Life
Economics

![](_page_43_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_4.jpeg)

## **Immediate Benefits**

- Labi et al. (2005)
   18 to 36% decrease in roughness
   5 to 55% decrease in rut depth
   1 to 10% improvement in condition rating
   Noise
   Corlevel ay and Mastin (2007): 6.7 dB reduction
  - Corley-Lay and Mastin (2007): 6.7 dB reduction on overlaid PCC

![](_page_44_Picture_3.jpeg)

FHWA (2005): 5 dB reduction on overlaid PCC in Phoenix

■ 3dB reduction =  $\frac{1}{2}$  traffic volume

![](_page_44_Picture_6.jpeg)

# **Pavement Life**

Location	Traffic	Underlying Pavement	Performance, yrs.
	High/Low	Asphalt	16
Ohio	Low	Composite	11
	High	Composite	7
North Carolina		Concrete	6 - 10
Ontario	High	Asphalt	8
Illinois	Low	Asphalt	7 – 10
New York		Asphalt	5 – 8
Indiana	Low	Asphalt	9 – 11
Austria	High/Low	Asphalt	<u>≥</u> 10
	High	Concrete	<u>&gt;</u> 8
Georgia	Low	Asphalt	10

F

# **Pavement Life**

Location	Traffic	Underlying Pavement	Performance, yrs.
	High/Low	Asphalt	16
Ohio	Low	Composite	11
	High	Composite	7
North Carolina		Concrete	6 – 10
Ontario	High	Asphalt	8
Illinois	Low	Asphalt	7 – 10
New York		Asphalt	5 – 8
Indiana	Low	Asphalt	9 – 11
Austria	High/Low	Asphalt	<u>&gt;</u> 10
	High	Concrete	<u>&gt;</u> 8
Georgia	Low	Asphalt	10

F

# **Pavement Life**

Location	Traffic	Underlying Pavement	Performance, yrs.
	High/Low	Asphalt	16
Ohio	Low	Composite	11
	High	Composite	7
North Carolina		Concrete	6 – 10
Ontario	High	Asphalt	8
Illinois	Low	Asphalt	7 – 10
New York		Asphalt	5 – 8
Indiana	Low	Asphalt	9 – 11
Austria	High/Low	Asphalt	<u>&gt;</u> 10
 Austria	High	Concrete	<u>&gt;</u> 8
Georgia	Low	Asphalt	10

# Conclusions

Thin Overlays for Pavement Preservation Improve Ride Quality Reduce Distresses Maintain Road Geometrics Reduce Noise Reduce Life Cycle Costs Provide Long Lasting Service Place before extensive rehab required **Expected** performance 10 years or more on asphalt 6 to 10 years on PCC

## Thin Asphalt Overlays

Thin asphalt overlays are a popular solution to pavement preservation. They are economical, long-lasting, and effective in treating a wide variety of surface distresses to restore ride quality, skid resistance, and overall performance.

![](_page_49_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Picture_4.jpeg)

### Resources

- NCAT website: www.ncat.us
- New NAPA Publication:
  - IS-135, "Thin Asphalt Overlays for Pavement Preservation"
- Transportation Research Record:
  - Labi, et al. 2005.
- Ohio DOT:
  - Chou, et al. April 2008.

![](_page_50_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Picture_9.jpeg)