19th Arizona Pavements/Materials Conference

Rich Intermediate Layer

Gary L. Fitts, P.E. Kraton Polymers

KRATON[™]

Agenda

- Approaches to delay/prevent reflection cracking in overlays
- NCAT Test Track-Section N8
- Oklahoma I-40, ODOT experience
- Other examples
- Highly-Modified Asphalt binder

Interlayers

- Primary purpose: to delay or prevent distress from reflecting from underlying pavement/material
- Types:
 - Fabric/geotextiles
 - Woven, non-woven
 - Typically placed over a leveling course
 - Chip seal-type applications
 - Asphalt rubber/stress absorbing membrane interlayer (SAMI)
 - Underseal
 - Hot mix asphalt
 - Strata[®]
 - Rich intermediate/rich bottom layer



Potential Interlayer Concerns

- Multiple operations to mobilize for
 - Added complexity, cost, time
- Specialized work (geotextile placement, asphalt-rubber SAMI application)
- Traffic control during construction
- Cost
- Effectiveness
 - Mixed experience
 - Make sure that the conditions are appropriate
 - Stable underlying structure (minimal vertical movement under loading at cracks)
 - Underlying material resistant to moisture damage
 - Correct any problem with subsurface drainage.



Oklahoma DOT "Rich Intermediate Layer" (RIL)

- ODOT Specifications, Section 411(j)
- Characteristics: Flexible, impermeable, provides structural benefit
- Small nominal maximum aggregate size, high binder content, low air voids mixture using highly modified asphalt binder (HiMA)
 - PG76E-28
- Purpose: to resist reflection of underlying cracks through the surface while providing additional pavement structure and a leveling/profiling opportunity
- First used at the NCAT Test Track in Section N8



NCAT 2006 Construction, Sections N8 & N9, Oklahoma DOT

- ODOT tested the perpetual pavement concept in anticipation of building SH 152 southwest of OKC
 - Reconstructed the embankment for N8 and N9 to approximate central Oklahoma conditions
 - Both test sections included a "Rich Bottom Layer," and SMA surface
- Sections N8 (10 in., total) and N9 (14 in., total), Section N9 – no distress, as expected. N8 was severely distressed and required rehabilitation for safety and operational purposes
 - First rehabilitation attempt: milled 5 in., replaced with similar materials as before (as per typical ODOT rehab strategy), placing a geotextile on top of the dense-graded leveling course
 - Cracking observed after 2.7 million ESAL, then deteriorated rapidly requiring additional rehabilitation



Figure 1 Structural Cross Sections and Instrumentation (1)

Timm, D. H., D. Gierhart, and J. R. Willis. Strain Regimes Measured in Two Full Scale Perpetual Pavements. Proc., International Conference on Perpetual Pavement, Columbus, OH., 2009.



NCAT Section N8 – June 29, 2010





NCAT Section N8, Oklahoma DOT

- Excellent performance observed on the adjacent test section (N7), which was a thin (5³/₄-inch) pavement using "highly-modified" asphalt (HiMA) binder
- Milled 6 inches, replaced with a like thickness of mixtures using HiMA binder
 - This approach could be done very quickly and easily
 - Included a 1-inch "rich HPM" (RIL) lift to retard reflection cracking-designed to similar volumetric requirements as rich bottom layer mixture.



https://eng.auburn.edu/research/centers/ncat/files/technical-reports/rep16-04.pdf



NCAT Section N8 Rehabilitation-Results



Figure 4 IRI Evaluation of Oklahoma Perpetual Pavement Sections

NCAT Report 16-04

https://www.eng.auburn.edu/research/centers/ncat/files/technical-

reports/rep16-04.pdf

- Roughness, rutting stabilized after HiMA rehabilitation
- No cracks observed until more than 15 million ESAL
- A viable option for rapid rehabilitation of Interstates or other pavements subjected to heavy vehicle traffic



I-40, Caddo County (approx. MP 102.2-104.2)

- Feb-April 2012
- Milled 5 inches, replaced with:
 - 1½ in RIL, PG76-28E (HiMA)
 - 5 in S3, PG76-28E, in two lifts
 - 1½ in S5, PG76-28E
 - ³⁄₄" OGFC (PG76-28, not HiMA)





I-40, Caddo County

- Avg. 2020 IRI: 49.97 in/mi (EB), 47.81 in/mi (WB)*
- 2021 AADT = 29,600 with 36% trucks (7% single-unit, 29% combination)









ODOT History of RIL Use: 2012-2022

- Steady increase since 2018
- Used in all ODOT Districts
 - Most in District 1
- Projects ranging from county roads to Interstate highways





Oklahoma DOT Historical Cost Data

- Oklahoma Department of Transportation publishes "Average Price History," available online
- Compare RIL with Fabric Interlayer + S5 leveling

https://www.odot.org/contracts/avgprices/index.php

					nent of Transportation 01, 2019 to December 31, 2020		January 11, 2021	
				Weighted Average I By Item, Region				
ltem	District	Quarter	Number of Occur's	Total Quantity	Total Dollars	Avg Awarded Price	Avg of Low 3 Bidders	
411(D)	5965 / SI	PERPAVE,	TYPE S5(PG	76-28 OK) / TON				
	03	2020Q1	1	250.00	\$ 25,025.00	\$ 100.10	\$ 108.39	
	04	2020Q2	2	35.00	\$ 41,626.90 \$ 66,651.90	\$ 1,189.34 \$ 233.87	\$ 687.17 \$ 157.80	
411(D)	5970 / SI	JPERPAVE.	-	70-28 OK) / TON	00,001.00	\$200.01	4 101.00	
,	03	2020Q1 2020Q2	2 1	25,386.00 2,768.02	\$ 2,174,090.40 \$ 329,394.38	\$ 85.64 \$ 119.00	\$ 94.42 \$ 111.77	
	04	2019Q4	2	6,225.40	\$ 702,172.40	\$ 112.79	\$ 111.04	
	08	2020Q2	1	784.00	\$ 76,557.60	\$ 97.65	\$ 97.65	
			6	35,163.42	\$ 3,282,214.78	\$ 93.34	\$ 98.04	
411(D)	5975 / SU	JPERPAVE,	TYPE S5(PG	64-22 OK) / TON				
	02	2020Q2	4	24,947.00	\$ 2,133,329.45	\$ 85.51	\$ 87.02	
	03	2019Q3	2	119.70	\$ 21,405.00	\$ 178.82	\$ 316.32	
		2020Q1 2020Q3	2	13,605.00 4.50	\$ 1,112,497.50 \$ 2,250.00	\$ 81.77 \$ 500.00	\$ 90.18 \$ 666.67	
		2020Q3	3	6.582.00		\$ 500.00	\$ 83.67	
					\$ 518,130.00	3/0./2	3 03.07	
	05	2019Q3	1	2,330.00	\$ 518,130.00 \$ 229,505.00	\$ 98.50	\$ 101.00	
	05 06	2019Q3 2020Q4	1	2,330.00 5,542.97	\$ 229,505.00 \$ 663,343.82	\$ 98.50 \$ 119.67	\$ 101.00 \$ 119.67	
			1	2,330.00	\$ 229,505.00	\$ 98.50	\$ 101.00	
411(J)	06	2020Q4	1 15	2,330.00 5,542.97	\$ 229,505.00 \$ 663,343.82	\$ 98.50 \$ 119.67	\$ 101.00 \$ 119.67	
411(J)	06	2020Q4	1 15	2,330.00 5,542.97 53,131.17	\$ 229,505.00 \$ 663,343.82	\$ 98.50 \$ 119.67	\$ 101.00 \$ 119.67	
411(J)	06	2020Q4 P) RICH INT 2020Q2	1 2 15 ERMEDIATE 1	2,330.00 5,542.97 53,131.17 LAYER / TON 5,930.00	\$ 229,505.00 \$ 663,343.82 \$ 4,680,460.77 \$ 696,478.50	\$ 98.50 \$ 119.67 \$ 88.09 \$ 117.45	\$ 101.00 <u>\$ 119.67</u> <u>\$ 90.11</u> \$ 120.73	
411(J)	06 6410 / (Si 01	2020Q4 P) RICH INT 2020Q2 2020Q3	1 15 ERMEDIATE 1 2	2,330.00 5,542.97 53,131.17 LAYER / TON 5,930.00 33,593.00	\$ 229,505.00 \$ 663,343.82 \$ 4,680,460.77 \$ 696,478.50 \$ 3,390,107.00	\$ 98.50 \$ 119.67 \$ 88.09 \$ 117.45 \$ 100.92	\$ 101.00 <u>\$ 119.67</u> \$ 90.11 \$ 120.73 \$ 104.98	
411(J)	06 6410 / (SI 01 02	2020Q4 P) RICH INT 2020Q2 2020Q3 2020Q2	1 <u>2</u> 15 ERMEDIATE 1 2 1	2,330.00 5,542.97 53,131.17 LAYER / TON 5,930.00 33,593.00 5,400.00	\$ 229,505.00 \$ 663,343.82 \$ 4,680,460.77 \$ 696,478.50 \$ 3,390,107.00 \$ 761,400.00	\$ 98.50 \$ 119.67 \$ 88.09 \$ 117.45 \$ 100.92 \$ 141.00	\$ 101.00 <u>\$ 119.67</u> <u>\$ 90.11</u> \$ 120.73 \$ 104.98 \$ 137.10	
411(J)	06 6410 / (SI 01 02 04	2020Q4 P) RICH INT 2020Q2 2020Q3 2020Q2 2020Q2 2020Q1	1 <u>2</u> 15 ERMEDIATE 1 2 1 2 1 2	2,330.00 5,542.97 53,131.17 LAYER / TON 5,930.00 33,593.00 5,400.00 20,018.00	\$ 229,505.00 \$ 663,343.82 \$ 4,680,460.77 \$ 696,478.50 \$ 3,390,107.00 \$ 761,400.00 \$ 1,983,916.00	\$ 98.50 \$ 119.67 \$ 88.09 \$ 117.45 \$ 100.92 \$ 141.00 \$ 99.11	\$ 101.00 <u>\$ 119.67</u> <u>\$ 90.11</u> \$ 120.73 \$ 104.98 \$ 137.10 \$ 105.06	
411(J)	06 6410 / (SI 01 02 04 05	2020Q4 P) RICH INT 2020Q2 2020Q3 2020Q2 2020Q1 2020Q4	1 15 ERMEDIATE 1 2 1 2 1 2 1	2,330.00 5,542.97 53,131.17 LAYER / TON 5,930.00 33,593.00 5,400.00 20,018.00 5,611.00	\$ 229,505.00	\$ 98.50 \$ 119.67 \$ 88.09 \$ 117.45 \$ 100.92 \$ 141.00 \$ 99.11 \$ 104.27	\$ 101.00 <u>\$ 119.67</u> <u>\$ 90.11</u> \$ 120.73 \$ 104.98 \$ 137.10 \$ 105.06 \$ 105.66	



Cost Comparison: RIL vs. Fabric + Leveling

Item	Low bid	Avg. 3 low bids
S411(J), RIL (1.25")	\$114.10/ton	\$120.35/ton
S407(D), Tack Coat (NT), (0.10 gal/sy)	\$3.28/gal	\$3.32/gal
S409, Fabric	\$2.33/sy	\$2.28/sy
S409, Bit. Binder	\$3.99/gal	\$4.54/gal
S411 (D), Type S5 (PG64-22), 1.25"	\$80.29/ton	\$85.63/ton
S411 (D), Type S5 (PG76-28)	\$95.20/ton	\$102.40/ton

Source: Oklahoma DOT(<u>https://www.odot.org/contracts/avgprices/index.php</u>), March 14, 2022 Price History



Comparison: RIL vs. Fabric + Leveling*

- RIL Cost = RIL (1.25 in) + Tack (trackless tack @ 0.10 gal/sy)
- Fabric = Fabric + Bituminous Binder (@ 0.225 gal/sy) + S5 (1.25 in)

Alternative	Low Bid	Avg. 3 lowest
1.25 in Rich Intermediate Layer (RIL)	\$8.17/sy	\$8.60/sy
Fabric, 1.25 in. S5 (PG64-22)	\$8.75/sy	\$9.19/sy
Fabric, 1.25 in. S5 (PG76-28)	\$9.77/sy	\$10.34/sy

*Note that this does <u>not</u> account for differences in mobilization, traffic control or other items



ODOT Specification Requirements, RIL

- Section 411/708, 2019 Standard Specifications
- Laboratory Mix Design Properties:
 - S5 gradation (9.5 mm NMS), min. 5.5% binder content
 - N_{des} = 50 gyrations, 97% G_{mm}, VMA ≥ 15.5%, VFA: 73-79%
 - Hamburg Wheel Tracking: max 12.5 mm deformation after 20,000 cycles
- PG76E-28 binder grade (HiMA)

Table 411	:7			
Mix Design Properties of Laboratory Molded				
Non-Superpave Specimens				
Property	RIL			
Number of SGC Gyrations	50			
Required Density,	97.0			
% of G_{mm}	97.0			
VMA ª, %	≥15.0			
TSR minimum	0.80			
Draindown, %	—			
Permeability, $cm/s \times 10^{-5}$	≤12.5			
Hamburg rut depth, mm	≤12.5 ^b			
^a VMA is based on the bulk specific gravity of the				
aggregates.				
^b Based on PG binder type.				

Special Provision 411-015



Oklahoma DOT HiMA Specification, PG76E-28

PLANT MIX BITUMINOUS BASES AND SURFACES

708.03 ASPHALT MATERIALS

Provide asphalt cement in accordance with AASHTO M 320 or M 332 with additional specifications as detailed in Table 708:2 as required by the Contract.

Table 708:2 AASHTO M 332 Requirements for Asphalt Cement					
Test	PG 58-28 (PG 58S-22)	PG 64-22 (PG 64S-22)	PG 70-28 (PG 64V-28)	PG 76-28 (PG 64E-28)	PG 88-28 (PG 76)-28)
J _{nr} 3.2, kPa ¹	M 332				
R3.2, %	_	_	≥ 50	≥ 80	≥ 95
PAV DSR	M 332				

Note: Asphalt binder suppliers will provide handling requirements for their products to the asphalt producer.

¹ May be allowed if 100x micrographs of PG 76E-28 sulfur cured at 2, 4, and 6 hours indicates a uniform dispersion of polymer and approved by the Materials Division Engineer.



708.03

Iowa DOT Hot Mix Asphalt Interlayer Specification

- PG 58-34E binder
- No RAP
- AASHTO T-321 Min 100,000 cycles to failure at 2000 microstrain
- In use since 2014, mostly for overlaying jointed concrete pavement



November 2014

RESEARCH PROJECT TITLE Assessment of Asphalt Interlayer Designed on Jointed Concrete

SPONSORS

Iowa Department of Transportation (InTrans Project 13-475) Federal Highway Administration

Assessment of Asphalt Interlayer Designed on Jointed Concrete

tech transfer summary

Based on the substantial reduction in reflective cracking and only marginal cost increases from using the interlayer on this research project, it is recommended that future hot mix asphalt (HMA) overlay projects in Iowa consider using the crack-relief interlayer to delay reflective cracking.

https://intrans.iastate.edu/app/uploads/2018/03/asphalt_interlayer_on_jointed_concrete_t2.pdf



Alabama DOT Projects



- 1) I-59/-20, Tuscaloosa Co., 2016-7
- 2) I-459, Jefferson Co., 2018
- 3) I-85, Macon Co., 2021
- 4) I-59, Etowah & Dekalb Co.'s, 2022
- 9.5 mm NMS Superpave, designed at 2% air voids requiring HiMA (PG76-22E per ALDOT specs)
- Used to delay/prevent reflection cracking



Alabama I-59/20

- Opened in 1970, rehabilitated in 1983, 1990 and 2001
- Extensive longitudinal cracking
 - About 1/3 of cracks extended beyond top 4 inches of pavement
 - Deflection (FWD) analysis suggested the need for additional pavement thickness
- 17 bridges within project limits complicated things
 - Very costly to raise the surface profile to allow for additional structure
 - Estimated to cost almost \$8.7 million just to raise bridge surfaces
- Drew from NCAT experience on Section N8





Alabama I-59/20 Rehabilitation



From Braden Smith (Hunt Refining) at 2018 SEAUPG Meeting



HiMA (Highly-Modified Asphalt) Binder

- Not a product, but a binder grade
 - Examples include PG76E-28 (Oklahoma), PG76-28E (HP)(Virginia), High Polymer (Florida), HPG (Texas)
 - Distinguished by high MSCR recovery/low compliance at elevated temperature
- Results in higher SBC content (2X-3X) that of conventional polymermodified binder grades
- Enables the use of high binder content without instability or bleeding



TxDOT Item 3000, Crack Attenuating Mixture (CAM)









"S-Curve" – Effect of increasing SBS content





FHWA "Every Day Counts" Initiative, EDC-6

- Targeted Overlay Pavement Solutions (TOPS)
- Solutions for integrating innovative overlay procedures into practices that can improve performance, lessen traffic impacts, and reduce the cost of pavement ownership.
- Approximately half of all infrastructure dollars are invested in pavements, and more than half of that investment is in overlays. By enhancing overlay performance, State and local highway agencies can maximize this investment and help ensure safer, longer-lasting roadways for the traveling public.

State of the Practice

Recent improvements to design methods, interlayer technology, slab geometry, and concrete mixtures have broadened concrete overlay surface treatment applicability, reliability, sustainability, and cost-effectiveness. A joint effort by Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, and Oklahoma resulted in the development of an improved design procedure for jointed unbonded concrete overlays on either concrete or composite pavements.

For asphalt overlays, several State departments of transportation (DOTs) have adopted SMA due to increased service life and performance. The Maryland, Alabama, and Utah DOTs each used over 1 million tons of SMA during a 5-year period. DOTs in Florida, Georgia, New Jersey, New York City, Tennessee, and Virginia found highly modified asphalt in thin overlays is more resistant to reflective cracking. It has increased pavement life by two to four times for DOTs in Alabama and Oklahoma.





https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/innovation/everydaycounts/edc_6/

HiMA Applications

- Improved OGFC performance
 - TTI study for FDOT estimates increase of ~50% in service life compared to conventional PMA
- Greater resistance to reflection cracking in dense-graded mixtures and SMA
 - Virginia DOT, FDOT
- Increased AASHTO layer coefficient (0.54 vs 0.44) for Florida DOT
- More resistant to studded tire wear-Alaska DOT&PF research and experience

- FDOT-over 700,000 mix tons using High Polymer since 2017
- TxDOT has let and awarded two projects on I-35 in Austin using "HPG" (HiMA) in SMA, Laredo District also using
- Oklahoma DOT-another major rehab project on I-40 coming up this fiscal year

https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/innovation/innovator/issue93/page_03.html



KRATON[™]

Thanks!

- Gary Fitts gary.fitts@kraton.com
 210 381 6922
- https://kraton.com/products/paving/pavingsbs.php



19th Arizona Pavements/Materials Conference

Legal Disclaimer

All information set forth herein is for informational purposes only. Kraton Corporation, on behalf of itself and its affiliates ("KRATON"), believes the information set forth herein to be true and accurate. Any recommendations, presentations, statements or suggestions that may be made are without any warranty or guarantee whatsoever and shall establish no legal duty on the part of KRATON. The product(s) shown herein may not be available in all geographies where KRATON is represented.

The legal responsibilities of KRATON with respect to the products described herein are limited to those set forth in KRATON's Conditions of Sale or any effective sales contract. KRATON does not warrant that the products described herein are suitable for any particular uses or applications. Users of KRATON's products must rely on their own independent judgment, and must conduct their own studies, registrations, and other related activities, to establish the suitability of any materials or KRATON products selected for any intended purpose, and the safety and efficacy of their end products incorporating any KRATON products for any application. Physical properties obtained may vary depending on certain conditions, and the results obtained will ultimately depend on actual circumstances and in no event KRATON guarantees the achievement of any specific results. Customer is responsible for ensuring that workplace safety and disposal practices are in compliance with applicable laws.

Nothing set forth herein shall be construed as a recommendation to use any Kraton product in any specific application or in conflict with any existing intellectual property rights. KRATON reserves the right to withdraw any product from commercial availability and to make any changes to its products. KRATON expressly disclaims any and all liability for any damages or injuries arising out of any activities relating to the use of any information set forth in this publication, or the use of any KRATON products.

*KRATON, and the Kraton logo are either trademarks or registered trademarks of Kraton Corporation, or its subsidiaries or affiliates, in one or more, but not all countries.

©2022 Kraton Corporation

