## LOW VOLUME ROAD PROJECT REVIEW

Highway Name and Location	SH 96A, Milepost 25 - 46							
Treatment Used	p seal topped 1.5" Overlay and/or Milling in surgical locations.							
2014								
2015								
2016								

## LOW VOLUME ROAD PROJECT REVIEW



## LOW VOLUME ROAD PROJECT REVIEW

41	46	2014	91	100	97	92	97	0	7	TR	AN MODERATE		
Condition after treatment Yr 3 - 2016 See Below:													
BMP	Emp	Year	Iri	Rut	Fatg	Tran	Long	Crbk	DL	DL_Id	x Cond		
22	26	1995	79	100	93	57	88	-1	3	TRAN	LOW		
26	31	2014	83	100	100	94	100	-1	9	IRI	MODERATE		
31	36 41	2014	89 07	100	100	96 74	100	-   1	10 7		MODERATE		
30 //1	41	2014	07 80	100	97	74 88	09 Q/	-1 -1	6		MODERATE		
Condition after treatment Vr 4			t Vr /	2017	Soo	Below	- 1	0					
PMD	Emp	Voor	Inci	Dut	Eata	Tran		Crbk	Ы		v Cond		
22.1	26	1995	80	98	71	46	2011g	-1	0	TRAN			
26	31	2014	83	100	99	88	99	-1	9	IRI	MODERATE		
31	36	2014	89	100	100	93	100	-1	10	IRI	MODERATE		
36	39.1	2014	89	100	100	97	100	-1	10	IRI	MODERATE		
39.1	43	2017	100	100	100	100	100	-1	15	FATO	; HIGH		
43	46	2014	91	98	100	94	99	-1	7	IRI	MODERATE		
Condi	tion af	ter trea	tmer	nt Yr 5 -	2018	See	Below:						
BMP	Emp	Year	lri	Rut	Fatg	Tran	Long	Crbk	DL	DL_ld	x Cond		
22.1	26	1995	80	98	71	46	96	-1	0	TRAN	LOW		
26	31	2014	84	100	98 100	90	100	-1	9 10		MODERATE		
36	30 201	2014	07 80	100	100	09 05	100	-1 -1	10		MODERATE		
39.1	43	2014	83	83	92	65	89	-1	4	TRAN	MODERATE		
43	46	2014	91	98	100	94	99	-1	7	IRI	MODERATE		
Chang	ge in Dl	_ condit	ion d	ocumer	nted	Aver	age DL	increase	e of ~	10 year	S.		
Treatment Quantity					v Un	it -	Treatme	nt Area		Unit	Cost	Calculated Cost (SY)	
Bon	n of Asp	halt Mat			,		(5)	()		Cost			
(Planing)			49,826	S	Y 49,8		326	9	2.45	\$122,073.70	\$2.45		
HMA (Gr SX) (75)(PG 64-		4-		_									
Cov	22) (1.5")			24,938	To	n	302,	279	\$	73.15	\$1,824,214.70	\$6.03	
COV	(Type II) 1			171,881	S	Y	171,	881	\$	2.20	\$378,138.20	\$2.20	
Emulsified Asphalt (CRS-			110	Та		171	001	¢1	00.00	¢74 240 00			
Emulsified Asphalt (Slow			415	T.	// 1	171,	001	φI	00.00	\$74,340.00	<b>\$</b> 0.43		
Setting) 13,856 Gal						al	277,	120	\$	52.50	\$34,640.00	\$0.13	
Takea	aways	Areas	of the	e projec	ct wher	e dela	minatio	n of the	e exis	ting HM	A was occurring	were treated	
		with 1	.5" m	ill/fill.	Most c	of the r	emaind	er of th	e pro	ject wa	is a thin overlay	. A couple of	
		areas where the roadway was not too rough compared to adjacent areas were not treated											
		with H	MA m	hill/fill (	or over	lav. A	chip se	al was r	place	d over a	s much of the p	project as	
	budget would allow upon completion of the paving (chin seal was placed from MP 26 to											om MP 26 to	
		MP 39)	. The	projec	t allow	ed the	use of	slag chi	ps in	one tes	t section which	has performed	
	very well. Similar to the US 24 project, the areas selected to remain in place with no HMA												
	treatment prior to the project are new patienably reugher than these groas where pe												
	I contribute project are now noticeably rougher than those areas where no												
	HIVIA was praced. Noticeable enough to get complaints about the ride in those areas upon											ffored york	
	completion of the project. As noted in the condition data, the treatment offered very										nered very		
	little benefit to the transverse cracking reflecting through.												