IMPROVING TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND USE SEATTLE, WA JUNE 23, 2010

Implementing MEPDG in Wisconsin



Laura L Fenley, PE Pavement Structure Engineer Wisconsin Department of Transportation



<u>PAVEMENT DESIGN</u>

•Policy and guidance in statewide bureau

•Designs (primary users of traffic data) done in regions (or by consultants)

<u>TRAFFIC</u>

•Monitoring and Forecasting in same building, but different sections

•Both in a different division, housed in a building on the opposite side of the city from Pavements

Implementation - Phase I, Traffic

- 2006
- WIMs
 - 15 permanent WIMs
 - 15 portable WIMs
- 43 vehicle classification stations
- Ultimately reviewed data from 21 LTPP sites (14 separate WIMs)

MEPDG Main Input Screen

71880200.dgp - Mechanistic Empirical Pavement Design Guide File Edit View Tools Help Froject [C:\DG2002\Projects\WisDOT\Comparison Studies\Rubblize\71880200\71880200.dgp] Analysis Status: General Information Site/Project Identification Analysis % Complete Traffic 100% Analysis Parameters Climatic 100% Thermal Cracking 100% AC Analysis 100% Summary 100% S Inputs Results Traffic - Input Summary Traffic Volume Adjustment Factors Project Monthly Adjustment Traffic General Project Information: ٦ Vehicle Class Distribution Climatic Parameter Value Design Hourly Truck Distribution New Flexible Туре Traffic Growth Factor Layer Design Life 18 Years C:\DG2002\Projects\WisDOT\Comparison Stuc Axle Load Distribution Factors Climate Output Summary Construction Date 9/2009 General Traffic Inputs E Flexible Summary Traffic Open Date 10/2009 \mathbf{v} Number Axles/Truck Layer Modulus > Axle Configuration AC Modulus (plot) Wheelbase Fatigue Cracking Properties Surface Down Damage (plot) 5 11 15 10 Setting Value - Structure Surface Down Cracking (plot) Units US Customary HMA Design Properties Bottom Up Damage (plot) Analysis Type Probabilistic Layers Bottom Up Cracking (plot) Output Type Excel Worksheet Enabled Warnings Layer 1 - Asphalt concrete Thermal Cracking Layer 2 - Asphalt concrete Crack Depth (plot) Layer 3 - Cold Recycled Asphalt - RAP (includes milling) Thermal (C-h) (plot) Layer 4 - Crushed gravel Crack Length (plot) Run Analysis Layer 5 - A-7-6 Crack Spacing (plot) Thermal Cracking Rutting Rutting (plot) IRI (plot)

MEPDG Basic Traffic Input Screen

Loiz View Tools Help		
Image: State of the s	Traffic Design Life (years): 18	vsis Status: alysis 2 Complete Traffic 100% Climatic 100% Thermal Cracking 100%
Inputs Traffic Traffic Traffic Volume Adjustment Factors Monthly Adjustment	Opening Date: October, 2009 Initial two-way AADTT: 107 Number of lanes in design direction: 1	AC Analysis 100% Summary 100%
Vehicle Class Distribution Hourly Truck Distribution Traffic Growth Factor Axle Load Distribution Factors General Traffic Inputs Number Axles/Truck Axle Configuration Wheelbase	Percent of trucks in design direction (%):50.0Percent of trucks in design lane (%):100.0Operational speed (mph):55	rain Project Information: sameter Value be New Flexible sign Life 18 Years nate C:\DG2002\Projects\WisDOT\Comparison Stur nstruction Date 9/2009 tific Open Date 10/2009
Climate Structure HMA Design Properties Layers Layers Layer 1 - Asphalt concrete Layer 2 - Asphalt concrete Layer 3 - Cold Recycled Asphalt - RAP (includes milling Layer 4 - Crushed gravel Layer 5 - A-7-6 Thermal Cracking	Traffic Volume Adjustment: Edit Axle load distribution factor: Edit General Traffic Inputs Edit	tting Value its US Customary alysis Type Probabilistic tput Type Excel Worksheet smings Enabled
	Traffic Growth Linear, 2.35%	



Traffic Volume Adjustment Factors -Monthly Adjustment Factors



Honeybee – state insect

• WisDOT does not currently report-out this information. We total by month, but not individual class.

• Default values are recommended at this time.



Traffic Volume Adjustment Factors – Vehicle Class Distribution



- Traffic forecasters pull information out of TRADAS and combine into our 5 classes.
- Several TTC groups are recommended for WisDOT's use.

Mourning Dove – state symbol of peace

TTC (Truck Traffic Classification) Groups

Sel	ect ger	neral cate	egory:	Principal Arterials - Ir	nterstate and Defense 🚽 AAD select s	ted General	Category;	
		^ = rec	commended	value	Ve	hicle Llass	Percenti	
	1 *	TTC	Bus %	Multi-Trailer %	Multi-Trailer % Single-trailer and Single-unit(SU) Trucks			
-	*	5	(<2%)	(>10%)	Predominately Single-trailer trucks.		85	
-	*	8	(<2%)	(>10%)	"High percentage of single-trailer truck with some single	Class 5	10.5	
	*	11	(<2%)	(>10%)	Mixed truck traffic with a higher percentage of single-tra	Charles C	28	
	*	13	(<2%)	(>10%)	Mixed truck traffic with about equal percentages of sing	CIASS D	1	
		16	(<2%)	(>10%)	Predominantly single-unit trucks.	Class 7	0.3	
	*	3	(<2%)	(2 - 10%)	Predominantly single-trailer trucks	Ciass r		
		7	(<2%)	(2 - 10%)	Mixed truck traffic with a higher percentage of single-tra	Class 8	7.6	
		10	(<2%)	(2 - 10%)	Mixed truck traffic with about equal percentages of sing	01035 0	1	
		15	(<2%)	(2 - 10%)	Predominantly single-unit trucks.	Class 9	74	
7	*	1	(>2%)	(<2%)	Predominantly single-trailer trucks			
	*	2	(>2%)	(<2%)	"Predominantly single-trailer trucks with a low percentage	Class 10	1.2	
	*	4	(>2%)	(<2%)	Predominantly single-trailer trucks with a low to modera			
		6	(>2%)	(<2%)	Mixed truck traffic with a higher percentage of single-ur	Class 11	3.4	
		9	(>2%)	(<2%)	Mixed truck traffic with about equal percentages of sing			
		12	(>2%)	(<2%)	Mixed truck traffic with a higher percentage of single-ur	Class 12	0.6	
		14	(>2%)	(<2%)	Predominantly single-unit trucks		-	
	0	17	(>25%)	(<2%)	Mixed truck traffic with about equal single-unit and single	Class 13	0.3	
ali	2.1		1		N			

Phase I suggested "The vehicle class distributions at any given LTPP site...could be reasonably matched with...TTC groups 2, 4, 9 or 12."

Phase I Recommendations

Highway Functional Class	Matched TTC Group	Number of Sites	Recommended TTC Group*	
Pural Minor Arterial (PMA)	9	1	0 12	
	12 1		5, 12	
Rural Principal Arterial-	2	4	2.4	
Interstate (RPA-I)	4	3	Ζ, т	
Rural Principal Arterial –	9	1	0 10	
State Route (RPA-SR)	12 1		9, 12	
	2	3		
Rural Principal Arterial –	4	6		
US (RPA-US)	9	1	2, 4	
	12	1		
UPA (Urban Principal	2	1	0.4*	
Arterial)	4	1	2, 4"	

* The recommendation was based on a very limited number of LTPP sites. Further verification is needed.



Traffic Volume Adjustment Factors – Hourly Distribution



American Water Spaniel – state dog

- At this time we do not have any sites that collect this or a report that presents this information. Could glean with some effort.
- Phase I recommends using defaults.

Opening Date:	October, 2009	AADTT: 107
Design Life (years):	18	% Traffic Design Direction: 50
		% Traffic Design Lane: 100
Vehicle-class spec	cific traffic growth	
		Default Growth Function
		C No Growth
		Linear Growth
		C Compound Growth
		Default growth rate (%) 2.35
		View Growth Plots
lote: Vehicle-class di	stribition factors are ne	eeded to view the effects of traffic growth.

• Traffic growth function information comes from our traffic forecasters.

Traffic Volume Adjustment Factors – Traffic Growth Factors



White-tailed deer – state wildlife animal

Axle Load Distribution Factors



State animal



Badger – state animal

Axle Load Distribution Fa			212
Axle Load Distribution C Level 1: Site Specific C Level 2: Regional C Level 3: Default	Export Axle File	View Cumulative Distribution Distribution	Axle Types Single Axle Tandem Axle Tridem Axle Quad Axle

Axle Factors by Axle Type

Season	Veh. Class	Total	3000	4000	5000	6000	700
February	4	100.00	1.8	0.96	2.91	3.99	6.8
February	5	100.00	10.03	13.21	16.41	10.61	9.24
February	6	100.00	2.47	1.78	3.45	3.95	6.7
February	7	100.00	2.14	0.55	2.42	2.7	3.21
February	8	100.00	11.65	5.36	7.83	6.99	7.99
February	9	100.00	1.74	1.37	2.84	3.53	4.93
February	10	100.00	3.64	1.24	2.36	3.38	5.18
February	11	100.00	3.55	2.91	5.19	5.27	6.33
February	12	100.00	6.68	2.29	4.88	5.87	5.98
February	13	100.00	8.88	2.67	3.81	5.23	6.04
1	1.	🗸 ок		Cancel			

- Currently don't have a method to generate this information.
- Phase I use default distributions for most design situations. Specific information should be gathered for critical pavements.

General Traffic Inputs



Number Axles/Truck Axle Configuration Wheelbase

	Single	Tandem	Tridem	Quad
Class 4	1.62	0.39	0	0
Class 5	2	0	0	0
Class 6	1.02	0.99	0	0
Class 7	1	0.26	0.83	0
Class 8	2.38	0.67	0	0
Class 9	1.13	1.93	0	0
Class 10	1.19	1.09	0.89	0
Class 11	4.29	0.26	0.06	0
Class 12	3.52	1.14	0.06	0
Class 13	2.15	2.13	0.35	0

🥒 ОК

🗶 Cancel

Number of Axles per Truck

Defaults currently recommended \bullet

RUPPIDG LDIOF

Number Axles/Truck	📃 Axle Configu	ration	Wheelbase	
Averag outside Dual tir Tire Pr	e axle width (edg dimensions,ft): e spacing (in): essure (psi)	e-to-edge)	8.5 12 120	
Axle Spacing (in)				
Tande	m axle: 51	.6		
Trider	n axle: 49	.2		
Quad	axle: 49	.2		

Axle Configuration

Number Axles/Truck 🔄 Wheelbase Wheelbase distribution information for JPCP top-down cracking. The wheelbase refers to the spacing between the steering and the first device axle of the truck-tractors or heavy single units. Short Medium Long Average Axle Spacing (ft) 12 15 18 Percent of trucks (%): 33.0 33.0 34.0

Wheelbase

Status of Implementation in Wisconsin

We plan to implement soon after DARWin M-E becomes available

Have good materials and climate data

Have not thoroughly investigated our traffic dataCan we use defaults?Can we use existing TTCs?Which traffic inputs are most sensitive?

Is a more thorough study needed?

How will we analyze our data and get it into the MEPDG? •Atlas? •Trafload? •PrepME?



American Robin – state bird



Muskellunge – state fish

How will we instruct our pavement designers to use traffic data?Will we define which TTCs are appropriate for what roadways?Will we sometimes use WIM data?

We will hold off implementation if we feel we're not ready

Thank you





Laura L Fenley, PE Pavement Engineer Wisconsin DOT 3502 Kinsman Blvd Madison WI 53704 608 246-5455 laura.fenley@dot.wi.gov