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“Quiet” Pavement

What it is:
- In General – a wearing surface that minimizes tire-pavement noise production and propagation
“Quiet” Pavement

Asphalt – “small-textured” porous mix (e.g., open-graded asphalt concrete)
“Quiet” Pavement

Concrete – negative-textured longitudinal grind and groove (e.g., “Next Generation Concrete Surface”)
Noise Measurement

Wayside

Tire-Pavement (i.e. OBSI)
Chapter 790 of the 2011 Virginia Acts of Assembly (Code of Virginia § 33.1-223.2:21)

Directs VDOT to:

- Expedite the development of QP technology by including contract specs for QP technology and sound mitigation alternatives if sound mitigation is a consideration.
- Construct demonstration projects to assess QP technologies.
- Perform assessments to evaluate functionality/safety of QP technology in Virginia's climate over two full winters.
- Include in the report:
  - Results of demonstration projects,
  - Results of the use of QP in other states,
  - A plan for routine implementation of QP, and
  - Safety, cost, performance issues of the technologies.
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Project Selection Criteria

- Four-lane divided, high-speed corridor
- Good overall pavement structure
- Good geometrics
- Limited at-grade intersections
- 1-mile per asphalt technology/ ½-mile for concrete
- No curb/gutter or existing sound mitigation measures
1. SR 7 By-Pass in Leesburg (A)
2. SR 199 west of Williamsburg (A)
3. SR 288 near Chester (A)
4. I-64 Virginia Beach (C)
5. SR 76 Richmond (C)
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Preliminary Findings - “new” materials and treatments
QP Demonstration Projects – Spring 2012
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Typical Virginia Pavements vs. QP Demonstration Projects

OBSI (dBA)

- 2010 OBSI Survey—Typical Virginia Pavements
- QP Demonstration Projects – Spring 2012
Friction – LWT & GT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavement Type</th>
<th>LWT-S-12</th>
<th>GT-S-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMA 9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-PFC 9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFC 9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFC 12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary (Tire-Pavement Noise)

- Quiet asphalt technologies *measurably* less noisy on average than control (note: control technology NOT noisy)
- Next Generation Concrete Surface (NGCS) *noticeably* less noisy than control
- None of the surfaces became louder over the winter (note: milder than normal winter)
Summary (Other Properties)

• Ride quality is critical to quiet pavements and excellent ride quality was achieved in the projects.
• The QP technologies exhibit good resistance to skidding
• The QP technologies have reduced splash and spray with improved wet-weather visibility
• There were no reports of compromised safety during winter weather with QP
Next Steps

• Two most promising asphalt technologies to be tested at NCAT – starting fall 2012
• Two most promising technology components (rubber modified binder & PFC 12.5) to be installed summer 2012
• Noise (and other) testing continues
• Costs will continue to be evaluated
  – Life-cycle cost models to be developed
Life Cost Model Components

• Allowable substitution – will FHWA permit QP strategy in lieu of noise barriers?
• “Acoustic longevity” – QP replacement cycle?
• Additional maintenance costs – winter and periodic cleaning/vacuuming
• Value of other functional benefits – e.g., reduced rolling resistance, improved safety & comfort, etc.
For more information:
Kevin.McGhee@vdot.virginia.gov

Links to Interim Report:
http://leg2.state.va.us/dls/h&sdocs.nsf/0/e0a4b50ad340248c8525787e0057d09a?OpenDocument

http://www.virgiiniadot.org/VDOT/Projects/asset_upload_file884_5721.pdf