State Report Questions – Fall 2010 NCC Meeting

Minnesota

1. Briefly summarize your current pavement smoothness requirements.

    ✓ Our current specifications are in a transition mode.
    ✓ Over the past 5 years we have been working on a combined ride specification for both surfaces. A majority of the projects have been using a concrete only ride spec utilizing IRI with bumps (0.3 inch) and dips (0.5 inch) limits.
    ✓ In 2009, we did 6 pilot "ghost" specification projects with the combined spec. The intent was for the Contractor to gather the data under the "ghost" spec and analyze the data both under the old and new spec and we would base payment on the old spec. These projects used IRI with bumps and dips. In addition the contractor had to provide areas of localized roughness (ALR) data (this is the new measure we intend to use instead of bumps and dips).
    ✓ In 2010, we did 6 pilot projects with the combined specification. This year we implemented the requirement to use Proval for analyzing all ride data. We also set rough limits for ALR based on the previous year's information. We will compile all of the data and see if we need to adjust the ALR limits.
    ✓ In 2011, we intend to fully implement the combined pavement specification for all future projects. We are also including it in our new spec book.

    ✓ All of our equipment is required to have yearly certification at MnROAD. We also have provided training for the Contractors on gathering and analyzing the data with the ride equipment and the operation of Proval.

2. Do the requirements apply to both PCC and HMA?

    ✓ All of the physical testing requirements are the same for PCC and HMA, however the pay equations are not equivalent. I have attached the most combined ride specification that will be getting incorporated into the specification. (Although we are going from passive to active voice – so it may change from the attached version.)

3. Are you considering changes in the future? (Next 2 to 3 years)

    See #1 above

4. If yes, what indices are you considering using?

    See #1 above