



TRC0207

**Monitoring Hot Mix Asphalt on the  
Interstate Rehabilitation Program**

Mark W. Frazier, Davin M. Webb

Final Report

2003

Draft Final Report

TRC-0207  
Monitoring Hot Mix Asphalt on the Interstate Rehabilitation Program

By

Mark W. Frazier  
Engineering Research Technician  
And  
Davin M. Webb  
Research Information Coordinator

Planning & Research Division  
Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department

Conducted in Cooperation with the U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Highway Administration

September 2003

The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department or the Federal Highway Administration. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents.....	1
Introduction.....	2
Project History.....	3
Project Results.....	6
Summary.....	7
Recommendations.....	7
Appendices	
Appendix A - Database Titles.....	8
Appendix B - BX0100.....	11
Appendix C - B60115.....	12
Appendix D - B80104.....	13
Appendix E - B80105 .....	14
Appendix F - B10102.....	16

## INTRODUCTION

The Interstate Rehabilitation Program (IRP) involves the reconstruction of a large number of miles of Interstate within a five-year period. With leadership from the Arkansas General Assembly, the Governor's Office, and the Arkansas Highway Commission, voters approved the program in 1999. The rehabilitation on Arkansas' Interstates uses future federal and state funds through the sale of innovative GARVEE (Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicles) bonds.

The construction began under the IRP in the late spring of 2000 and will rebuild over 300 of Arkansas' 655-mile Interstate highway system. Through the financing of GARVEE bonds, the Arkansas Highway Commission will use future federal funds to retire \$575 million worth of bonds to be issued over 3 years. Repayment will also come from required state matching funds and the proceeds from a phased-in four-cent-a-gallon increase of the state diesel fuel tax.

This presents the Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department with the opportunity to monitor the design and production of large quantities of Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA) and the immediate and long-term impact of Interstate traffic. All of the designs in the final pavement will be of the same gradation levels, but material sources, and HMA producers, and pavement contractors will vary.

The TRC project "Monitoring Hot Mix Asphalt on Interstate Bond Program" was implemented in 2001 with the following.

1. Monitor projects constructed under the IRP from the design of HMA used on projects through construction.
2. Utilize design mix values and Acceptance Sampling and Independent Assurance Sampling results to build a database.
3. Utilize this data to predict performance based on national Superpave research.
4. Monitor in-service performance.
5. Indicators of "what not to do" may prove to give timely results that can be used on other IRP projects.

The results of this study would provide an in-depth look at the mix design, production, lay down process and performance of HMA on the Interstate. With such a vast amount of data being collected in a short period of time, the overall quantity of data would allow the Department to quickly and more accurately evaluate each job. It was anticipated that this research would also be an aid in more efficiently collecting field data for processing and analysis.

## PROJECT HISTORY

In accordance with the Constitution and By-Laws of the Transportation Research Committee (TRC), a Research Subcommittee for TRC-0207 "Monitoring Hot Mix Asphalt on Interstate Bond Program" was formed in January 2001. Those members were Allan Holmes, Chairman, Frank Russenberger, Mike Limbird, Brad Fryer, Brent Dather, FHWA, and Davin Webb, Project Coordinator.

The first subcommittee meeting was held February 6, 2001 with all members present but Brent Dather, FHWA. Alan Meadors, the current Staff Research Engineer was also present.

During this meeting discussion covered whether or not this would be an in-house project or a contracted project. It was agreed that an in-house project could attain the goals of the project especially since the Department was close to implementation of the new SiteManager Program.

Fields needed for the database were discussed and it was agreed that a version patterned after the Superpave database (Appendix A) presented at the meeting would be acceptable. There were also concerns raised over the ability to accurately and easily convert station numbers over to log miles or would it be in the best interest of the Department's long range goals to go ahead and collect the limits using Global Positioning System (GPS) and get the latitude and longitude of each job limit.

Another question discussed was collecting the data from the field since there were no computer laptops assigned to any of the asphalt plant inspectors. The subcommittee agreed on the possibility of purchasing approximately ten laptops for this project in order to get the data electronically. David Henning, Staff Construction Engineer, would also be contacted to see where the Department stands on the implementation of the new SiteManager Program.

SiteManager is a Windows-based client/server application that will work with any State Highway Agency's existing database. SiteManager is compatible with the other software in AASHTO's Trns\*Port family of software, and can exchange data with mainstream business software applications such as word processors and spreadsheets.

SiteManager is basically an integrated series of computerized forms for entering and viewing all information needed for a contract. Information entered on these forms is stored in a central database, so when a user calls up a report or record, it reflects the most up-to-date information available.

SiteManager eliminates the need to enter duplicate information; the program automatically transfers information from one form to all other forms and reports that use the same information.

The subcommittee agreed that there would be a draft work plan ready for review at the next meeting. The work plan included four phases:

**Phase I – Data Collection.** The data would be collected on all IRP projects that are active during this phase. All other IRP projects were added as necessary to give an adequate representation for statistical purposes. It was anticipated that the project would rely heavily on data gathered electronically by construction project level staff. Each inspector would complete a *Report of Inspection at Asphalt Plant* form and the *Verification of Contractor's Tests for Asphalt Concrete Hot Mix* form. These forms

would be e-mailed to the Project Coordinator serving as Principal Investigator (PI) in the research office. There would also be random on-site field inspections at which time the PI/Research personnel would make digital video of the asphalt lay down process. The Coordinator would also periodically acquire various other data taken at each site for updating the database.

**Phase II – Site Inspections.** Research and District personnel would monitor each site. Research staff would take digital photographs and the video of the sites during each monitoring visit. The Global Positioning System (GPS) would be used to locate features, coring locations and any paving irregularities found. If a problem area were detected, personnel would immediately attempt to locate the failure source and provide data and documentation to support the findings.

**Phase III – Data Analysis.** Data analysis will include collecting, compiling, sorting and verifying the data as well as the data collection process. A database would be created from the data received via e-mail from the Resident Engineers. Once the data has been imported into the database, any number of various queries could be run on the data to quickly and efficiently compare like data. This comparison could show if there are similar problems on any other jobs.

**Phase IV – Reports.** A final report would be written that includes all findings from this research effort. An implementation report or recommendations for the project would be developed from the findings.

The Transportation Research Committee (TRC) approved this project on May 24, 2001 for inclusion in the fiscal year 2002 Research Program. The work plan for “Monitoring Hot Mix Asphalt on Interstate Rehabilitation” was submitted at the Spring TRC for fiscal year 2002. It was approved as project TRC-0207. The work plan included the total budget for this project and a line item appropriation. The plan also contained competitive bid prices for laptop computers and a digital camera.

Laptop computers were purchased for use in the project in July 2001. There was still work to be done by Materials Division on standardizing some of the forms and spreadsheets that would be installed on the computers.

Asphalt plant inspectors in Districts 1, 4, 6, and 8 received new laptop computers purchased for this project in September 2001. The new SiteManager Program was not installed at this time because the Materials Components of the program were not worked out yet. The laptops were issued with only standard forms from the Materials and Construction directory and the option was left to the Resident Engineer to determine which forms he wished his inspectors to use.

Contact with the Resident Engineers on the IRP projects would need to be made first because they would need to review and approve the data forms before being forwarded to the Research office from the field.

There was not a current timetable for implementation of the SiteManager Program because only the Construction Management side of the program was the focus at this time. Also focus on the actual contractor payment through SiteManager was being developed.

The complete distribution of the laptop computers for the bond project materials inspectors was done in October of 2001. They were provided with the standard forms from the AHTD Materials and Construction directories. Also another share folder in the Construction directory provided some of the different verification/tracking forms that various Resident Engineer (RE) offices had created. Contact was needed with the bond project REs to arrange the lot reports for the ACHM mixes to be e-mailed to the Research office after being reviewed and approved.

At a subcommittee meeting held October 16<sup>th</sup> Mark Frazier was assigned to this project to replace Davin Webb as Project Coordinator September of 2002. Mr. Webb would still assist with the project because of his early involvement with the start of the project. Jerry Trotter replaced Brad Fryer on the subcommittee and shortly after Mark Bradley replaced Alan Meadors as Staff Research Engineer on the subcommittee.

A memo was sent out to the Resident Engineer (RE) offices that had IRP jobs assigned to them. The memo asked for information about mixes used on the IRP jobs and their content, plant suppliers, aggregate used, location in log miles and/or stations of IRP jobs and where mixes are used, and if the mixes were changed during the IRP job.

Rochelle Blue, RE 32 from District 3, responded with information on IRP job BX0100 (Appendix B). In lieu of entering data on the spreadsheet electronically she sent copies of the mix designs used, locations where each mix was placed and the typical sections, special details and plan and profiles for the project. She sent information on IRP jobs B30100 and B30101 the middle of October. The data was similar to what was sent on IRP job BX0100.

Tim Baber, RE 64 from District 6 sent in a spreadsheet with data on IRP job B60115 (Appendix C) the third week of October. Information from District 8 about IRP jobs B80104 (Appendix D) and B80105 (Appendix E) were sent also from Mike Hays and Joseph Knight, from the RE 86 office. Breakdown of tonnage per lot and mix design was received for Job B10102 (Appendix F).

The data was received from Districts 1, 3, 6, and 8 and entered into the database. The amount and format of information varied from one IRP job to another and consumed vast amounts of time to sort. After these responses there was no more follow-up or data turned in even though the IRP jobs have continued to be let, worked, and completed.

During the summer of 2003, a subcommittee meeting was held to decide the status of this research project and its future. Everyone (including new members Jerry Trotter and Mark Bradley) except Brent Dather, FHWA representative were present. The consensus was to finalize this project.

## PROJECT RESULTS

The collection of data from the field was not uniform from district to district. Much of the data is in hard copy format and very detailed. There are inspector's diaries available to review but these are handwritten and contain large volumes of notes to review.

Some information is kept at the Resident Engineer's office and some is forwarded to the main building for storage. Various divisions and sections have data available but may be stored in different formats.

Materials Division has approximately 1,000 mix designs listed on the Materials intranet. The Pavement Management group in the Research Section of the Planning and Research Division has information on International Roughness Index and Ride Number. The plans for various jobs are available through the Programs and Contracts Division. The Construction Division has additional information related to ongoing construction jobs.

If a problem occurs on a particular IRP job the data is available in various offices of the Department. Also the experience and knowledge of our Resident Engineers, inspectors, and other professional personnel is available for input.

Troubleshooting and researching the problem area has been standardized for a long time and many field and laboratory tests would still be performed as they have in the past to resolve the problem.

Field review would include a physical inspection of the problem area and surrounding terrain. The grade and sub-grade make-up of the terrain and its affect on the site are considered. Core samples of materials from the site would be taken and tested in the laboratory to confirm quality and assurance testing.

Asphalt plants and quarry/pit operations and procedures are reviewed to ensure specification materials were used in the construction project and the contractors' proper handling and application of the materials are also considered.

Hopefully because many on-going quality and assurance tests are performed on the materials used during the construction the problem stage is never reached. It is noted that no pavement problems have arisen during the course of this project.

Without the standardized electronic collection format (SiteManager) fully completed and on-line, the collection of available data for the database creates a vast amount of work in manually entering the data and is extremely time consuming. The inconsistency in data submitted is also a problem.

## SUMMARY

The potential and scope of having one database with all the information pertaining to mix designs and acceptance and assurance sampling results was an excellent idea but difficulties developed with collection of field data without the use of a standardized electronic software medium (SiteManager).

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Complete the development of the SiteManager Program. Though some features of SiteManager are being utilized (i.e.-construction, payment tracking to contractor); the Materials Management Module of SiteManager is not fully developed for use yet. The Materials Module would include analysis, design, development, testing, beta testing, and warranty phases. The Materials Division has estimated that this may take as much as three years to implement.
2. In the interim, forms should be standardized for use in the field by inspectors. Not all forms utilized now are the same from job to job. These forms need to be standardized to accommodate transfer to the SiteManager Program format.
3. A review needs to be made on the retention of records kept by the Department. Because of a recommendation by a QIP committee in 1997, the life expectancy of materials records pertaining to finalized jobs kept at the RE offices is three years. After that it is up to the Resident Engineer decision to keep or destroy the records.
4. In the future the problem statement should be resubmitted with appropriate changes after the SiteManager Program has been implemented.

Appendix A  
Database Titles

APPROVED_DATE	MIX_DSN_NO	COMMENTS	FIELD_DATA_SHEETS	RUT_AVERAGE	MAX_RUT	JOB #	COUNTY	ROUTE	SECTION
BEG. L.M. / STATION #	END L.M. / STATION #	BASE	BINDER	LEVELING	SURFACE				
		LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER	LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER	LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER	LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER				
INSIDE LANE WIDENING/BASE	INSIDE LANE WIDENING/BINDER	INSIDE LANE WIDENING/LEVELING	INSIDE LANE WIDENING/SURFACE	OUTSIDE LANE WIDENING/BASE					
LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER	LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER	LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER	LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER	LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER					
OUTSIDE LANE WIDENING/BINDER	OUTSIDE LANE WIDENING/LEVELING	OUTSIDE LANE WIDENING/SURFACE	INSIDE SHOULDER/BASE	INSIDE SHOULDER/BINDER					
LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER	LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER	LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER	LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER	LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER					
INSIDE SHOULDER/LEVELING	INSIDE SHOULDER/SURFACE	OUTSIDE SHOULDER/BASE	OUTSIDE SHOULDER/BINDER	OUTSIDE SHOULDER/LEVELING					
LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER	LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER	LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER	LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER	LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER					
OUTSIDE SHOULDER/SURFACE	Layer Data Comments								
LBS. PER SQ. YD   KGS. PER SQ. METER									

Surface

BX0100

Mix Design # SP280C-01

- 2487+00-2536+83.5 LML-Rt+Lt Lns & Shlds
- 2539+66.5-2552+13.5 LML-Rt+Lt Lns & Shlds
- 2558+26.5-2575+03.42 LML-Rt+Lt Lns & Shlds
- 2585+36.5-2625+46 LML-Rt+Lt Lns & Shld
- 2585+36.5-2627+50 LML-Lt Ln
- 2585+36.5-2625+50 LML-Lt Shld
- 2487+00-2536+83.5 RML-Lt+Rt Lns & Shlds
- 2539+66.5-2552+13.5 RML-Lt+Rt Lns & Shlds
- 2558+26.5-2575+03.42 RML-Lt+Rt Lns & Shlds
- 2585+36.5-2630+73 RML-Rt Shld
- 2585+36.5-2619+30 RML-Rt Ln
- 2585+36.5-2670+30 RML-Lt Ln & Sh
- 2595+45-2612+90 Ramp 1
- 2594+25-2598+50 Ramp 1 Decel
- 2598+50-2601+70 Ramp 1 Trans
- 2592+30-2605+15 Ramp 4 Accel
- 2604+75-2615+00 Ramp 4
- 2610+99-2628+30 Ramp 3 2nd lift
- 2608+00-2620+00 Ramp 2 2nd lift
- 2620+00-2631+25 Ramp 2 Accel
- 2743+70-2799+00 Ramp C
- 2746+71-2747+61 Ramp C Gore
- 2549+10-2552+50 RML Lt Guardrail Widening
- 2585+36.5-2588+36 LML Lt Guardrail Widening
- 2536+83-2544+00 LML Lt Guardrail Widening
- 2585+36.5-2588+85 LML Rt Guardrail Widening
- 2558+26-2561+15 LML Lt Guardrail Widening
- 2558+26.5-2561+79 LML Rt Guardrail Widening

Appendix C  
B60115

JOB_NO	OLD_JOB_NO	RESIDENT_ENGINEER	CONTRACTOR	DIST	COUNTY	ROUTE	SECT	
B60115	R60045	T BABER	ROGERS GROUP, INC.	6	Hot Spring	30	21	
BEGIN	END	LENGTH	BEG_LAT	BEG_LONG	END_LAT	END_LONG	LET_MO	
			GPS Coordinates					
85.96	92.84	6.88					6	
LET_YR	COMP_MO	COMP_YR	JOB_STATUS	TYPE_WORK	JOB_NAME	EXISTING_CONDITION	TYPE_WORK	
00	8	2002	Let	Rubblize & Overlay	SOCIAL TIME WEST (D. Woodhouse)			
LANE_WIDTH	NO LANES	DIRECTION	N_MAX	SUPPLIER_AND_DATA	AC%	SUPPLIER	SUPPLIER_CHANGED	
12	2	EB	205	Rogers Group - Friendship				
		WB	205	Rogers Group - Friendship				
		EB	205	Martin Marietta - Jones Mill				
		EB	205	Rogers Group - Friendship				
		WB	205	Rogers Group - Friendship				
		WB	205	Rogers Group - Friendship				
		EB	205	Martin Marietta - Jones Mill				
		WB	205	Rogers Group - Friendship				
		EB	205	Martin Marietta - Jones Mill				

# Appendix D B80104

Job No. B80104 Job Name Johnson Co. Line-Mill Creek (F) R80038, R80039 Old Job No. R80038, R80039 Resident Engineer McAlister, Burnett, Tolleson Contractor Gilbert, Central District 8 County Pope Route 40 Section 22 Begin 71.51 End 76.85 Length 5.34 Month Let 4 Year Let 2001 Month Completed 6 Year Completed 2002 Job Status Complete

Existing Condition		Lane Width	No. Lanes	Direction	Base		AC SUPPLIER		PG	%AV	%VMA	%VFA	N_MAX	PLANT	Rates		Station	Location
MIX_DSN_NO	AC%				MIX_DSN_NO	AC%	N_MAX	PG	%AV	%VMA	%VFA	N_MAX	PLANT	MIX_DSN_NO	AC SUPPLIER	AC%	Station	Location
SP363C-01	4.3	12	4	E-W	SP363C-01	4.3	205	76	4	12.3	68.2	205	London	SP363C-01	Royal	5.1	4040+80	WB-in/sh
																	3986+80	WB-in/sh
																	3930+70	WB-in/sh
																	3793+02	WB-in/sh
																	3848+26	WB-in/sh
																	3891+92	WB-in/sh
																	4023+40	WB-out
																	4060+25	WB-out
																	4074+46	WB-out
																	3956+95	WB-out
																	3831+20	WB-out
																	4060+25	WB-in/sh
																	4071+12	WB-in/sh
																	4071+12	WB-out
																	3831+20	WB-out
																	3789+30	WB-out
																	3813+60	WB-out
																	3788+20	WB-out
																	3901+10	WB-in/sh
																	3790+25	WB-in/sh
																	3814+00	WB-in/sh
																	3874+25	EB-in/sh
																	3874+25	EB-in/sh
																	3909+36	EB-in/sh
																	3931+76	EB-in/sh
																	3961+50	EB-in/sh
																	3790+35	EB-out
																	3868+79	EB-out
																	3931+80	EB-out
																	4015+75	EB-out
																	3993+25	EB-in/sh
																	4060+00	EB-in/sh

Binder		AC SUPPLIER		PG	%AV	%VMA	%VFA	N_MAX	PLANT	Rates		Station	Location
MIX_DSN_NO	AC%	AC SUPPLIER	PG	%AV	%VMA	%VFA	N_MAX	PLANT	MIX_DSN_NO	AC SUPPLIER	AC%	Station	Location
SP107-02	4.5	Royal	76	4	13.3	71.2	205	London	SP384C-01	Royal	5.1	3826+35	EB-in/sh
												3858+60	EB-in/sh
												3791+70	EB-out
												3827+25	EB-out
												3827+25	EB-out
												3810+03	WB-in/sh
												3962+95	WB-in/sh
												3931+94	WB-in/sh
												3930+67	WB-out
												3865+10	WB-out
												3818+60	WB-out
												3931+95	EB-in/sh
												3932+00	EB-out
												3986+50	EB-out
												3801+00	EB-in/sh

**Appendix D  
B80104**

Type Work  
R/O

Rate

683

610

666

666

615

615

679

565

575

522

720

597

700

770

613

592

565

621

489

466

500

479

592

515

Surface	Rates						
	%AV	%VMA	%VFA N MAX	PLANT	Station	Location	Rate
4	14.6	72.8	205	London	4001+10	4071+12	WB-in/sh 243
					3932+00	4001+10	WB-in/sh 233
					3811+80	3901+00	WB-in/sh 193
					3782+50	3881+00	WB-out 212
					3931+00	4071+12	WB-out 221
					3782+50	3811+80	WB-in/sh 302
4	14.6	72.9	205	London	3932+20	4053+50	EB-in/sh 242
					3936+75	4052+80	EB-out 284
					3791+80	3877+00	EB-in/sh 239
					3792+15	3903+20	EB-out 237

## Appendix D B80104

Job No. B80104 Job Name Johnson Co. Line-Mill Creek (F) R80038, R80039 Resident Engineer McAlister, Burnett, Tolleson Contractor Gilbert Central Old Job No. R80038, R80039 District 8 County Pope Route 40 Section 22 Begin 71.51 End 76.85 Length 5.34 Month Let 4 Year Let 2001 Month Completed 6 Year Completed 2002 Job Status Complete

Existing Condition		Lane Width		No. Lanes		Direction		Base	
MIX_DSN_NO	AC%	AC SUPPLIER	N_MAX	%VFA	%VMA	%AV	PLANT	Station	Location
SP363C-01	4.3	Royal	205	68.2	12.3	4	London	3986+80	WB-in/sh
								3930+70	WB-in/sh
								3793+02	WB-in/sh
								3848+26	WB-in/sh
								3891+92	WB-out
								4023+40	WB-out
								4023+57	WB-out
								4060+25	WB-out
								4047+46	WB-out
								3956+95	WB-out
								3901+10	WB-in/sh
								4060+20	WB-out
								4071+12	WB-in/sh
								4060+25	WB-out
								4071+12	WB-out
								3891+30	WB-out
								3831+20	WB-out
								3789+30	WB-out
								3813+60	WB-out
								3788+20	WB-out
SP425C-01	4.2	Royal	205	66.7	12	4	London	3901+10	WB-in/sh
								3790+25	WB-in/sh
								3814+70	EB-in/sh
								3874+25	EB-in/sh
								3909+36	EB-in/sh
								3931+76	EB-in/sh
								3961+50	EB-in/sh
								3993+25	EB-in/sh
								3961+50	EB-in/sh
								3790+35	EB-out
								3868+79	EB-out
								3908+13	EB-out
								3931+80	EB-out
								4015+75	EB-out
								4054+80	EB-out
								3993+25	EB-in/sh

Binder		AC SUPPLIER		N_MAX		%VFA		%VMA		%AV		Rates	
MIX_DSN_NO	AC%	AC SUPPLIER	PG	PLANT	Station	Location	Rate	MIX_DSN_NO	AC%	AC SUPPLIER	PG	MIX_DSN_NO	Rate
SP107-02	4.5	Royal	76	London	3826+35	EB-in/sh	333	SP384C-01	5.1	Royal	76	SP384C-01	333
					3858+60	EB-in/sh	334						334
					3791+70	EB-out	325						325
					3827+25	EB-out	312						312
SP392C-01	4.6	Royal	76	London	3810+03	WB-in/sh	321						321
					3962+95	WB-in/sh	350						350
					3931+94	WB-in/sh	348						348
					3930+67	WB-out	354						354
					3865+10	WB-out	405						405
					3818+60	WB-out	398						398
SP434C-01	4.5	Royal	76	London	3931+95	EB-in/sh	340	SP443C-01	5.1	Royal	76	SP443C-01	340
					3932+00	EB-out	327						327
					3886+50	EB-out	348						348
					3801+00	EB-in/sh	328						328

**Appendix D  
B80104**

Type Work  
R/O

Rate
683
610
666
666
615
615
679
565
575
522
720
597
700

770
613
592
565
621
489
466
500
479
592
515

Surface	Rates			
	%AV	%VMA	%VFA N MAX PLANT	Station Location Rate
4	14.6	72.8	205	London 4001+10 4071+12 WB-in/sh 243
				3932+00 4001+10 WB-in/sh 233
				3811+80 3901+00 WB-in/sh 193
				3782+50 3881+00 WB-out 212
				3931+00 4071+12 WB-out 221
				3782+50 3811+80 WB-in/sh 302
4	14.6	72.9	205	London 3932+20 4053+50 EB-in/sh 242
				3936+75 4052+80 EB-out 284
				3791+80 3877+00 EB-in/sh 239
				3792+15 3903+20 EB-out 237



**Appendix E**  
**B80105**

Source

Jack Woods Russellville  
Jack Woods Russellville  
Jack Woods Russellville

Jack Woods Russellville  
Jack Woods Russellville  
Jack Woods Russellville

**Appendix F  
B10102**

**JOB NO. B10102  
FAP BIM-B40-0(1)0 7 IMD-40-4(75)216  
BRINKLEY - GOODWIN (F)  
MONROE & ST. FRANCIS COUNTIES  
Forrest City Plant**

**EXHIBIT S-1**

**BREAKDOWN OF TONNAGE PER LOT AND MIX DESIGN  
ACHM (PG76-22) BASE COURSE (1 1/2")**

Lot No.	Lab No.		Date	AB	Air Voids	Densities	VMA
1	SP028C-01	Forrest City	8/22/01	4.6	3.6	93.5	12
2	SP028C-01	Forrest City	9/7/01	4.5	3.8	92.4	12
3	SP028C-01	Forrest City	9/10/01	4.4	4.2	93	12.3
4	SP028C-01	Forrest City	9/10/01	4.6	4	92.7	12.4
5	SP028C-01	Forrest City	9/19/01	4.5	3.6	93.4	12
6	SP028C-01	Forrest City	9/24/01	4.6	4.1	91.5	11.1
7	SP028C-01	Forrest City	9/27/01	4.4	3.8	92.4	11.8
8	SP028C-01	Forrest City	10/1/01	4.5	3.7	92.5	12
9	SP028C-01	Forrest City	10/5/01	4.6	4.2	93.5	12.6
10	SP028C-01	Forrest City	10/24/01	4.5	3.6	93.6	11.8
11	SP028C-01	Forrest City	10/30/01	4.6	3.7	92.4	12.1
12	SP028C-01	Forrest City	10/31/01	4.6	3.2	92.2	11.7
13	SP028C-01	Forrest City	11/10/01	4.5	4	92.7	12.3
14	SP028C-01	Forrest City	11/13/01	4.6	4.1	94.5	12.6
15	SP028C-01	Forrest City	3/12/02	4.6	4.3	92.6	12.8
16	SP028C-01	Forrest City	3/14/02	4.6	4.2	93.1	12.5
17	SP028C-01	Forrest City	3/15/02	4.6	3.8	93.6	12.1
18	SP028C-01	Forrest City	3/16/02	4.5	4.3	92.3	12.4
19	SP028C-01	Forrest City	3/23/02	4.5	3.8	93.6	11.9
20	SP028C-01	Forrest City	3/26/02	4.5	4.2	94	12.3
21	SP028C-01	Forrest City	3/27/02	4.4	3.7	92.4	11.8
22	SP028C-01	Forrest City	3/28/02	4.5	3.7	93.1	11.9
23	SP028C-01	Forrest City	4/3/02	4.4	3.4	92.5	11.6
24	SP028C-01	Forrest City	4/9/02	4.5	3.9	92.3	12.3
25	SP028C-01	Forrest City	4/10/02	4.5	4.5	93.1	12.7
26	SP028C-01	Forrest City	4/15/02	4.5	4.2	93.2	12.4
27	SP028C-01	Forrest City	4/16/02	4.5	3.2	93.7	11.6
28	SP028C-01	Forrest City	4/18/02	4.5	3.8	94	12