

Mechanistic–Empirical Pavement Design Guide

A Manual of Practice

July 2008
Interim Edition



Mechanistic–Empirical Pavement Design Guide

A Manual of Practice

July 2008
Interim Edition



© 2008, by American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. All rights reserved.
This book, or parts thereof, may not be reproduced in any form without written permission of the
publisher. Printed in the United States of America.

Publication Code: MEPDG-1

ISBN: 978-1-56051-423-7

**AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY
AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
2007/2008**

President: Pete Rahn, Missouri

Vice President: Allen D. Biehler, P.E., Pennsylvania

Secretary/Treasurer: Carlos Braceras, Utah

Regional Representatives

REGION I

David A. Cole, Maine, One-Year Term

Kris Kolluri, New Jersey, Two-Year Term

REGION II

Stephanie Kopelousos, Florida, One-Year Term

Butch Brown, Mississippi, Two-Year Term

REGION III

Debra Miller, Kansas, One-Year Term

Kirk Steudle, Michigan, Two-Year Term

REGION IV

Gary Ridley, Oklahoma, One-Year Term

Rhonda Faught, New Mexico, Two-Year Term

Non-Voting Members

Immediate Past President: Victor M. Mendez, Arizona

Executive Director: John Horsley, Washington, D.C.

2007/2008 JOINT TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ON PAVEMENTS

Dan Dawood (*Chair*)
Pennsylvania

Linda Pierce (*Vice Chair*)
Washington

REGION 1

Vacant (*Design*)
Delaware
Robin Davis (*Design*)
Maryland
Tim Smith (*Materials*)
New York
Wes Yang (*Design*)
Vermont
Michael Pologruto (*Design*)

REGION 2

Alabama
Larry Lockett (*Materials*)
Arkansas
Phillip McConnell (*Design*)
Louisiana
Jeff Lambert (*Design*)
North Carolina
Judith Corley-Lay (*Design*)
South Carolina
Andy Johnson (*Design*)

REGION 3

Kansas
Andy Gisi (*Design*)
Minnesota
Curt Turgeon (*Materials*)
Missouri
Jay F. Bledsoe (*Design*)
Ohio
Aric Morse (*Design*)
Iowa
Chris Brakke (*Design*)

REGION 4

California
Bill Farnbach (*Design*)
Colorado
Richard Zamora (*Design*)
Oklahoma
Jeff Dean (*Design*)
Vacant (*Design*)
Wyoming
Rick Harvey (*Materials*)

OTHER

AASHTO Liaison
Keith Platte and
Ken Kobetsky

Standing Committee on
Aviation
Gary Harris, IA
FHWA
Pete Stephanos

Port Authority of New
York and New Jersey
Vacant
TRB
Amir Hanna

PREFACE

This document describes a pavement design methodology that is based on engineering mechanics and has been validated with extensive road test performance data. This methodology is termed mechanistic-empirical (M-E) pavement design, and it represents a major change from the pavement design methods in practice today.

From the early 1960s through 1993, all versions of the American Association for State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) *Guide for Design of Pavement Structures* were based on limited empirical performance equations developed at the AASHTO Road Test in the late 1950s. The need for and benefits of a mechanistically based pavement design procedure were recognized when the 1986 AASHTO *Guide for Design of Pavement Structures* was adopted. To meet that need, the AASHTO Joint Task Force on Pavements, in cooperation with the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), sponsored the development of an M-E pavement design procedure under NCHRP Project 1-37A.

A key goal of NCHRP Project 1-37A, *Development of the 2002 Guide for Design of New and Rehabilitated Pavement Structures: Phase II* was the development of a design guide that utilized existing mechanistic-based models and data reflecting the current state-of-the-art in pavement design. This guide was to address all new (including lane reconstruction) and rehabilitation design issues, and provide an equitable design basis for all pavement types.

The *Mechanistic-Empirical Pavement Design Guide* (MEPDG), as it has now become known, was completed in 2004 and released to the public for review and evaluation. A formal review of the products from NCHRP Project 1-37A was conducted by the NCHRP under Project 1-40A. This review has resulted in a number of improvements, many of which have been incorporated into the MEPDG under NCHRP Project 1-40D. Project 1-40D has resulted in Version 1.0 of the MEPDG software and an updated design guide document.

Version 1.0 of the software was submitted in April 2007 to the NCHRP, FHWA, and AASHTO for further consideration as an AASHTO provisional standard and currently efforts are underway on Version 2.0 of the software. Simultaneously, a group of state agencies, termed lead states, was formed to share knowledge regarding the MEPDG and to expedite its implementation. The lead states and other interested agencies have already begun implementation activities in terms of staff training, collection of input data (materials library, traffic library, etc.), acquiring of test equipment, and setting up field sections for local calibration.

This manual presents the information necessary for pavement design engineers to begin to use the MEPDG design and analysis method. The FHWA has a web site for knowledge exchange for the MEPDG (<http://knowledge.fhwa.dot.gov>)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of Manual	1
1.2 Overview of the MEPDG Design Procedure	1
2. Referenced Documents and Standards	9
2.1 Test Protocols and Standards	9
2.2 Material Specifications	11
2.3 Recommended Practices and Terminology	11
2.4 Referenced Documents	11
3. Significance and Use of the MEPDG	15
3.1 Performance Indicators Predicted by the MEPDG	15
3.2 MEPDG General Design Approach	16
3.3 New Flexible Pavement and HMA Overlay Design Strategies Applicable for Use with the MEPDG	17
3.4 New Rigid Pavement, PCC Overlay, and Restoration of Rigid Pavement Design Strategies Applicable for Use with the MEPDG	20
3.5 Design Features and Factors Not Included Within the MEPDG Process	23
4. Terminology and Definition of Terms	27
4.1 General Terms	27
4.2 Hierarchical Input Levels	29
4.3 Truck Traffic Terms	29
4.4 Smoothness	30
4.5 Distress or Performance Indicator Terms—HMA-Surfaced Pavements	31
4.6 Distress or Performance Indicator Terms—PCC-Surfaced Pavements	31
5. Performance Indicator Prediction Methodologies—An Overview	33
5.1 Calibration Factors Included in the MEPDG	33
5.2 Distress Prediction Equations for Flexible Pavements and HMA Overlays	34
5.3 Distress Prediction Equations for Rigid Pavements and PCC Overlays	49
6. Hierarchical Input Levels—Deciding on the Input Level	67
6.1 Introduction to Hierarchical Input Levels	67
6.2 Purpose of the Hierarchical Input Levels	67
6.3 Selecting the Input Level	68
7. General Project Information	71
7.1 Design/Analysis Life	71
7.2 Construction and Traffic Opening Dates	71
8. Selecting Design Criteria and Reliability Level	73
8.1 Recommended Design-Performance Criteria	73
8.2 Reliability	74
9. Determining Site Conditions and Factors	77
9.1 Truck Traffic	77
9.2 Climate	83

9.3	Foundation and Subgrade Soils	84
9.4	Existing Pavements	86
10.	Pavement Evaluation for Rehabilitation Design	87
10.1	Overall Condition Assessment and Problem Definition Categories.	87
10.2	Data Collection to Define Condition Assessment.	89
10.3	Analysis of Pavement Evaluation Data for Rehabilitation Design Considerations.	104
11.	Determination of Material Properties for New Paving Materials.	109
11.1	Material Inputs and the Hierarchical Input Concept	109
11.2	HMA Mixtures; Including SMA, Asphalt-Treated or Stabilized Base Layers, and Asphalt Permeable-Treated Base Layers.	109
11.3	PCC Mixtures, Lean Concrete, and Cement-Treated Base Layers	117
11.4	Chemically Stabilized Materials; Including Lean Concrete and Cement-Treated Base Layer . .	117
11.5	Unbound Aggregate Base Materials and Engineered Embankments	124
12.	Pavement Design Strategies	129
12.1	New Flexible Pavement Design Strategies—Developing the Initial Trial Design	129
12.2	New Rigid Pavement Design Strategies—Developing the Initial Trial Design	136
13.	Rehabilitation Design Strategies	143
13.1	General Overview of Rehabilitation Design Using the MEPDG.	143
13.2	Rehabilitation Design with HMA Overlays	145
13.3	Rehabilitation Design with PCC Overlays.	164
14.	Interpretation and Analysis of the Results of the Trial Design	181
14.1	Summary of Inputs for Trial Design	181
14.2	Reliability of Trial Design.	181
14.3	Supplemental Information (Layer Modulus, Truck Applications, and Other Factors) . . .	182
14.4	Predicted Performance Values	184
14.5	Judging the Acceptability of the Trial Design.	185
Appendix: Getting Started with the MEPDG		
A.1	Installing the Software.	189
A.2	Uninstalling the Software	190
A.3	Running the Software	190
Abbreviations And Terms		
	Abbreviations.	195
	Terms	196
Index		
	Index of words.	201

LIST OF FIGURES

1-1	Conceptual Flow Chart of the Three-Stage Design/Analysis Process for the MEPDG.	2
1-2	Typical Differences Between Empirical Design Procedures and an Integrated M-E Design System, in Terms of HMA-Mixture Characterization.	3
1-3	Typical Differences Between Empirical Design Procedures and an Integrated M-E Design System, in Terms of PCC-Mixture Characterization	4
1-4	Flow Chart of the Steps That Are More Policy Decision-Related and Needed to Complete an Analysis of a Trial Design Strategy.	6
1-5	Flow Chart of the Steps Needed to Complete an Analysis of a Trial Design Strategy.	7
3-1	New (Including Lane Reconstruction) Flexible Pavement Design Strategies That Can Be Simulated with the MEPDG (Refer to Subsection 12.1); Layer Thickness Not Be Scale.	18
3-2	HMA Overlay Design Strategies of Flexible, Semi-Rigid, and Rigid Pavements That Can Be Simulated with the MEPDG (Refer to Subsection 13.2); Layer Thickness Not Be Scale.	19
3-3	New (Including Lane Reconstruction) Rigid Pavement Design Strategies That Can Be Simulated with the MEPDG (Refer to Subsection 12.2); Layer Thickness Not Be Scale.	21
3-4	PCC Overlay Design Strategies of Flexible, Semi-Rigid, and Rigid Pavements That Can Be Simulated with the MEPDG (Refer to Subsection 13.3); Layer Thickness Not Be Scale.	22
5-1	Graphical Illustration of the Five Temperature Quintiles Used in the MEPDG to Determine HMA-Mixture Properties for Load-Related Distresses	35
5-2	Comparison of Measured and Predicted Total Rutting Resulting from Global Calibration Process	38
5-3	Comparison of Cumulative Fatigue Damage and Measured Alligator Cracking Resulting from Global Calibration Process.	41
5-4	Comparison of Measured and Predicted Lengths of Longitudinal Cracking (Top-Down Cracking) Resulting from Global Calibration Process.	42
5-5	Comparison of Measured and Predicted Transverse Cracking Resulting from Global Calibration Process	46
5-6	Comparison of Measured and Predicted IRI Values Resulting from Global Calibration Process of Flexible Pavements and HMA Overlays of Flexible Pavements.	49
5-7	Comparison of Measured and Predicted IRI Values Resulting from Global Calibration Process of HMA Overlays of PCC Pavements.	50
5-8	Comparison of Measured and Predicted Percentage JPCP Slabs Cracked Resulting from Global Calibration Process.	52
5-9	Comparison of Measured and Predicted Transverse Cracking of Unbounded JPCP Overlays Resulting from Global Calibration Process.	52

5-10	Comparison of Measured and Predicted Transverse Cracking for Restored JPCP Resulting from Global Calibration Process	53
5-11	Comparison of Measured and Predicted Transverse Joint Faulting for New JPCP Resulting from Global Calibration Process	58
5-12	Comparison of Measured and Predicted Transverse Joint Faulting for Unbound JPCP Overlays Resulting from Global Calibration Process	59
5-13	Comparison of Measured and Predicted Transverse Joint Faulting for Restored (Diamond Grinding) JPCP Resulting from Global Calibration Process	59
5-14	Comparison of Measured and Predicted Punchouts for New CRCP Resulting from Global Calibration Process	62
5-15	Comparison of Measured and Predicted IRI Values for New JPCP Resulting from Global Calibration Process	64
5-16	Comparison of Measured and Predicted IRI Values for New CRCP Resulting from Global Calibration Process	65
8-1	Design Reliability Concept for Smoothness (IRI)	75
10-1	Steps and Activities for Assessing the Condition of Existing Pavements for Rehabilitation Design	91
12-1	Flow Chart for Selecting Some Options to Minimize the Effect of Problem Soils on Pavement Performance	131
12-2	Limiting Modulus Criteria of Unbound Aggregate Base and Subbase Layers	135
13-1	Steps for Determining a Preferred Rehabilitation Strategy	144
13-2	Flow Chart of Rehabilitation Design Options Using HMA Overlays	145
13-3	Site Features Conducive to the Selection of the Rubblization Process for Rehabilitating PCC Pavements	160
13-4	Recommendations for a Detailed Investigation of the PCC Pavement to Estimate Remaining Life and Identifying Site Features and Conditions Conducive to the Rubblization Process	161
13-5	Evaluate Surface Condition and Distress Severities on Selection of Rubblization Option	162
13-6	Foundation Support Conditions Related to the Selection of the Rubblization Process	163
13-7	Overall Design Process for Major PCC Rehabilitation Strategies of All Pavement Types	166
A-1	MEPDG Software Screen	191
A-2	MEPDG Program Layout	192
A-3	Color-Coded Inputs to Assist User in Input Accuracy	192
A-4	MEPDG Context Sensitive Help (Brief Description of Input)	193
A-5	MEPDG Tool Tip Help	194

LIST OF TABLES

5-1	Reflection Cracking Model Regression Fitting Parameters	47
5-2	Assumed Effective Base LTE for Different Base Types	56
6-1	Predominant Input Levels Used in Recalibration Effort of the MEPDG	69
8-1	Design Criteria or Threshold Values Recommended for Use in Judging the Acceptability of a Trial Design.....	74
8-2	Levels of Reliability for Different Functional Classifications of the Roadway.....	76
9-1	Minimum Sample Size (Number of Days per Year) to Estimate the Normalized Axle Load Distribution—WIM Data	78
9-2	Minimum Sample Size (Number of Days per Season) to Estimate the Normalized Truck Traffic Distribution—Automated Vehicle Classifiers (AVC) Data	78
9-3	TTC Group Description and Corresponding Truck Class Distribution Default Values Included in the MEPDG Software	81
9-4	Definitions and Descriptions for the TTC Groups	82
9-5	Summary of Soil Characteristics as a Pavement Material	86
10-1	Checklist of Factors for Overall Pavement Condition Assessment and Problem Definition ...	89
10-2	Hierarchical Input Levels for a Pavement Evaluation Program to Determine Inputs for Existing Pavement Layers for Rehabilitation Design Using the MEPDG.....	92
10-3	Field Data Collection and Evaluation Plan.....	95
10-4	Guidelines for Obtaining Non-Materials Input Data for Pavement Rehabilitation.....	96
10-5	Use of Deflection Basin Test Results for Selecting Rehabilitation Strategies and in Estimating Inputs for Rehabilitation Design with the MEPDG	98
10-6	Summary of Destructive Tests, Procedures, and Inputs for the MEPDG.....	100
10-7	Distress Types and Severity Levels Recommended for Assessing Rigid Pavement Structural Adequacy	105
10-8	Distress Types and Levels Recommended for Assessing Current Flexible Pavement Structural Adequacy	106
11-1	Major Material Types for the MEPDG	110
11-2	Asphalt Materials and the Test Protocols for Measuring the Material Property Inputs for New and Existing HMA Layers	111
11-3	Recommended Input Parameters and Values; Limited or No Testing Capabilities for HMA (Input Levels 2 or 3)	115
11-4	PCC Material Input Level 1 Parameters and Test Protocols for New and Existing PCC.....	118
11-5	Recommended Input Parameters and Values; Limited or No Test Capabilities for PCC Materials (Input Levels 2 or 3).....	119

11-6	Chemically Stabilized Materials Input Requirements and Test Protocols for New and Existing Chemically Stabilized Materials	122
11-7	Recommended Input Levels 2 and 3 Parameters and Values for Chemically Stabilized Materials Properties.	123
11-8	C-Values to Convert the Calculated Layer Modulus Values to an Equivalent Resilient Modulus Measured in the Laboratory.	124
11-9	Unbound Aggregate Base, Subbase, Embankment, and Subgrade Soil Material Requirements and Test Protocols for New and Existing Materials	125
11-10	Recommended Input Levels 2 and 3 Input Parameters and Values for Unbound Aggregate Base, Subbase, Embankment, and Subgrade Soil Material Properties	126
13-1	Definitions of the Surface Condition for Input Level 3 Pavement Condition Ratings and Suggested Rehabilitation Options	147
13-2	Candidate Repair and Preventive Treatments for Flexible, Rigid, and Composite Pavements	149
13-3	Summary of Major Rehabilitation Strategies and Treatments Prior to Overlay Placement for Existing HMA and HMA/PCC Pavements	150
13-4	Data Required for Characterizing Existing PCC Slab Static Elastic Modulus for HMA Overlay Design	156
13-5	Recommendations for Performance Criteria for HMA Overlays of JPCP and CRCP.	157
13-6	Recommendations for Modifying Trial Design to Reduce Distress/Smoothness for HMA Overlays of JPCP and CRCP.	158
13-7	PCC Rehabilitation Options—Strategies to Correct Surface and Structural Deficiencies of All Type of Existing Pavements	165
13-8	Summary of Key Aspects of Joint Design and Interlayer Friction for JPCP Overlays.	168
13-9	Data Required for Characterizing Existing PCC Slab	169
13-10	Description of Existing Pavement Condition.	169
13-11	Summary of Factors That Influence Rehabilitated JPCP Distress	172
13-12	Guidance on How to Select the Appropriate Design Features for Rehabilitated JPCP Design.	174
13-13	Recommendations for Modifying Trial Design to Reduce Distress/Smoothness for JPCP Rehabilitation Design	175
13-14	Summary of Factors That Influence Rehabilitated CRCP Distress and Smoothness	177
13-15	Guidance on How to Select the Appropriate Design Features for Rehabilitated CRCP Design	178
14-1	Reliability Summary for Flexible Pavement Trial Design Example	182
14-2	Reliability Summary for JPCP Trial Design Example	182
14-3	Guidance for Modifying HMA Trial Designs to Satisfy Performance Criteria	186
14-4	Guidance on Modifying JPCP Trial Designs to Satisfy Performance Criteria	187
14-5	Guidance on Modifying CRCP Trial Designs to Satisfy Performance Criteria	187

CHAPTER 1**Introduction**

The overall objective of the *Mechanistic-Empirical Pavement Design Guide* (MEPDG) is to provide the highway community with a state-of-the-practice tool for the design and analysis of new and rehabilitated pavement structures, based on mechanistic-empirical (M-E) principles. This means that the design and analysis procedure calculates pavement responses (stresses, strains, and deflections) and uses those responses to compute incremental damage over time. The procedure empirically relates the cumulative damage to observed pavement distresses. This M-E based procedure is shown in flowchart form in Figure 1-1. “MEPDG,” as used in this manual, refers to the documentation and software package (NCHRP 2007.a).

The MEPDG represents a major change in the way pavement design is performed. The two fundamental differences between the *Guide for Design of Pavement Structures* (AASHTO, 1993) and the MEPDG are that the MEPDG predicts multiple performance indicators (refer to Figure 1-1) and it provides a direct tie between materials, structural design, construction, climate, traffic, and pavement management systems. Figures 1-2 and 1-3 are examples of the interrelationship between these activities for hot-mix asphalt (HMA) and Portland cement concrete (PCC) materials.

1.1 PURPOSE OF MANUAL

This manual of practice presents information to guide pavement design engineers in making decisions and using the MEPDG for new pavement and rehabilitation design. The manual does not provide guidance on developing regional or local calibration factors for predicting pavement distress and smoothness. A separate document, *Standard Practice for Conducting Local or Regional Calibration Parameters for the MEPDG*, provides guidance for determining the local calibration factors for both HMA and PCC pavement types (NCHRP, 2007.b).

1.2 OVERVIEW OF THE MEPDG DESIGN PROCEDURE

Pavement design using the MEPDG is an iterative process—the outputs from the procedure are pavement distresses and smoothness, not layer thicknesses. The designer first considers site conditions (i.e., traffic, climate, subgrade, existing pavement condition for rehabilitation) in proposing a trial design for a new pavement or rehabilitation strategy. The trial design is then evaluated for adequacy against user input, performance criteria, and reliability values through the prediction of distresses and smoothness. If