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ABSTRACT
Tire-pavement noise is the result of a complex system of noise generation mechanisms and is affected by several different pavement and atmospheric parameters. Accurately predicting tire-pavement noise from given a set of parameters has proven difficult for researchers. The purpose of this research was to explore a wealth of pavement, atmospheric, and noise data taken at the MnROAD pavement test facility and to develop a model to predict tire-pavement noise on asphalt pavements. Using a series of sub-models, variables significant to noise generation were identified. Finally, two distinct models of noise generation were developed, each capable of predicting one-third octave band on-board sound intensity (OBSI) spectra. The models were developed using a hybrid statistical-experimental approach and were able to predict overall OBSI levels to within 1.5 dB for 80–90% of the pavements tested.

INTRODUCTION
A significant amount of transportation-related noise is generated and amplified by the interaction of the tires and the pavement surface under varied climatic conditions. While the composition and structure of the tires are beyond the control of pavement designers, many properties of the pavement surface can be controlled to help to mitigate tire-pavement noise. The ability to predict tire-pavement noise for various pavement surfaces based on properties of those surfaces would allow evaluation of changing pavement surface properties prior to implementation.

The model summarized in this paper was developed using the extensive database of pavement material and noise data available at the MnROAD pavement test facility. The overall objective was to develop a model to predict on-board sound intensity (OBSI) levels on asphalt pavements taking the pavement surface properties into account. Ultimately, two nonlinear statistical models were developed using data from MnROAD test cells. The models predict one-third octave band and overall sound intensity levels using the pavement and climatic parameters that were found to have the most significant effects on tire-pavement noise generation. Further details on both models and their development are available in the final report (1).

Scope
The models were developed based on noise and physical property data collected on 25 asphalt-surfaced roadway test sections at the MnROAD pavement testing facility (15 on the Mainline and 10 on the Low Volume Road), as summarized in Table 1. These test sections were mostly constructed in 2007 and 2008 using a variety of materials, mixtures and layer thicknesses.

An extensive database containing a wide range of information has been amassed since the time of construction, including measurements of noise, friction, surface texture, ride quality, temperature, distress and structural capacity, among other properties. One complication for the modeling is that complementary data about different parameters at about the same time is not always available.

The On-Board Sound Intensity (OBSI) method AASHTO TP 76 (2) is used here, because that is the method used routinely at MnROAD to collect tire-pavement noise data. In this method, sound intensity probes placed near the leading and trailing edges of the tire-pavement interface detect only sound radiating from the tire. Since noise is measured near the source, the impacts of climatic conditions on the propagation of sound are reduced, though effects of the climate on the generation mechanisms will still exist.

The models were developed for the types of asphalt surfaces tested at MnROAD and based on the types of test data available. Applying these models to other surface types or with...
different input variables would require validation and perhaps revision of the models. However, the models were formulated and implemented in such a way that future revisions can be readily accommodated.

### TABLE 1 Cells Used in Model Analysis and Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Surface Type</th>
<th>Binder</th>
<th>Spec/Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>75-Blow Marshall Mix Mill &amp; Inlay</td>
<td>PG52-34</td>
<td>SPWEB340A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ultrathin Bonded Wearing Course</td>
<td>Novachip</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ultrathin Bonded Wearing Course</td>
<td>Novachip</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hot Mix Asphalt</td>
<td>PG64-34</td>
<td>SPWEB440F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.75mm Taconite Mix</td>
<td>PG64-34</td>
<td>2360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Warm Mix Asphalt</td>
<td>PG58-34</td>
<td>SPWEB440C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Warm Mix Asphalt</td>
<td>PG58-34</td>
<td>SPWEB440C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Warm Mix Asphalt</td>
<td>PG58-34</td>
<td>SPWEB440C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Warm Mix Asphalt</td>
<td>PG58-34</td>
<td>SPWEB440C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Warm Mix Asphalt</td>
<td>PG58-34</td>
<td>SPWEB440C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hot Mix Asphalt with RAP</td>
<td>PG58-28</td>
<td>SPWEB440B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hot Mix Asphalt with Fractionated RAP</td>
<td>PG58-28</td>
<td>SPWEB440B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hot Mix Asphalt with Fractionated RAP</td>
<td>PG58-28</td>
<td>SPWEB440B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Warm Mix Asphalt</td>
<td>PG58-34</td>
<td>SPWEB440C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Warm Mix Asphalt – Aging Study</td>
<td>PG58-34</td>
<td>SPWEB440C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hot Mix Asphalt (Chip Seal in 2009)</td>
<td>PG58-34</td>
<td>SPWEB340C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Hot Mix Asphalt (Double Chip Seal in 2011)</td>
<td>PG58-34</td>
<td>SPWEB340C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Hot Mix Asphalt – Taconite Aggregate</td>
<td>PG64-34</td>
<td>SPWEB240F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Hot Mix Asphalt</td>
<td>PG58-34 PPA</td>
<td>SPWEB340C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Hot Mix Asphalt</td>
<td>PG58-34 SBS+PPA</td>
<td>SPWEB340C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Hot Mix Asphalt</td>
<td>PG58-34 SBS</td>
<td>SPWEB340C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Hot Mix Asphalt</td>
<td>PG64-34</td>
<td>SPWEB440F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Hot Mix Asphalt</td>
<td>PG58-34 Elvaloy+PPA</td>
<td>SPWEB340C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Pervious HMA</td>
<td>PG70-28</td>
<td>2360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Pervious HMA</td>
<td>PG70-28</td>
<td>2360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cells on Low Volume Road; all others on Mainline.

**Approach**

The development of models to predict OBSI levels required identifying those pavement characteristics and environmental effects that impact noise generation and amplification, as well as the availability of MnROAD data to support the models.

Tire-pavement noise is generated and amplified through a variety of mechanisms, including tire carcass vibration, slip-stick, air pumping, adhesion and others (3). A number of pavement surface characteristics may affect the generation and propagation of tire-pavement noise. Different pavement parameters affect different mechanisms, and some are more important than others. Characteristics that are strongly related to tire-pavement noise include the surface texture, surface condition, friction, air voids, sound absorption, mechanical impedance (stiffness) and others. Pavement surface characteristics also depend on some mixture characteristics, such
as aggregate gradation, volumetrics and binder type. These characteristics may vary to some extent with daily or seasonal changes in temperature and moisture conditions. Factors of somewhat lesser importance include airflow resistance, roughness and surface rating.

Controlling tire-pavement noise involves interfering with or disrupting these mechanisms. For example, air movement (pumping) can be reduced by using a porous asphalt surface where the air can be dissipated through the open pores in the pavement.

**Texture**

Pavement texture is one of the surface characteristics with the greatest impact on tire-pavement noise, therefore it is included in virtually all tire-pavement noise models (e.g., 4–6). There are, however, different aspects of texture that must be considered. Consequently, texture is generally broken into different ranges of texture wavelength.

Microtexture is defined as the fine-scale texture of the surface with a wavelength less than 0.5 mm (7, 8) and is a function of the surface texture of the aggregate particles. Microtexture is related to friction; hence it affects noise generated by tire vibrations induced by friction and by the adhesion between the tire and the pavement surface, especially at frequencies above 1000 Hz (9, 10). Sandberg and Ejsmont suggest that higher microtexture typically causes increased friction, which increases the stick-slip noise generation mechanism. On the other hand, increased microtexture also leads to a decrease in adhesion, which results in a lowering of the stick-snap mechanism. These conflicting changes may explain why clear relations between microtexture and tire-pavement noise are not always observed (11). Inclusion of a microtexture term was explored during model development but was not found to have a significant impact for the pavements tested in this study.

Macrotexture, with wavelengths between 0.5 mm and 50 mm, is determined by the overall properties of the pavement surface. It is related to the type of asphalt surface (e.g., dense versus porous), the gradation of the aggregates in the mixture, and presence of air voids at the surface. Macrotexture of the pavement is a major factor affecting air pumping, impact-induced vibrations, friction-induced vibrations, adhesion, pipe resonance and Helmholtz resonance and has been shown to affect OBSI levels in the 630–1000 Hz range (12–14).

Macrotexture can be measured by several methods, two of which have been used at MnROAD. Measurement with a laser profiler or Circular Track (or Texture) Meter (CTM) can be used to separate the effects of different texture wavelengths within the macrotexture range. Both types of measurements have been made at MnROAD. A RoboTex laser profiler, meeting the requirements of ISO 13473-4 (15), was used one time over three days in 2011. The CTM, standardized in ASTM E2157 (16), has been used periodically since 2008.

**Friction**

Pavement friction is closely related to texture. Changes in friction primarily affect the slip-stick mechanism, and so affect OBSI levels at high frequencies (17). Friction is most commonly measured in the U.S. using an ASTM towed friction trailer (18). Another standard test of wet friction is described in ASTM E1911 (19), using the dynamic friction tester (DFT). Both types of data are available at MnROAD; the DFT has been used periodically on some cells since 2008 and the towed friction trailer has been used one to three times annually. Because friction and texture are so closely related, the need to include both terms in the model was explored during model development; macrotexture measurements were found to be sufficient to predict noise on the surfaces tested in this study.
Seasonal and short-term variations in friction are widely recognized (e.g., 20–22). Typically friction levels are lowest towards the end of summer and highest during the winter or spring.

**Temperature**

Changes in the air and pavement temperatures can affect tire-pavement noise generation mechanisms. Increased temperatures are generally associated with increases in high-frequency noise, likely due to changes in adhesion or friction properties, and decreases in low-frequency noise, through changes in the mechanical impedance of the pavement (I).

**Mechanical Impedance**

The mechanical impedance of the pavement is related to the flexibility and energy dissipation properties of the pavement surface. In an asphalt mixture, the mechanical impedance is related to the stiffness, or modulus, of the mixture. The modulus of the pavement materials has an unknown effect on tire-pavement noise, but it is potentially a fairly important factor affecting impact-generated vibrations (II).

Mixture stiffness is affected by many factors, including the mixture type, aggregate type and gradation, binder properties and mixture volumetrics. A more elastic binder, such as a polymer modified binder, would be expected to produce a more flexible mixture. Asphalt mixture stiffness properties change as the temperature changes, so the mechanical impedance, as measured by the modulus, would also change over the course of a day or seasonally. Since asphalt binders age over time through oxidation, the mechanical impedance could also change over the life of the pavement as the mixture stiffens.

Modulus can be measured or estimated in a variety of ways. Some laboratory data on mixture stiffness, specifically dynamic modulus, is available in the MnROAD database. However, this data was only collected at the time of construction, so cannot be used to evaluate changes in stiffness seasonally or because of aging. Consequently, the best estimates of modulus over time are backcalculated layer moduli from periodic Falling Weight Deflectometer (FWD) readings. The EverCalc software program (23) was selected to analyze the FWD data based on work by Rao and Von Quintus (24).

Other parameters that have been shown in the literature to affect tire-pavement noise were considered for inclusion in the models but were dropped. These include airflow resistance, pavement condition rating, and ride quality. Porosity and sound absorption were also not included, since only two pervious HMA surfaces were available in the data set. If more permeable pavements were to be included, another parameter, such as sound absorption, might need to be added.

**THE MECHANISM DECOMPOSITION APPROACH TO TIRE-PAVEMENT NOISE MODELING**

Since tire-pavement noise is the result of several generation mechanisms, and each of these mechanisms is affected differently by changes in pavement parameters, an accurate noise prediction model must allow for the noise from each mechanism to vary independently. The mechanism decomposition method is one technique to accomplish this. The fundamental theory of this hybrid statistical-experimental approach is that a tire-pavement sound intensity spectrum can be decomposed into several constituent spectra, each representing the contribution from a generation mechanism (25). Since each mechanism is an independent noise source, the constituent spectra are added logarithmically to form the total tire-pavement noise spectrum.
A fundamental principle of the mechanism decomposition method is that although a change in pavement parameters may cause a complicated change in the shape of an OBSI spectrum, the shapes of the underlying constituent spectra do not change significantly. It is assumed that changes in pavement parameters may change the magnitudes, but not the shapes, of the constituent spectra. Statistical techniques can be used to determine the effect of pavement parameters. For example, a simple one-parameter model of tire-pavement noise may be defined using Equations 1.

\[
\begin{align*}
L_{\text{low}}(f) &= L_{\text{low}}(f) + \beta_1 \alpha + \beta_2 \quad \text{Eqn 1a} \\
L_{\text{mid}}(f) &= L_{\text{mid}}(f) + \beta_3 \alpha + \beta_4 \quad \text{Eqn 1b} \\
L_{\text{high}}(f) &= L_{\text{high}}(f) + \beta_5 \alpha + \beta_6 \quad \text{Eqn 1c}
\end{align*}
\]

where \(L_{\text{low}}\), \(L_{\text{mid}}\), and \(L_{\text{high}}\) are constituent spectra, each relating to a distinct noise generation mechanism; \(L_{\text{low}}^*, L_{\text{mid}}^*, \text{ and } L_{\text{high}}^*\) are modified constituent spectra; \(\alpha\) is a pavement or atmospheric parameter such as mean profile depth or air temperature; and \(\beta_{1-6}\) are best-fit coefficients determined through nonlinear least-squares curve fitting.

A predicted total OBSI spectrum is formed from the modified spectra according to Equation 2.

\[
L_{\text{total}} = 10 \log_{10} \left( 10^{\frac{L_{\text{low}}}{10}} + 10^{\frac{L_{\text{mid}}}{10}} + 2 \sqrt{10^{\frac{L_{\text{low}}}{10}} 10^{\frac{L_{\text{mid}}}{10}} \cos \phi} + 10^{\frac{L_{\text{high}}}{10}} \right) \quad \text{Eqn 2}
\]

The term involving \(\cos \phi\) represents a phase relationship between the low- and mid-frequency spectra, which can constructively or destructively interfere (26). This predicted spectrum can then be compared to the OBSI spectrum on a given pavement. The fit coefficients, \(\beta_{1-6}\), are determined by comparing measured and predicted OBSI spectra for a number of different pavements, each having a different parameter \(\alpha\). For this research project, the coefficients were determined by minimizing the total squared error between the measured and predicted one-third octave band levels using the \texttt{lsqnonlin} function in MATLAB.

**IDENTIFICATION OF VARIABLES SIGNIFICANT TO TIRE-PAVEMENT NOISE**

As shown earlier, many different parameters have been shown in the literature to affect tire-pavement noise to one extent or another. For efficient model development, however, the variables with significant effects on tire-pavement noise needed to be identified. These variables were identified by developing a series of simplified models for tire-pavement noise using MnROAD data. Each simplified model involved only one or two variables, and all of the other variables were controlled. By controlling for all other parameters, the effect of air temperature alone could be identified.

A series of one- and two-parameter models was developed to identify the pavement parameters that most affect tire-pavement noise in the different frequency ranges. The effect of temperature on OBSI levels is discussed as an example of how the reduced-parameter models were used. Air and pavement temperatures and OBSI measurements were made on 21 pavements over the course of approximately 14 hours on two different days at MnROAD. For the first test, in April 2011, atmospheric temperature varied from 0.7–11.0°C, and pavement temperature varied from 5.0–27.5°C. During the second test, in June 2011, air temperature varied from 19.9–33.9°C, and pavement temperature varied from 17.9–48.9°C. One-third octave band OBSI
spectra varied about 2–5 dB with temperature for this experiment, depending on frequency. For some frequency ranges, colder temperatures consistently resulted in higher OBSI levels than warmer temperatures. Using pavement temperature produced more consistent temperature (best-fit) coefficients across pavements and between the April and June data sets than did the air temperature measurements. The average pavement temperature coefficients for the low-, mid- and high-frequency constituent spectra were -0.016, -0.030, and -0.078 dB/°C, respectively. This shows the low- and mid-frequency spectra are affected less by temperature changes than the high-frequency spectrum. For an annual temperature variation of 50°C, these coefficients would yield OBSI variations of 0.8, 1.5, and 3.9 dB for the three constituent spectra. Therefore, temperature effects on the low- and mid-frequency spectra (0.8 and 1.5 dB annual variation) are not significant and do not need to be considered in future modeling efforts. Temperature effects on the high-frequency spectrum (3.9 dB variation) should be considered.

Similar approaches were used to control variables and evaluate one or two parameters at a time. If a parameter produced a significant impact (2 dB or greater) on noise in one or more frequency ranges, that parameter was considered in development of the final model. Details are available in the final report (1). The following parameters would found to have a significant impact on OBSI at some frequencies:

- Temperature was found to affect high-frequency noise.
- Texture (evaluated using RoboTex data) was found to affect low- and mid-frequency spectra positively (that is, an increase in texture causes an increase in OBSI) and to affect high-frequency spectra negatively (increased texture reduces noise).
- Mean profile depth (MPD) affected all three frequency ranges, but may be redundant with texture. As with texture, in increase in MPD led to increased low- and mid-frequency spectra but a decrease in high-frequency noise.
- Absorption may affect OBSI levels, but is likely related to other parameters, such as texture, so was considered in further modeling but would not be used as a sole parameter.
- Friction was found to impact OBSI levels in the low- and mid-frequency ranges, but again is likely correlated with other parameters, such as texture.
- Temperature and age were modeled in a two-parameter model; OBSI levels were observed to increase over time at all frequency ranges, but the increase was less above 1600 Hz.
- Temperature and modulus were also modeled jointly since asphalt is viscoelastic; both modulus and temperature were included in further development but the need to include both parameters was considered.

The model coefficients for all one-parameter models considered are shown in Table 2. For each parameter, the range of values is also shown, along with the maximum potential dB effect on each of the three constituent spectra. For each parameter, the maximum dB effect was found by multiplying the model coefficient by the range in the parameter found in the data set. For example, the leading edge, low-frequency coefficient for MPD was found to be 3.46 dB/mm. The range in MPD measured for all pavements was 1.1 mm, giving a maximum potential effect of 3.8 dB. In the table, maximum effects of greater than 4 dB are highlighted in red (with bold, italic type), indicating a significant effect on noise levels. Effects between 2 and 4 dB are shown in yellow (with bold type), indicating a moderate effect. Effects of less than 2 dB are shown in green (with italic type) to indicate that the parameter has little effect. In general, the low-
frequency spectrum is affected most by macrotexture parameters (MPD, 64-mm wavelength) and
is less affected by microtexture, absorption and temperature. The mid-frequency spectrum is
affected by all texture parameters and absorption. The high-frequency spectrum is most affected
by microtexture and air temperature. Using the two-parameter age-temperature model, it was
shown that age significantly affects the low- and mid-frequency spectra but not the high-
frequency spectrum. The two-parameter temperature-modulus model was used to show that
modulus and temperature must both be considered for the high-frequency spectrum but not
necessarily for the low-frequency spectrum. Many pairs of parameters, such as 12.5 mm texture
and MPD, are highly correlated, so the need to include both in the final model was explored.

Some variables were found not to be necessary for each of the three constituent spectra.
For example, air and pavement temperature do not affect low-frequency noise, so these variables
were not included in later models.

### TABLE 2 One-parameter model coefficients, parameter ranges, and maximum dB effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MPD (mm)</th>
<th>skew</th>
<th>$\lambda_{1.25 \text{ mm}}$ (dB)</th>
<th>$\lambda_{12.5 \text{ mm}}$ (dB)</th>
<th>$\lambda_{64 \text{ mm}}$ (dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(dB/EU)</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-freq.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-freq.</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-freq.</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum effect (dB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-freq.</td>
<td><strong>3.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-freq.</td>
<td><strong>8.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-freq.</td>
<td><strong>1.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FN $\alpha_{1000 \text{Hz}}$ $T_{\text{pav}}$ ($^\circ$C) $T_{\text{air}}$ ($^\circ$C)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(dB/EU)</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-freq.</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-2.84</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-freq.</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-freq.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-3.95</td>
<td>-4.77</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum effect (dB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-freq.</td>
<td><strong>3.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-freq.</td>
<td><strong>2.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-freq.</td>
<td><strong>0.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEVELOPMENT OF THE FINAL MECHANISM DECOMPOSITION MODELS

Using the mechanism decomposition approach, the significant variables identified and the available MnROAD data, two models to predict tire-pavement noise were developed. The first method is based on using the RoboTex texture data, and the second uses CTM texture data in a similar fashion.

Statistical Models of OBSI Levels

The final version of the CTM model is shown in Equations 3a-c.

\[
\begin{align*}
L_{\text{low}}^* &= L_{\text{low}} + \beta_1 L_M + \beta_2 T + \beta_3 E + \beta_4 \\
L_{\text{mid}}^* &= L_{\text{mid}} + \beta_5 L_M + \beta_6 E + \beta_7 \\
L_{\text{high}}^* &= L_{\text{high}} + \beta_8 L_M + \beta_9 T + \beta_{10}
\end{align*}
\]

where \(L_{\text{low}}^*, L_{\text{mid}}^*,\) and \(L_{\text{high}}^*\) are modified constituent spectra, the macrotexture term \(L_M\) (dB at 12.5 mm wavelength) is determined based on CTM data, \(T\) is pavement surface temperature (°C), \(E\) is the pavement modulus (GPa) and \(\beta_{1-10}\) are best-fit coefficients determined through nonlinear least-squares curve fitting.

A predicted total OBSI spectrum is formed according to Equation 2 and compared to the OBSI spectrum on a given pavement to determine the fit coefficients, \(\beta_{1-10}\). The final model, including the best-fit coefficients, is shown in Equation 4a-c for the leading edge (LE). Similar equations for the trailing edge can be found in the final report (1).

\[
\begin{align*}
L_{\text{LE, low}}^* &= L_{\text{LE, low}} + 0.11 L_M + 0.031 T + 0.098 E - 4.2 \text{ dB} \\
L_{\text{LE, mid}}^* &= L_{\text{LE, mid}} - 0.12 L_M + 0.068 E + 5.8 \text{ dB} \\
L_{\text{LE, high}}^* &= L_{\text{LE, high}} - 0.20 L_M - 0.060 T + 7.2 \text{ dB}
\end{align*}
\]

The final version of the RoboTex model is shown in Equations 5a-c

\[
\begin{align*}
L_{\text{low}}^* &= L_{\text{low}} + \beta_1 L_M + \beta_2 T + \beta_3 Y + \beta_4 E + \beta_5 \\
L_{\text{mid}}^* &= L_{\text{mid}} + \beta_6 L_M + \beta_7 Y + \beta_8 E + \beta_9 \\
L_{\text{high}}^* &= L_{\text{high}} + \beta_{10} L_M + \beta_{11} T + \beta_{12} Y + \beta_{13}
\end{align*}
\]

where \(Y\) is the number of years since the pavement texture was measured, and \(\beta_{1-13}\) are best-fit coefficients. The final model is shown in Equation 6a-c for the leading edge.

\[
\begin{align*}
L_{\text{LE, low}}^* &= L_{\text{LE, low}} + 0.50 L_M - 0.050 T + 1.29 Y + 0.073 E - 18.3 \text{ dB} \\
L_{\text{LE, mid}}^* &= L_{\text{LE, mid}} + 0.024 L_M + 1.12 Y + 0.030 E - 0.3 \text{ dB} \\
L_{\text{LE, high}}^* &= L_{\text{LE, high}} - 0.28 L_M - 0.10 T + 0.60 Y + 11.2 \text{ dB}
\end{align*}
\]

The models described by Equations 4 and 6 are complex, yet their individual terms can be interpreted physically. The results of using the model with the CTM and RoboTex texture data to predict noise at the leading and trailing edges are described below.
Macrotexture – when using the CTM to measure macrotexture, the resulting model coefficients indicate that low-frequency noise would increase with increasing macrotexture (positive coefficient), the mid-frequency range would increase somewhat less, and the high-frequency content would decrease (negative coefficient). An increase of 6 dB in the macrotexture is predicted to result in an overall noise level increase of approximately 0.3 dB. Using the RoboTex model, the OBSI spectrum is predicted to increase at frequencies below 1250 Hz, but decrease at higher frequencies, as shown in Figure 1. The macrotexture terms in the mid-frequency spectra have much smaller coefficients, meaning that macrotexture is predicted to have a smaller effect in the mid-frequency range. These results match previous findings by Sandberg and Ejsmont (4). The overall level is predicted to increase by approximately 0.5 dB.

![FIGURE 1 Predicted effects of pavement parameters on OBSI spectra using RoboTex model.](image)

Modulus – for both models, an increase in the modulus of the pavement, backcalculated from FWD readings, is expected to cause an increase in noise in the low- and mid-frequency ranges, with little effect on high-frequency noise, as shown in Figure 1. An increase in modulus of 10 GPa is predicted to result in an overall increase in the noise level of approximately 0.5 dB in both models.

Pavement Temperature – both models result in negative coefficients over most frequency ranges, indicating that as pavement temperature increases, noise would decrease. This is consistent with findings by other researchers (26). An increase of temperature will also likely result in a change in the pavement modulus, which also needs to be considered. The combined effects of a change in temperature and a change in modulus are shown in Figure 1. The CTM model predicts an
overall decrease in noise of approximately 0.7 dB with an increase in temperature of 10°C, and
the RoboTex model predicts a decrease of approximately 1.8 dB. While the increased
temperature alone causes a small decrease in noise, the resulting change in modulus with
increased temperature results in a larger decrease.

Effect of Time – the RoboTex model (but not the CTM model) incorporates the effects of time on
OBSI predictions. The time term, $Y$, can be thought of as a correction for the increase in
macrotexture over time. The term is needed for the RoboTex model, since texture scans were
only performed once, while OBSI measurements were made over the course of several years.
The term is not necessary for the CTM model, since CTM measurements were made at regular
intervals. The predicted result of aging a pavement three years is shown in Figure 1. The result is
a broadband increase in noise, with the overall level predicted to increase by approximately
3 dB.

Model Accuracy
Several different metrics were used to judge the accuracy of the models by comparing model
predictions to measured OBSI data. For the CTM model, a total of 13 different asphalt
pavements had texture data measured at different times. The sound levels were measured on
these cells several times over more than five years, for a total of 441 different measurements of
leading and trailing OBSI noise. For the RoboTex model, 22 different asphalt pavements were
were scanned with the RoboTex equipment. A total of 1421 different OBSI measurements were
made on these pavements.

- The measured and predicted overall OBSI levels are shown in Figure 2 (top). The
  average error in overall OBSI levels is 1.0 dB for the CTM model and 0.8 dB for the
  RoboTex model. For comparison, the run-to-run variation in overall octave bands for the
data used in this study, representing the average variations between two runs on the same
pavement on the same day, was approximately 0.6 dB.

- For both models, the residual errors between the measured and predicted levels by test
cell vary between about 0.5 and 1.5 dB.

- The average error by temperature range (from 0 to 60°C in 10°C) varied between about
  0.5 and 1.5 dB. The worst prediction occurs during very hot temperatures when other
mechanisms, such as adhesion between the pavement and the tread blocks, may become
more prominent.

- Comparisons of the measured and predicted one-third octave band spectra are shown in
  Figure 2 (center and bottom). For the CTM model, this figure shows that for frequencies
up to and including 1000 Hz, the predicted OBSI levels fall in a more narrow range than
the measured values, so that the cluster of points takes on more of a horizontal shape
rather than centering on the 1:1 line. This suggests that the model is not predicting the
OBSI levels well in this range. For the RoboTex model, the spread within the measured
and predicted values is approximately the same, and the data points are approximately
symmetric about the 1:1 line.

- The average residual errors in one-third octave bands by frequency band show that the
CTM model predicts the OBSI level to within 2 dB on average and the RoboTex model
to within 1.5 dB on average.
Discussion

In general, the model developed using RoboTex data is more accurate than the model using the CTM data. The overall level accuracy, summarized in Table 3, is better for the RoboTex model. The overall prediction errors by cell, year and temperature range are all higher for the CTM model than for the RoboTex model. The one-third octave band data (Figure 2, center and bottom) shows that the CTM model is not doing a good job of predicting the one-third octave band spectra for frequencies up to and including 1000 Hz. However, it is much easier, less expensive and more feasible for an agency to measure texture using the CTM model versus the RoboTex model.

**TABLE 3 Percent of pavements with noise levels predicted to within 1.5 dB for the two models**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>RoboTex Model</th>
<th>CTM Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading Edge</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailing Edge</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The improved performance of the RoboTex method may be due to several reasons. Firstly, although RoboTex data was only collected once, it was collected on 22 test cells vs 13 cells tested with the CTM. When the number of OBSI readings taken on these pavements is considered, there was over three times as much data for the RoboTex model compared to the CTM model. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, is the nature of the texture measurements themselves. The RoboTex collects 100 lines of data, resulting in approximately 15,000 m of data within a test cell; this resulted in error bars on the texture measurements of 0.1–0.2 dB. The CTM, on the other hand, was typically used to test eight locations within a test cell. Given the circumference of the circle scanned by the CTM, this resulted in approximately 7–8 m of data per cell. In other words, there was about 2000 times more texture data from the RoboTex as from the CTM. The error bars on the CTM texture data were 3–5 dB, leading to 2–3 dB variation in the predicted OBSI. It might be possible to improve the accuracy of the CTM model by performing more measurements in each test cell, but the time and labor required to do so is likely prohibitive and could not reasonably be expected to provide the same amount of data as was obtained with the RoboTex.

Understanding the limitations of the models, then, either can be used to predict tire-pavement noise based on differing input values. The RoboTex model provides better accuracy because of the extensive amount of texture data available; however, the model is more accurate when the texture measurements are more recent and collection of the RoboTex data is expected to be a one time, or certainly rare, event. The CTM data is much more feasible to collect frequently, however, the model is not as accurate because even with frequent measurements, there is not as much texture data available because of the much shorter path measured.

Discussion and Conclusions

The objective of this project was to develop a model to predict on-board sound intensity (OBSI) levels on asphalt pavements using field and laboratory data from MnROAD and including the effects of pavement surface and material characteristics.
Only asphalt surfaces were studied in this project. However, there was a fairly wide range of surface types. Most of these surfaces were constructed in 2007 and 2008, so the pavement age is limited. A total of 25 test cells were used in various portions of the study.

The models show that to achieve a low noise pavement, a smooth surface with a low stiffness is preferable. As the macrotexture and stiffness decrease, the peak and overall OBSI levels also decrease. Since modulus is related to temperature, increasing the temperature results in a decrease in the modulus, but some surface materials are more sensitive to changes in temperature than others. In general, stiffer materials tend to experience greater decreases in stiffness than softer materials. In this study, the ultrathin wearing courses were among the stiffer materials and produced some of the higher noise levels. The sections with chip or surface seals had higher texture and also higher noise levels. The warm mix asphalt and lower traffic volume mixtures tended to have lower stiffness values and lower noise. The models also reflect that noise tends to increase as pavements age, but none of the cells tested were approaching the end of their service life or exhibiting high levels of distress.

The following conclusions can be drawn from this study:

- Different noise generation and amplification mechanisms affect different frequency ranges. In addition, different pavement characteristics affect different mechanisms.
- The mechanism decomposition method allows the effects of changes in various pavement parameters on the low-, mid- and high-frequency noise spectra to be predicted independently. The changes in the individual constituent spectra are then logarithmically added to yield estimates of overall tire-pavement noise and one-third octave bands levels.
- Using simplified one- or two-parameter models, the factors that have the greatest impact on tire-pavement noise in low-, mid- and high-frequency ranges were identified. In general, the low-frequency spectrum was found to be affected most by macrotexture parameters and less by microtexture, absorption, and temperature. The mid-frequency spectrum was affected by all texture parameters and absorption. The high-frequency spectrum was most affected by microtexture and air temperature.
- Some variables were found not to be necessary for each of the three constituent spectra, so they were eliminated from further model development at the appropriate frequency ranges.
- Ultimately, it was found necessary for the models to consider the effects of pavement macrotexture, air temperature, modulus of the pavement surface layer, and the combined effect of temperature and modulus. Only two porous pavements were included in the data set; if more porous pavements were included, an absorption parameter might be found to be significant.
- The models were developed for the types of asphalt surfaces tested at MnROAD and based on the types of test data available. Because the models rely heavily on modulus, they would not be reliably used on other pavement types that have different stiffness values and respond differently to changes in temperature compared to asphalt mixtures. A wide range of asphalt mixtures was studied, so the models are applicable to a wide range of types of asphalt surfaces, but high levels of distress and old pavements were not tested.
- In addition, the models were developed to predict noise as measured by the OBSI method; attempts to correlate OBSI data to other types of noise data have yielded mixed results. Applying these models to other surface types, with different input variables or to predict other noise measurements would require validation and perhaps revision of the
models. However, the models were formulated and implemented (in an Excel spreadsheet) in such a way that future revisions can be readily accommodated.

- The models have been found to predict the overall OBSI sound intensity level to within 1.5 dB and the one-third octave bands to within 2 dB for most of the pavements tested.

Other metrics and evaluation of the model accuracy by cell, year, temperature and other factors are also reported and are generally favorable.
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