FOREWORD

This report compares network-level friction measurements obtained with a continuous friction measurement system, Sideway-force Coefficient Routine Investigation Machine (SCRIM), and a traditional locked-wheel skid trailer (LWST). The report also describes the results of two “harmonization” experiments at the two national LWST testing calibration facilities and recommends equations for converting the SCRIM friction measurements to traditional LWST friction measurements. A strong correlation was found between LWST measurements using a ribbed tire and the SCRIM measurements, as both measurements are more sensitive to microtexture than macrotexture. The results show that harmonization is possible with reasonable confidence, as long as it is conducted with significant controls. Field or network-level harmonization resulted in higher variability than at the calibration facilities since the SCRIM and LWST did not test exactly the same surfaces. The report highlights the value of continuous friction measurement to assess the frictional characteristics of pavement surfaces.
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## Abstract

This report compares network-level friction measurements obtained with a Sideway-force Coefficient Routine Investigation Machine (SCRIM) and traditional locked-wheel skid trailer (LWST). The report also describes the results of two “harmonization” experiments at the two national LWST testing calibration facilities and recommends equations for converting the SCRIM friction measurements to traditional friction measurements. A strong correlation was found between LWST measurements using a ribbed tire and the SCRIM measurements, as both measurements are more sensitive to microtexture than macrotexture. The results show that harmonization is possible with reasonable confidence, as long as it is conducted with significant controls. Field or network-level harmonization resulted in higher variability since the SCRIM and LWST did not test exactly the same surfaces. Since no high-speed friction measurement test can obtain both micro- and macrotexture, it is important to gather mean profile depth (MPD) data at the same time as the friction measurements. Incorporating equipment to obtain other geometric parameters normally used in safety/friction demand assessments, such as grade, cross-slope, and curvature, is also highly recommended.
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### SI* (MODERN METRIC) CONVERSION FACTORS

**APPROXIMATE CONVERSIONS TO SI UNITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>WHEN YOU KNOW</th>
<th>MULTIPLY BY</th>
<th>TO FIND</th>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### LENGTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ft</th>
<th>inches</th>
<th>25.4</th>
<th>millimeters</th>
<th>mm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yd</td>
<td>feet</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>meters</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>1.604</td>
<td>kilometers</td>
<td>km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in²</th>
<th>square inches</th>
<th>645.2</th>
<th>square millimeters</th>
<th>mm²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ft²</td>
<td>square feet</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>square meters</td>
<td>m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yd²</td>
<td>square yard</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>square meters</td>
<td>m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ac</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>hectares</td>
<td>ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi²</td>
<td>square miles</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>square kilometers</td>
<td>km²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### VOLUME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fl oz</th>
<th>fluid ounces</th>
<th>29.57</th>
<th>milliliters</th>
<th>mL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gal</td>
<td>gallons</td>
<td>3.785</td>
<td>liters</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ft³</td>
<td>cubic feet</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>cubic meters</td>
<td>m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yd³</td>
<td>cubic yards</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>cubic meters</td>
<td>m³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Volumes greater than 1000 L shall be shown in m³.

#### MASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>oz</th>
<th>ounces</th>
<th>28.35</th>
<th>grams</th>
<th>g</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lb</td>
<td>pounds</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>kilograms</td>
<td>kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>short tons (2000 lb)</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>megagrams (or &quot;metric ton&quot;)</td>
<td>Mg (or &quot;T&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TEMPERATURE (exact degrees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>°F</th>
<th>°C</th>
<th>5 (F-32)/9</th>
<th>Fahrenheit</th>
<th>Celsius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>°C</td>
<td>°F</td>
<td>or (C-273)/1.8</td>
<td>Celsius</td>
<td>°F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ILLUMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fc</th>
<th>foot-candles</th>
<th>10.76</th>
<th>lux</th>
<th>lx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ft</td>
<td>foot-Lamberts</td>
<td>3.426</td>
<td>candela/m²</td>
<td>cd/m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FORCE and PRESSURE or STRESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lb</th>
<th>poundforce</th>
<th>4.45</th>
<th>newtons</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lb/ft²</td>
<td>poundforce per square inch</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>kilopascals</td>
<td>kPa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPROXIMATE CONVERSIONS FROM SI UNITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>WHEN YOU KNOW</th>
<th>MULTIPLY BY</th>
<th>TO FIND</th>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### LENGTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm</th>
<th>millimeters</th>
<th>0.039</th>
<th>inches</th>
<th>in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>meters</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>feet</td>
<td>ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>meters</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>yards</td>
<td>yd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>km</td>
<td>kilometers</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>mi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm²</th>
<th>square millimeters</th>
<th>0.0016</th>
<th>square inches</th>
<th>in²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m²</td>
<td>square meters</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>square feet</td>
<td>ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m²</td>
<td>square meters</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>square yards</td>
<td>yd²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha</td>
<td>hectares</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>ares</td>
<td>ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>km²</td>
<td>square kilometers</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>square miles</td>
<td>mi²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### VOLUME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mL</th>
<th>milliliters</th>
<th>0.034</th>
<th>fluid ounces</th>
<th>fl oz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>liters</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>gallons</td>
<td>gal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m³</td>
<td>cubic meters</td>
<td>35.31</td>
<td>cubic feet</td>
<td>ft³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m³</td>
<td>cubic meters</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>cubic yards</td>
<td>yd³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g</th>
<th>grams</th>
<th>0.035</th>
<th>ounces</th>
<th>oz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kg</td>
<td>kilograms</td>
<td>2.202</td>
<td>pounds</td>
<td>lb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg (or &quot;T&quot;)</td>
<td>megagrams (or &quot;metric ton&quot;)</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>short tons (2000 lb)</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TEMPERATURE (exact degrees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>°C</th>
<th>°F</th>
<th>1.8°C+32</th>
<th>Fahrenheit</th>
<th>°F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>°F</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>or °C-273/1.8</td>
<td>Celsius</td>
<td>°F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ILLUMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fc</th>
<th>foot-candles</th>
<th>3.426</th>
<th>lux</th>
<th>lx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ft</td>
<td>foot-Lamberts</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>candela/m²</td>
<td>cd/m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FORCE and PRESSURE or STRESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>newtons</th>
<th>0.225</th>
<th>poundforce</th>
<th>lbf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kPa</td>
<td>kilopascals</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>poundforce per square inch</td>
<td>lb/in²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SI is the symbol for the International System of Units. Appropriate rounding should be made to comply with Section 4 of ASTM E280.
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## LIST OF ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS, AND SYMBOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARFMS</td>
<td>Area Reference Friction Measurement System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST</td>
<td>bituminous surface treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFME</td>
<td>continuous friction measurement equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFT</td>
<td>Dynamic Friction Tester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGAC</td>
<td>dense graded asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT</td>
<td>Florida Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN</td>
<td>friction number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTC</td>
<td>Field Test Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFST</td>
<td>high friction surface treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>International Friction Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>investigatory level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT</td>
<td>Indiana Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWST</td>
<td>locked-wheel skid trailer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPD</td>
<td>mean profile depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCDOT</td>
<td>North Carolina Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCHRP</td>
<td>National Cooperative Highway Research Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGFC</td>
<td>open graded asphalt concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>orthogonal regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCCP</td>
<td>portland cement concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFC</td>
<td>permeable friction course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFMP</td>
<td>pavement friction management program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>root mean square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRIM</td>
<td>Sideway-force Coefficient Routine Investigation Machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLR</td>
<td>simple linear regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>stone matrix asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>slip ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM</td>
<td>thin overlay mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRC</td>
<td>Transportation Research Center (Ohio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTI</td>
<td>Texas Transportation Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TXDOT</td>
<td>Texas Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TY-D</td>
<td>type D mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TZD</td>
<td>Toward Zero Deaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>vehicle miles traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>Washington Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The United States has experienced gradual improvements in highway safety since the enactment of the Highway Safety Act of 1966. According to recent studies, the highway fatality rate on U.S. highways has decreased steadily from about 5.5 fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in 1966 to about 1.16 fatalities per 100 million VMT in 2017 (NHTSA 2017). In addition, the total number of highway fatalities during the same time has decreased 27 percent from 50,894 to 37,133. However, over the last decade, several years of decreases in fatalities have been followed by increases, indicating that there is still much work to be done to achieve a highway system free of fatalities.

For pavement surfaces, efforts to decrease fatalities are focused on ensuring adequate friction/texture through the following:

- Proper design and construction of pavement surface mixes;
- Sufficient routine testing and monitoring of the friction/texture of in-service pavements;
- Application of corrective treatments in a cost-effective manner based on carefully established criteria linking friction/texture to crash risk.

Over the last 15 years, the methodology of crash prevention has evolved from making improvements based on crash events to a data-driven, risk-based, systemic approach to crash analysis. An effective pavement friction management program (PFMP) is a critical component in the effort to reduce pavement-related crashes and will assist in achieving the National Strategy on Highway Safety Toward Zero Deaths (TZD) effort.

OVERVIEW OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION PAVEMENT FRICTION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM

In 2010, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) initiated a study to develop and promote PFMPs and investigate the benefits of using continuous friction measurement equipment (CFME) as compared to conventional locked-wheel skid trailer (LWST) testing. The overall goal of the study is to reduce highway crashes and related fatalities through the development and demonstration of PFMPs. Such programs, when properly devised and effectively implemented, have the potential to reduce the number and severity of crashes by decreasing crashes related to pavement friction and texture.

Phase I of a study titled “Development and Demonstration of Pavement Friction Management Programs” consisted of a theoretical analysis of vehicle, tire, and pavement interactions as they relate to skidding and resulting crashes, as well as a detailed evaluation of the pavement friction and texture measurement equipment used in managing pavement friction. One of the outcomes of this phase was an “Equipment Evaluation” report that rated the CFMEs that were available on a variety of factors. This report recommended the Sideway-force Coefficient Routine Investigation Machine (SCRIM) for testing in Phase II of the study.
The SCRIM allows continuous measurements of the following data:

- Sideway-force friction coefficient, using dynamic vertical load measurements with a free-rolling test wheel oriented at a 20-degree angle, in 1-, 2.5-, 5-, 10-, or 20-m averages, on the left wheel path;

- Mean profile depth (MPD) macrotexture with a 64-kHz, single-spot laser in 1- and 10-m averages on the left wheel path;

- Road geometry (grade, cross slope, and horizontal curvature) every 10 m;

- Temperature (pavement, tire, and air) in 1- and 10-m averages;

- Forward-facing video at a rate of one frame every 5 m.

The SCRIM has an operating speed between 15 and 55 mph, and a range of 150 miles per 2,200-gal tank of water. Data from the SCRIM are geolocated to enable integration with other data sets.

Phase II of the study, titled “Acceptance Testing and Demonstration of the Continuous Friction Measurement Equipment (CFME),” started in 2014. The following objectives were set for this phase:

- Assist four states in developing their PFMPs by considering pavement friction, texture, and crashes;

- Develop and demonstrate methods for establishing investigatory levels of friction and macrotexture for different friction demand categories in the four states;

- Demonstrate proven continuous friction and macrotexture measurement equipment for network-level data collection.

Phase II began with the purchase, training, and acceptance of the new SCRIM CFME (figure 1). Several candidate State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) were evaluated for participation in the study by considering a range of factors (e.g., friction/texture testing practices, safety and crash/fatality reporting practices, geographic diversity, availability and quality of historical friction and crash data). Based on the results of that evaluation, Indiana, Texas, Florida, and Washington were selected as participants in the study.
In each of the four states, the research team met with DOT staff to identify a circuit of roads several hundred miles long for the joint SCRIM and LWST friction testing. The friction and texture data from the testing, together with historical friction, crash, and other data provided by the DOT, made up the data matrix for the analysis of the roads composing the circuit. The complete set of data analyzed using different methodologies established investigatory friction thresholds to identify road sections that should be reviewed for possible friction and/or texture enhancement.

REPORT OBJECTIVES

This report focuses on the following objectives:

1. Compare the network-level friction measurements obtained with the SCRIM with measurements made with the traditional LWST (every 0.5 or 1.0 mi). This comparison includes data from the four states in the FHWA study and additional data collected in North Carolina.

2. Report the results of two “harmonization” experiments at the two national skid testing calibration facilities and compare them with the network-level results.

3. Assess, and if appropriate, recommend equations for converting the SCRIM friction measurements (SR30) at 30 mph to the traditional friction measurements used by most States, SN40R and SN40S at 40 mph, considering the use of macrotexture in the conversion.
CHAPTER 2. BACKGROUND

This section provides background on friction and macrotexture measurement methods and technologies, focusing on their application for network-level pavement safety evaluation.

PAVEMENT SURFACE TEXTURE

To maneuver a vehicle safely, a pavement surface should be able to provide adequate traction (also called skid resistance) to the vehicle tires in both dry and wet conditions. The pavement provides skid resistance through its surface texture. The texture of the pavement surface is separated into three categories according to texture wavelength, or the measureable distance from the peak of one asperity to another. In descending order of wavelength, the three categories are megatexture, macrotexture, and microtexture (Hall 2009). However, only macrotexture and microtexture are critical for influencing tire-pavement friction (figure 2).

Microtexture

Macrotexture

Source: Adapted from Hall (2009).

Figure 2. Illustration. Pavement surface texture characteristics that influence pavement friction.

Macrotexture is the average value of the mean 50-mm subsegment depth of a 100-mm segment. Wavelengths range from 0.5 mm to 50 mm. The spacing between the aggregates creates a channel for water to flow so that the peak of each aggregate is exposed to interaction with tire tread. At a wavelength of less than 0.5 mm, microtexture characterizes the surface texture of each aggregate (Hall 2009).

FRICTION

When the speed or direction of a vehicle is changed, frictional forces develop at each tire-pavement contact patch to resist the slipping of the rubber blocks of the tire tread. The frictional forces that develop at the tire-pavement interface have two components: adhesion and hysteresis (Hall 2009). The adhesion component results from the stretching, breaking, and reformation of
molecular bonds between the rubber blocks of the tire tread and the pavement microtexture. At the same time, as the tire slides over the pavement surface, the tire tread immediately deforms as it strikes the macrotexture, and since the rubber is viscoelastic it does not immediately recover its original shape. This lagged recovery and the energy lost during the recovery results in the second component of friction, hysteresis (Michelin 2001).

In this report, friction is considered a function of the two surface texture components on the road: microtexture and macrotexture. The microtexture of the road surface is what contacts the rubber of the vehicle tire and allows friction from the first component, the adhesion between the two surfaces. The greater the microtexture, the greater the friction and the greater the stopping ability once the rubber of the tire encounters it. Microtexture is the finer texture that is not so easy to see but much easier to feel if one moves one’s finger across a pavement’s surface. It comes from the aggregate particles (and degree of polish on larger exposed aggregate surfaces), sand, portland cement paste, or bituminous components in the surface material mix.

Macrotexture is the texture you can easily see on the surface. It is the tining, grooving, or drag surface finish of a rigid concrete surface or the degree of “openness” of an asphalt concrete surface or, even perhaps, the “jaggedness” of a chip seal surface. When a road is wet and/or experiencing rainfall, macrotexture gives water a place to evacuate when the tire comes along such that the rubber of the tire and the microtexture of the surface can make contact. It does this by providing void channels or space for the water to move to and through. Macrotexture is increasingly important as travel speeds increase. Under wet conditions, it takes both plenty of macrotexture and plenty of tire tread to be safe. Macrotexture is more closely associated with the hysteresis component of friction.

### Longitudinal Friction Force

When a vehicle traveling along a straight path changes speed, the difference in the rolling velocity of the wheels ($V_R$) and the velocity of the vehicle ($V_V$) causes the rubber blocks of the tire tread to shear initially as they enter the tire-pavement contact patch and then slip as they leave. The stresses induced by the shearing of the rubber blocks produce the longitudinal friction force ($F_L$), which is expressed as the product of the wheel weight ($W$) and the longitudinal friction coefficient ($\mu$) (Michelin 2001; figure 3).

Although the standard model for $\mu$ is expressed as the ratio of $F_L$ to $W$, the majority of the variation in $\mu$ depends on the amount of tire slip at the tire-pavement contact patch (Michelin 2001). Figure 4 illustrates the relationship between $\mu$ and the percentage of slip or slip ratio (SR) (computed using equation 1) in the instance of braking (Hall 2009).

---

where \( SR \) = slip ratio (\%), \( R \) = wheel radius, and \( \omega \) = the angular velocity of the wheel.

\[
SR = \frac{V_r - R \times \omega}{V_v} \times 100 = \frac{V_r - V_v}{V_v} \times 100
\]

Figure 3. Diagram. Forces influencing longitudinal friction.

Figure 4. Graph. Longitudinal friction coefficient versus percentage of slip.

Prior to applying the brakes, when the wheel is \textit{free-rolling} \((V_R = V_v)\), both \( \mu \) and \( SR \) are approximately zero. At the instant the brakes are applied, \( \mu \) quickly increases to a maximum value when \( SR \) is between 15 and 20 percent \((SR = SR_{\text{Critical}})\) (Do & Roe 2008). After passing the
peak of the curve, $\mu$ begins to decrease with $V_R$ until the wheels are fully locked ($V_R = 0$ and $SR = 100\%$).

**Transverse Friction Force**

When a vehicle changes direction (e.g., traversing a curve) at a constant speed, the difference in the direction the vehicle is traveling and the direction the front wheels are pointed creates a slip angle ($\delta$), which can be computed using equation 2 (Michelin 2001; figure 5-A).

\[ \delta = \sin^{-1}\left(\frac{L_{\text{Shear}} + L_{\text{Slip}}}{L_C}\right) = \sin^{-1}\left(\frac{\Delta L_S}{L_C}\right) \tag{2} \]

where $\delta$ = slip angle of front wheel path;
$L_{\text{Shear}}$ = length of sheared rubber tread;
$L_{\text{Slip}}$ = length of rubber tread slippage;
$\Delta L_S$ = combined length of shearing and slippage;
$L_C$ = total length of tire-pavement contact patch

The slip angle $\delta$ causes the rubber blocks of the tire tread to shear as they enter the tire-pavement contact patch and then slip as they exit. The stresses induced by the shearing of the rubber blocks produce the transverse friction force ($F_T$) shown in figure 5-B.

Similar to $\mu$, the transverse friction coefficient ($\eta$) is expressed as the ratio of $F_T$ to $W$. Furthermore, the majority of the variation in $\eta$ depends on $\delta$ in the same way that the majority of $\mu$ varies with $SR$. Figure 6 shows the relationship between $\eta$ and $\delta$. Prior to entering a curve, $\eta$ and $\delta$ are approximately zero. As the vehicle enters a curve, $\eta$ rapidly increases to a maximum value when $\delta$ equals $\delta_{\text{Critical}}$. The critical slip angle, $\delta_{\text{Critical}}$, can range from 4 degrees to 7 degrees for passenger cars, or 6 degrees to 10 degrees for trucks (Michelin 2001).
A. Shearing and slipping of the rubber tread.

B. Generation of transverse friction force ($F_T$).

**Figure 5. Illustrations.** Influence of the front-wheel path slip angle on (A) the shearing and slipping of the rubber tread and (B) the generation of the transverse friction force ($F_T$).

**Figure 6. Graph.** Side-force coefficient versus slip angle.
FRICTION AND MACROTEXTURE TESTING EQUIPMENT

Network-level testing requires high-speed measurement equipment. There are two categories of high-speed friction test methods, continuous and non-continuous. The locked-wheel (AASHTO T 242/ASTM E 274) is a non-continuous friction measurement test. There are three general types of continuous friction measurement equipment (CFME): fixed-slip (ASTM E 2340), sideway-force coefficient, and variable-slip (ASTM E 1859) (Henry 2000). These high-speed methods are operated at a fixed speed, generally between 30 and 50 mph, while they simultaneously wet the surface with a user-defined, uniform water film thickness on the pavement surface in front of the test wheel(s), usually 0.0197 inches (0.5 mm).

Friction Measurement Equipment

In the U.S., the locked-wheel technique is the most common method used by state highway agencies (Henry 2000). The locked-wheel equipment consists of a trailer equipped with two wheels with full-size tires (15 by 6 inch), one or both of which are used to test longitudinal friction. A test wheel on a locked-wheel device is fitted with either a standard smooth tire (AASHTO M 286/ASTM E 524) or a standard ribbed tire (AASHTO M 261/ASTM E 501). According to Hall (2009), the smooth tire is “sensitive to macrotexture,” while the ribbed tire is more “sensitive to microtexture.” A locked-wheel device measures friction by completely locking up the test wheel(s) and recording the average sliding force for a period of 3 s and reporting a 1-s average after reaching the fully locked state (100% slip). Thus, with a 40-mph test speed, a 1-s test time is equivalent to testing the pavement surface for approximately 59 ft. The full-lock requirement means that measurements can only be recorded periodically over short intervals of time. For example, one test per mile results in approximately 1.1% of the pavement surface being tested.

The SCRIM is more common internationally. It uses a free-rolling wheel, a treadless tire, and a fixed 20-degree slip angle to generate (and measure) a continuous frictional force. In contrast with the locked-wheel systems, the SCRIM tests 100 percent of the pavement surface, usually reporting at intervals as short as every 4 inches (0.1 m). The measured friction is usually reported as an SR30, or SCRIM reading at a standardized testing speed of 30 mph (50 km/h).

Surface Texture

For network-level measurements, the more practical alternative for testing macrotexture on in-service roads is to use high-speed equipment. High-speed, vehicle-mounted laser devices are used to obtain the profile of the pavement surface and a macrotexture parameter computed from this profile; typically, the MPD (ASTM E-1845) or the root mean square (RMS) is reported.

Differences in the design and configuration of friction testing equipment and their test tires create different sensitivities to speed and macrotexture (or MPD). According to Hall et al. (2009), the LWST standard ribbed tire is insensitive to MPD, whereas the standard smooth tire is very sensitive to MPD. Fuentes et al. (2014) explored this further by investigating the speed dependence of friction measured with a ribbed tire and a smooth tire on pavement surfaces with different levels of MPD. They showed that measurements made using both tires had similar
speed dependence on pavement surfaces with high MPD. In contrast, the speed dependence was significantly different on pavement surfaces with lower MPD.

Figure 7 compares the friction along several sections of road as measured with an LWST using both the ribbed (SN40R) and the smooth (SN40S) tire. The figure also includes continuous friction (SR30) and MPD, which were measured with the SCRIM. The figure shows that where there are changes in MPD, there are also marked changes in the smooth-tire measurements (SN40S). However, there do not appear to be any significant changes in the ribbed-tire measurements (SN40R) for the same changes to MPD. In general, the figure appears to support Hall et al.’s (2009) statement that the LWST with a ribbed tire is relatively insensitive to changes in MPD. The figure also shows that the SCRIM SR30 and LWST SN40R measurements trend in a reasonably similar manner. Therefore, it is clear that the SCRIM measurements provide an indication of both microtexture from the SR30 results and macrotexture from the MPD results needed for complete friction evaluations, and continuously.

B. SR30, SN40S, SN40R, and MPD for State Route AA, State Route BB, State Route CC/DD, State Route HH, State Route T, State Route TT, and State Route JJ.

Figure 7. Graphs. Example comparison illustrating equipment sensitivity to MPD.
The relationship between pavement friction, texture, and testing speed has been investigated for many years. Leu and Henry (1978) first predicted the relationship between friction and skid speed considering the micro- and macrotexture of pavement. Henry (2000) proposed a revised formula (known as the Penn State model), which relates friction with speed through the following formula (equation 3):

\[
F(S) = F_0 * e^{-\frac{S}{S_0}}
\]

where \(F(S)\) = friction measured with equipment at speed \(S\);
\(F_0\) = a nondimensional constant that depends on microtexture and represents the theoretical friction at skid speed of 0;
\(S\) = skid speed in km/h;
\(S_0\) = a constant with speed units that depends on macrotexture.

The model was subsequently modified so that the reference speed would be 10 km/h instead of 0, as follows in equation 4:

\[
F(S) = F_{10} * e^{-\frac{S-10}{S_0}}
\]

where \(F_{10}\) = the friction value obtained for a skid speed of 10 km/h.

The values for \(F_{10}\) and \(S_0\) were obtained based on measurements with different equipment using smooth and ribbed tires; however, the data did not present a good correlation in all cases (Wallman & Astrom 2001).

In the 1980s, PIARC conducted an international experiment to compare and harmonize the measurements of texture and skid resistance. The result of that experiment was what we know today as the International Friction Index (IFI). The experiment involved 16 countries and 47 measurement systems, and evaluated 54 different sections in Spain and Belgium (Wambold et al. 1995). The experiment also determined initial harmonization constants for the different equipment used in the experiment. As shown in equation 5, the reference speed was changed to 60 km/h:

\[
FR60 = FRS * e^{\frac{s-60}{s_p}}
\]

where \(FR60\) = friction at the skid speed of 60 km/h;
\(FRS\) = friction value at \(S\) km/h;
\(s\) = slip speed;
\(s_p\) = speed constant, which has speed units and is related to macrotexture.

Other experiments, such as HERMES (Descornet 2004) and TYROSAFE (Vos & Groenendijk 2009) have also tried to harmonize measurements taken with the different friction measuring equipment to a common scale. However, a general harmonization has proven to be very challenging, although some organizations have had better results for their specific equipment (Flintsch et al. 2008).
CHAPTER 3. DATA COLLECTION

This section discusses the details of the data collection on the selected sample networks and at
the two U.S. skid testing calibration facilities.

CONTINUOUS FRICTION MEASUREMENT EQUIPMENT VERSUS TRADITIONAL
LOCKED-WHEEL SKID TRAILER DATA COLLECTION

The high-resolution coverage provided by CFME like the SCRIM is particularly important when
potential friction problems are relatively short road segments with locally high demand for
friction, such as curves and intersections. Kummer and Meyer (1967) in National Cooperative
Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 37 established that “because the intensity of the
polishing process increases markedly with tread element slip, all other factors being equal, the
lowest friction levels are found on high-speed roads, curves, and approaches to intersections; in
short, in locations at which high friction values are needed most.” Due to the LWST standard
practice of testing on a sampling basis and the challenge of testing in some curves and
intersections, many times road sections with lower friction in areas with a higher friction demand
are not tested.

The importance of having a higher testing resolution is illustrated in the following example.
Figure 8 compares the LWST and SCRIM measurements on one of the routes surveyed. In this
section, LWST measurements were taken at two different testing frequencies. From mile 35 to
mile 40, the LWST measurements were taken every 0.1 mi; across the rest of the route they were
done at the usual 1.0-mi interval.

Figure 9 zooms in on the results of the measurements from mile 39 to mile 40. The figure
highlights that the two sets of measurements in general follow the same trend, but the SCRIM
measurements are more sensitive to spatial fluctuations in friction. For example, both systems
identified relatively lower friction values near mile 39.4. However, the figure also shows several
examples where the LWST is simply insensitive to short variations in friction. The higher
granularity of the continuous friction measurement identified relatively higher values at mile
39.0 and mile 39.7, higher values that were not picked up by the LWST.
The discrepancy in resolution provided between the SCRIM and LWST is magnified when the LWST measurements are taken at the conventional frequency of one test every 1 mile. Figure 10
zooms in on the friction measurements from mile 54 to mile 60, where the LWST is only measuring one 59-ft segment every mile. In this plot, the data collected with the SCRM detected two lower friction spots, including one at mile 59.8, which the LWST missed because it did not conduct any measurements in the 0.1-mi intervals between mile 59 and 60.

Source: CSTI

Figure 10. Graph. Detail of measurements on State Route A between mileposts 54 and 60 (low LWST spatial frequency).

Source: CSTI

Figure 11. Photo. State Route A at mile marker 59.8.
Further investigation of the mile 59.8 location revealed that the cause of this lower friction section is probably exacerbated with the vehicle braking and turning at the intersection. This phenomenon, recognized some 50 years ago by Kummer and Meyer (1967), is typical of intersections where vehicles are braking and turning and thus polishing the pavement aggregates at a higher rate. It is also interesting to note that this is one of the locations with the highest number of crashes on that route. For the road segment from mile 33 to 60, the location with the second highest number of crashes is mile 59.9, with 25 reported crashes over the 3 years preceding this testing. Therefore, this section, which was identified using the SCRIM but missed with the lower-resolution testing of the LWST, is a good candidate to investigate for a localized friction enhancement treatment such as a high friction surface treatment (HFST). This information also illustrates the potential benefit of conducting continuous friction measurements before HFST installation to better identify the beginning and end points of the HFST for construction purposes.

Minimum threshold levels of friction, called investigatory levels (ILs), are used in pavement friction management to trigger an investigation to determine what is causing the deficiency in the skid resistance (Highways England 2015). Threshold levels are determined by relating the crash data to the friction measurements indicated by a significant increase in crashes below the threshold friction level.

Figure 12 presents an example of an alternative way to visualize continuous friction measurements done for one of the states in the study. Using geospatial tools, a colored scale indicating the friction level relative to the IL is overlain on map data. Figure 12 provides a rough sketch of what can be done with this tool to better appreciate the interplay of geometry, traffic maneuvering/friction demand, and available friction.
Figure 12. Map. SCRIM measurements on State Route A from milepost 59.8 to 59.9.

The color scale is set to reflect a recommended IL of 50–55 (SR30) for the curve section, with each colored section representing 30 ft of roadway. For this illustration, the conventional LWST testing frequency would have missed the concerning dip in friction, while the SCRIM data clearly show that friction is a consideration that should be investigated further.

NETWORK-LEVEL DATA COLLECTION

The data for this comparison were collected in collaboration with four state DOTs, Florida (FDOT), Indiana (INDOT), Texas (TXDOT), and Washington (WSDOT), under the FHWA Pavement Friction Management Support Program Project. The friction data were obtained in a separate data collection effort for each individual state highway agency using a SCRIM and the various ASTM E274 LWSTs equipped with either a standard ribbed tire (ASTM E501) or smooth tire (ASTM E524). Similarly, skid resistance was also collected in North Carolina through a contract with the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) in an effort to compare data measured with an LWST, a Grip Tester (a fixed-slip CFME), and a SCRIM.

Table 1 shows the approximate total centerline length, in one direction of travel, of the roads tested in each state with the SCRIM. Skid resistance was tested on the travel lane of each roadway.
Table 1. Length of all roads tested per state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Miles Tested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida (Ribbed Tire)</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana (Smooth Tire)</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina (Ribbed Tire)</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas (Smooth Tire)</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington (Ribbed tire)</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Pre-Processing

The SCRIM collects friction data continuously every 100 mm; however, the SCRIM software can average that data into 1-, 2.5-, 5-, 10-, or 20-m segments. Macrotexture is also collected continuously and averaged in either 1- or 10-m segments. All other data are collected and then reported every 10 m. For consistency, all raw data are averaged in 10-m segments for network-level analysis of 0.1-mi sections.

When network-level testing is conducted, because of different roadway conditions (e.g., traffic, geometric design, etc.), it is not always possible to operate the equipment at constant speeds. Therefore, the measured friction is later standardized for speed. For the SCRIM, the British standard for skidding resistance (HD 28/15) corrects to a speed of 50 km/h (31 mph) all friction measured from 25 to 85 km/h using equation 6 (Highways England, 2015). In this study, if the testing speed for any 10-m segment fell outside of this range, then the segment was not reported.

\[
SR(30) = SR(S) \times \left( \frac{-0.015 \times S^2 + 4.77 \times S + 799}{1000} \right)
\]

where \( SR(30) \) = friction corrected to 30 mph (50 km/h);
\( SR(S) \) = uncorrected SCRIM reading friction measurement;
\( S \) = speed at which the friction is measured in mph.

Segments with potentially wrong macrotexture measurements were also removed in the cases when (1) the macrotexture was measured on a wet (or reflective) pavement surface, which was recorded as “abort,” or (2) the file showed a large percentage of dropouts (>10%).

Friction characterization of the 10-m segment data into meaningful averages for each 0.1-mi pavement site was accomplished using the minimum value of a three-point moving-average filter (20 m ≈ 60 ft) for the entire 0.1 mi. The filter length was selected to align with the locked-wheel tester, which reports friction from an average of 1 s of measurement at 40 mph (a distance of 59 ft). The analysis then selected the lowest value in that 0.1-mi moving-average data, which represents the lowest measurement that any LWST could find if it knew exactly where the lowest 1-s average test result would happen in every 0.1 mi. The three-point moving-average filter is a more conservative estimation of a possible low-friction area in the entire 0.1-mi section instead of using the lowest point value. The average friction value of the entire 0.1-mi section is not
considered appropriate because the objective of using continuous measurements is to remove the possibility of missing low-friction spots.

In all the network-level pilots, the data collected with the LWST and the SCRIM devices were paired using Global Position System (GPS) coordinates to effect a pairing as close as possible with both devices. Table 2 lists the total number of miles tested with the SCRIM in each State, and considering how many tests were done per mile with the LWST, the total number of paired measurements is listed. In general, the States collected LWST measurements between a 0.5- and 1-mi intervals. Sometimes, on very short segments, measurements were made at higher frequency (generally every 0.1 mi).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Miles Tested</th>
<th>LWST/mile</th>
<th>Data Points Paired</th>
<th>Data Points SCRIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>6,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>7,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>8,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>4,855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive Statistics**

In every state, the skid resistance measured with the LWST was compared to the SCRIM measurement (SR30) averages in the closest 0.1-mi segment. At all of the locations, the LWST was either equipped with a ribbed tire (ASTM E501) or smooth tire (ASTM E524). FDOT and WSDOT use a ribbed tire, while INDOT and TXDOT use a smooth tire. Unlike the others, NCDOT uses both a ribbed and a smooth tire. However, since the number of NCDOT test results with the smooth tire were very limited, only the results for the NCDOT ribbed tire were used in these comparisons.

The plots shown in figure 13 and figure 14 show the comparisons of the MPD and skid resistance measured with the SCRIM and LWST, respectively. Because of the vast difference in the number of data points for each device, it is very difficult to make a direct comparison between the two devices by looking at these plots.

However, it is interesting to note that these results and the results shown in figure 7 show that the SCRIM plots more closely align with those of the LWST with a ribbed tire than those of the LWST with a smooth tire. This has already been corroborated by previous studies that have found that the SCRIM friction measurements are “independent of their macrotexture” because of “very little correlation between SR and MPD” (Roe et al., 1991 and Roe et al., 1998).
The figures compare the friction of the two devices measured on different pavement surfaces. The majority of the pavement surfaces in each state were either dense graded asphalt (DGAC) or portland cement concrete (PCC). Other less common surfaces included bituminous surface treatment (BST) or chip seals, open graded asphalt concrete (OGFC) or permeable friction course (PFC), seal coats, stone matrix asphalt (SMA), thin overlay mix (TOM), and type D mix (TY-D).

As stated before, differences in the design and configuration of testing equipment and their test tires create different sensitivities to speed and MPD. Fuentes et al. (2014) explored this further by investigating the speed dependence of friction measured with a ribbed and the smooth tire on pavement surfaces with different levels of MPD. They showed that measurements made using both tires had similar speed dependence on pavement surfaces with high MPD. In contrast, the speed dependence was significantly different on pavement surfaces with lower MPD.
Figure 13. Charts. SCRIM and MPD network-level comparisons.
Figure 14. Charts. LWST (ribbed and smooth tires) and MPD network-level comparisons.

HARMONIZATION TESTING

Friction comparisons were made with measurements done at the Ohio Transportation Research Center (TRC) and at the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) RELLIS campus facility for the
purpose of comparing the SCRM with both reference LWSTs (Tech Memo, Fernando et al., and Bilbee, DOT Pooled Fund TPF-5(345), TRC report). These two sites are the Field Test Centers (FTCs) used to calibrate all LWSTs in the United States. Each FTC has an Area Reference Friction Measurement System (ARFMS) that serves as the reference for all calibrations at each site (ASTM E-2793).

These experiments were done in controlled conditions to assure that the pavement sections tested with the two pieces of equipment coincided accurately. In many previous efforts to compare friction testing systems, clearly pairing the test result data sets to ensure that the pavement surface tested was the same for both systems has been challenging and was a significant source of analysis variability.

For the measurements made at both FTCs, average values over the lengths tested with the LWST within the section were compared. In these locations, the average length used to obtain the SCRM averages depended on the length of the LWST section being measured, which varied depending on the speed of the devices in each particular test. For example, at 40 mph the distance of the LWST test section is 59 ft, at 50 mph it is 73 ft, etc., and so data were obtained using the 1-m option and approximated to the required distance to compare.

Because of this, the variability for the network analysis is much higher because it can be stated with confidence that the two tests (SCRM and LWST) were not testing the exact same pavement surface, as was achieved at the both FTC test facilities. In the two FTC locations, the SCRM and LWST tests were matched (paired) to the same pavement surface, and with a finer granularity.

Ohio Transportation Research Center

The TRC was the center originally contracted by the FHWA in the 1970s as part of a program to reduce interstate variation in the locked-wheel skid measurements of pavement surfaces (Bilbee 2018). In June 2018, the annual equipment comparison, organized by the pooled fund TPF-3(345) Surface Properties Consortium – Managing the Pavement Properties for Improved Safety, was held at the TRC (figure 15).

Correlation performed at the TRC consisted of 12 skids on a Low Mu Pad, 12 skids on a Mid Mu Pad, and 12 skids on a High Mu Pad at speeds of 40 mph and 60 mph. The pads were tested in the following order: Low Mu on the first pass (Pad 0), and then Mid and High Mu together on the second pass (Pad 2 and 1). Note: “Low Mu” is intended to represent relatively low skid resistance, “Mid Mu” moderate skid resistance, and “High Mu” relatively high skid resistance.

During the correlation, all LWST systems were operated simultaneously, both with the E501 ribbed tire and the E524 smooth tire. The SCRM used its regular tire for both correlations and all speeds.
Figure 15. Photo. Equipment used in the experiment from the Friction Pooled Fund.

The TRC’s standard E-274 locked-wheel tester (figure 16) was used as the reference device. Testing on all three surfaces was conducted as described above, but only the results of this LWST using the ribbed tire were used to determine a conversion equation for the SCRIM measurements.

Figure 16. Photo. TRC standard E-274 locked-wheel tester.

Texas Transportation Institute RELLIS Facility

The other LWST calibration center is located at the TTI RELLIS campus. The facility consists of an abandoned runway, of which three lanes have been modified for testing friction equipment. The section tested covered nine segments with different surfaces, as shown in figure 17. Friction measurements were collected in September 2016 using the TTI “reference” LWST with a smooth tire (figure 18) and the SCRIM (Fernando et al. 2017).
Measurements were taken on PAD 1 (portland cement concrete), PAD 2 (Jennite flush seal), PAD 5 (rounded gravel hot mix), PAD 6 (rounded gravel chip seal), and PAD 7 (lightweight aggregate chip seal). A second set of measurements was taken on the second wheel path of PAD 2, providing as a result, measurements on six sections. On each section, eight runs were conducted at 30, 40, and 50 mph using the SCRIM and two LWSTs, a reference unit owned by TTI and another unit provided by TXDOT. Both devices used a smooth tire (ASTM E524). In summary, 24 measurements were done with each of the three different devices. Only the TTI LWST data are used in this report.

In addition to the high-speed measurements, a CT meter and Dynamic Friction Tester (DFT) were used to take reference macrotexture and friction measurements, respectively. Seven stations were defined along each PAD and three tests were done at each station. An average of the 21 measurements was obtained in each PAD to use as reference to calculate \( S_p \) and the A and B constants (Barrantes et al. 2018), which are required for harmonizing friction measurements using the IFI (ASTM E 1960).
CHAPTER 4. ANALYSIS

This section first presents the results of the comparisons under controlled conditions at the skid calibration centers and then compares them with the results of analyzing all the network-level data collected.

HARMONIZATION COMPARISONS

This section summarizes the results obtained from the two controlled experiments at the ASTM E-274 locked-wheel skid calibration centers, which have been reported in Fernando et al. (2017) and Bilbee (2018), and expands the analysis to recommend interconversion equations.

Ribbed Tire Friction Number

The comparison for the friction number (FN) measured with the ribbed tire used the measurements obtained at the TR C facility in Ohio. Figure 19 presents the FN normalized to 40 mph (FN40R) versus the SCRIM reading normalized to 30 mph (SR30). The figure shows that the relationship is not exactly along the equality line, but the two are very highly correlated for this controlled field test.

![Figure 19. Graph. Comparison of FN40R and SR30 at TRC.](image)

Source: CSTI.

The predicted FN40R values are approximately 87% of the SR30 measurements. The difference is expected as the SCRIM should measure a higher FN because it operates at a lower slipping ratio and its measurements are normalized to a lower reference speed (30 vs. 40 mph). As explained in the section on surface texture, it seems like the SCRIM measurements are more closely related to the ribbed tire measurements because both tires are more sensitive to the microtexture on the road and do not exhibit much sensitivity to changes in MPD (figure 7).
Equation 7, obtained using orthogonal regression, as discussed later in the report, can be used to convert between the two measurements:

\[
FN40R = 0.87 \times SR30 - 1.5
\] 

(7)

**Smooth Tire Friction Number**

The comparison for the FN measured with the smooth tire was based on the results of the testing conducted at the TTI RELLIS facility (Fernando et al. 2017). Figure 20-A compares the average results from each of the sections tested at speeds of 30, 40, and 50 mph. Figure 20-B shows the relationship between the measurements after normalizing the FNs and SRs to 40 and 30 mph, respectively. In this case, FN40S is even lower when compared with the SR30 measurements, as the slope coefficient is similar but in this case the intercept is almost 10 points.

The experiment determined the IFI parameters for the SCRIM \((A = 0.085, B = 0.615)\), but further studies recommended using the simplified procedure shown in equation 8 to convert from SCRIM to LWST measurements using the smooth tire (Barrantes et al. 2018). The equation uses the IFI speed corrections \(s_p\) to bring the measurements to a common slip speed, but does not require determination of an estimated friction value at 60 km/h \(F60\), thus eliminating the need to make reference skid measurements using the DFT.

\[
FNS = SR \times e^{\frac{s_{SCRM} - s_{LWST}}{s_p}}
\] 

(8)

where \(FNS = LWST\) friction number at a speed \(s_{LWST}\);

\(s_p = a + (b \times MPD)\)

\(a\) and \(b\) = ASTM constants \((a = 14.2\) and \(b = 89.7)\);

MPD = macrotexture mean profile depth (mm);

\(s_{SCRM} = 0.34 \times\) SCRIM testing speed (km/h);

\(s_{LWST} = LWST\) testing speed (km/h standard = 64.37 m/h or 40 km/h);
Figure 20. Graphs. Comparison of FN40S and SR30.

A. FNS vs. SR.

B. FN40S vs. mean SR30.

Source: CSTI.
COMPARISON OF LOCKED-WHEEL SKID TRAILER AND SIDEWAY-FORCE
COEFFICIENT ROUTINE INVESTIGATION MACHINE NETWORK-LEVEL
MEASUREMENTS

This section compares all the network-level LWST and SCRIM measurements. These
comparisons were separated based on the LWST tire used. The term in-service refers to the
measurements collected in the field under roadway conditions that an operator conducting
routine testing would experience. In contrast, the TRC and TTI comparisons previously
discussed were conducted under controlled conditions in which many of the variables that affect
measured skid resistance have at least been mitigated, if not eliminated, thus improving the
likelihood of conducting a rigorous comparison between the LWST and the SCRIM.

Methodology

This study compares the LWST and SCRIM using orthogonal regression (OR). This method of
regression assumes that both $x$ and $y$ have unobserved measurement error, in the form of “noise”
in the data. This is in contrast to simple linear regression (SLR), which assumes that only $y$ has
unobserved measurement error while the measurement error of $x$ is minimal. Therefore, while
SLR treats $x$ and $y$ as fixed and random variables, respectively, OR treats both $x$ and $y$ as random
variables. Since both $x$ and $y$ are random variables in OR, another term, called the variance ratio
($\theta$) is introduced, that divides the variance of $y$ by the variance of $x$. The SCRIM and LWST
equipment used in this study were not tested for repeatability, and therefore, the analysis assumes
that both $x$ and $y$ have equal measurement error ($\theta$ is set to 1).

The slope ($\beta_1$) and intercept ($\beta_0$) of the OR line are estimated using equations 9 and 10, where $\bar{x}$
and $\bar{y}$ are averages of $x$ and $y$. Finally, the degree to which $x$ and $y$ are related (i.e., the strength
of the fitted OR line) is measured using simple correlation, which is a value from 0 to 1. Correlation
values closer to 1 indicate a strong association between $x$ and $y$.

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = \frac{s_{yy} - \theta s_{xx} + \sqrt{(s_{yy} - \theta s_{xx})^2 + 4\theta s_{xy}^2}}{2s_{xy}} \quad (9)$$

$$\hat{\beta}_0 = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x} \quad (10)$$

Ribbed Tire Comparison

Figure 21 compares the LWST ribbed tire and SCRIM measurements, differentiated by source.
In this comparison, the results of the OR fitting indicate a high correlation (0.79) between the
two devices. Both testing systems are more sensitive to microtexture than macrotexture.
Although the relationship is strong, the correlation considering all the network-based data is
lower than that found using only the TRC data (superimposed as a red dashed line and triangle
data points). It is expected the TRC correlation would be higher due to the efforts to ensure the
paired data points came from the two testing devices testing the same section of pavement
surface. This cannot readily be duplicated in network testing data.
For the TRC fit, the correlation is nearly perfect (figure 19), and thus, equation 7 is recommended for converting between SR30 and FN40R.

Source: CSTI.

**Figure 21. Graph. Comparison of LWST ribbed tire (FN40R) and SCRIM (SR30).**

**Smooth Tire Comparison**

Figure 22-A compares the SR30 and SN40S measurements. Similar to the comparison with the LWST ribbed tire, the controlled conditions at TTI provided a much better association than the network-oriented data set. However, this should be expected because (1) each point in the case of the TTI facility represents the average of several measurements, and (2) the effort to ensure the paired data points came from the two testing devices testing the same section of pavement surface. For the network-level measurements, the correlation (0.64) was significantly lower than for the controlled experiment (0.95) and also lower than for the case for the ribbed tire (0.79). It is reasonable to expect the correlation between the LWST smooth tire, which is more sensitive to macrotexture, and the SCRIM, which is more sensitive to microtexture, to be weaker than the correlation between the LWST ribbed tire and SCRIM.

The conversion presented in equation 5 was applied and the resulting “predicted” FN40S are compared with measured values in figure 22 -B. Although the match still departs from the 1-to-1 line, it is closer to the equality line and almost perfect when pairing the data when the conditions were controlled (TTI). For this reason, equation 5 is recommended to convert between SR30 and FN40S, using the macrotexture value corresponding to the friction measurement.
A. FN40S vs. mean SR30.

B. Measured FN40S vs. estimated FN40S.

Source: CSTI.

Figure 22. Graphs. Comparison of LWST smooth tire (FN40S) and SCRIM (SR30).
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the overall network-level comparisons and the harmonization studies, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The collection of continuous friction and macrotexture data through the adoption of CFME instead of the traditional sampling approach using an LWST provides higher resolution data for assessing the frictional characteristics of the pavement surface. The frictional characteristics can be used with safety analysis procedures to identify pavement sections for investigation of possible friction enhancement.

2. There is strong correlation between the LWST measurements using a ribbed tire and the SCRIM measurements, as both measurements are more sensitive to microtexture than macrotexture. As expected, FN40R values are approximately 87% of the SR30 values. If warranted, the following equation is recommended for the interconversion between FN40R and SR30:

\[ FN40R = 0.87 \times SR30 - 1.5 \]  

(7)

3. The correlation is weaker between the LWST measurements using a smooth tire and the SCRIM measurements, but the interconversion equation using macrotexture measurements (MPD) produced acceptable results. The following equation is recommended for the interconversion between FN40S and SR30, after normalizing the speeds for each device:

\[ FN40S = SR30 \times e^{\frac{-48.0}{Sp}} \]  

(8)

where \( S_p = 14.2 + 89.7 \times MPD \), and MPD = macrotexture mean profile depth (mm).

4. Harmonization is possible with reasonable confidence, but it needs to be conducted with significant controls, such as the TTI and TRC comparisons (to ensure that the pavement surface measured is the same for each paired test). Field or network-level harmonization results in higher variability due to the fact that the testing rarely aligns perfectly (i.e., exactly the same surfaces are tested with both devices).

5. SCRIM rubber tire friction measurements are more sensitive to microtexture. Since no high-speed friction measurement test can obtain both micro- and macrotexture, it is important to gather macrotexture MPD data at the same time that the friction measurements are done. There are several high-speed, non-contact systems that can be used to collect macrotexture MPD data (e.g., high-speed laser). Incorporating equipment that can simultaneously obtain other geometric parameters normally used in safety/friction demand assessments such as grade, cross-slope, and curvature, is also highly recommended.
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