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Data collected by the Iowa Department of Transportation (DOT) regarding road conditions across the state of Iowa were used to model pavement condition index (PCI). The data were for calendar year 2013, with the exception of updated PCI values from 2014 and 2015 and indicators of the resurfacing of road segments in 2014 and 2015. The data file provided by the Iowa DOT consisted of nearly 4,000 observations.

Eighteen different road conditions and measures were considered as possible model inputs. Of the 18 measures, 11 were used in the final prediction of PCI in 2014 and 2015 for portland cement, composite, and asphalt cement pavement types. These measures included International Roughness Index (IRI), friction value, age, average daily traffic, PCI value in 2013, number of lanes, daily temperature change, surface type, pavement thickness, speed limit, and reconstructed kips.

Series of multiple regression models were developed for the different pavement types, including aggregated pavement types with combined data. The results reveal that all 11 variables except age have a statistically significant relationship with PCI. The efficacies of the derived models, as measured by $R^2$ values, range from 61% to 83%. Additional analyses also show that the efficacies of the derived models, as measured by root mean square error (RMSE) values, range from 6.29 to 9.52. We can interpret the RMSE values as indicating that approximately 95% of all prediction values should fall within 12.58 and 19.04 of the PCI values predicted by the models. Therefore, it is concluded that linear predictive models, which involve distress and descriptive characteristics of road conditions, provide a reasonable basis for estimating PCI. However, these models can be further improved by examining nonlinear effects.
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MODELING PAVEMENT CONDITION INDEX

Data collected by the Iowa Department of Transportation (DOT) regarding road conditions across the state of Iowa were used to model pavement condition index (PCI). All data were for calendar year 2013, with the exception of updated PCI values from 2014 and 2015 and indicators of the resurfacing of road segments in 2014 and 2015.

The research described in this report investigated the use of various road characteristics and measures to model future PCI values. Specifically, predictive models for PCI values in 2014 and 2015 were developed using only data available at the close of 2013. Eighteen different road conditions and measures were considered as possible model inputs. Of the 18 measures, 11 were used in the final prediction of PCI in 2014 and 2015 for portland cement, composite, and asphalt cement pavement types. These measures included International Roughness Index (IRI), friction value, age, average daily traffic, PCI value in 2013, number of lanes, daily temperature change, surface type, pavement thickness, speed limit, and reconstructed kips. Comprehensive descriptions of the variables are provided in Appendix A.

Analyses were conducted by pavement type for those pavement types with sufficient data (Pavement Types 1, 3, and 4 in the Iowa DOT data). An overall analysis for all pavement types combined is also presented in this report.

The data file was provided by the Iowa DOT and included nearly 4,000 observations.

All analyses were completed using JMP Pro software (version 12.1.0, 64-bit) from SAS Institute, Inc. The analysis workflow incorporated multiple regression modeling, including multicollinearity considerations and residual analyses. Variable selection techniques utilized in the analyses included stepwise regression and JMP’s All Possible Models platform. Best model fit was determined by minimizing model root mean square error (RMSE).
MODELING PCI FOR PAVEMENT TYPE 1

Pavement Type 1 is portland cement (PC). About 35% of the observations in the data set were for Pavement Type 1. Of the 18 measures, only 5 remain in the final model for predicting PCI one year ahead (predicting PCI_{2014}). Thirteen variables were easily eliminated from consideration based on collinearity concerns and statistical insignificance (p>5%). The prediction equation is as follows:

Predicted PCI_{2014} = 3.65 + 0.8\times \text{PCI}_{2013} + 0.066\times \text{IRI\_Index} + 0.124\times \text{Friction\_Value} + 0.0001\times \text{Average\_Daily\_Traffic} + 0.62\times \text{Number\_Of\_Lanes}

The model has an RMSE of 6.29 and an $R^2$ of 77.9%.

We can interpret the RMSE value as indicating that approximately 95% of all PCI_{2014} values (for Pavement Type 1) should fall within 12.58 (2\times 6.29) of the PCI predicted by this model. The $R^2$ indicates that approximately 77.9% of the observation-to-observation variability in recorded PCI_{2014} values can be accounted for by this model.

All variables in this model are statistically significant (p<5%).

If we turn our attention to predicting PCI two years ahead (predicting PCI_{2015}), then of the 18 measures, only 7 remain in the final model. As expected, the model predicting PCI two years ahead does not fit as well as the model predicting PCI one year ahead. The prediction equation is as follows:

Predicted PCI_{2015} = 13.18 + 0.54\times \text{PCI}_{2013} + 0.02\times \text{DaysTempChange\_2013} + 0.19\times \text{IRI\_Index} + 0.14\times \text{Friction\_Value} + 0.00017\times \text{Average\_Daily\_Traffic} + 0.00000004\times \text{Reconstruct\_18\_KIPS} + 0.9\times \text{Number\_Of\_Lanes}

The model has an RMSE of 8.76 and an $R^2$ of 61.7%.

Approximately 95% of all PCI_{2015} values for Pavement Type 1 should fall within 17.52 (2\times 8.76) of the PCI predicted by this model. The $R^2$ indicates that approximately 61.7% of the observation-to-observation variability in recorded PCI_{2015} values can be accounted for by this model.

All variables in this model are statistically significant (p<5%).

Table 1 shows the summary statistics for each of the variables used to model Pavement Type 1.
Table 1. Summary statistics for Pavement Type 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age_2013</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>25.3493</td>
<td>17.5327</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>87.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed_Limit</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>55.2429</td>
<td>10.6600</td>
<td>20.0000</td>
<td>70.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement_Thickness</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>10.0008</td>
<td>1.4948</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>19.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number_Of_Lanes</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>3.7754</td>
<td>1.2119</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>9.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average_Daily_Traffic</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>11543.7</td>
<td>11981.8</td>
<td>10.0000</td>
<td>90400.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average_Daily_Trucks</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>1541.85</td>
<td>2149.64</td>
<td>66.0000</td>
<td>11498.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC DATA-Annual_18_KIPS</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>412534</td>
<td>695016</td>
<td>468.000</td>
<td>3672775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accum_KIPS_Since_Resurfacing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4142452</td>
<td>3599507</td>
<td>53610.0</td>
<td>1.06E+07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruct_18_KIPS</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>1.03E+07</td>
<td>1.67E+07</td>
<td>166816</td>
<td>9.46E+07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDITION DATA-IRI_Index</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>46.7608</td>
<td>21.9242</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>84.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friction_Value</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>51.1042</td>
<td>7.2548</td>
<td>22.0000</td>
<td>65.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface_Type</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>73.7458</td>
<td>2.1371</td>
<td>60.0000</td>
<td>92.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement_Width</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>27.2568</td>
<td>7.9389</td>
<td>5.9000</td>
<td>67.9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI_2013</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>62.1798</td>
<td>15.9733</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
<td>94.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DaysTempChange_2013</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>88.9488</td>
<td>32.2593</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>137.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI_2014</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>65.6076</td>
<td>16.7997</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
<td>98.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI_2015</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>69.3687</td>
<td>17.6523</td>
<td>11.0000</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The selected scatter plots in Figure 1 show how four variables—PCI_2014, PCI_2013, Age_2013, and CONDITION DATA-IRI_Index—interact to help predict PCI_2014 for Pavement Type 1. The scatter plots in Figure 2 use the same variables to help predict PCI_2015.
Figure 1. Selected scatter plots showing how four variables interact to predict PCI_2014 for Pavement Type 1
Figure 2. Selected scatter plots showing how four variables interact to predict PCI_2015 for Pavement Type 1
MODELING PCI FOR PAVEMENT TYPE 3

Pavement Type 3 is composite pavement, which typically indicates portland cement or continuously reinforced concrete overlaid with asphalt at some point in the life of the road. About 52% of the observations in the data set were for Pavement Type 3. Of the 18 measures, only 9 remain in the final model for predicting PCI one year ahead (predicting PCI_2014). Nine variables were easily eliminated from consideration based on collinearity concerns and statistical insignificance (p>5%). The prediction equation is as follows:

Predicted PCI_2014 = 29.52 + 0.75*PCI_2013 + 0.15*IRI_Index + 0.00015*Average_Daily_Traffic – 0.0000008*Accum_KIPS_Since_Resurfacing + 0.06*Surface_Type – 0.16*Pavement_Thickness + 1.86*(if Median=YES) – 0.06*AGE_2013 + 19.7*(if RS_in2014=YES)

The model has an RMSE of 7.35 and an $R^2$ of 83.1%.

We can interpret the RMSE value as indicating that approximately 95% of all PCI_2014 values for Pavement Type 3 should fall within 14.7 (2*7.35) of the PCI predicted by this model. The $R^2$ indicates that approximately 83.1% of the observation-to-observation variability in recorded PCI_2014 values can be accounted for by this model.

All variables in this model are statistically significant (p<5%).

If we turn our attention to predicting PCI two years ahead (predicting PCI_2015), then only 9 of the 18 measures remain in the final model. As expected, the model predicting PCI two years ahead does not fit as well as the model predicting PCI one year ahead. The prediction equation is as follows:

Predicted PCI_2015 = 51.65 + 0.7*PCI_2013 + 0.00012*Average_Daily_Traffic + 0.000008*Annual_18_KIPS – 0.0000015*Accum_KIPS_Since_Resurfacing + 0.22*Speed_Limit + 0.89*(if Median=YES) – 0.17*AGE_2013 + 17.7*(if RS_in2014=YES) + 21.3*(if RS_in2015=YES)

The model has an RMSE of 9.52 and an $R^2$ of 71.1%.

Approximately 95% of all PCI_2015 values for Pavement Type 3 should fall within 19.04 (2*9.52) of the PCI predicted by this model. The $R^2$ indicates that approximately 71.1% of the observation-to-observation variability in recorded PCI_2015 values can be accounted for by this model.

All variables in this model are statistically significant (p<5%).

Table 2 shows the summary statistics for each of the variables used to model Pavement Type 3.
Table 2. Summary statistics for Pavement Type 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age_2013</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>13.6645</td>
<td>10.4561</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>84.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed_Limit</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>51.3493</td>
<td>9.3573</td>
<td>20.0000</td>
<td>70.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement_Thickness</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>13.8827</td>
<td>2.8245</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>29.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number_Of_Lanes</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>2.7349</td>
<td>1.0975</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>8.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average_Daily_Traffic</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>5913.57</td>
<td>6496.80</td>
<td>380.00</td>
<td>82800.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average_Daily_Trucks</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>532.639</td>
<td>519.889</td>
<td>45.0000</td>
<td>7187.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC DATA-Annual_18_KIPS</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>86630.0</td>
<td>117258</td>
<td>5740.00</td>
<td>1728320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accum_KIPS_Since_Resurfacing</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>1529599</td>
<td>1461844</td>
<td>6050.00</td>
<td>1.07E+07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruct_18_KIPS</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>4618742</td>
<td>4337785</td>
<td>256205</td>
<td>7.25E+07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDITION DATA-IRI_Index</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>55.4741</td>
<td>20.3906</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friction_Value</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>51.0350</td>
<td>7.5218</td>
<td>22.0000</td>
<td>68.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface_Type</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>67.1051</td>
<td>6.5332</td>
<td>60.0000</td>
<td>92.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement_Width</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>27.6139</td>
<td>8.0814</td>
<td>16.1000</td>
<td>71.9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI_2013</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>64.9253</td>
<td>16.9972</td>
<td>11.0000</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DaysTempChange_2013</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>91.9595</td>
<td>26.6472</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>137.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI_2014</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>67.7312</td>
<td>17.9984</td>
<td>14.0000</td>
<td>97.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI_2015</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>68.1391</td>
<td>17.6334</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>97.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The selected scatter plots in Figures 3 and 4 show how four variables interact to help predict PCI_2014 and PCI_2015, respectively, for Pavement Type 3.
Figure 3. Selected scatter plots showing how four variables interact to predict PCI_2014 for Pavement Type 3
Figure 4. Selected scatter plots showing how four variables interact to predict PCL_2015 for Pavement Type 3
MODELING PCI FOR PAVEMENT TYPE 4

Pavement Type 4 is asphalt cement (AC). About 13% of the observations in the data set were for Pavement Type 4. Of the 18 measures, only 4 remain in the final model for predicting PCI one year ahead (predicting PCI_2014). Fourteen variables were easily eliminated from consideration based on collinearity concerns and statistical insignificance (p>5%). The prediction equation is as follows:

Predicted PCI_2014 = 32.24 + 0.86*PCI_2013 + 1.63*(if Median=YES) – 0.09*AGE_2013 + 18.55*(if RS_in2014=YES)

The model has an RMSE of 7.70 and an R² of 83.9%.

We can interpret the RMSE value as indicating that approximately 95% of all PCI_2014 values for Pavement Type 4 should fall within 15.4 (2*7.70) of the PCI predicted by this model. The R² indicates that approximately 83.9% of the observation-to-observation variability in recorded PCI_2014 values can be accounted for by this model.

All variables in this model except AGE_2013 (p=0.0645) are statistically significant (p<5%); however, removing AGE_2013 increases the RMSE of the model.

If we turn our attention to predicting PCI two years ahead (predicting PCI_2015), then only 11 of the 18 measures remain in the final model. As expected, the model predicting PCI two years ahead does not fit as well as the model predicting PCI one year ahead. The prediction equation is as follows:

Predicted PCI_2015 = 83.78 + 0.71*PCI_2013 + 0.14*IRI_Index - 0.18*Friction_Value - 0.004*Average_Daily_Trucks + 0.00002*Annual_18_KIPS - 0.388*Pavement_Thickness + 5.8*(if Median=YES) - 4.84*Number_Of_Lanes - 0.26*AGE_2013 + 19.25*(if RS_in2014=YES) + 19.96*(if RS_in2015=YES)

The model has an RMSE of 8.38 and an R² of 80.5%.

Approximately 95% of all PCI_2015 values for Pavement Type 4 should fall within 16.76 (2*8.38) of the PCI predicted by this model. The R² indicates that approximately 80.5% of the observation-to-observation variability in recorded PCI_2015 values can be accounted for by this model.

All variables in this model are statistically significant (p<5%).

Table 3 shows the summary statistics for each of the variables used to model Pavement Type 4.
Table 3. Summary statistics for Pavement Type 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age_2013</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>15.0216</td>
<td>10.7763</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>83.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed_Limit</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>54.5887</td>
<td>7.5491</td>
<td>20.0000</td>
<td>70.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement_Thickness</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>11.9740</td>
<td>4.3446</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>29.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number_Of_Lanes</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>2.4697</td>
<td>1.0194</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>9.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average_Daily_Traffic</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>4511.02</td>
<td>8426.04</td>
<td>370.00</td>
<td>90400.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average_Daily_Trucks</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>791.282</td>
<td>1845.13</td>
<td>10.0000</td>
<td>11344.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC DATA-Annual_18_KIPS</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>149744</td>
<td>386828</td>
<td>1760.00</td>
<td>2265580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accum_KIPS_Since_Resurfacing</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1829318</td>
<td>5146355</td>
<td>8090.00</td>
<td>4.08E+07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruct_18_KIPS</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>5537606</td>
<td>1.45E+07</td>
<td>304281</td>
<td>1.11E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDITION DATA-IRI_Index</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>59.2446</td>
<td>19.8291</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friction_Value</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>52.3417</td>
<td>7.6589</td>
<td>20.0000</td>
<td>70.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface_Type</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>63.6190</td>
<td>6.0724</td>
<td>30.0000</td>
<td>92.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement_Width</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>25.0048</td>
<td>4.5177</td>
<td>22.0000</td>
<td>54.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI_2013</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>64.9199</td>
<td>18.4179</td>
<td>9.0000</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DaysTempChange_2013</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>86.9264</td>
<td>32.5324</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>137.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI_2014</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>67.5447</td>
<td>18.6986</td>
<td>10.0000</td>
<td>97.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI_2015</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>68.4128</td>
<td>18.7326</td>
<td>22.0000</td>
<td>97.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scatter plots in Figures 5 and 6 show how four variables interact to help predict PCI_2014 and PCI_2015, respectively, for Pavement Type 4.
Figure 5. Selected scatter plots showing how four variables interact to predict PCI_2014 for Pavement Type 4
Figure 6. Selected scatter plots showing how four variables interact to predict PCI_2015 for Pavement Type 4
APPENDIX A. VARIABLE DEFINITIONS

The descriptive variables considered as potential input variables in this research were as follows:

- **AGE_2013** – years since construction or resurfacing (as calculated from 2013 data)
- **Speed_Limit** – speed limit in miles per hour
- **Pavement_Thickness** – pavement thickness in inches
- **Number_Of_Lanes** – number of lanes
- **Average_Daily_Traffic** – average daily traffic as a count per day
- **Average_Daily_Trucks** – number of trucks per day
- **Annual_18_KIPS** – annual 18 kips measured in ESALs
- **Accum_KIPS_Since_Resurfacing** – accumulated kips since resurfacing, measured in kips
- **Reconstruct_18_KIPS** – accumulated kips since construction, measured in kips
- **IRI_Index** – International Roughness Index
- **Friction_Value** – friction value from 5 to 75
- **Surface_Type** – surface type from 0 to 96
- **Pavement_Width** – pavement width
- **Median** – YES/NO, with YES indicating the segment has a median and NO indicating the segment does not have a median
- **DaysTempChange_2013** – Number of days in 2013 where the maximum temperature was greater than 32°F and the minimum temperature was less than or equal to 32°F
- **RS_in2013** – YES/NO, with YES indicating the segment was resurfaced in 2013 and NO indicating the segment was not resurfaced in 2013
- **RS_in2014** – YES/NO, with YES indicating the segment was resurfaced in 2014 and NO indicating the segment was not resurfaced in 2014
- **RS_in2015** – YES/NO, with YES indicating the segment was resurfaced in 2015 and NO indicating the segments was not resurfaced in 2015
- **PCI_2013** – pavement condition index as recorded in 2013 data
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