



Organizational Results Research Report

November 2007  
OR08.010

# Investigations of Failures of Epoxy Polymer Overlays in Missouri

Prepared by  
Missouri Department  
of Transportation

**FINAL REPORT**

RI06-020

**Investigations of Failures of Epoxy Polymer Overlays  
in Missouri**

Prepared for  
Missouri Department of Transportation  
Organizational Results

by  
Jennifer Harper, PE  
Missouri Department of Transportation

Acknowledgment to:  
Dave Amos  
Josh Kampeter  
Margie Bramon

**November 2007**

The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the principal investigators and the Missouri Department of Transportation; Organizational Results Division. They are not necessarily those of the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. This report does not constitute a standard or regulation.

**TECHNICAL REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE.**

1. Report No.:		2. Government Accession No.:		3. Recipient's Catalog No.:	
4. Title and Subtitle: Investigations of Failures of Epoxy Polymer Overlays in Missouri				5. Report Date: November 2007	
				6. Performing Organization Code:	
7. Author(s): Jennifer Harper, PE				8. Performing Organization Report No.: RI06-020	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address: Missouri Department of Transportation Organizational Results PO BOX 270, JEFFERSON CITY MO 65102				10. Work Unit No.:	
				11. Contract or Grant No.:	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address:  Missouri Department of Transportation Research, Development and Technology PO BOX 270, JEFFERSON CITY MO 65102				13. Type of Report and Period Covered: Final Report.	
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code:	
15. Supplementary Notes: The investigation was conducted in cooperation with the U. S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration.					
16. Abstract: Missouri has had some epoxy polymer overlays that have exceeded their life expectancy of 10 – 15 years while other overlays have shown signs of failure within 2 years after placement. The purpose of this research study was to try and determine why some epoxy polymer overlays (EPO) have provided successful protection for over a decade and why some overlays have begun to fail after only a few years.					
17. Key Words: Epoxy Polymer Overlays			18. Distribution Statement: No restrictions. This document is available to the public through National Technical Information Center, Springfield, Virginia 22161.		
19. Security Classification (of this report): Unclassified.		20. Security Classification (of this page): Unclassified.		21. No of Pages: 20	22. Price:

## Executive Summary

Epoxy Polymer Overlays have been used to seal bridge decks in the United States for over 40 years. Missouri placed the first epoxy polymer overlay (EPO) in June of 1989 on the Poplar Street Bridge over the Mississippi River in St. Louis. MoDOT now has well over 300 bridge decks treated with an epoxy polymer overlay.

Missouri has had some epoxy polymer overlays that have exceeded their life expectancy of 10 – 15 years while other overlays have shown signs of failure within 2 years after placement. The purpose of this research study was to try and determine why some epoxy polymer overlays (EPO) have provided successful protection for over a decade and why some overlays have begun to fail after only a few years. While an EPO provides protection from chloride penetration and water infiltration when it works correctly, it is more expensive than traditional deck sealers that are meant to last 3-5 years. When the EPO fails short of its lifespan it is not cost effective and can also be difficult to remove.

Organizational Results randomly selected 10 EPO bridges from each of the 10 districts to create a database of information. The study attempted to find correlations between the performance of the EPO with previous deck rating, product type, span length, girder type, number of freeze/thaw cycles, temperature at placement, and ADT.

An unexpected observation during the study was the presence of pitting on a majority of the bridge decks. Sixty-two out of ninety eight bridges had pitting of some degree. (The epoxy polymer overlay on two of the bridge decks had completely worn off.) One source of pitting is the presence of air bubbles in the epoxy component of the overlay. In discussions with epoxy suppliers it was noted that the use of certain types of paddles for mixing can lead to air bubbles within the epoxy. The proper type of paddle to be used is called a “jiffy paddle” or a “Sika paddle.”

Epoxy Polymer overlays can provide a long lasting protection for bridge decks, but only if the bridge deck is still in decent shape. Once the deck deteriorates and requires patching on more than 5% of the deck, the overlay will most likely perform well for only a few years. MoDOT has had many successes with epoxy polymer overlays but also many failures. Many of the failures can be attributed to decks that were beyond the deterioration level of a good EPO candidate.

## Introduction

Epoxy Polymer Overlays have been used to seal bridge decks in the United States for over 40 years. Missouri placed the first epoxy polymer overlay (EPO) in June of 1989 on the Poplar Street Bridge over the Mississippi River in St. Louis. MoDOT now has well over 300 bridge decks treated with an epoxy polymer overlay.

An epoxy polymer overlay usually consists of an epoxy polymer binder and fine aggregates used to construct a thin, 0.25” to 1.0”, overlay. The overlay is constructed in two lifts to achieve the desired thickness. An EPO overlay is more expensive than a traditional overlay; however it has several advantages:

- ❑ Adds very little dead load
- ❑ Very fast cure times
- ❑ Shallow depths which eliminates the need for raising the approach slabs
- ❑ Transition from overlaid lane to non-overlaid lane during construction
- ❑ A waterproof, long-lasting wearing surface
- ❑ Excellent skid resistance

Missouri has had some epoxy polymer overlays that have exceeded their life expectancy of 10 – 15 years while other overlays have shown signs of failure within 2 years after placement. The goal of this study was to determine the causes of the failures, enabling MoDOT to use EPOs only in locations that it will provide cost effective protection.

## Objective

The purpose of this research study was to try and determine why some epoxy polymer overlays (EPO) have provided successful protection for over a decade and why some overlays have begun to fail after only a few years. While an EPO provides protection from chloride penetration and water infiltration when it works correctly, it is more expensive than traditional deck sealers that are meant to last 3-5 years. When the EPO fails short of its lifespan it is not cost effective and can also be difficult to remove.

Organizational Results randomly selected 10 EPO bridges from each of the 10 districts to create a database of information. Appendix A shows the locations of the bridges evaluated. Care was taken to include a range of ages for the bridges selected in each district. An attempt was made to speak with each District Bridge Engineer to discuss their experiences with EPOs, and a survey was conducted for each bridge where a rating was given from visual observation. The EPO rating was based solely on the overlay itself, not on the deck condition. The ratings are:

- Excellent—No visual defects found
- Good—less than 1% of the overlay showed problems
- Fair—1% to 5% of the overlay showed problems
- Poor—over 5% of the overlay showed problems.

A chart with the deck rating for each bridge is located in Appendix B.

Types of defects for each bridge were also recorded. The defects noted were:

- Cracking
- Pitting
- Delamination
- Peeling
- Missing areas of epoxy
- Sunken/cracked areas
- Spalling/loose areas
- Post overlay patches



Cracking



Pitting



Delamination



Peeling



Missing areas of epoxy



Sunken/cracked areas



Spalling/loose areas



Post overlay Patches

Once each deck had been rated, background information was collected from each district. The background information, when available, included:

- Date of overlay
- Age of overlay
- Previous deck rating
- Product
- Contractor
- Weather at placement
- ADT
- ADT
- Girder type
- Longest span length
- Average number of freeze/thaw cycles for the district

Due to the age of some of the overlays and retention policies between districts, background information was attained for only 68 bridges.

## Discussion

### General Observations

Epoxy polymer overlays are not a “repair” for bridge decks. They are only a means of protecting a deck that is in fairly good condition but is at risk for chloride and water penetration. Once a bridge deck has defects over a significant surface area, an EPO will not provide long lasting protection for the bridge deck and can even hamper repair efforts in the future. MoDOT’s Bridge Division generally recommends placing EPOs on bridge decks that are rated a 7 or higher and have less than 5% of the deck requiring repairs. Information gathered during the investigation indicated that many of the bridges that received overlays had significantly more than 5% defects. Many of the failures observed in the site visits appeared to be a failure of the top surface of the deck as opposed to a failure of the epoxy. Where possible, epoxy that had separated from the deck was examined. In most cases there was a layer of concrete paste on the bottom surface of the epoxy indicating that the epoxy had not debonded from the deck, but that the top surface of deck had delaminated. See Figure 1.



Figure 1. Epoxy Polymer Overlay that has concrete paste attached to the bottom

EPOs are initially hydrophobic and should not be exposed to water until they have fully cured. MoDOT’s specs require that the deck is dry and that rain is not in the forecast for 24 hours after placement. However there are some misconceptions about this requirement. Field logs have shown that some contractors consider the deck satisfactory as long as there is not standing water on the deck. One of the approved products is Sikadur 22, Lo-Mod. On the data sheet for the product it refers to a damp deck as being acceptable. However further in the data sheet, the limitations state that for “porous substrates” i.e., concrete bridge decks, the surface must be free of moisture. Inspectors must be aware that the deck must be free of moisture in order to get a good bond between the epoxy and the bridge deck. The Michigan DOT requires a moisture test, ASTM D 4263 “Standard Test Method for Indicating Moisture in Concrete by the Plastic Sheet Method.” This test is simple to perform. It involves taping a polyethylene sheet to the bridge deck for a period of time and then visually inspecting the underside of the sheet and the concrete surface for the presence of water. The ASTM standard requires leaving the plastic sheet in place for 16 hours, however Michigan specs require a minimum of two hours. It is highly recommended that this test be included in the MoDOT specifications to verify that the deck is completely dry. The presence of water in the deck will prevent an adequate bond between the concrete and EPO. This could be behind some of the failures on I-29 in District 1. Unlike many of the failures observed, in this area the epoxy appeared to “flake” off the bridge deck. See Figure 2.



Figure 2. Epoxy “flaking” off the bridge deck

Initially no patterns could be found between the epoxy failures and the background information that was gathered on each bridge. We eventually determined that MoDOT EPOs were experiencing two different problems, pitting and all other defects. Once pitting was removed from the other defects, we began to see patterns between those bridges with failing overlays and characteristics of the bridge deck itself. We also examined each factor looking at all of the epoxy bridges as a whole and then at only the newer overlays placed in 2000 or later. We picked the year 2000 as a cutoff of “newer overlays” so that we could verify that the patterns we were seeing were not due to the varying ages of the bridges. For example, certain products were used on the earlier overlays and other products were used on the newer overlays. Looking at the bridges as a whole would show inferior performance for the older type of epoxy even if it was due to the age differences as opposed to the product itself.

### Pitting

An unexpected observation during the study was the presence of pitting on a majority of the bridge decks. Sixty-two out of ninety eight bridges had pitting of some degree. (The epoxy polymer overlay on two of the bridge decks, K108 placed in 1990 and A1944 placed in 1984, had worn to the point that determining failure mechanisms was impossible.) The degree of pitting ranged from pinprick sized pits to quarter inch sized pits. Pitting has been noted in many literature reports; however most sources claim that the pits will never line up between the two layers of overlay and should not be of concern. In the course of the investigation we found areas where the pits DID line up which create a funnel for water and chlorides to enter the deck. We also found that once the pitting became larger the EPO began to show signs of cracking between the pits, which eventually became block cracking. One source of pitting is the presence of air bubbles in the epoxy component of the overlay. In discussions with epoxy suppliers it was noted that the use of certain types of paddles for mixing can lead to air bubbles within the epoxy. The proper type of paddle to be used is called a “jiffy paddle” or a “Sika paddle.” Most epoxies have a maximum speed for the paddle, mixing any quicker can introduce air. Inspectors should verify that the contractor is using the correct type of paddle for mixing the epoxy and that the correct speed is being used. It was also noted that an increase in temperature leads to an increased chance of pitting. See Figure 3. During higher temperatures, extra care should be given to working out any remaining air bubbles during placement. The likelihood of pitting also increased with the number of freeze/thaw cycles. See Figure 4.




Figure 3. High Temperature at Placement vs. Pitting




Figure 4. Freeze/Thaw Cycles vs. Pitting

### Previous Deck Rating

The condition of a bridge deck should be the most important consideration when determining if a bridge is a good candidate for an epoxy polymer overlay. An EPO can provide good protection for a deck that is in decent condition. Once a significant portion of the bridge deck has deteriorated, it is past the point that an EPO can help. In conversations with the district personnel the decision to place an EPO on a bridge is made anywhere from the design engineer to the district bridge engineer. The decision has been based on a number of different factors including the appearance of an epoxy

polymer overlay. It is important to involve someone who is familiar with the deck and its present condition. While the deck rating can be helpful information it can be several years between a deck rating and actual placement of the overlay. A deck rating can also be based on visual inspection only; any areas that are beginning to delaminate can be missed without a full deck survey. It is important that a deck be revisited close to the placement of the overlay to determine that there has not been a significant change in the deck condition since the initial decision to place the overlay.

For those bridges that we were able to gather background information, we collected the previous deck survey prior to placement. Most bridges had either a rating of 6 or 7. There were a few decks that were previously rated an 8 however there were only five. Four out of the five had overlays that ranged in age from 12-14 years old so there is not enough data to draw any conclusions for those bridges. In order to quantify the EPO rating, each bridge was given a number of the EPO rating of 4 for excellent down to 1 for poor. The average rating for the overlay on the bridges with a previous deck rating of 6 was a 2.4 whereas the average rating for the overlay on the bridges with a previous deck rating of 7 was a 3.14. See Figure 5. The bridge decks with a higher deck rating prior to placement are more likely to have an excellent or good rated overlay.




Figure 5. Previous Deck Rating vs. EPO Rating

While deck rating can be an important tool for screening possible candidates, it does not take the place of a full deck evaluation. A bridge deck may be rated a 7 yet still have up to 10% delaminations, in which case it is not a good candidate for an EPO. Likewise a deck may have no delaminations but be rated a 6 because of transverse cracking and efflorescence. An EPO might perform very well on this deck. It is suggested that as well as a determination of delaminations and chloride testing, a pull-off test be performed on the bare deck. This will give the engineer an idea of the strength of the deck itself. If the deck has a low tensile strength, it is likely the EPO will pull off the top layer of paste.

## Product Type

An effort was made to relate product type to overlay performance. We were able to get the product information for fifty-five of the bridges. Sikadur 22 and Unitex Pro Poxy III were almost exclusively used. Those two products accounted for forty-seven of the placements. Unfortunately an accurate comparison could not be made because the Sikadur overlays had an average age of 8.5 years whereas the Unitex decks had an average age of 3.5 years.

## Freeze/Thaw Cycles

The number of freeze/thaw cycles greatly impacts a bridge deck. When water infiltrates the surface then freezes it can cause fractures in the concrete. The same can be said for epoxy polymer overlays, especially if the overlay has pitting. We gathered climatological data for each bridge deck. The Midwest Regional Climate Center provides the average values for temperatures from 1971 to 2000. By looking at the number of days below freezing and above freezing we estimated the number of freeze/thaw cycles at the nearest weather station to each bridge. As expected as the number of freeze/thaw cycles increases the average rating of the overlays decreased. See Figure 6.




Figure 6. Freeze/Thaw Cycles vs. EPO rating

## Temperature at Placement

The temperature at placement was retrieved from the National Climatic Weather Center. There is a loose correlation between temperature and overlay performance. Epoxies that were placed when the high temperature was in the 80s appear to have the best performance. See Figure 8. Temperature variations will affect the viscosity of the epoxy. For decks that have steep grades or are superelevated this can be a concern in high temperatures. When the temperature is too high the epoxy can run and cause it to be too thick at the lowest elevation. MoDOT specifications require that the temperature of the bridge deck at placement be in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendation. For decks with a superelevation or with a steep grade, it is recommended that an upper temperature limit be set. When the epoxy becomes too thick it can put the top layer of

deck in tension as the deck moves causing fractures in the deck surface. If the temperature is too low the epoxy can thicken causing placement problems with the aggregate not embedding in the epoxy.

### Span Length/Girder type

The span lengths of the bridge had an effect on the performance of the overlays. We compared the longest span length and overlay rating which indicated that the longer span bridges were more likely to have problems with their overlays. See Figure 7 and 8. This is not surprising since the longer spans will be more flexible, increasing the chance of the epoxy and/or deck cracking. Some of the newer epoxies are more flexible than the older epoxies, which should help with this problem. For bridges with long spans it would be more cost effective to look for an epoxy that is more flexible as opposed to going with the cheapest product. Transpo-T48 is a more flexible epoxy that might provide better protection on flexible decks. The girder type is related to the span length so the same pattern was found. Bridges with steel wide-flange sections and P/S I girders had higher EPO ratings than steel plate girders. See Figure 9.




Figure 7. Longest Span vs. EPO rating




Figure 8. Longest Span vs. EPO rating for EPOs placed in 2000 or later




Figure 9. Girder Type vs. EPO rating

## ADT

As expected when the number of cars and trucks that drive on an epoxy polymer overlay increases the overlay rating decreases. See Figure 10.




Figure 10. ADT vs. EPO


## Conclusions

Epoxy Polymer overlays can provide a long lasting protection for bridge decks, but only if the bridge deck is still in decent shape. Once the deck deteriorates and requires patching on more than 5% of the deck, the overlay will most likely perform well for only a few years. MoDOT has had many successes with epoxy polymer overlays but also many failures. Many of the failures can be attributed to decks that were beyond the deterioration level of a good EPO candidate.

Recommendations include:

- While deck rating can be used as a screening tool, a deck evaluation should be performed on each deck prior to placing an epoxy polymer overlay. An EPO should not be placed if more than 5% of the deck requires repairs. It is also recommended to do a pull-off test on the bare deck along with chloride testing and checking for delaminations to ensure that the epoxy will not pull off the top layer of deck.
- Require that a moisture test be performed on a deck before placement. The “Standard Test Method for Indicating Moisture in Concrete by the Plastic Sheet Method” is a simple test that would ensure that the deck is dry and the epoxy will bond to the deck.
- Make sure the proper type of paddle is used to mix the epoxy and that the speed of the paddle meets the product recommendations. During hot weather extra care should be given to working out any air bubbles in the epoxy.
- Revisit the deck prior to the placement of the EPO to verify that there have not been significant changes to the bridge deck.
- For bridges with steep grades or with superelevations, provide an upper limit on temperature to prevent the epoxy becoming too fluid and pooling at the lowest elevation.
- For bridges with long spans or flexible decks, require a flexible epoxy even if it is a little more expensive. A suggested brand is Transpo-T48.

# Appendix A



**Legend**

**Overlay Rating**

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

— IS

— US

— MO

— RT

- - BU

□ Boundary

September 10, 2007

System analysis\GIS\MapData\Map\_OR...

## Appendix B

Bridge #	District	County	Year Overlaid	RT	Route	overlay rating including pitting	overlay rating w/o pitting
A-726 NB	1	Andrew	1994	RT	59	poor	poor
A-1393 NB	1	Holt	1996	IS	29	poor	poor
A-1770 NB	1	Holt	1998	IS	29	poor	poor
A-1771 NB	1	Holt	1996	IS	29	poor	poor
A-1907 SB	1	Holt	2003	IS	29	fair	good
A-1909 SB	1	Holt	2003	IS	29	fair	fair
A-1912 SB	1	Holt	2003	IS	29	poor	poor
A-2706 SB	1	Holt	2001	IS	29	poor	poor
A-2716	1	Holt	1992	US	159	fair	good
A-1770 SB	1	Holt	1998	IS	29	poor	poor
A-2903	2	Carroll	2003	US	24	poor	excellent
L-593	2	Chariton	1991	MO	11	poor	poor
A-1447	2	Chariton	1991	MO	11	poor	fair
A-2570	2	Grundy	1996	US	65	poor	good
A-4636	2	Howard	2002	MO	87	good	good
A-2662	2	Randolph	1991	RT	C	poor	poor
A-130	2	Saline	2002	CRD	211	excellent	excellent
G-131	2	Saline	1994	US	65	fair	fair
A-2877	2	Saline	1999	MO	41	poor	poor
A-2906	2	Carroll	2003	US	24	poor	excellent
A-2300	3	Audrain	2003	RT	W	excellent	excellent
A-2899	3	Lewis	2004	MO	156	good	good
A-3424	3	Lewis	2004	US	61	excellent	excellent
A-3384	3	Lewis	2004	US	61	good	good
A-3446	3	Lincoln	1992	RT	KK	poor	poor
A-2608	3	Lincoln	2002	US	61	good	good
A-2601 SB	3	Lincoln	2002	US	61	good	good
A-2604	3	Lincoln	2002	MO	47	poor	good
A-2835	3	Lincoln	1990	RT	E	fair	fair
A-2978	3	Montgomery	2003	RT	RA	excellent	excellent
K-108	4	Clay	1990	US	69	poor	poor
A-1944	4	Clay	1984	RP	435N to 210W	poor	poor
A-2181 E	4	Clay	1998	MO	210	poor	fair
A-1687	4	Platte	1991	RP	29N TO IS635S	poor	poor
A-2723	4	Jackson	1997	US	24	poor	good
A-4363	4	Jackson	2003	US	24	fair	excellent
A-5007	4	Jackson	2003	US	24	good	good
A-1175	4	Johnson	1994	US	50	poor	poor
A-2281	4	Platte	1997	RP	29N TO RTDW	poor	poor
A-2503	4	Clay	1993	MO	291	poor	good
A-048	5	Boone	2002	MO	740	excellent	excellent
A-800	5	Boone	2005	US	63C	good	good
A-2109	5	Callaway	2003	US	54	poor	poor
A-3124	5	Boone	2002	US	63	good	good
A-2914	5	Cole	1995	RT	C	poor	poor

Bridge #	District	County	Year Overlaid	RT	Route	overlay rating including pitting	overlay rating w/o pitting
A-2810	5	Miller	1991	MO	52	poor	poor
A-2749	5	Miller	1998	US	54	poor	poor
A-2750	5	Miller	1996	US	54	poor	poor
A-808	5	Pettis	1996	US	65	poor	poor
A-809	5	Pettis	1996	US	65	poor	poor
L-624	6	St. Charles	2003	US	61	excellent	excellent
A-2807	6	St. Louis	2006	IS	170	excellent	excellent
A-4783	6	St. Louis	2006	US	40	excellent	excellent
A-4783	6	St. Louis	2006	US	40	excellent	excellent
A-2788	6	St. Louis	2006	IS	170	excellent	excellent
A-1458	6	St. Charles	1993	US	40	poor	poor
A-1523	6	St. Louis City	2000	RP	Pine St. to IS64	fair	fair
A-1523	6	St. Louis City	2000	RP	Pine St. to IS64	good	good
A-2809	6	St. Louis	2006	IS	170	excellent	excellent
A-1157	6	St. Louis	1993	MO	21	poor	poor
A-2532	7	Barton	1993	MO	43	poor	fair
A-2533	7	Barton	1993	MO	43	poor	poor
A-1142	7	Bates	1996	US	71	poor	poor
A-2692	7	Jasper	1993	MO	43	poor	good
A-3229 EB	7	Jasper	2001	MO	96	fair	good
A-4070	7	St. Clair	2005	MO	82	excellent	excellent
A-4069	7	St. Clair	2005	MO	82	excellent	excellent
A-1448	7	Vernon	1991	RT	BB	poor	poor
A-2948 WB	7	Vernon	1994	US	54	poor	poor
A-2948 EB	7	Vernon	1994	US	54	poor	poor
H-834	8	Dallas	1994	US	65	fair	fair
A-1651	8	Greene	2006	US	65	excellent	excellent
A-3035	8	Dallas	2002	RT	D	good	good
A-0280 EB	8	Greene	2006	LP	44	fair	excellent
A-1654	8	Greene	2006	US	65	excellent	excellent
A-3357	8	Greene	2003	US	65	excellent	excellent
A-2476	8	Hickory	2002	RT	O	good	good
G-248	8	Laclede	2006	S OR	44	excellent	excellent
A-2676	8	Laclede	2003	RT	O	good	good
A-2259	8	Wright	2002	RT	F	good	good
A-2205	9	Iron	2004	RT	N	excellent	excellent
A-1711	9	Reynolds	1997	MO	21	fair	fair
G-360	9	Reynolds	1997	MO	21	fair	good
A-1627	9	Phelps	1992	CRD	7300	fair	fair
K-789	9	Howell	2004	MO	137	excellent	excellent
A-3411	9	Reynolds	2004	RT	J	excellent	excellent
F-427	9	Texas	2004	US	63	good	good
A-2536	9	Texas	1993	US	60	poor	poor
A-1997	9	Washington	1998	MO	8	poor	poor
A-3080	9	Phelps	2002	RT	BB	fair	good
F-959	10	Dunklin	1993	US	412	good	good
A-1430	10	Dunklin	1993	US	412	poor	poor

<b>Bridge #</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Year Overlaid</b>	<b>RT</b>	<b>Route</b>	<b>overlay rating including pitting</b>	<b>overlay rating w/o pitting</b>
F-1001	10	Dunklin	1992	MO	84	fair	excellent
A-2093 NB	10	Mississippi	2003	IS	57	fair	fair
A-2093 SB	10	Mississippi	2003	IS	57	poor	poor
K-570	10	New Madrid	1991	US	62	poor	poor
A-2951	10	New Madrid	1991	US	62	poor	fair
A-2518	10	St. Francois	1995	US	67	poor	fair
A-1431	10	Dunklin	1993	US	412	poor	good
A-2538	10	St. Francois	1995	US	67	poor	poor



Missouri Department of Transportation  
Organizational Results  
P. O. Box 270  
Jefferson City, MO 65102

573.526.4335  
1 888 ASK MODOT  
[innovation@modot.mo.gov](mailto:innovation@modot.mo.gov)