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#### Abstract

A new structural design procedure has been developed for heavily trafficked plain-jointed concrete pavement. The objective of this design procedure is to provide a structure that gives zero-maintenance (i.e., very low structural maintenance) performance over the designated design period. The overall design procedure includes both a serviceabilityperformance analysis and a fatigue-damage analysis; however, only the serviceability-performance analysis procedure is described here. The fatigue-damage analysis provides a direct evaluation of slab cracking, whereas the serviceability-performance analysis provides an overall evaluation of several distress types. Long-term performance data from 25 sections of the original AASHO test road that have been under heavy mixed traffic on I-80 since 1962 were used to derive the new design equations. The new equations fit the long-term performance data much better than did the original AASHO equation that was based on only 2 years' data. Westergaard's edge-stress equation and a climatic factor were incorporated into the design equation to extend it to a large variety of conditions. Performance data from 12 additional heavily trafficked projects located in various climates were used to determine the climatic effects on performance. The new design procedure results in a pavement structure that is expected to provide zero-maintenance performance over the designated design period.


A new structural design procedure for plain-jointed concrete pavement has been developed from long-term performance data of many heavilytrafficked pavements. The procedure is based on the serviceability-performance concept and also on a fatigue-damage analysis and was developed specifically to provide zero-maintenance (i.e., very low structural maintenance) performance over the design period (1, 2) [only the serviceability-performance analysis is described here; the fatigue-damage analysis, which gives a direct evaluation of slab cracking, is described elsewhere (2)].

The 2-year American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHO) Road Test provided data that were used to derive an empirical equation that has been used extensively in concrete pavement design since $1962(3,4)$. One of the major deficiencies of the AASHO performance equation is that it is based on data for only 2 years, and most of the sections that failed did so because of severe pumping (5).

Since the end of the AASHO Road Test in 1960, the Illinois Department of Transportation has monitored the performance of 25 of the original sections of the test road (which was opened to traffic as part of I-80 in 1962). These data represent a time period of 16 years and the application of almost 20 million $80-\mathrm{kN}$ ( $18000-$ lbf $=18$-kip) equivalent single-axle loads (ESALs). The new design equation was developed by using multiple regression techniques to provide a more accurate representation of the relationships among the serviceability index, the accumulated $80-\mathrm{kN}$ ESALs, and the slab thicknesses. Data were also obtained from 12 other plainjointed concrete projects located in other regions of the United States to provide information about the effects of climate on performance. A summary of the data used in the analysis is given in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

## DEVELOPMENT OF NEW DESIGN EQUATION <br> Original AASHO Equation

The AASHO Road Test provided data from which empirical relationships among portland cement concrete (PCC) slab thickness, load magnitude, type of axle, number of load applications, and serviceability index of the pavement for road-test conditions (i.e., the specific environment and materials) were derived by using multiple regression analyses (5):
$\log W=\log \rho+G / B$
where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{W}= & \text { number of axle-load applications (load magni- } \\
& \text { tude } \mathrm{L} 1 \text { and axle type load } \mathrm{L} 2, \text { to a service- } \\
& \text { ability index of } \mathrm{P} 2), \\
\log \rho= & 5.85+7.35 \log (\mathrm{H}+1)+4.62 \log (\mathrm{~L} 1+\mathrm{L} 2)+ \\
& 3.28 \log (\mathrm{~L} 2), \\
\mathrm{B}= & 1.00+3.63(\mathrm{~L} 1+\mathrm{L} 2)^{5 \cdot 20} /(\mathrm{H}+1)^{8 \cdot 46} \mathrm{~L}^{3.52}, \\
\mathrm{G}= & \log [(\mathrm{P} 1-\mathrm{P} 2) /(\mathrm{P} 1-1.5)], \\
\mathrm{H}= & \mathrm{PCC} \text { slab thickness (in), } \\
\mathrm{L} 1= & \text { load on a single or a tandem axle (kips), } \\
\mathrm{L} 2= & \text { axle code (1 for single axles or } 2 \text { for tandem } \\
& \text { axles), } \\
\mathrm{P} 1= & \text { initial serviceability index, and } \\
\mathrm{P} 2= & \text { terminal serviceability index. }
\end{aligned}
$$

(These equations and Figure 9 were developed for U.S. customary units only; therefore, values are not given in ST units.)

By using the Spangler corner equation, the empirical model given by Equation 1 was modified and extended to include the material properties. The following basic assumptions were made in this extension:

1. The variation in pavement life (W) for different magnitudes of load at the same level of the ratio of tensile stress:strength of the PCC slab can be calculated by using Equation 1 and is covered in the design procedure by the traffic equivalence factors, and
2. Any change in the ratio of tensile stress: strength that results from changes in the values of the material properties will have the same effect on $W$ as an equivalent change in slab thickness (calculated by Spangler's equation) will have on $W$ as calculated by Equation 1.
The resulting final structural design model is given below:

$$
\begin{align*}
\log W_{18}= & 7.35 \log (\mathrm{H}+1)-0.06 \\
& +\left(\mathrm{G} /\left\{1+\left[1.624 \times 10^{7} /(\mathrm{H}+1)^{8.46}\right]\right\}\right) \\
& +(4.22-0.32 \mathrm{P} 2) \log \{(\mathrm{FF} / 215.63 \mathrm{~J}) \\
& \left.\times\left(\mathrm{H}^{0.75}-1.133\right) /\left[\mathrm{H}^{0.75}-\left(18.42 / \mathrm{Z}^{0.25}\right)\right]\right\} \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

where

```
\(\mathrm{W}_{18}=\) number of 18 -kip single-axle loads required
        to reduce the serviceability index from P1 to
        P2,
FF = mean modulus of rupture of PCC slab (28-d
        cure and 3 rd point loading) ( \(\mathrm{lbf} / \mathrm{in}^{2}\) ),
    \(J=\) load transfer coefficient,
    Z \(=\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{k}\),
    \(\mathrm{E}=\) modulus of elasticity of PCC slab ( \(\mathrm{lbf} / \mathrm{in}^{2}\) ), and
    \(\mathrm{k}=\) modulus of foundation support ( \(1 \mathrm{bf} / \mathrm{in}^{3}\) ).
```

It has also been suggested $(\underline{4}, \underline{6})$ that other terms should be added to this equation to include the effects of variation of subbase quality and of climate.

The data given in Table 4, which were determined by the Illinois Department of Transportation, for the 25 sections were analyzed to determine the ability of Equation 2 to predict long-term performance. The number of $80-\mathrm{kN}$ ESALs accumulated to each year (i.e., 1962, $1968,1969,1971,1972$, and 1974) for each project was
calculated on the basis of the mixed traffic data measured at the site and the computed load-equivalency factors. These values were plotted against the number of $80-\mathrm{kN}$ loads predicted by using Equation 2 to cause a loss of serviceability index from 4.5 to the values shown in Table 3. The result is shown in Figure 1.

The standard error of the estimate (standard deviation of residuals) is 0.31 for $\log \mathrm{W}$. Figure 1 clearly shows that Equation 2 predicts poorly for thick slabs [ $\mathrm{H}>241 \mathrm{~mm}$ ( 9.5 in )]. For example, the actual number of $80-\mathrm{kN}$ ESALs for a $318-\mathrm{mm}$ ( $12.5-\mathrm{in}$ ) slab is about 18 million, and the value by using computed Equation 2 is more than 50 million. This standard error is considerably larger than the error based on only the results of the 2 -year road test, which was 0.22 .

## New Design Equation

An approach similar to that used to develop Equation 2 was used to develop a modified equation. Data from the 25 AASHO sections were used in the regression analyses

Table 1. General data for 25 sections of plainjointed concrete pavements constructed for AASHO Road Test (1958-60) and then subjected to regular mixed traffic on $1-80$ (1962-74).

| Project <br> No. | Loop | Section | Allowable Axle Load (kN) | No. of $80-\mathrm{kN}$ ESALs ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (millions) | Pavement Section ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  | Diameter of Joint Dowels ${ }^{\circ}$ (cm) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Thickness of PCC Slab (cm) | Thickness of Granular Base (cm) |  |
| JCP-1 | 4 | 672 | 143 | 11.16 | 20.3 | 7.6 | 2.54 |
| JCP-2 | 4 | 658 | 143 | 11.16 | 20.3 | 15.2 | 2.54 |
| JCP-3 | 4 | 652 | 143 | 11.16 | 20.3 | 22.9 | 2.54 |
| JCP-4 | 4 | 676 | 143 | 11.32 | 24.1 | 7.6 | 2.85 |
| JCP-5 | 4 | 702 | 143 | 11.32 | 24.1 | 15.2 | 2.85 |
| jCre | 1 | 800 | 143 | 11.22 | 24.1 | 22.9 | 2.85 |
| JCP-7 | 5 | 552 | 178 | 13.75 | 24.1 | 0 | 2.85 |
| JCP-8 | 5 | 512 | 178 | 13.75 | 24.1 | 7.6 | 2.85 |
| JCP-9 | 5 | 542 | 178 | 13.75 | 24.1 | 7.6 | 2.85 |
| JCP-10 | 5 | 528 | 178 | 13.75 | 24.1 | 15.2 | 2.85 |
| JCP-11 | 6 | 352 | 214 | 17.82 | 24.1 | 7.6 | 2.85 |
| JCP-12 | 6 | 368 | 214 | 17.82 | 24.1 | 15.2 | 2.85 |
| JCP-13 | 6 | 390 | 214 | 17.82 | 24.1 | 15.2 | 2.85 |
| JCP-14 | 6 | 376 | 214 | 17.82 | 24.1 | 22.9 | 2.85 |
| JCP-15 | 5 | 530 | 178 | 14.09 | 27.9 | 7.6 | 3.13 |
| JCP-16 | 5 | 498 | 178 | 14.09 | 27.9 | 15.2 | 3.13 |
| JCP-17 | 5 | 510 | 178 | 14.09 | 27.9 | 22.9 | 3.13 |
| JCP-18 | 6 | 364 | 214 | 18.94 | 27.9 | 7.6 | 3.13 |
| JCP-19 | 6 | 378 | 214 | 18.94 | 27.9 | 7.6 | 3.13 |
| JCP-20 | 6 | 388 | 214 | 18.94 | 27.9 | 15.2 | 3.13 |
| JCP-21 | 6 | 398 | 214 | 18.94 | 27.9 | 15.2 | 3.13 |
| JCP-22 | 6 | 366 | 214 | 18.94 | 27.9 | 22.9 | 3.13 |
| JCP-23 | 6 | 396 | 214 | 19.47 | 31.7 | 7.6 | 3.70 |
| JCP-24 | 6 | 350 | 214 | 19.47 | 31.7 | 15.2 | 3.70 |
| JCP-25 | 6 | 380 | 214 | 19.47 | 31.7 | 22.9 | 3.70 |

Notes: $1 \mathrm{kN}=225 \mathrm{lbf}$ and $1 \mathrm{~cm}=2.54 \mathrm{in}$,
Road opened to traffic 1958; two-directional ADT $=11100$ (mean over 1962-1974) and 18900 (1974); number of lanes $=4$; and percentage of traffic that is trucks $=32$.
${ }^{a}$ Total one-directional in heaviest traveled lane. $\quad{ }^{b}$ All subgrades clay. $\quad{ }^{c}$ Contraction joint spacing $=4.6 \mathrm{~m}(15 \mathrm{ft})$.

Table 2. Traffic data for 12 plain-jointed concrete pavements.

| Project <br> N n. | General Theation | Route No. | Date Opened | Two-Directional ADT |  |  | No. of Lanes | Percentage Trucks | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. of } 80-\mathrm{kN} \\ & \text { (18-kip) } \\ & \text { ESALs } \\ & \text { (millions) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Avg. Over Life | In 1 Year |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Value | Year |  |  |  |
| JPC-26 | Tacoma, Washington | I-5 | 1962 | 36750 | 57250 | 1974 | $\begin{gathered} 6 \text { in } 1962 ; \\ 8 \text { in } 1971 \end{gathered}$ | 12 | 5.42 |
| JCP-27 | San Francisco | I-80 | 1955 | 35750 | 55000 | 1974 | 6 | 13 | 14.57 |
| JCP-28 | Los Angeles | I-5 | 1954-1958 | 67500 | - |  | 4 | - | - |
|  |  |  | 1959-1974 | 113500 | 129000 | 1974 | 6 | 12 | 39.65 |
| JCP-29 | Dallas | I-35 | December 1960 | 12000 | 19300 | 1974 | 4 | 6 | 3.60 |
| JCP-30 | Salt Lake City | I-15 | 1965 | 76500 | 102000 | 1974 | 3 | 8 | 5.12 |
| JCP-31 | Phoenix | I-17 | 1960 | 41500 | 75000 | 1974 | 6 | 25 | 30.23 |
| JCP-32 | New Brunswick, NJ | US-130 | 1949 | 12850 | 17100 | 1974 | 4 | 44 | 35.93 |
| JCP-33 | Atlanta | I-75 and I-85 | 1950 | 100000 | 170000 | 1974 | 6 | 9 | 21.74 |
| JCP-34 | Denver | I-70 | i964 | 37250 | 50800 | 1374 | E | 25 | 6.45 |
| JCP-35 | Denver | I-25 | 1964 | 56300 | 75000 | 1974 | 6 | 25 | 8.83 |
| JCP-36 | Detroit | Davison Expressway | 1942 | 44300 | 61600 | 1976 | 6 | 8 | 18.73 |
| JCP-37 | Toronto | Highway 27 | 1970 | 65000 | 80000 | 1976 | 6 | 12 | 6.53 |

*Total one-directional in heaviest traveled lane.

Table 3. Pavement data for 12 plain-jointed concrete pavements.

| Project <br> No. | Thickness of <br> PCC Slab (cm) | Subbase 1 |  | Subbase 2 |  | Subbase 3 |  |  | Transverse Joints |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Material | Thickness (cm) | Material | Thickness (cm) | Material | Thickness (cm) | Subgrade <br> Material | Type | Spacing <br> (m) |
| JCP-26 | 22.9 | Granular base | 5.1 | Granular base | 17.8 | - | - | Glacial till | Contraction | 4.6 |
| JCP-27 | 20.3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cement-treated } \\ & \text { base } \end{aligned}$ | 10.2 | Granular base | 30.1 | - | - | Sand, clay, and silt | Contraction | 4.6 |
| JCP-28 | 20.3 | ```Cement-treated``` | 10.2 | Granular base | 10.2 | Sand | 20.3 | Sand and silt | Contraction | 4.6 |
| JCP-29 | 25.4 | Granular base | 15.2 | Asphalt concrete ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 10.2 | - | - | Austin chalk | Contraction | 4.6 |
| JCP-30 | 22.9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cement-treated } \\ & \text { base } \end{aligned}$ | 10.2 | Granular base | 5.1 | - | $=$ | Imported borrow fill | Contraction (skewed) | 3.7-5.8 |
| JCP-31 | 22.9 | Granular base | 10.2 | Select material | 15.2 | - | - | Clay | Contraction (skewed) | 4.6 |
| JCP-32 | 25.4 | Granular base | 30.1 | Select material | 15.2 | - | - | Silt and clayey silt | Contraction | 4.6 |
| JCP-33 | 20.3 | Granular base | 15.2 | - | - | - | - | Silty clay | Contraction | 9.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Expansion | 151 |
| JCP-34 | 20.3 | Granular base | 15.2 | Granular base | 35.6 | - | - | Sand and gravel | Contraction (skewed) | 3.7-5.8 |
| JCP-35 | 20.3 | Granular base | 15.2 | - | - | - | - | Sand and gravel | Contraction (skewed) | 4.6 |
| JCP-36 | 25.4 | Granular base | 12.7 | - | - | - | - | Clay | Contraction | 7.6 |
| JCP-37 | 22.9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cement-treated } \\ & \text { base } \end{aligned}$ | 15.2 | - | - | - | - | Clay | Contraction (skewed, dowels) | 3.7-5.8 |

Note: $1 \mathrm{~m}=3.28 \mathrm{ft}$.
${ }^{-}$Old pavernent.

Figure 1. Equivalent $80-\mathrm{kN}$ single-axle load applications: predicted by using Equation 2 versus actual data calculated from 16 years at AASHO test-road site.


Figure 2. Typical performance curve for original AASHO test-road sections on 1-80 (16-year data).

to determine the functions $\beta$ and $\rho$. Analysis of the resulting equation and the performance data showed that this equation did not fit the general trend of the data for thicker slabs. A typical plot for a single $241-\mathrm{mm}$ (9.5in) PCC slab is shown in Figure 2. Equation 2 cannot fit this type of performance curve because of its mathematical form. A new approach based on a different

Table 4. Performance data for 25 sections of AASHO test road that are in service on I-80 (1958-74).

| Section <br> No. | Serviceability Index |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1962 | 1968 | 1969 | 1971 | 1972 | 1974 |
| 672 | 4.10 | 3.44 | 3.21 | 2.61 | 2.76 | 1.69 |
| 658 | 4.10 | 3.14 | 2.83 | 2.61 | 2.11 | 1.69 |
| 652 | 4.10 | 3.01 | 3.02 | 2.98 | 2.57 | 1.69 |
| 552 | 4.30 | 3.36 | 3.52 | 3.14 | 3.14 | 2.87 |
| 676 | 4.00 | 3.21 | 3.21 | 2.88 | 3.28 | 2.75 |
| 512 | 4.30 | 3.70 | 3.70 | 3.36 | 3.36 | 3.32 |
| 542 | 4.20 | 3.36 | 3.12 | 3.21 | 3.01 | 2.88 |
| 352 | 3.10 | 2.98 | 3.11 | 2.80 | 2.95 | 2.96 |
| 702 | 4.20 | 3.36 | 3.52 | 3.07 | 3.28 | 2.94 |
| 528 | 4.30 | 3.79 | 3.61 | 3.28 | 3.36 | 3.27 |
| 368 | 4.30 | 3.52 | 3.70 | 3.36 | 3.52 | 3.16 |
| 390 | 4.30 | 4.00 | 3.79 | 3.14 | 3.01 | 3.36 |
| 690 | 4.20 | 3.21 | 3.52 | 3.21 | 2.85 | 2.95 |
| 376 | 4.30 | 3.36 | 3.44 | 3.21 | 3.21 | 3.44 |
| 530 | 4.30 | 3.36 | 3.70 | 3.36 | 3.28 | 3.11 |
| 364 | 4.30 | 3.79 | 3.78 | 3.21 | 3.28 | 3.44 |
| 378 | 4.30 | 3.61 | 3.21 | 3.21 | 3.21 | 3.23 |
| 498 | 4.50 | 3.52 | 3.70 | 3.14 | 3.28 | 3.08 |
| 388 | 4.30 | 3.44 | 3.52 | 3.28 | 3.61 | 3.44 |
| 398 | 4.30 | 4.11 | 3.70 | 3.70 | 3.44 | 3.44 |
| 510 | 4.40 | 3.36 | 3.44 | 3.07 | 3.21 | 3.23 |
| 366 | 4.30 | 3.89 | 3.21 | 3.29 | 3.34 | 3.39 |
| 396 | 4.30 | 3.44 | 3.44 | 3.21 | 3.36 | 3.52 |
| 350 | 4.20 | 3.70 | 3.89 | 3.45 | 3.63 | 3.81 |
| 380 | 4.20 | 3.36 | 3.35 | 3.06 | 3.28 | 3.39 |

mathematical function is needed to develop an equation that fits the form of the performance curve.

After several trial analyses, the following mathematical form was selected because it fits the actual measured performance data for the 25 AASHO sections.
$W_{18}^{\prime}=\left\{\rho \ln [(3 / y)-1]+\beta \mid 10^{6}\right.$
where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{W}_{18}^{\prime}= & \text { total equivalent single-axle loads to reduce the } \\
& \text { serviceability index from } \mathrm{P} 1 \text { to } \mathrm{P} 2, \\
\beta= & -50.08826-3.77485 \mathrm{H}+30.64386(\mathrm{H})^{1 / 2} \\
\rho & =-6.69703+0.13879 \mathrm{H}^{2} \text {, and } \\
\mathrm{y} & =\mathrm{P} 2+\{3.0 /[\exp (-\beta / \rho)+1]\}-\mathrm{P} 1 .
\end{aligned}
$$

The standard error of the estimate of $\log \mathrm{W}_{18}^{\prime}$ is 0.22 . The adequacy of Equation 3 to predict the performance
of the 25 sections over a 16 -year period is shown in Figure 3, which can be directly compared with Figure 1. The new equation has a much smaller standard error ( 0.22 versus 0.31 ); the difference can be seen in the figures. Individual plots for the $203-$, $241-$, $274-$, and $318-\mathrm{mm}$ (8-, $9.5-, 11-$, and $12.5-\mathrm{in}$ ) thick slabs are shown in Figure 4. Equation 3 fits the long-term performance data much better than did Equation 1.

This expression permits only an evaluation of the effect of PCC slab thickness and terminal and initial serviceability index on equivalent $80-\mathrm{kN}$ load applications. Therefore, it was extended so that other variables could be included, such as the k -value and the PCC modulus of rupture, by using the Westergaard edge-stress equation in a way similar to that in which the Spangler corner equation was incorporated into the original AASHO equation (4). The following equation was obtained:

$$
\begin{align*}
\log W_{18}= & \log W_{18}^{\prime}+(3.893-0.706 \mathrm{P} 2) \log \\
& \times(\mathrm{F} 28 / 690) \times 4 \log \left[\left(8.789^{0.75} / \mathrm{M}\right)+0.359\right] \\
& \div\left\{4 \log \left[\left(\mathrm{Z}^{0.25} \times 0.540 \mathrm{H}^{0.75}\right) / \mathrm{M}\right]+0.589\right\} \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{M}= & \left(1.6 \mathrm{a}^{2}+\mathrm{H}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}-0.675 \mathrm{H}, \\
\mathrm{a}= & \text { radius of applied edge load (in), } \\
\mathrm{F} 28= & \text { modulus of rupture used in design }(28-\mathrm{d}, 3 \mathrm{rd} \\
& \text { point load adjusted for variability) }=\mathrm{FF} \\
& -\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{Fcv} / 100) \mathrm{FF}, \\
\mathrm{FF}= & \text { mean modulus of rupture at } 28 \mathrm{~d}, 3 \mathrm{rd} \text { point load } \\
& \left(\mathrm{lbf} / \mathrm{in}^{2}\right), \\
\mathrm{Fcv}= & \text { coefficient of variation of modulus of rupture } \\
& \text { (percent), and } \\
\mathrm{C=}= & 1.03, \text { constant that represents a confidence } \\
& \text { level of } 85 \text { percent. }
\end{aligned}
$$

The Westergaard edge-load equation was used because the fatigue analysis and field observations of the distress, as discussed by Darter (2), show that the edge of the slab is the critical stress point.

Based on these results, Equation 4 is the best performance equation derived and is believed to be adequate for design purposes. Its standard error is 0.22 based on 150 data points from the 25 AASHO sections (which is the same as the standard error of Equation 1).

Figure 3. Accuracy of new design (Equation 4).


## CLIMATIC EFFECT

Performance data were collected from 12 plain-jointed concrete projects located in eight states. These projects ranged in age from 6 to 34 years and the total number of $80-\mathrm{kN}$ ( $18-\mathrm{kip}$ ) ESA Ls in their heaviest traveled lanes ranged up to 39 million.

Analyses were conducted to determine whether the pavements in regions different from Illinois showed different performances. Four general climatic regionswet and freezing (WF); wet, but not freezing (W); dry and freezing (DF); and dry, but not freezing (D)-were chosen based on precipitation (PPN), potential evapotranspiration (EVT), frost heave, and freeze-thaw damage as defined below ( $1 \mathrm{~m}=39.4 \mathrm{in}$ ).

| Climatic Region | PPN and EVT (m) | Frost Heave and Freeze-Thaw Damage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WF | $\mathrm{PPN} \geqslant \mathrm{EVT}$ or PPN $\geqslant 0.76$ | Occurs in pavements in region |
| W | PPN $\geqslant E V T$ or PPN $\geqslant 0.76$ | Does not occur in pavements in region |
| DF | PPN < EVT | Occurs in pavements in region |
| D | PPN < EVT | Does not occur in pavements in region |

[Generally, frost heave and freeze-thaw damage occur in areas that have a mean freezing index $>0$ (7)]. A climatic factor (CF) was defined as follows:
$C F=W_{18 \text { (computed) }} / W_{18 \text { (actual) }}$
where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{W}_{18}(\text { computed })= \text { total number of } 80-\mathrm{kN} \text { ESALs to } \\
& \text { reduce serviceability index from } \\
& \text { initial value to terminal value com- } \\
& \text { puted by using Equation } 4 .
\end{aligned}
$$

CF can theoretically range from less than 0.1 to more than 1.0; when it equals 1.0, there is no significant climatic effect for a given pavement. A computation of CF for each of the pavements is given in Table 5. There is considerable scatter in each climatic region, but the results indicate that pavements perform somewhat differently in the different climatic regions.

| Region | CF Range | Mean CF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WF | 0.64-1.45 | 1.02 |
| DF | 0.79-1.26 | 1.02 |
| W | 0.56-1.12 | 0.84 |
| D | 0.29-0.71 | 0.47 |

These data indicate, for example, that similar plainjointed concrete pavements constructed in D-climates would last about twice as long as those in W-climates. However, additional data are needed to further verify these results.

T he following values are recommended for use in design.

| Region |  | Design Value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| WF |  | 1.0 |
| W | 0.9 |  |
| DF | 1.0 |  |
| D | 0.6 |  |

The relation between the number of $80-\mathrm{kN}$ ESALs predicted (by using Equations 4 and 5) and the number

Table 5. Data used to compute climatic factors.

| Project <br> No. | Climatic <br> Region | H (cm) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FF } \\ & (\mathrm{MPa}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{K}^{\mathrm{a}} \\ & \left(\mathrm{MN} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Serviceability Index | $\mathrm{W}_{10}$ (millions) |  | CF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Calculated ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Actual ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |
| 1-3 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | WF | 20.3 | 4.77 | 31.3 | 1.7 | 15.44 | 11.16 | 1.38 |
| 4-6 | WF | 24.1 | 4.77 | 31.3 | 2.8 | 15.07 | 11.32 | 1.33 |
| 7-10 | WF | 24.1 | 4.77 | 31.3 | 3.1 | 12.25 | 13.75 | 0.89 |
| 11-14 | WF | 24.1 | 4.77 | 31.3 | 3.2 | 11.40 | 17.82 | 0.64 |
| 15-17 | WF | 27.9 | 4.77 | 31.3 | 3.1 | 20.42 | 14.09 | 1.45 |
| 18-22 | WF | 27.9 | 4.77 | 31.3 | 3.4 | 15.70 | 18.94 | 0.83 |
| 23-25 | WF | 31.7 | 4.77 | 31.3 | 3.6 | 18.62 | 19.47 | 0.96 |
| 32 | WF | 25.4 | 5.18 | 53.6 | 3.0 | 22.83 | 35.93 | 0.64 |
| 36 | WF | 25.4 | 4.15 | 31.3 | 2.5 | 20.87 | 18.73 | 1.11 |
| 37 | WF | 22.9 | 4.48 | 109.0 | 3.9 | 6.11 | 6.53 | 0.94 |
| 26 | W | 22.9 | 4.83 | 52.2 | 3.9 | 6.08 | 5.42 | 1.12 |
| 33 | W | 20.3 | 4.88 | 54.3 | 3.4 | 12.16 | 21.74 | 0.56 |
| 30 | DF | 22.9 | 4.73 | 72.7 | 4.0 | 5.12 | 5.12 | 1.00 |
| 34 | DF | 20.3 | 4.88 | 96.0 | 3.4 | 8.10 | 6.45 | 1.25 |
| 35 | DF | 20.3 | 4.88 | 99.8 | 3.6 | 6.97 | 8.83 | 0.79 |
| 27 | D | 20.3 | 4.73 | 122.7 | 3.0 | 10.29 | 14.57 | 0.71 |
| 28 | D | 20.3 | 4.73 | 136.2 | 3.0 | 11.58 | 39.65 | 0.29 |
| 31 | D | 22.9 | 5,08 | 54.3 | 3.2 | 12.57 | 30.23 | 0.42 |

Note: $1 \mathrm{~cm}=0.4 \mathrm{in}, 1 \mathrm{MPa}=145 \mathrm{lbf} / \mathrm{in}^{2}$, and $1 \mathrm{MN} / \mathrm{m}^{3}=3.68 \mathrm{lbf} / \mathrm{in}^{3}=$
Mean of lowest 9 months on top of subbase.
Computed from Equation 4 .
Computed from trafic datat that had similar slab thickness and traffic were combined

Figure 4. Comparisons of original AASHO performance (Equation 2) with new design (Equation 4) for slabs of varying thickness.


Figure 5. Comparison of actual (computed from traffic data) with predicted (computed by using Equations 4 and 5) ESALs over life of each project.
of $80-\mathrm{kN}$ ESA LS computed (or actual) for all pavements is shown in Figure 5. The total $80-\mathrm{kN}$ ESAL data were computed based on the heaviest traveled lane from the
time the pavement was opened to traffic until the date of the survey at which the serviceability index was determined. The computed ESALs were adjusted by the recommended climatic factors. The standard error of prediction of Equations 4 and 5 is 0.175 .

## TERMINAL SERVICEABILITY INDEX FOR LOW-MAINTENANCE DESIGN

A terminal serviceability index must be selected for design. The value selected affects (a) the initial construction cost of the pavement, (b) the probability that structural distress will occur that requires maintenance, and (c) the costs to users caused by rough pavements. The higher the terminal servic eability index, the more substantial the structure must be and, therefore, the higher the construction cost of the pavement. However,
the higher the terminal serviceability index, the lower the maintenance cost and the costs to users from rough pavements and maintenance operations.

Figure 6 (8) shows that the total user costs at three different average daily traffic (ADT) rates over a $20-$ year life span increase dramatically as the terminal serviceability at the 20th year is decreased from 3.5 to 2.0. The rate of increase is very high for a terminal serviceability of less than 3.0.

The loss of serviceability of a jointed concrete pavement is caused by several types of distress. A previous analysis (8) indicated that linear cracking, faulting at joints and cracks, spalling of joints and cracks, and differential settlement of the slabs (causing roughness) are the major causes of loss of serviceability. As the serviceability index decreases from its initial value after construction, the probability that the pavement will require mainlemance increases. A plot of serviceability index versus the percentage of projects showing relatively low maintenance performance is shown in Figure 7 for all 37 projects (pavements having less than 0.3 percent of their areas patched were considered to be low maintenance). All the pavements that had serviceability indexes of 3.6 or more showed low maintenance performance, but those that had serviceability indexes of less than 2.7 had all received maintenance, some of which was extensive. The 50th percentile for receiving maintenance is a serviceability index of 3.0 .

B ased on these results and the desirability of keeping construction costs as low as possible, a design terminal serviceability index in the range of 3.0 to 3.5 is the minimum acceptable. A minimum value of 3.0 is selected because it provides a reasonable ensurance that little or no maintenance will be required before the pavement reaches this value and because costs to users do not increase significantly at this value.

## DESIGN APPLICATION

A sensitivity analysis of Equations 4 and 5 is given to illustrate the effects of five design parameters-the slab

Figure 6. Total extra costs to users versus terminal serviceability for different traffic conditions.

Figure 7. Effect of serviceability on maintenance requirements.


Figure 8. Sensitivity of Equation 4 over a range of conditions.

thickness, the modulus of rupture of PCC, the modulus of foundation reaction, the climatic factor, and the total number of $80-\mathrm{kN}$ ESALs applied in the design lane. The relative effects of these variables are shown in Figure 8 in which all of the curves are developed for a terminal serviceability index of 3.0 . These curves show that each of the parameters has a significant effect on pavement life as measuifed by the number of $00-\mathrm{kN}$ DisA Lis. Examples of the effects of each parameter are shown below in terms of the change in number of $80-\mathrm{kN}$ ESA Ls caused by changes in each of the other parameters (1 $\mathrm{MPa}=145 \mathrm{lbf} / \mathrm{in}^{2}, 1 \mathrm{MN} / \mathrm{m}^{3}=3.68 \mathrm{lbf} / \mathrm{in}^{3}$, and $1 \mathrm{~cm}=$ $0.39 \mathrm{in})$.

| Design Parameter | Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In Parameter | In Millions of 80-kN ESALs |
| Modulus of rupture, MPa | 4.1 to 5.5 | 9.2 to 16.5 |
| k -value of foundation, $\mathrm{MN} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ | 27.1 to 136 | 9.2 to 14.5 |
| Slab thickness, cm | 23 to 28 | 9.2 to 20.0 |
| Climatic region | WF to D | 9.2 to 15.3 |

A variation over the typical range of each parameter produces a significant change in the number of $80-\mathrm{kN}$ ESALs. (A typical lane loading for a heavily trafficked pavement is 1 million $80-\mathrm{kN}$ ESALs/year, which means that these are equivalent to years of pavement life.)

A graphical solution to Equation 4 is shown in Figure 9 for a terminal serviceability index of 3.0 . The use of this chart in design is illustrated below. Assume the following parameters and solve for the required slab thickness:

| Parameter | Value |
| :--- | :--- |
| Climatic region | WF |
| Millions of $80-\mathrm{kN}$ ESALs | 20.0 |
| k-value on top of subbase, $\mathrm{MN} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ | 27.1 |
| $\mathrm{~F} 28, \mathrm{MPa}$ | 4.1 |

Therefore, the required PCC slab thickness is 279 mm (11 in). The total number of $80-\mathrm{kN}$ ESALs is not reduced because the project is located in a WF climate, and the $C F=1.0$.

If the pavement were located in a D-climate, the required slab thickness would be calculated as follows: Millions of $80-\mathrm{kN}$ ESALs $=20.0 \times 0.6=12.0$, and slab thickness $=241 \mathrm{~mm}(9.5 \mathrm{in})$. Here, the traffic computed in the design lane is reduced by the recommended $\mathrm{CF}=$ 0.6 for a D-climate. [Additional recommendations on obtaining design input values are given by Darter (1)].

## JOINTS, SHOULDERS, AND SUBBASE

Joint design is also a very important consideration. Most of the projects used in the development of the design procedure had $4.6-\mathrm{m}$ ( $15-\mathrm{ft}$ ) contraction-type joint spacing with dowel bars. Field studies have shown that dowel bars must be used in all climates, except possibly D. If dowels are not used, serious faulting may develop under heavy traffic as discussed in detail by Darter (2) and Packard (9). Joint spacing must also be limited to about 4.6 m because field studies have shown that longer slabs show much greater transverse cracking. Adequate high-durability sealants must be used to prevent water and other materials from infiltrating. Shoulders must be designed for low maintenance. This requires either PCC-tied shoulders or full-depth asphalt concrete shoulders with sealed longitudinal joints (2). The subbase should be of high-quality, stabilized nonerodable material.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. A new structural design procedure has been developed for heavily trafficked jointed concrete pavements. The procedure is based on the serviceabilityperformance concept and a fatigue-damage analysis. Only the development of the serviceability-performance analysis is described here, which was derived from long-term performance data from 25 pavement sections in service on I-80 in Illinois. A major objective of the procedure is to provide zero-maintenance (very-low structural maintenance) performance.
2. The new design equation represents an improvement over the existing AASHO equation and fits the long-

Figure 9. Graphical solution of Equation 4 for use in design of low-maintenance, heavily trafficked, plain-jointed concrete pavements.

term 16-year data much better. Performance data were obtained from 12 projects located in various climates in the United States and compared with the performance of the Illinois pavements. Significant differences were found, and a climatic factor was introduced to adjust the design for varying climates.
3. A terminal serviceability index of 3.0 is recommended for design of heavily trafficked pavements to keep structural maintenance requirements at a minimum throughout the design period.
4. Although this paper emphasizes the determination of adequate slab thickness, several other design factorsincluding shoulders, subbase, joint spacing and load transfer, subdrainage, and joint sealant-are of equal importance.
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## Abridgment

# Pavement Design Characteristics of In-Service Portland Cement Concrete 

Thomas W. Kennedy, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Texas, Austin


#### Abstract

The primary objectives of this investigation were (a) to determine the modulus of elasticity and the fatigue life of in-service concrete under repeated loads, (b) to estimate the variations in these properties, and (c) to determine the changes in the modulus of elasticity caused by repeated loads. Cores from four recently constructed portland cement concrete pavements in Texas were tested by using both the static and the repeatedload indirect tensile tests (Table 1), and the tensile strengths, fatigue lives, and moduli of elasticity and the variations of these properties were estimated.


## EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

The indirect tensile test involves loading a cylindrical specimen with either static or repeated compressive loads that act parallel to and along the vertical diametral plane. To distribute it and to maintain a constant loading area, the compressive load is distributed through $13-\mathrm{mm}(0.5-\mathrm{in})$ wide steel loading strips that are curved at the interface to fit the specimen.

This loading configuration develops relatively uniform tensile stresses that are perpendicular to and along the vertical axis and are fairly uniform over approximately the center 70 percent of the specimen. Failure generally occurs by splitting along the vertical axis. Estimates of the modulus of elasticity were obtained by using the applied load, the corresponding horizontal deformations ( $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{R}}$ ), and an assumed Poisson's ratio.

The test specimens were cut from the cores and were 51 mm (2 in) high and approximately 102 mm (4 in) in diameter. A capping compound of high-strength gypsum plaster was applied to smooth the irregularities produced by coring. The apparaius used in the capping produced a radius of curvature that was the same as the radius of the specimens. All specimens were from the lower portion of the core.

In the static tests, a preload of $89 \mathrm{~N}(20 \mathrm{lbf})$, which corresponds to a tensile stress of about $11 \mathrm{kPa}(1.5$
$\mathrm{lbf} / \mathrm{in}^{2}$ ), was applied to the specimen to prevent impact loading and to minimize the effect of seating the loading strip. The specimen was then loaded at a rate of 13 $\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{min}(0.5 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{min})$. Loads and vertical deformation were continously recorded on an $\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{Y}$ plotter.

In the repeated-load test, a preload of 89 N was used to prevent impact loading and to reduce movement of the specimen. Then, repeated total loads that produced total tensile stresses ranging from 2.17 to 3.56 MPa ( 315 to $516 \mathrm{lbf} / \mathrm{in}^{2}$ ) were applied in the form of a haversine at a frequency of 1 Hz with a 0.4 -s load duration and a $0.6-\mathrm{s}$ rest period.

All tests were conducted at $24^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(75^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$ and continued until failure, which was considered to occur when the specimen fractured completely. The recoverable (or resilient) horizontal deformations were measured at 25 , 50 , and 100 cycles and then periodically monitored during the remainder of the test.

The properties analyzed were the indirect tensile strength, the resilient modulus of elasticity, and the fatigue life, i.e., the number of load applications required to completely fracture the specimen. Values of the indirect tensile strength and the resilient modulus of elasticity were calculated by using the equations

Table 1. Summary of project data.

| District <br> Project <br> Identification | Type of <br> Aggregate | Cement <br> Factor <br> $\left(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right.$ ) | Water-to- <br> Cement Ratio | Beam <br> Strength <br> (MPa) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 E | Limestone | 240 | 0.58 | 448 |
| 17 B | Gravel | 252 | 059 | 39 n |
| 17 M | Gravel | 252 | 0.59 | 396 |
| 19 B | Iron ore, slag, <br> and gravel | $279-330$ | $0.43-0.53$ | 396 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]
[^0]:    Note: $1 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}=0.018$ sack $/ \mathrm{yd}^{3}$ and $1 \mathrm{MPa}=145 \mathrm{lbf} / \mathrm{in}^{2}$,
    ${ }^{3}$ Either by mass or by mass to volume.
    ${ }^{\text {b }} 7$-d field curing, center-point loading, using cast beams,

