Research Report
UKTRP-84-23

PAVEMENT THICKNESS DESIGNS UTILIZING LOW-STRENGTH (POZZOLANIC) BASE AND SUBBASE MATERIALS

by

Gary W. Sharpe

Robert C. Deen

Herbert F. Southgate

and

Mark Anderson

Transportation Research Program
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

August 1984

PAVEMENT THICKNESS DESIGNS UTILIZING LOW-STRENGTH (POZZOLANIC) BASE AND SUBBASE MATERIALS

by
Gary W. Sharpe
Robert C. Deen
Herbert F. Southgate
and
Mark Anderson

Transportation Research Program
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

ABSTRACT

This paper presents information whereby laboratory test data for pozzolanic base and subbase materials may be combined with elastic layer theory and a limiting strain criterion to determine thickness designs equivalent to conventional asphaltic concrete and crushed stone pavement structures. A summary of laboratory testing in Kentucky also is presented. An example thickness design determination is presented and includes an economic comparison of alternative designs with the conventional asphaltic - crushed stone thickness design.

INTRODUCTION

NATURE OF POZZOLANIC MATERIALS

The use of pozzolans in cementing materials antedates recorded history. Ancient Egyptians used a cement composed of calcined impure gypsum. The Greeks and Romans used calcined limestone and later developed pozzolanic cements by grinding together lime and a volcanic ash.

The material added to hydraulic cements by the Romans to improve quality was a loosely consolidated rock of volcanic origin, consisting of various fragments of pumice, obsidian, feldspar, pyroxines, quartz, etc. The name **pozzolana** was first applied to that material; however, the term has been extended to include not only natural volcanic materials, but diatomaceous earths and other highly siliceous rocks and artificial products. Pozzolans are defined as siliceous materials, even though not cementitious in themselves, since they contain constituents that will combine with lime in the presence of water at ordinary temperatures to form compounds that possess cementing properties.

Naturally occurring pozzolans include clays and shales, opaline materials, and volcanic tuffs and pumicites. Pozzolans may or may not require calcination to make them active. Most natural (and artifical) pozzolans require grinding to a high degree of fineness to make them suitable. Artifical pozzolans come from industrial byproducts or wastes and include fly ash (flue dust), silica fume, powdered brick, burnt clays and shales, and some slags.

USE OF LOW-STRENGTH MATERIALS

With the escalating costs of materials and construction for highways and streets, many agencies charged with the responsibility of designing and constructing highways are utilizing byproduct pozzolanic materials. Low-strength (pozzolanic) materials have been used fairly extensively in some areas of the United States as well as abroad. In general, pozzolanic materials have been used to stabilize an aggregate base or subbase by addition of fly ash and a source of lime to develop a cementitious reaction. Additionally, portland cement or cement kiln dust have been used to stabilize aggregate subbase and (or) base materials.

Until recently, the use of pozzolanic materials in highway and street construction in Kentucky was not often economically competitive with abundant supplies of high-quality aggregates. However, as costs of production and processing aggregate materials have increased, so has the feasibility of stabilized bases, and particularly pozzolanic base materials. To date, pozzolanic bases in Kentucky have been used primarily in low-volume traffic situations. Mixtures that have been considered recently and evaluated to some degree include the following:

- Lime kiln dust, fly ash, and dense-graded aggregate;
- Byproduct lime and dense-graded aggregate;
- Lime kiln dust, fly ash, dense-graded aggregate, and sand;
- Lime kiln dust, fly ash, and limestone mine screenings (waste material from limestone

quarrying operations); and

- "Scrubber sludge," quicklime, and dense-graded aggregate or pond ash.

Pozzolanic base or subbase materials have been utilized on an experimental basis for a number of Lexington, Kentucky, street projects. Two projects for the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet also are being evaluated. Thus, performance experience currently is limited, but at the same time evolutionary. Therefore, modifications in designs presented in this report may be required in the future to reflect additional experience and performance of field projects.

ELASTIC LAYER THEORY OF PAVEMENT THICKNESS DESIGN

Current thickness design procedures for both rigid and flexible pavements in Kentucky have been developed using elastic layer theory matched with pavement performance histories. Flexible thickness design procedures (1, 2) are supported by over 40 years of pavement performance experience and also have been related to AASHO Road Test data. Rigid pavement design procedures (3, 4, 5) have been related to performance experience embodied in design procedures of the Portland Cement Association (6) and the AASHO Road Test (7, 8).

Thickness designs in Kentucky (both flexible and rigid) are based on limiting strain criteria. A strain-repetitions failure criterion for flexible pavements was developed by matching theoretically computed strains with repetitions determined from historical pavement performance data and

previous empirical thickness design procedures. For rigid pavements, a limiting strain criterion was developed and related to the merged fatigue criteria of the Portland Cement Association and AASHTO thickness design procedures.

LOW-STRENGTH BASE AND SUBBASE MIXTURES

MATERIALS

Kentucky specifications (9) currently require pozzolanic mixtures used as base components of pavement structures to have unconfined compressive strengths greater than 600 psi at 7 days when specimens are prepared and cured in accordance with ASTM C 593. Mixtures used for bases normally have three components: fly ash, a source of lime (hydrated lime, quicklime, or lime kiln dust), and an aggregate. Cement or cement kiln dust have been substituted for the lime source.

Pozzolanic mixtures used as subbases are not generally required to have strengths as great as those for bases. There are no strength requirements in Kentucky for subbase applications. Recent experience on one project resulted in compressive strengths in the order of 300 psi at 7 days when cured according to ASTM C 593. Two mixtures that have potential as a subbase material have been investigated in the laboratory: 1) scrubber sludge, aggregate, and some form of lime and 2) aggregate stabilized with baghouse lime. Compressive strengths of 300 to 600 psi at 7 days when cured according to ASTM C 593 have been obtained.

Fly Ash

The properties of fly ash will vary dependent upon sources and properties of coal burned at the specific facility under consideration. The range of typical properties of fly ash are illustrated in Reference 10. The fly ash is silt-size spherical particles 0.015 to 0.050 mm in diameter.

Sources of Lime

Commercial sources of lime for use as a stabilizing material include quicklime and hydrated lime. Most highway agencies specify that lime materials shall meet requirements of ASTM C 207, Type N. Typical properties of limes used for stabilization are summarized in References 10 and 11.

The characteristics of lime and cement kiln dusts may vary significantly, dependent upon specifics for each producing location. Typical ranges of composition and physical properties of cement and lime kiln dusts are reported elsewhere (12). Lime kiln dusts used in Kentucky for laboratory and field analyses were within those typical ranges.

Scrubber sludge is a waste material obtained with the use of scrubbers to remove fly ash and residue from coal-burning processes of electric generating power plants. Scrubber sludge (flue gas desulfurization sludge) consists of fly ash and a lime dust slurry filter cake material. The filter cake is a compound of calcium sulfate and calcium sulfite. Quicklime or hydrated lime normally is added to the sludge for stabilization. Stabilization reactions begin

almost immediately after the combination of fly ash and lime to the dewatered sludge.

Aggregates

Aggregates for both base and subbase pozzolanic mixtures that have been investigated included dense-graded limestone aggregates, limestone mine screenings (byproduct of limestone quarrying operations), river sand, slag, and gravels. Additionally, pond ash waste material has been evaluated in the laboratory and may be an appropriate aggregate for a subbase. The predominant aggregate in Kentucky has been dense-graded limestone. Specifications for dense-graded aggregates and gravel bases in Kentucky are summarized in Table 1 (13).

Two types of aggregate -- dense-graded limestone aggregate and pond ash (also called bottom ash) -- have been used to prepare sludge-aggregate mixtures. The dense-graded aggregate meet specifications of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. Gradation tests as well as a slake-durability test (Kentucky method) (14) were performed on the pond ash. The slake-durability test resulted in 5 percent loss. Gradation specifications for dense-graded aggregate as well as gradations and characteristics of a pond ash material from one facility in Kentucky are presented in Figure 1. There was a disproportionate amount (outside specifications for compacted base) of plus 1-inch material for the pond ash. The large size of the coarse particles is an indication that the pond ash might be more suitable as a subbase material than as a base material.

SPECIMEN PREPARATION

All specimens for this study were prepared in general accordance with ASTM C 593(79) in 4-inch diameter by 4.6-inch molds. Deviations from that method involved the use of a 5.5-pound hammer and a 12-inch free fall instead of the specified 10-pound hammer and 18-inch drop. Moisture-density relationships were determined in accordance with ASTM D 698(79) instead of ASTM D 1557(79). Maximum dry density and optimum moisture content were determined using a polynomial curve-fitting procedure. A smoothing technique was used to eliminate localized changes in concavity.

Initial mixtures contained high percentages of fine particles, and compaction procedures were varied from those specified in ASTM C 593(79), which are more applicable to coarse mixes. Even though subsequent specimens involved coarser mixes, compaction techniques were kept constant so direct comparisons of engineering properties could be made.

All specimens prepared for or obtained from base course mixtures were submerged in water for 4 hours before testing for compressive strengths, as required by ASTM C 593(79). If slaking occurred, then the materials and (or) mixture proportions were eliminated from consideration as pavement components.

The only deviations from ASTM C 593 (79) occurred when aggregate-scrubber sludge mixtures were tested. It was not possible to submerge sludge specimens, because some began to slake immediately upon submergence. Slaking also prevented vacuum saturation or freeze-thaw testing. Strength testing

of scrubber sludge was performed without submergence. This deficiency, while considered acceptable for material proposed as a subbase where confinement is provided by base and pavement layers, is not appropriate for base course construction. ASTM C 593(79) also specifies accelerated curing at 100 F in a sealed container. Other curing conditions included ambient curing and combinations of accelerated and ambient curing. Certainly, additional research is necessary to develop specifications and variations thereof to adequately reflect needed characterizations of materials for specific applications.

TESTING

Unconfined compressive strength tests (ASTM C 39(72)), splitting tensile strength tests (ASTM C 496(71)), and tests for static-chord modulus (ASTM C 469(65)) were performed. During compressive strength tests, additional information was obtained by measuring deformation with deflection dial gauges. A computer program was developed to calculate and plot the static-chord modulus of elasticity (see Figure 2) from axial load and axial deformation data. To facilitate a computer solution, the modulus was calculated by a four-point least-squares fitting technique.

Attempts were made to measure lateral deformation during compressive strength testing for the purpose of obtaining data from which Poisson's ratio could be estimated. Poisson's ratio was estimated from the ratio of the slopes of the axial stress-axial strain curve and the axial stress-lateral strain curves. Techniques used to

measure lateral strains, however, did not produce consistent and reliable results. Therefore, the literature was searched to determine the experience of others (10, 15); values from 0.08 to 0.3, dependent upon stress level as a percentage of the ultimate, were indicated. A Poisson's ratio of 0.15 was assumed for all pozzolanic base mixtures (16) until sufficient reliable test data for Kentucky mixtures could be accumulated. A summary of results of recent laboratory analyses in Kentucky are presented in Table 2.

PAVEMENT THICKNESS DESIGN

DESIGN METHODOLOGIES

Structural Number

Other agencies have developed layer coefficients for pozzolanic base materials for use with the AASHTO Interim Guide for flexible pavement design (7). There has been considerable discussion regarding the use and reliability of layer coefficients compared with more rationally based design systems have been advocated by others.

A review of literature has indicated considerable variability among suggested layer coefficients for pozzolanic materials (10, 17, 18). The range of suggested coefficients varies from 0.20 to 0.44 with most recommendations in the order of 0.28 to 0.30 for pozzolanic base mixtures. Lesser values for structural coefficients are recommended for lower strength materials used as subbases.

Stress Ratio

Other thickness design procedures (19) use a failure criterion relating the ratio of flexural strength to modulus of rupture as a function of repetitions to failure. Flexural strength and modulus of rupture are determined from laboratory tests and analyses.

ELASTIC MODULUS FOR POZZOLANS

Early thickness designs utilizing pozzolans in Kentucky were restricted to low-volume city street applications (20) and related well to other design methodologies. The same evaluations using thickness design procedures (based on static-chord modulus) for low-fatigue city street applications resulted in somewhat unrealistic thickness requirements when applied to high-fatigue design levels. Comparisons with other design methodologies also indicated reasonable correlations at low fatigue levels but wide variations for high-fatigue applications. However, there was concern that elastic-layer parameters determined from some laboratory and field analyses did not completely account for the characteristics of pozzolanic materials.

A literature review indicated a wide range of elastic moduli for low-strength base and subbase materials dependent upon specific procedures used to determine the parameters. All studies reviewed indicated increasing elastic moduli for pozzolanic materials proportionate to increases in compressive strength and (or) tensile strength. However, magnitudes of elastic moduli did vary considerably for similar compressive strengths.

Initial estimates of elastic moduli in this study were determined by the static-chord method (ASTM C 469(65)) and generally were relatively low (30,000 psi to 300,000 psi) (see Figure 3). Elastic moduli for lime-fly ash mixtures reported in Reference 10 were on the order of 100,000 psi to 500,000 psi for similar levels of compressive stresses (see Figure 3). Even greater magnitudes of elastic moduli (1,600,000 psi to 3,300,000 psi) have been reported by others (12).

Least-squares regression analyses were used to evaluate trends of modulus of elasticity versus unconfined compressive strength and tensile strength for the various sources of data (Figure 3). The Kentucky relationship (for the static-chord modulus) is most conservative and was developed for a number of pozzolanic base mixtures evaluated in Kentucky. Resilient moduli presented in the FHWA report showed the greatest rate of change of modulus per unit of compressive stress while data from the NCHRP report indicated a somewhat lesser rate of change. Data presented in the FHWA report (12) are resilient moduli determined by repeated load testing for a range of fly ash-kiln dust ratios and also a variety of sources of fly ash and kiln dusts (lime and cement kiln dusts). Figures 3 and 4 illustrate trends of resilient modulus as a function of unconfined compressive strength and splitting tensile strength for all data. Additional plots have been developed for specific mixture proportions or components. Elastic moduli presented in Table 9 of Reference 10 were determined

from plate load tests. Median moduli and compressive strengths were used to develop the relationship presented in Figure 3. The relationship of compressive strength versus modulus of elasticity based on data reported in the NCHRP synthesis was selected as a "middle-of-the-road" criterion to determine design elastic moduli. Additional research is necessary to verify and refine this design criterion.

Kentucky laboratory analyses were based on ASTM C 469(65) and resulting values were essentially static moduli of elasticity. A Model 400 Road Rater was used to obtain deflection measurements from in-service pozzolanic pavements. Deflection data indicated considerable variability and are currently being evaluated in more detail. However, preliminary analyses indicate back-calculated moduli of 1,000,000 to 3,000,000 psi.

Ahlberg and Barenburg (15) reported flexural moduli of elasticity from 1,500,000 to 2,500,000 psi. Resilent moduli reported by Collins and Emery (12) varied from 370,000 to 3,300,000 psi. Others (10) have reported ranges of modulus from 100,000 psi at a compressive strength of 400 psi to a modulus of 500,000 psi at a compressive strength of 1,000 psi.

The modulus of elasticity of asphaltic concrete varies as a function of temperature and frequency of loading (21, 22). On the other hand, granular cohesionless materials have relatively constant moduli for frequencies of 0.1 to 50 Hz (23). For a soil that may be considered to behave as a linear viscoelastic solid, the elastic modulus is a function

of frequency (24). Hardin and Black (25, 26) have demonstrated dramatic variations of elastic moduli of cohesive soils at low frequencies (less than 0.1 Hz) because of creep phenomena. This partially explains observed variations in elastic moduli from static and dynamic tests. Futhermore, it also has been demonstrated that modulus varies as a function of strain amplitude (23, 25, 26), which varies considerably among test procedures.

Static moduli were not considered representative for actual traffic loading conditions. Resilient moduli are determined on the basis of repeated load tests at 1 to 2 Hz. Road Rater deflections were obtained at 25 Hz using a 600-pound force dynamic load and a 1,670-pound force static load. Others (15) estimated elastic moduli from tests for flexural strength. In view of the significant variations of both frequency and strain amplitude of actual traffic loadings, the need at this time for conservative design moduli is apparent. Additionally, Kentucky thickness design procedures, while predicated on a limiting strain-repetitions criterion, were verified initially by Benkelman beam defelection behavior where rebound deflections were obtained at low (creep) vehicle speeds (0.5 to 1.0 Hz) for an 18,000-pound axleload and were matched with theoretical deflections calculated using the Chevron N-layer program (27). Thus, an interim criterion relating compressive strength and modulus of elasticity is presented in Figure 3.

SUGGESTED DESIGN METHODOLOGY

Thickness design procedures in Kentucky (flexible and rigid) have been developed on the basis of limiting strain-repetitions criteria. The flexible pavement criterion limits vertical compressive strains at the top of the subgrade and the tensile strain at the bottom of the asphaltic concrete (1, 2, 28) (Figures 5 and 6). The rigid pavement design criterion is an expression of a stress-ratio fatigue criterion (3, 4, 5) in terms of tensile strain versus repetitions for various combinations of modulus of elasticity and modulus of rupture. The same approach was used to develop a tensile strain-repetitions criterion for pozzolanic base materials (Figure 7).

For the pozzolanic material, the ratio of flexural stress to compressive stress at failure was estimated to be 0.25 at the ultimate compressive strength (15). Based on current Kentucky specifications of a minimum compressive strength of 600 psi, the flexural stress for pozzolanic base materials is 150 psi. The minimum design modulus of elasticity from Figure 3 is 250,000 psi. The assumed Poisson's ratio of 0.15 for pozzolanic materials (16) is near the value used to develop rigid pavement designs in Kentucky. The shape of the fatigue envelope used by the Portland Cement Association (6) for portland cement concrete pavements was applied to pozzolanic materials and defines the relationship of ratio of allowable tensile stress to repetitions of an 18,000-pound single axleload (3, 4, 5). The allowable tensile stress versus repetitions relationship

for pozzolanic materials is the Portland Cement Association curve shifted according to the following relationship:

Tensile Strain = (Flexural Strength) x (Stress Ratio)
÷ (Modulus of Elasticity)

where the stress ratio value corresponds to a specific value for repetitions of an 18,000-pound equivalent axleload. More specifically, for pozzolanic base mixtures,

Tensile Strain = (150 psi) x (Stress Ratio)
÷ (250,000 psi).

The above equations convert the ratio of allowable stress ratio to allowable tensile strain at the bottom of the pozzolanic base (see Figure 7). The resulting criterion, when compared to one proposed by Thompson (19), is slightly more conservative. Experience with pozzolanic pavements in Kentucky has been limited; the proposed criterion also may adjustment based on field performance.

Recent studies (3, 4, 5) have involved the application of work and energy principles to combine all strain components into a single resultant. Strain energy density is the energy at a point in a body to resist the energy imposed on that body by an outside load and is equal and opposite to the WORK at that point, as defined by classical physics (29, 30). The strain energy density for each point in the pavement structure must be summed (integrated) to obtain the total strain energy, which would equal the total work caused by the external force. Strain energy density, or work, at a given location within the structure may be used as the basis of design rather than using a single

strain, such as the vertical compressive strain, as the criterion. Recent investigations of both flexible and rigid pavements have utilized concepts of equal work as the bases of thickness designs.

To develop a design procedure utilizing pozzolans in the pavement structure, the elastic layer theory embodied in the Chevron N-layer computer program (27) was used first to determine thickness requirements for conventional designs (1/3 asphaltic concrete and 2/3 crushed stone base) using traditional materials based on criteria presented in Figures 5 and 6 (1, 2, 28). Work at critical locations -- bottom of the asphaltic concrete and (or) top of the subgrade -- were determined and used as the controlling fatigue value for the respective materials at their critical locations.

Elastic layer theory then was used to determine strains and work for a matrix of thicknesses of pozzolanic base (of varying moduli of elasticity) combined with several thicknesses of asphaltic concrete surfacing. Results of those analyses were used to develop a series of graphs similar to Figures 8 and 9.

Determination of an equivalent structural thickness design utilizing pozzolans may be determined by matching the critical strains and work for a conventional pavement design with companion work and strains for some combination of thicknesses of asphaltic concrete surfacing and pozzolanic base. The work and the vertical compressive strain at the top of the subgrade for the control (conventional) pavement were used in combination with Figures 8 and 9 (and other

similar graphs) to determine thicknesses of pozzolanic bases corresponding to specific elastic moduli and various thicknesses of asphaltic concrete surfacing. Thicknesses of pozzolanic bases will be slightly increased using a criterion based on work compared to vertical compressive strain. Resultant thicknesses of pozzolanic bases were used to develop Figure 10. The specific thickness of pozzolanic base may then be determined dependent upon the desired modulus of elasticity and the desired thickness of asphaltic concrete surfacing. Modulus of elasticity may be related to compressive strength by Figure 3.

Design thicknesses (based on the work at the top of the subgrade) were checked against the limiting tensile strain criterion (Figure 6) (1, 2, 28) at the bottom of the asphaltic concrete and the limiting tensile strain at the bottom of the pozzolanic base (Figure 7) to verify that fatigue of the asphaltic concrete and pozzolanic base were not controlling. Experience in Kentucky has shown that tensile strain at the bottom of the asphaltic concrete layer is normally not the controlling design criterion because the relatively "stiff" moduli of pozzolanic bases limit the magnitude of tensile strains at the interface between asphaltic concrete and pozzolanic base.

EXAMPLE DESIGN

Phase I of the design procedure involves the determination of thickness requirements for a conventional asphaltic concrete pavement. Consider, for example, the following design conditions:

Design 18-kip EAL's = 5,000,000

Design Subgrade = CBR 9

Using Kentucky thickness design curves, a conventional asphaltic concrete pavement would be as follows:

Asphaltic Concrete Surface and (or) Base = 7 inches

Dense-graded Aggregate Base = 14 inches

In Phase II, structurally equivalent designs using pozzolanic base materials are determined. Critical strains and work for conventional designs are determined using the Chevron N-layer computer program (Figures 8 and 9). Limiting strains corresponding to those of conventional structures may be used to determine thickness requirements for pozzolanic bases for a constant thickness of asphaltic concrete. Analyses of a number of asphaltic concrete thicknesses may be used to develop Figure 10. The specific thickness design is based on estimated elastic modulus obtained from an analyses of compressive strength data (Figure 3). Three alternative designs are summarized in Table 3, which illustrates also the economic comparisons with conventional designs.

ECONOMICS OF THE USE OF POZZOLANIC MATERIALS

The major benefit associated with the use of a pozzolanic base is the substitution of a less expensive material for a portion of a more expensive component of the pavement structure. Pozzolanic bases may be especially advantageous as alternatives to very thick conventional asphaltic concrete pavements or thick full-depth asphaltic

concrete pavements where deep rutting may be a potential problem. Pozzolanic bases also may be a cost effective alternative for some rigid pavements. This, however, has not been considered in Kentucky.

Table 3 summarizes an economic comparison of a conventional asphaltic concrete pavement with three theoretically equivalent thickness designs using pozzolanic bases. Thickness designs for the pozzolanic bases were determined on the basis of a design modulus of 350,000 psi for the pozzolanic material; this corresponds to a 7-day compressive strength (ASTM C 593 curing) of 800 psi. The quantities are actual quantities for a project for which a pozzolanic base is being considered.

OTHER FACTORS

EFFECTS OF CURING

Effects of curing were detected in the field by deflection measurements. Table 4 presents a summary of deflection data obtained directly on a 6-inch layer of lime kiln dust - fly ash - dense-graded aggregate base for three city street projects. Design proportions for Site 1 and Site 2 were the same: 8 percent lime kiln dust, 8 percent fly ash, and 84 percent dense-graded aggregate. Design proportions for Site 3 were 6 percent lime kiln dust, 6 percent fly ash, and 88 percent dense-graded aggregate. Field deflection measurements were obtained at similar ages for all sites: 7 to 9 days after placement. Prior

laboratory and field data indicated subgrade conditions were similar for the three projects (CBR 4).

Site 1 was placed in mid August and curing conditions were very favorable -- temperatures ranged from 60 F to 80 F and the bituminous curing membrane was in good condition. Site 2 was placed in early November when air temperatures were much cooler (40 F to 60 F). The bituminous curing membrane was not placed immediately after compaction. Site 3 was placed in early May. Air temperatures were unseasonably cool and rainfall was record setting. Site 3 was drenched immediately after placement of the bituminous curing membrane, and the membrane was "washed" away in some locations. In those areas, the surface of the base course was unbound or poorly bound. The site also was subjected to significant rainfall during the initial 7-day curing period. It is apparent from the deflection data that greater strengths resulted for more favorable curing conditions. Deflection data also indicated the influence of the bituminous curing membrane on proper curing and associated strength gains.

Both laboratory (Table 2) and field data (Table 4) indicated that high temperatures and moisture retention are primary contributors to good curing and associated gains in strength. Thus, placement of pozzolanic base materials is recommended when air temperatures are expected to be greater than 60 F for at least 7 days. Placement of a bituminous curing membrane is apparently essential for the development of high early strengths.

AUTOGENOUS HEALING

Another aspect associated with low-strength pozzolanic base materials is the potential for reflective cracking of the overlying asphaltic concrete surfacing. It is anticipated that greater amounts of cracking will occur during curing of higher-strength pozzolans.

Results of the deflection testing of the three test sites reported above stimulated additional interest in the effects of curing and autogenous healing. A series of lime kiln dust - fly ash - dense-graded aggregate mixtures were prepared in 6-inch diameter by 12-inch cylinders and cured at room temperature for 28 days. Compressive strengths of those specimens were 231 psi for Mixture A and 209 psi for Mixture B. The aggregate portion for Mixture A consisted of 84 percent dense-graded limestone; Mixture B contained 42 percent sand and 42 percent limestone mine screenings. The fine portions of both mixtures contained 8 percent each of fly ash and lime kiln dust. That was considerably less than for specimens compacted and cured according to ASTM C 593 (4-inch high by 4.6-inch diameter cylinder cured at 100 F for 7 days). Compressive strengths in those cases were 1,501 psi for Mixture A and 1,194 for Mixture B. The 6- by 12-inch cylinders tested for compressive strengths at 7 days were not destroyed, but were sealed in plastic bags and cured to an age of 240 days. The cylinders were again subjected to compressive testing. Compressive strengths at that time were 870 psi for Mixture A and 1,367 psi for Mixture B. Significant strength gains may be partially

attributable to long-term strength gain characteristics of pozzolanic materials and also autogenous healing of the initial failure locations.

Autogenous healing apparently occurs in pozzolanic base specimens if left undisturbed and curing conditions remain favorable. However, conditions in the field may not be duplicated by laboratory conditions. Autogeneous healing of cracks in field installations may be slowed by the stressing under traffic loadings. Field curing conditions (temperature and moisture) also may vary considerably.

CLOSING COMMENTS

Experience in Kentucky relative to the performance and life-cycle costs of pozzolanic pavements almost has been nonexistent. Thickness design procedures for pozzolanic pavements have been developed by other agencies for other regions, but the extent to which Kentucky conditions are represented could not be determined at this time. This paper represents initial efforts to develop a thickness design methodology for pozzolanic pavements that is related to performance histories in Kentucky as well as to laboratory test data characterizing the properties of pozzolans. It is anticipated that the procedures presented herein may be the nucleus for the development of a complete set of thickness design curves using pozzolanic or other low-strength base materials.

Additional research and experience relative to life-cycle costs, durability of materials, fatigue-shear

strain relationships, and pavement performance will be necessary to refine procedures and methodologies for thickness design. Pavement sections are currently in place and are being monitored to provide such data for future analyses and refinements. Economic analyses apparently indicate competitiveness with other materials for initial construction.

A major criticism of pozzolanic pavements relates to reflective cracking of asphaltic concrete layers associated with shrinkage cracking in the pozzolanic base. Additional evaluations are currently ongoing. One technique with significant potential involves the use of stress-relief layers between the pozzolanic and asphaltic concrete layers. Benefits are yet to be determined.

REFERENCES

1. Havens, J. H.; Deen, R. C.; and Southgate, H. F.; "Design Guide for Bituminous Concrete Pavement Structures," Research Report UKTRP-81-17, Kentucky Transportation Research Program, University of Kentucky, Lexington, August 1981.

2. Southgate, H. F.; Deen, R. C.; and Havens, J. H.; "Development of a Thickness Design System for bituminous Concrete Pavements," Research Report UKTRP-81-20, Kentucky Transportation Research Program, University of Kentucky, Lexington, November 1981.

3. Southgate, H. F.; Havens, J. H.; Deen, R. C.; and Newberry, D. C. Jr; "Development of a Thickness Design

System for Portland Cement Concrete Pavements," Research Report UKTRP-83-5, Kentucky Transportation Research Program, University of Kentucky, Lexington, February 1983.

4. Southgate, H. F.; and Deen, R. C.; "Thickness Design Curves for Portland Cement Concrete Pavements," Research Report UKTRP-84-3, Kentucky Transportation Research Program, University of Kentucky, Lexington, February 1984.

5. Southgate, H. F.; and Deen, R. C.; "Thickness Design Procedure for Portland Cement Concrete Pavements," Research Report UKTRP-84-6, Kentucky Transportation Research Program, University of Kentucky, Lexington, March 1984.

6. "Thickness Design for Concrete Pavements," Portland Cement Association, Skokie, Il, 1966.

7. **Interim Guide for Design of Pavement Structures,** American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Washington, DC, 1972 and 1981.

8. **The AASHO Road Test Report 5, Pavement Research,** Special Report 61E, Highway Research Board, Washington, DC, 1962.

9. Special Provision 83(70), "Fly Ash Stabilized Bases," Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, Frankfort.

10. **Lime - Fly Ash - Stabilized Bases and Subbases,** National Cooperative Highway Research Program Synthesis of Highway Practice No. 37, Transportation Research Board, Washington, DC, 1976.

11. **Chemical Lime Facts,** Bulletin 214, 3rd Edition, National Lime Association, 1973.

12. Collins, R. J.; and Emery, J. J.; "Kiln Dust - Fly Ash Systems for Highway Bases and Subbases," Report No. FHWA/RD-82/167, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, DC, September 1983.

13. **Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction**, Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, Frankfort, 1983.

14. "Slake Durability Index Test," Method KM-64-513-76, Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, Frankfort, 1976.

15. Ahlberg, H. L.; and Barenburg, E. J.; "Pozzolanic Pavements," Engineering Experiment Station Bulletin 473, University of Illinois, Urbana, 1965.

16. Barenburg, E. J.; "Lime-Fly Ash-Aggregate Mixtures in Pavement Construction," National Ash Association, 1974.

17. Gomez, M.; and Thompson, M. R.; "Structural Coefficients and Thickness Equivalency Ratios," University of Illinois, Urbana, June 1983.

18. Larson, T. D.; and Lindow, E. S.; "An Evaluation of Pennsylvania's Flexible Pavement Design Methodology," The Pennsylvania Transportation Institute, The Pennsylvania State University, State College, December 1974.

19. Thompson, M. R.; "Concepts for Developing a Nondestructive Testing Based Asphalt Concrete Overlay Thickness Design Procedure," University of Illinois, Urbana, June 1982.

20. Sharpe, G. W.; Southgate, H. F.; and Deen, R. C.; "Development of Pavement Thickness Designs Using Pozzolanic Base Materials," Research Report UKTRP-83-25, Kentucky

Transportation Research Program, University of Kentucky, Lexington, October 1983.

21. Kallas, B. F.; and Riley, J. C.; "Mechanical Properties of Asphalt Pavement Materials," **Proceedings**, Second International Conference on the Structural Design of Asphalt Pavements, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1967.

22. Shook, J. F.; and Kallas, B. F.; "Factors Influencing Dynamic Modulus of Asphaltic Concrete," **Proceedings**, The Association of Asphalt Paving Technologists, Vol 38, 1969.

23. Drnevich, V. P.; and Jent, J. P.; "Response of Saturated Sands to Cyclic Shear at Earthquake Amplitudes," Water Resources Research Institute Report No. 87, University of Kentucky, Lexington, October 1975.

24. Richart, F. E., Jr.; Hall, J. R., Jr.; and Woods, R. D.; **Vibrations of Soils and Foundations**, Prentice-Hall, Inc, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1970.

25. Hardin, B. O.; and Black, W. L.; "Vibration Modulus of Normally Consolidated Clay," **Journal of the Soil Mechanics and Foundation Division**, Vol 94, No. SM2, American Society of Civil Engineers, New York, March 1968.

26. Hardin, B. O.; and Black, W. L.; Closure to "Vibration Modulus of Normally Consolidated Clay," **Journal of the Soil Mechanics and Foundation Division**, Vol 95, No. SM6, American Society of Civil Engineers, New York, November 1969.

27. Michelow, J.; "Analysis of Stresses and Displacements in an N-layered Elastic System under a Load

Uniformily Distributed on a Circular Area," Chevron Research Corporation, Richmond, Ca, September 1963.

28. Deen, R. C.; Southgate, H. F.; and Havens, J. H.; "Structural Analysis of Bituminous Concrete Pavements," Research Report 305, Division of Research, Kentucky Department of Highways, Lexington, May 1971.

29. Sokolnikoff, I. S.; **Mathematical Theory of Elasticity**, Second Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Co, New York, 1956.

30. Deen, R. C.; Southgate, H. F.; and Mayes, J. G.; "The Effect of Truck Design on Pavement Performance," **Proceedings**, The Association of Asphalt Paving Technologists, Vol 49, 1980.



Figure 1. Gradation Curves -- Dense-Graded Limestone Aggregate and Pond Ash Material.



Figure 2. Example Determination of Static-Chord Modulus.



Figure 3. Modulus of Elasticity versus Compressive Strength for Various Data Sources.



Figure 4. Resilient Modulus as a Function of Splitting Tensile Strength.



Figure 5. Limiting Subgrade Vertical Compressive Strain versus Repetitions of an 18,000-pound Axleload.



Figure 6. Limiting Tensile Strain at Bottom of the Asphaltic Concrete versus Repetitions of an 18,000-pound Axleload.



Figure 7. Limiting Tensile Strain at Bottom of the Pozzolanic Base versus Repetitions of an 18,000-pound Axleload.



Figure 8. Vertical Compressive Strain at Top of Subgrade versus Thickness of Pozzolanic Base for Constant Modulus of Elasticity of Pozzolanic Base and Constant Thickness of Asphaltic Concrete Surfacing.



Figure 9. Work at Top of Subgrade versus Thickness of Pozzolanic Base for Constant Modulus of Elasticity of Pozzolanic Base and Constant Thickness of Asphaltic Concrete Surfacing.



Figure 10. Equivalent Thickness Designs Using Pozzolanic Base for Varying Thicknesses of Asphaltic Concrete and Moduli of Pozzolanic Base Materials.

TABLE 1. SPECIFICATIONS FOR DENSE-GRADED AGGREGATE BASES AND GRAVEL BASES IN KENTUCKY (13)

SIEVE SIZE (SQUARE OPENING)	PERCENTAGE FINER (BY WEIGHT) DENSE-GRADED AGGREGATE	GRAVEL AGGREGATE
2"		100
1"	100	
3/4"	70 - 100	
3/8"	50 - 80	
No. 4	35 - 65	25 - 65
No. 10	25 - 50	
No. 40	12 - 30	6 - 30
No. 100		5 - 20
No. 200	5 - 12	

Wear -- 40% loss (maximum)
Soundness (Five Cycles) -- 12% loss (maximum)
Friable Particles -- 1.0% (maximum)
Shale -- 2.0% (maximum)

TABLE 2. STRENGTH PARAMETERS FOR VARIOUS POZZOLANIC MIXTURES AND FOR VARIOUS CURING CONDITIONS

MIXTURE COMPONENTS (percent)													
FLY ASH	LIME KILN DUST	BY-PRODUCT LIME	SCRUBBER SLUDGE	RIVER SAND	DENSE-GRADED AGGREGATE	POND ASH	OPTIMUM MOISTURE CONTENT (percent)	MAXIMUM DRY DENSITY (pcf)	MIXTURE SOURCE (a)	CURING CONDITION (b)	UNCONFINED COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (psi)	MODULUS OF ELASTICITY (psi)	SPLITTI TENSIL STRENG (psi)
--	--	--	10	--	--	90	11.8	126.2	field	No. 1	186	14,453	---
--	--	--	10	--	--	90	11.8	126.2	field	No. 7	557	83,836	---
--	--	--	15	--	--	85	9.5	143.6	field	No. 1	309	24,185	---
--	--	--	15	--	--	85	9.5	143.6	field	No. 7	670	37,526	---
--	--	--	20	--	--	80	11.7	133.5	field	No. 1	264	18,067	---
--	--	--	20	--	--	80	11.7	133.5	field	No. 7	560	29,029	---
--	--	--	30	--	--	70	12.4	128.3	field	No. 1	211	14,302	---
--	--	--	30	--	--	70	12.4	128.3	field	No. 7	393	58,306	---
--	--	--	100	--	--	--	43.7	71.6	field	No. 3	71	9,564	---
--	--	--	100	--	--	--	43.7	71.6	field	No. 1	98	11,430	---
--	--	--	100	--	--	--	43.7	71.6	field	No. 6	166	21,369	---
--	--	--	100	--	--	--	43.7	71.6	field	No. 7	130	10,814	---
--	--	--	100	--	--	--	43.7	71.6	field	No. 11	155	21,007	---
--	--	--	10	--	--	90	10.3	150.5	lab	No. 1	99	8,870	13
--	--	--	10	--	--	90	10.3	150.5	lab	No. 7	826	77,471	62
--	--	--	10	--	90	--	9.9	133.7	lab	No. 1	153	7,159	4
--	--	--	10	--	90	--	9.9	133.7	lab	No. 7	286	26,124	10
--	--	--	15	--	--	85	11.2	151.4	lab	No. 1	160	10,285	7
--	--	--	15	--	--	85	11.2	151.4	lab	No. 7	646	59,187	68
--	--	--	15	--	85	--	10.9	130.6	lab	No. 1	189	7,782	6
--	--	--	15	--	85	--	10.9	130.6	lab	No. 7	275	17,700	12
--	--	--	20	--	--	80	11.0	132.9	lab	No. 1	196	15,512	12
--	--	--	20	--	--	80	11.0	132.8	lab	No. 7	617	55,834	9
--	--	--	20	--	80	--	11.8	124.9	lab	No. 1	168	10,080	9
--	--	--	20	--	80	--	11.8	124.9	lab	No. 7	254	17,576	---
--	--	--	100	--	--	--	50.4	65.2	lab	No. 1	107	9,508	---
--	--	--	100	--	--	--	50.4	65.2	lab	No. 7	207	14,955	---
--	--	12	--	--	88	--	6.5	142.1	lab	No. 1	646	35,038	---
--	--	12	--	--	88	--	6.5	142.1	lab	No. 2	738	44,431	---
--	--	16	--	--	84	--	7.3	140.6	lab	No. 1	636	23,295	---
--	--	16	--	--	84	--	7.3	140.6	lab	No. 2	515	25,157	---
--	--	20	--	--	80	--	6.8	135.8	lab	No. 1	315	11,589	---
--	--	20	--	--	80	--	6.8	135.8	lab	No. 2	232	6,377	---
8	8	--	--	--	84	--	5.6	134.3	field	No. 1	1,192	87,545	---
8	8	--	--	--	84	--	5.6	134.3	field	No. 4	922	74,445	---
8	8	--	--	--	84	--	---	----	cores	No. 9	585	62,980	---
8	8	--	--	--	84	--	---	----	cores	No. 10	1,570	216,524	---
8	8	--	--	--	84	--	7.4	139.6	lab	No. 1	1,987	166,618	226
8	8	--	--	--	84	--	7.4	139.6	lab	No. 2	2,403	202,027	---
8	8	--	--	--	84	--	7.4	139.6	lab	No. 4	897	96,608	---
8	8	--	--	--	84	--	7.4	139.6	lab	No. 6	3,222	259,895	387
8	8	--	--	--	84	--	7.4	139.6	lab	No. 8	308	----	---
5	5	--	--	--	90	--	7.5	139.2	lab	No. 1	1,291	94,669	---
5	5	--	--	--	90	--	7.5	139.2	lab	No. 2	1,526	150,962	---
5	5	--	--	--	90	--	7.5	139.6	lab	No. 4	228	----	---
5	5	--	--	--	90	--	7.5	139.6	lab	No. 5	280	18,314	---
6	4	--	--	--	90	--	6.4	146.3	lab	No. 1	488	37,634	---
10	10	--	--	--	80	--	8.0	133.1	lab	No. 1	296	17,619	---
8	4	--	--	--	88	--	6.9	142.1	lab	No. 1	1,116	----	---
8	6	--	--	--	86	--	8.1	150.8	lab	No. 1	1,290	----	---
8	8	--	--	10	74	--	7.5	141.0	lab	No. 1	1,255	----	---
8	8	--	--	10	74	--	7.5	141.0	lab	No. 2	280	----	---
8	8	--	--	10	74	--	7.5	141.0	lab	No. 3	134	----	---
8	8	--	--	10	74	--	7.5	141.0	lab	No. 4	136	----	---
8	8	--	--	25	59	--	7.6	138.7	lab	No. 1	1,272	----	---
8	8	--	--	25	59	--	7.6	138.7	lab	No. 2	356	----	---
8	8	--	--	25	59	--	7.6	138.7	lab	No. 3	82	----	---
8	8	--	--	25	59	--	7.6	138.7	lab	No. 4	123	----	---
8	8	--	--	50	34	--	7.1	135.6	lab	No. 1	923	----	---
8	8	--	--	50	34	--	7.1	135.6	lab	No. 2	157	----	---
8	8	--	--	50	34	--	7.1	135.6	lab	No. 3	105	----	---
8	8	--	--	50	34	--	7.1	135.6	lab	No. 4	79	----	---
10	10	--	--	80	--	--	10.1	110.9	lab	No. 1	89	9,139	---
8	8	--	--	42	42(c)	--	7.0	138.1	lab	No. 1	349	14,956	---
8	8	--	--	32	52(d)	--	6.6	137.5	lab	No. 1	157	4,237	---
8	8	--	--	--	84(e)	--	8.0	135.1	lab	No. 6	1,317	127,193	---
8	8	--	--	42	42(e)	--	7.2	133.6	lab	No. 1	1,194	----	---
8	8	--	--	42	42(e)	--	7.2	133.6	lab	No. 2	69	----	---
8	8	--	--	42	42(e)	--	7.2	133.6	lab	No. 3	439	----	---

a. "Lab" refers to samples mixed from dry components in the laboratory, "field" refers to samples mixed in the laboratory with components from a field situation, "cores" refers to samples obtained by coring an existing pavement.

b. Curing conditions :
   - No. 1 -- 7 days at 100 F in a sealed container (ASTM C 593-79)
   - No. 2 -- 7 days at 100 F in a sealed container and then 7 days at room temperature in air
   - No. 3 -- 7 days at room temperature in a sealed container
   - No. 4 -- 14 days at room temperature in air
   - No. 5 -- 21 days at room temperature in a sealed container
   - No. 6 -- 28 days at 100 F in a sealed container
   - No. 7 -- 7 days at 100 F in a sealed container and then 21 days at room temperature in air
   - No. 8 -- 28 days at room temperature in air
   - No. 9 -- 49 days ambient curing (field conditions) followed by a 14 day soaking period
   - No. 10 -- 132 days ambient curing (field conditions) followed by a 14 day soaking period
   - No. 11 -- 62 days at room temperature in air

c. No. 11 aggregate substituted for dense-graded aggregate.

d. Aggregate substituted for dense-graded aggregate consists of 32% No. 11, 20% aggregate meal.

e. Mines screenings substituted for dense-graded aggregate.

TABLE 3. ECONOMIC COMPARISONS FOR PAVEMENT DESIGNS UTILIZING POZZOLANIC MATERIALS

MATERIALS	THICKNESS (INCHES)	PAVING AREA (SQUARE YARDS)	TONNAGE*	UNIT COST ($/TON)	TOTAL COST ($)	SAVINGS ($)
ALTERNATE A -- Conventional Design -- 7" asphaltic concrete 14" dense-graded aggregate						
Dense-Graded Aggregate	14	131,469	101,231	$7.55	$764,295	
Asphaltic Concrete						
Base	4 1/2	129,762	32,116	20.69	664,482	
Binder	1 1/2	128,759	10,623	20.75	220,419	
Surface	1	128,302	7,057	24.31	171,546	
Total for Alternate					1,820,742	0
ALTERNATE B -- 7" asphaltic concrete 6" pozzolanic base						
Pozzolanic Base	6	131,469	43,385	13.75	596,544	
Crack Relief Layer		129,762		1.88	243,952	
Asphaltic Concrete						
Base	4 1/2	129,762	32,116	20.69	664,482	
Binder	1 1/2	128,759	10,623	20.75	220,419	
Surface	1	128,302	7,057	24.31	171,546	
Total for Alternate					1,896,943	(76,201)
ALTERNATE C -- 5" asphaltic concrete 8" pozzolanic base						
Pozzolanic Base	8	131,469	57,846	13.75	795,387	
Crack Relief Layer		129,762		1.88	243,952	
Asphaltic Concrete						
Base	2 1/2	129,762	17,842	20.69	369,157	
Binder	1 1/2	128,759	10,623	20.75	220,419	
Surface	1	128,302	7,057	24.31	171,546	
Total for Alternate					1,800,461	20,281
ALTERNATE D -- 3" asphaltic concrete 10" pozzolanic base						
Pozzolanic Base	10	131,469	72,308	13.75	994,234	
Crack Relief Layer		128,759		1.88	243,952	
Asphaltic Concrete						
Binder	2	128,759	14,163	20.75	293,892	
Surface	1	128,302	7,057	24.31	171,546	
Total for Alternate					1,694,624	126,118

*Tonnages estimated on the basis of 110 pounds per square yard per inch

TABLE 4. ROAD RATER DEFLECTIONS ON 6-INCH POZZOLANIC BASES

PROJECT NUMBER	DEFLECTIONS (inches x 10^{-5}) SENSOR NUMBER No. 1	No. 2	No. 3
1	53.8	29.8	15.1
2	118.5	46.0	24.8
3	147.2	56.9	24.3