

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement	1
Objectives	1
Key Products of This Research	2
LTPP DATA RETRIEVAL	3
VERIFICATION OF k-VALUE GUIDELINES	5
Summary of NCHRP 1-30 k-Value Findings	5
Availability of Subgrade Data in LTPP	6
Evaluation of Backcalculation Methods	7
Effect of Slab Size Correction on Backcalculated k	21
Coefficient of Variation in k Along Section Length	26
Comparisons of Plate Load Data With Other Data	26
Comparison of Backcalculated k and Other Soils Data	31
Improvements to NCHRP 1-30 k-Value Guidelines	34
VERIFICATION OF PROPOSED AASHTO PERFORMANCE MODEL	39
Improved Consideration of Support in AASHTO Methodology	39
Deficiencies in 1993 AASHTO Procedure Related to Pavement Support	39
Improved AASHTO Methodology Recommended	41
Field Verification of New Models	42
Validation of Design Model With LTPP Data	45
Performance Prediction Capability of Proposed New Model	49
Performance Prediction for GPS-3 (JPCP)	49
Performance Prediction for GPS-4 (JRCP)	64
Performance Prediction for GPS-5 (CRCP)	64
Corner Stress Evaluation for Undoweled GPS-3 Sections	64
Variability Components of Model Prediction	68
CONCLUSIONS	71
The k-Value Guidelines	71
Concrete Pavement Performance Model	72

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX

SUPPLEMENTAL VERSION OF AASHTO GUIDE, PART II, SECTION 3.2 RIGID PAVEMENT DESIGN AND SECTION 3.3 RIGID PAVEMENT JOINT DESIGN

SECTION 3.2 RIGID PAVEMENT DESIGN	75
3.2.1 Develop Effective Modulus of Subgrade Reaction (k-Value)	76
3.2.2 Determine Required Structural Design	91
3.2.3 Stage Construction (no change)	128
3.2.4 Roadbed Swelling and Frost Heave (no change)	128
SECTION 3.3 RIGID PAVEMENT JOINT DESIGN	136
3.3.1 Joint Types (no change)	136
3.3.2 Joint Geometry and Load Transfer	136
Faulting Model for Doweled Joints	138
Faulting Model for Undoweled Joints	140
Joint Layout (no change)	144
Joint Dimensions (no change)	144
3.3.3 Joint Sealant Dimensions (no change)	144
RIGID PAVEMENT DESIGN EXAMPLE	145
REFERENCES	149

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Backcalculated dynamic k-value, best fit 7 versus AREA ₇	14
Figure 2.	Backcalculated dynamic k-value, best fit 5 versus AREA ₅	14
Figure 3.	Backcalculated dynamic k-value, best fit 4 versus AREA ₄	15
Figure 4.	Backcalculated dynamic k-value, best fit 3 versus AREA ₃	15
Figure 5.	Backcalculated dynamic k, best fit 7 versus best fit 4	16
Figure 6.	Backcalculated dynamic k, best fit 5 versus best fit 3	16
Figure 7.	Backcalculated dynamic k, AREA ₇ versus AREA ₄	17
Figure 8.	Backcalculated dynamic k, AREA ₅ versus AREA ₃	17
Figure 9.	Backcalculated dynamic k, best fit 7 versus best fit 5	18
Figure 10.	Backcalculated dynamic k, best fit 4 versus best fit 3	18
Figure 11.	Backcalculated dynamic k, AREA ₇ versus AREA ₅	19
Figure 12.	Backcalculated dynamic k, AREA ₄ versus AREA ₃	19
Figure 13.	Improvement in backcalculated k-value with modified slab size correction	21
Figure 14.	Effect of load level on AREA ₄ backcalculated k-values for an example project	23
Figure 15.	Effect of load level on best fit 4 backcalculated k-values for an example project ...	24
Figure 16.	Coefficient of variation in backcalculated k-value for multiple load drops and load levels	25
Figure 17.	Mean backcalculated k-value before and after screening	27
Figure 18.	Coefficient of variation in backcalculated k along project length, before screening .	27
Figure 19.	Coefficient of variation in backcalculated k along project length, after screening ...	28
Figure 20.	Static k-value estimated from backcalculation compared to traditionally recommended ranges	32
Figure 21.	Comparison of static k-values estimated from backcalculation results and CBR ...	35
Figure 22.	Comparison of static k-values estimated from backcalculation results and R-value .	36
Figure 23.	Relationship of W to log S' /σ for three terminal serviceability levels for the proposed revised AASHTO extended concrete pavement design model	43
Figure 24.	Predicted versus actual log W for test sections from the extended I-80 tests and the FHWA database, using the proposed revised concrete pavement design model	44
Figure 25.	Ratio of predicted vs. actual log W versus ESAL prediction accuracy	46
Figure 26.	Predicted versus actual log W for GPS-3 using new model and P1 = 4.5	50
Figure 27.	Predicted versus actual log W for GPS-3 using new model and P1 = 4.25	51
Figure 28.	Predicted versus actual log W for GPS-3 using new model and P1 = 4.0	52
Figure 29.	Predicted versus actual log W for GPS-3 slabs less than 10 in [25.4 cm] thick and greater than or equal to 10 in [25.4 cm] thick	55
Figure 30.	Predicted versus actual log W for GPS-3 with granular and treated bases	56
Figure 31.	Predicted versus actual log W for GPS-3 in wet freeze climatic zone	57
Figure 32.	Predicted versus actual log W for GPS-3 in dry freeze climatic zone	58
Figure 33.	Predicted versus actual log W for GPS-3 in wet nonfreeze climatic zone	59
Figure 34.	Predicted versus actual log W for GPS-3 in dry nonfreeze climatic zone	60
Figure 35.	Predicted versus actual log W for GPS-3 using 1986 AASHTO model	61
Figure 36.	Frequency distribution of prediction error (predicted log W - actual log W) for both original AASHTO Road Test model and new NCHRP 1-30 model	63

LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

Figure 37. Predicted versus actual log W for GPS-4 using actual joint spacings	65
Figure 38. Predicted versus actual log W for GPS-4 using hypothetical 30-ft [9-m] joint spacing	66
Figure 39. Predicted versus actual log W for GPS-5 using hypothetical 15-ft [4.6-m] joint spacing	67
Figure 40. The k-value versus degree of saturation for cohesive soils	78
Figure 41. Approximate relationship of k-value range to CBR	81
Figure 42. Approximate relationship of k-value range to DCP penetration rate	82
Figure 43. Adjustment to k for fill and/or rigid layer	90
Figure 44. Midslab and joint loading positions defined	92
Figure 45. Mean annual wind speed, mph	97
Figure 46. Mean annual air temperature, °F	98
Figure 47. Mean annual precipitation, inches	99
Figure 48. Tensile stress at bottom of slab for midslab loading position, positive temperature differential, and full friction, for aggregate base and soft subgrade	122
Figure 49. Tensile stress at bottom of slab for midslab loading position, positive temperature differential, and full friction, for high-strength base and soft subgrade	123
Figure 50. Tensile stress at bottom of slab for midslab loading position, positive temperature differential, and full friction, for aggregate base and medium subgrade	124
Figure 51. Tensile stress at bottom of slab for midslab loading position, positive temperature differential, and full friction, for high-strength base and medium subgrade	125
Figure 52. Tensile stress at bottom of slab for midslab loading position, positive temperature differential, and full friction, for aggregate base and stiff subgrade	126
Figure 53. Tensile stress at bottom of slab for midslab loading position, positive temperature differential, and full friction, for high-strength base and stiff subgrade	127
Figure 54. Tensile stress at top of slab for joint loading position, negative temperature differential, and full friction, for aggregate base and soft subgrade	129
Figure 55. Tensile stress at top of slab for joint loading position, negative temperature differential, and full friction, for high-strength base and soft subgrade	130
Figure 56. Tensile stress at top of slab for joint loading position, negative temperature differential, and full friction, for aggregate base and medium subgrade	131
Figure 57. Tensile stress at top of slab for joint loading position, negative temperature differential, and full friction, for high-strength base and medium subgrade	132
Figure 58. Tensile stress at top of slab for joint loading position, negative temperature differential, and full friction, for aggregate base and stiff subgrade	133
Figure 59. Tensile stress at top of slab for joint loading position, negative temperature differential, and full friction, for high-strength base and stiff subgrade	134
Figure 60. Friction adjustment factor for stress at top of slab for joint loading	135

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Coefficients for AREA vs. ℓ equation	9
Table 2.	Coefficients for nondimensional deflection equation	10
Table 3.	Effect of slab size correction on backcalculated dynamic k-value	22
Table 4.	Plate load k versus AASHTO soil class	29
Table 5.	Plate load k versus California Bearing Ratio (CBR)	30
Table 6.	Backcalculated k versus plate load k	31
Table 7.	Actual versus predicted log W paired two-tailed t-test results for GPS-3, P1 = 4.5	49
Table 8.	Actual versus predicted log W paired t-test results for GPS-3, P1 = 4.25	53
Table 9.	Actual versus predicted log W paired t-test results for GPS-3, P1 = 4.0	53
Table 10.	Paired two-tailed t-test results for 1986 AASHTO model, GPS-3	54
Table 11.	Recommended k-value ranges for various soil types	80
Table 12.	Determination of design subgrade k-value from deflection measurements	87
Table 13.	Determination of seasonally adjusted effective subgrade k-value	89
Table 14.	Modulus of elasticity and coefficient of friction for various base types	95
Table 15.	Mean annual temperature, precipitation, and wind speed for selected U.S. cities	100
Table 16.	Slab thickness computed for granular base and 95 percent reliability	101
Table 17.	Slab thickness computed for treated base and 95 percent reliability	103
Table 18.	Slab thickness computed for high-strength base and 95 percent reliability	105
Table 19.	Slab thickness computed for granular base and 90 percent reliability	107
Table 20.	Slab thickness computed for treated base and 90 percent reliability	109
Table 21.	Slab thickness computed for high-strength base and 90 percent reliability	111
Table 22.	Slab thickness computed for granular base and 85 percent reliability	113
Table 23.	Slab thickness computed for treated base and 85 percent reliability	115
Table 24.	Slab thickness computed for high-strength base and 85 percent reliability	117
Table 25.	Mean joint faulting predictions for doweled jointed plain concrete pavement using Equation 52	141
Table 26.	Mean joint faulting predictions for doweled jointed reinforced concrete pavement using Equation 52	142
Table 27.	Mean joint faulting predictions for undoweled jointed plain concrete pavement using Equation 57	143
Table 28.	Recommended critical mean joint faulting levels for design	144

