Long Life PCC Pavements

2005 Southeastern Pavement Management & Design **Conference** June 21, 2005

American ConcretePavement Association

The Basic Questions

- How do you define long life pavements?
	- Facility type often dictates need for long life pavements
	- Pavement longevity may range from less than 2 years to greater than 60 years
- Can we afford long life pavements?
	- It depends on the ultimate goal for the highway network
	- What is the long-term cost/benefit
- Do we have the technology to build truly long life pavements?

Benefits of Long Life Pavements

- Drastic reduction in "down time" for maintenance and rehabilitation (construction times are not necessarily longer)
- ■ Greatly improved safety (work zone and other)
- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ ■ Reduced user costs (a predominant feature, if fully considered)
- **IMPROVED COST Effectiveness**

Pavement Selection

- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ ■ Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) is typically used to determine whether PCC or AC is the "better choice" for a specific roadway
- LCCA can also be effectively used to determine appropriate design features
- Realistic LCCA requires substantial historical data or generic models to evaluate performance and rehabilitation or maintenance requirements

Deterministic LCCA

- Deterministic LCCA is the more traditional method of LCCA
- This method assumes that the timing of maintenance and rehabilitation is well known and can be targeted for a specific project
- \blacksquare It also assumes that the costs to perform these activities are known with a high level of certainty
- Is this applicable to long life pavements?

Probabilistic LCCA

- **Probabilistic LCCA is an "improved" version of the** deterministic method
- The timing and costs associated with performing maintenance and rehabilitation activities are considered statistically
- In other words, instead of assuming the future is known with certainty, the most probable scenario is analyzed

Presentation Focus

- **This presentation is focused on developing long**life design alternatives and the selection of PCC design features
- The information presented is meant to provide insight into the process
- **The relative values shown should not be used in** actual practice, they are for illustration only

What are We Building?

Is it Cost Effective?

Design Optimization

Potential Savings

Concrete Pavement Design Requires Selection of Appropriate Features

- Ξ Subgrade modification
- \Box Drainage System
- **⊠** Subbase
- **☑** Joint Spacing
	- \Box 20 ft (6.1 m)
	- Ξ 15 ft (4.3 m)
- Dowels
- ThicknessШ
	- \Box 8 in (200 mm)
	- \Box 10 in (250 mm)
	- $\overline{\mathsf{M}}$ 12 in (300 mm)
- □ Reinforcement
- **Ø** Joint Sealant
	- None
	- Hot pour
	- **⊠** Silicone
	- Preformed
- **Surface Texture**
	- □ Transverse tine
	- **⊠** Burlap drag
- **Shoulder**
	- **⊠** Asphalt
	- \Box Concrete

Law of Diminishing Returns

Construction Cost

Cost - Performance Balance

Initial construction cost

Budget constraints

Life-cycle cost

For Each Added Design Feature

Contractor Survey

A survey was conducted to determine and document, in relative terms, the effects of various PCC pavement design features on initial pavement cost

Contractors Surveyed

Reference Section

- T. Transverse joints: 20 ft (6.1 m) uniform with no skew and no dowels
- T. Single-width saw cut to 3/8 in. (75 mm) with hot-poured filler
- \mathcal{L}^{max} Lanes: 12 ft (3.6 m); tied with #4 deformed bars 30 in. (75 mm) centers
- T. Subgrade prepared by scarifying to depth of 6 in. (150 mm) and recompacting at optimum moisture content.

Relative $Cost = 100$

Survey Instructions

- Base on common circumstances and conditions
- **Project 5 miles (8 km) long and within 50 miles (80** km) of home office
- Assume typical materials and construction procedures by state DOT
- Existing grade and alignment is adequate no earthwork

Features

- Slab Thickness
- **Subbase Type**
- **Shoulders**
- **Reinforcement**
- **D** Joint Spacing
- **Transverse Joint Load Transfer**
- **The Transverse Joint Sealant**

Slab Thickness

Reference Section: *10 in (250 mm) thick 20 ft (6.1 m) joint spacing Cost = 100*

The Contract of Street

Average Relative Cost **¹⁰⁰ ¹²⁵** *Reference Section:*

Subbase Type

densegraded subbase Cost = 100

 \blacksquare

Reference Section: Average Relative Cost *6 in (150 mm) thick*

Shoulders

The Second Service

6 in (150 mm) granular subbaseCost = 100

Reference Section: Average Relative Cost *Gravel shoulders on*

Transverse Joint Design

1 1/2 in (38-mm) D owels 20 f t (6.1 m) Jt. Spacing

- 1 1/2 in (38-mm) **D owels 15 f t (4.6 m) Jt. Spacing**
- **CRC - #6 b ars @ 8 in (200 mm) spacin g**

Reference Section: 10 in (250 mm) thick undoweled20 ft (6.1 m) joint spacing Cost = 100

Transverse Joint Sealant

Reference Section: Single 3/8 in (75-mm) cut filled with hot-pour sealant 20 ft (6.1 m) joint spacing Cost = 100

Average Relative Cost

Methods to DetermineCost-Effectiveness

- **Experience**
- Life-cycle cost analysis
	- **Initial cost**
	- Future cost
	- **Performance**
- \mathcal{L}_{max} Benefit/Cost analysis
	- **numeral initial cost**
	- **Performance**

User Costs?

Long Life Concrete Pavement Requirements

- Adequate design thickness and realistic options ■ ME-PDG will facilitate improved designs
	- Materials, support conditions, load transfer, etc. are considered to a greater extent
- Good construction practices
- Realistic expectations considering cost versus performance

Current Long Life Design Features

- Thicknesses up to 14 inches
- Optimized concrete mix design
- Rigid specifications on placement, curing, sawing, etc.
- Widened lanes (or tied concrete shoulders)
- Drainage, stainless dowels, others???

Historical Trends in Longevity

- Concrete pavements have significantly exceeded their design lives in most cases
- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ ■ The existing AASHTO design procedure (1972, 1986 and 1993) is very conservative for concrete
- Many factors not incorporated in the existing design have a significant impact (i.e. strength gain over time, innovative materials and so on

Survival Analysis Results - I-40 in OK

Survival Analysis Results Avg. Mean lif e

Typical Section in 2001

4 in (100 mm) Stabilized opengraded subbase on dense-graded subbase (with outlet pipes)

Widened transverse joints with silicone sealant

Increase in construction cost over 1970's era design = 46% How much longer will it last?

Summary

- Life-cycle cost analysis is a useful tool to compare design features/sections
- User delay costs appear essential to justify certain design options
- **Long life is achievable at reasonable cost**
- Attention to detail in design and construction is critical

Questions?

