

Optimizing Design Decisions and Construction Procedures for Full-Depth Pavement Recycling

David Jones, PhD

University of California Pavement Research Center



Outline

- Introduction
- Site investigation / strategy choice
- Design
- Construction
- Conclusions



Full-Depth Recycling (FDR)

- FDR is not a preservation treatment per se, but extends pavement life/increases resilience using in situ materials
- Used primarily for rehabilitation and/or structural improvement
 - Bottom-up distresses
- Typical design is 8-12in. (200-300mm) of FDR with 1.8-5in. (45-125mm) of AC
 - Chip seals used on lower volume roads
- Used nationwide / internationally
 - Not as widely as it should be



UCPRC Research



- Multi-phase research study on CR
 - Questioning everything!
- Phase 2: FDR: Extensive lab testing, long-term field performance monitoring, APT, and ME modeling
 - Pilot studies, incl. 21-yr old FDR-FA project
 - APT on FDR-N, FDR-FA, FDR-EA, and FDR-C
 - >34 million ESALs to 6mm rut in AC with loads up to 2.5x legal limit; no fatigue cracking
 - 36-cell test road to assess shrinkage crack mitigation measures on FDR-C
 - ME performance models for CR

Full-Depth Recycling

FDR-FA Layer



FDR-C Layer



Where to Use FDR

- Bottom-up distresses from the underlying layers
 - Bottom-up cracking (alligator A & B, block, shrinkage, etc.)
 - Thermal cracks
 - Base and/or subgrade rutting
 - Plus distresses usually addressed with PDR
- Recycles top 8 to 12in.
 - Milling teeth go through AC layers into underlying base
- 1 to 2 lane miles per day depending on recycle train
- Many PDR (CIR) projects should be FDR



Bottom-Up Distresses in Pavement Layers

- Use FDR-N, FDR-C or FDR-FA/EA depending on material properties and desired structural capacity



Bottom-Up Distresses from Subgrade

- Two additional options for increasing structural capacity:
 1. Add new RAP or AB material on top of existing road and recycle with FDR-FA or FDR-EA
 - Existing base becomes a subbase
 2. Use a two part process to build an inverted pavement
 - Mill surface and base and stockpile it
 - Stabilize subgrade with lime or cement
 - Process stockpiled material with EA or FA through CCP and place with paver



Recycling Methods

■ Methods:

- Single wheel-driven train
- Tandem wheel-driven train
- Single-unit track-driven train
- Cold central plant

■ Recycling Agents:

- None
- Emulsified or foamed asphalt
- Cement or lime (or both)
- Other proprietary



Outline

- Introduction
- Site investigation / strategy choice
- Design
- Construction
- Conclusions



Site Investigation

- Detailed site investigation is required to make informed decisions
 - Cost is negligible vs. extended life
- Investigation should include:
 - Visual assessment to identify and understand distresses and their cause and origin
 - Coring to determine optimal recycling depth, distress origin, variability, etc.
 - DCP tests through core hole
 - Sample of underlying material to approximate recycle depth
 - FWD and GPR if available
- Caltrans CR & site investigation guides
 - www.ucprc.ucdavis.edu/publications



Analysis Outline

- What do we have, what do we need to do?
 - ✓ Depth and origin of distresses are understood and CR will address them?
 - Target removing all distresses
 - Choose PDR (CIR) or FDR
 - ✓ Grade height can be raised?
 - 100% FDR still requires a surface
 - Can additional material be used for lane widening?
 - ✓ Sufficient material to recycle?
 - Including after pre-milling if grade height restrictions?
 - ✓ >15% underlying unbound material?
 - Fines improve gradation, density, strength and stiffness
 - Facilitates up-cut action / cools milling teeth
 - ✓ Drainage is functional?
 - Drainage-related problems will recur
 - ✓ USCS complete on unbound + combined materials?
 - Dictates choice of recycling agent



Choosing a Recycling Agent

- Asphalt and cementitious are mutually exclusive

	Material Type												
	AC + Good Base		AC + Marginal Base		Subgrade								
	Well Graded Gravel	Poorly Graded Gravel	Silty Gravel	Clayey Gravel	Well Graded Sand	Poorly Graded Sand	Silty Sand	Clayey Sand	Silt Or Silt With Sand	Lean Clay	Organic Silt/ Organic Lean Clay	Elastic Silt	Fat Clay, Fat Clay With Sand
USCS	GW	GP	GM	GC	SW	SP	SM	SC	ML	CL	OL	MH	CH
Foamed asphalt P ₂₀₀ 5 – 15 PI < 6	■ ■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■ ■	■	■	■	■						
Emulsified asphalt P ₂₀₀ 5 – 15 PI < 6	■ ■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■ ■	■	■	■	■						
Portland cement P ₂₀₀ >20, PI < 20 SO ₄ < 3,000 ppm	■	■	■ ■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■ ■			
Lime P ₂₀₀ >25, PI > 20 SO ₄ < 3,000 ppm								■ ■ ■ ■		■ ■ ■ ■		■ ■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■ ■

Outline

- Introduction
- Site investigation / strategy choice
- Design
- Construction
- Conclusions



Pavement Design

- Layer thicknesses
 - Base on available materials/target traffic
 - AASHTO 93 or ME?
 - Updated layer coefficients available for recycled layers
 - Limited representative CR performance models in most ME packages
 - Modeled as either AC or AB; neither is appropriate
 - AC thicknesses tend to be overly conservative



CalME Input: Layer Type

CalME: CALTRANS Mechanistic-Empirical Tool

Home Instructions Projects **Input** ME Design Tools Interpreting Results ? About US SI Save To DB Save To File

Project ID: IPR Guide Examples Trial Title: Guide Example #1

Project Location

District: 3 County: Yolo Route: 16 Direction: West PM Start: 0.000 PM End: 5.000 No. Lanes: 1

Project Length: Lane Miles: Avg #lanes:

Traffic Count Information

Location: 0.632-2.800 Location Description: AADT: 350 AADTT: 35 % Trucks: 9.9

Climate

Climate Zone: Inland Valley Suggested: Inland Valley

Design Lane Traffic Loads

Load Distribution (WIM Station): Group1a Suggested: Group1a

Growth Rate (From First Year): 5.5%

First Year: 52,655

First Year: 18,346

Design Life: Total ESALs: 408,170 TI: 8.1

Create a Trial Structure (Using Design Life and TI)

Subgrade: Select Generate

Pavement Structure

Selected Layer Type Using Unconfined Compressive Strength (UCS): psi TS->CSS TS->LSS CTB-Class B Apply Delete All

#	Old	Material	Age (d)	Thickness (ft)	Modulus-E (ksi)	R-value	GF	Cost (\$/ft3)	Actions
1		Subgrade	N/A	-1.00	0.0	N/A	1.99	0.00	Edit Delete Insert
2		FDR	N/A	-1.00 *	0.0 *	N/A	N/A	0.00	Save Cancel
3		AS	N/A	-1.00	0.0	N/A	N/A	0.00	Edit Delete Insert
4		Subgrade	N/A	∞	0.0	N/A	N/A	0.00	Edit Delete Insert

Add Layer Add 2 Layers Add 3 Layers Add 4 Layers Add 5 Layers

© 2022 University of California • Pavement • Research • Center

- Select
- HMA
- RHMA-G
- FDR**
- PDR
- CCPR
- PCC
- LCB
- CTB-Class A
- CTB-Class B
- AB
- ATPB
- AS
- TS
- Subgrade

CalME Input: FDR Materials

CalME: CALTRANS Mechanistic-Empirical Tool

Home Instructions Projects **Input** ME Design Tools Interpreting Results ? About US SI Save To DB Save To File

Project ID: IPR Guide Examples Trial Title: Guide Example #1

Project Location

District: 3 County: Yolo Route: 16 Direction: West PM Start: 0.000 PM End: 5.000 No. Lanes: 1

Project Length: Lane Miles: Avg #lanes:

Traffic Count Information

Location: 0.632-2.800 Location Description: AADT: 350 AADTT: 35 % Trucks: 9.9

Climate

Climate Zone: Inland Valley Suggested: Inland Valley

Design Lane Traffic Loads

Load Distribution (WIM Station): Group1a Suggested: Group1a

Growth Rate (From First Year): 5.5%

First Year Axles / Design Lane: 52,655

First Year Trucks / Design Lane: 18,346

Design Life: 20 yrs Total ESALs: 408,170 TI: 8.1

Create a Trial Structure (Using Design Life and TI)

Subgrade: SM Generate

Pavement Structure

Update Modulus for the Selected Layer Type Using Unconfined Compressive Strength (UCS): psi TS->CS TS->LSS CTB-Class B Apply Delete All

#	Old	Layer Type	Age (d)	Material	Thickness (ft)	Modulus-E (ksi)	R-value	GF	Cost (\$/ft ³)	Actions
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	RHMA-G	90	2020 Standard RHMA-G with PG 64-XX base binder for non-PRS Projects	0.20	627.9	N/A	N/A	0.00	Edit Delete Insert
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	FDR	90	2020 Standard FDR-FA	0.85	435.1	N/A	N/A	0.00	Save Cancel
3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AB	N/A	2020 Standard FDR-C	0.50	45.0	78	1.10	0.00	Edit Delete Insert
4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Subgrade	N/A	2020 Standard FDR-FA	∞	21.5	37	N/A	0.00	Edit Delete Insert

Add Layer Add 2 Layers Add 3 Layers Add 4 Layers Add 5 Layers For SM Subgrade, AB-min is 0.35 or Equiv. Min thick: 0.25; Max thick: 0.50

Error Message Summary

Select
 2020 Standard FDR-C
 2020 Standard FDR-FA
 2020 Standard FDR-N

Pavement Design

- Layer thicknesses
 - Based on available materials/target traffic
 - AASHTO 93 or ME
 - Updated layer coefficients available for recycled layers
 - Limited representative CR performance models in most ME packages
- Considerations
 - Choose recycle depth and recycling agent carefully
 - Cost difference between 10 & 12in. is relatively small
 - > 12in. can result in differential compaction, layer contamination, and shrinkage/block cracking



Mix Design



- Asphalt recycling agents (EA and FA)
 - Recommend ITS wet strength of 30psi (210kPa) based on modified Proctor or gyratory MDD
 - Marshall compaction and stability have issues when used on CR materials



- Cementitious
 - Use ICS + 1% as initial starting cement content
 - 1.5 hour pH test; good indicator of durability
 - Risk of modification-only and carbonation if not met
 - Target UCS of 250-450psi (1.7 to 3.1 MPa)
 - Risk of shrinkage crack at higher strengths

Outline

- Introduction
- Site investigation / strategy choice
- Design
- Construction
- Conclusions



Shrinkage Crack Mitigation on FDR-C

- Keep design strength between 250-450psi, based on ICS
- Spread cement accurately with no overlaps
- No dragging hoses
- Microcrack compacted surface
 - 48 to 56 hours after final compaction
 - 3 passes, 12 ton roller at max. vibration
 - Spray surface with water prior to start
- Microcracking works!



Shrinkage Crack Mitigation on FDR-C



- Mitigates, won't prevent cracks
- Introduces a network of fine cracks that do not have sufficient energy to reflect through AC surfacings
- Stiffness recovers quickly
- Extends fatigue life
- Cost is insignificant
- Increasing number of states require it in specifications



Paver-Laid FDR



- New generation CR equipment can recycle to 12in.
 - Asphalt or cement recycling agents
- Higher quality, faster, and cheaper FDR
- Requires high capacity paver, preferably with high compaction screed
- Appropriate rollers and roller weights

Outline

- Introduction
- Site investigation / strategy choice
- Design
- Construction
- Conclusions



Conclusions

- FDR is under-utilized method of rehabilitating/reconstructing distressed roads
- Versatile, fast, resilient and cost effective
- 100% use of already paid for in-place materials
- New CR developments include:
 - Focus on distress depth and origin
 - ME design procedures
 - Revised mix design procedures
 - New construction & QC procedures
 - Shrinkage-crack mitigation measures



Thank-you



djjones@ucdavis.edu
www.ucprc.ucdavis.edu