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ABSTRACT

In this investigation a relationship between the ratio of the moduli of two layers in a two-layer pavement system and the ratio of deflections in a load deflected basin was developed. Charts correlating the relationship between these ratios are given in the report. By means of these charts, the moduli of the asphaltic concrete layers and the sublayer can be determined from dynaflect or Benkelman beam deflection data. A method of determining the moduli is outlined. This method can be used as an aid in correcting pavement deflections for changes in subgrade modulus values due to changes in subgrade moisture. The method is explained by means of examples.
For pavement evaluation and rehabilitation there is a growing need for knowing the modulus of the asphaltic concrete pavement layer and the modulus of the support provided by its underlying layers. The nondestructive method for obtaining these values usually uses pavement surface deflection data. Although methods are available for predicting pavement deflections from the moduli of the top layer and the underlying layers, no suitable method is available to reverse the process, that is determining the moduli of the layers from the deflection data. This investigation was aimed at providing a graphical method whereby this can be done.

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The objective of this investigation was to develop charts, based on elastic theory, which would help in determining the moduli of the asphaltic concrete pavement layer and its supporting layers from data obtained by means of dynamic loading devices such as the dynaflect or nondynamic devices such as the Benkelman beam. To achieve this objective the method for analyzing two-layer elastic systems as developed by Burmister(1) and Chevron(2) was used.

THE TWO-LAYERED SYSTEM

The two-layered system considered in this investigation is shown in Figure 1. The top layer is the pavement thickness, hp, which consists of one or more asphaltic concrete layers. The average moduli, \( E_p \), and average Poisson's ratio, \( U_p \), of this top layer are assumed to represent the average elastic properties of the materials in the top asphaltic concrete layers. The bottom layer is the non-asphaltic subbase and soil subgrade of semi-infinite depth having a modulus, \( E_s \), and Poisson's ratio, \( U_s \).
DYNAFLECT DEFLECTIONS

The dynaflect is a machine which provides a dynamic load of 0 to 2,600 lb. (1,170 kg) at a frequency of 8 cycles per second (8 Hz) on a pavement through two force wheels and measures deflections at the center of the two wheels and at one-foot (30 cm) intervals from the center of the wheels and parallel to them. Thus five deflections as shown in Figure 2 are recorded.

Figure 1. Two-layered pavement system.

Figure 2. Deflection measured with dynaflect equipment.
USE OF DEFLECTION DATA
TO DETERMINE MODULI OF LAYERS

Variables

Theories and computer programs are available whereby if the elastic properties of pavement layers, i.e., the modulus and Poisson's ratio of materials and their thickness in each layer, are known, the surface deflections at any point on the pavement can be determined. However, no method or program is available for determining the elastic properties of the materials in the layered system from the thicknesses of the layers and the surface deflection data. The author believed that the only feasible approach to developing such a method was to develop charts whereby the elastic properties of the materials, the thickness of the layers, and the surface deflections could be correlated. Such charts then could be used to determine the unknown variable when the other variables were known.

In applying the technique, the variables to be correlated were as follows: (1) Wheel load, (2) tire pressure, (3) number of layers, (4) Poisson's ratio of each layer, (5) modulus of elasticity of each layer, (6) thickness of each layer, and (7) surface deflections. Because a chart system for correlating all these variables over varied ranges of values would be very cumbersome and difficult to use, the number of variables had to be reduced to the minimum necessary for practical usage. This was done as explained below.

1. Wheel load and tire pressure — Various agencies, including Virginia, have correlated dynaflect deflections with Benkelman beam deflections for a wheel load of 9-kips (40 kN) and a tire pressure of 70 psi (48 N/cm²), or a radius of contact of 6.4 inches (16.3 cm). Hence, in this investigation the wheel load and tire pressure and radius of contact are considered as constants of the values cited.

2. Number of layers — To simplify the evaluative technique, the pavement was divided into (a) the asphaltic concrete layer or layers, and (b) the non-asphaltic concrete layer or layers. This was necessary because the structural modulus of the asphaltic concrete is dependent on daily temperature variations while the structural modulus of its underlying layer or layers is dependent on daily moisture variations. The modulus of the asphaltic concrete layers, when determined separately from the non-asphaltic concrete layers, can be converted to the modulus at the standard temperature, which is needed.
3. Poisson's ratio of each layer — Data obtained from the computer study using the Chevron program was utilized to correlate the ratio of the moduli of the two-layered system and the ratio of the deflections in a deflection basin. This correlation showed that for a given value of the ratio of the elastic moduli of the two layers, the ratio of the deflections in a deflected basin does not change very much with changes in the Poisson's ratio of each of the two materials. A few examples of these are shown in Table 1. From these it can be seen that when Ep/Es = 1, for any change in the Poisson's ratio i.e., Up or Us) there is no change in the value of d1/dmax or spreadability*, or d2/dmax. When Ep/Es = 6, 30, or 120 for extreme changes in Us or Up, the change in d1/dmax, spreadability and d2/dmax is 4.1%. However, when calculating Ep and Es from the ratio of deflections or spreadability, it has been found that the effect of change in the values of Poisson's ratio is negligible.

4. Modulus of elasticity of each layer — A study was made over all practical ranges of combinations of Ep and Es to determine the method by which the moduli of the layers in a pavement could be correlated with the deflection data. It was found that the ratio of a deflection in a deflected basin to the maximum deflection like d1/dmax, d2/dmax, or spreadability correlates very well with Ep/Es. A few examples of Ep/Es = 10, 50, and 100 are given in Table 2. These examples show that irrespective of the values of Ep and Es (and also irrespective of their Poisson's ratios or maximum deflections) the value of d1/dmax, or d2/dmax, or spreadability is constant for a given value of Ep/Es and hp. Similarly, for a given value of d1/dmax, or d2/dmax, or spreadability and hp, the value of Ep/Es is constant.

Therefore, for a given value of hp, d1/dmax or d2/dmax have a fixed relationship with Ep/Es, irrespective of the values of the Poisson's ratio of the materials in the layered system.

*Spreadability is the percent ratio of the mean of the five deflections to dmax recorded in a deflected basin by means of a dynaflect and is

\[
\frac{d_{\text{max}} + d_1 + d_2 + d_3 + d_4}{d_{\text{max}}} \times 100.
\]
Table 1
Change in Ratio of Deflections with Change in Poisson's Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\frac{E_p}{E_s}$</th>
<th>Up</th>
<th>Us</th>
<th>$\frac{d_1}{d_{\text{max}}}$ x 100</th>
<th>$\frac{d_2}{d_{\text{max}}}$ x 100</th>
<th>Spread</th>
<th>Basic Data</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>31.35</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>31.35</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>59.03</td>
<td>40.42</td>
<td>49.91</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>58.51</td>
<td>40.85</td>
<td>50.47</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>79.32</td>
<td>59.19</td>
<td>62.97</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>79.42</td>
<td>59.89</td>
<td>63.73</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>80.26</td>
<td>55.57</td>
<td>60.24</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>80.64</td>
<td>56.54</td>
<td>61.08</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>77.66</td>
<td>55.85</td>
<td>60.60</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>76.03</td>
<td>53.56</td>
<td>59.02</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Units: 1 psi = 0.69 kN/m²; 1 in. = 2.54 cm.
Table 2

Relationship Between $\frac{E_p}{E_s}$ and Ratio of Deflections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\frac{E_p}{E_s}$</th>
<th>$E_p$ (psi)</th>
<th>$E_s$ (psi)</th>
<th>$\frac{d_1}{d_{max}} \times 100$</th>
<th>$\frac{d_2}{d_{max}} \times 100$</th>
<th>Spread</th>
<th>Basic Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hp. (in.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>59.04</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>59.04</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>59.05</td>
<td>32.49</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Change</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>85.08</td>
<td>73.83</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>85.12</td>
<td>73.83</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>85.06</td>
<td>73.77</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Change</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>87.49</td>
<td>70.04</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>87.64</td>
<td>70.01</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Change</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Units: 1 psi = 0.69 kN/m²; 1 in. = 2.54 cm.
Development of Design Charts

The above discussion shows that for given deflection data the ratio of the elastic moduli of materials in a two-layer system can be obtained, irrespective of the Poisson's ratio of the materials in the layered system.

By means of the Chevron program deflections at 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4 ft. (0, 30, 60, 90, and 120 cm) for 9,000 lb. (8,160 kg.) wheel load were determined for different values of $E_p$ and $E_s$ with $U_p = 0.47$ and $U_s = 0.47$. Based on this information, the following charts were drawn.

1. Figure 3 — Chart relating $d_1/d_{max}$ vs. $E_p/E_s$ vs. hp
2. Figure 4 — Chart relating $d_2/d_{max}$ vs. $E_p/E_s$ vs. hp
3. Figure 5 — Chart relating spreadability vs. $E_p/E_s$ vs. hp.

Similar charts can be drawn to suit the deflection measuring device used by an agency. For example, agencies using the Benkelman beam need a chart relating $d_2/d_{max}$ vs. $E_p/E_s$ vs. hp, which is given in Figure 4.
**CAUTION:**

a. Do not use for $\frac{d_1}{d_{\text{max}}} > 80$.

b. Do not extrapolate.

Figure 3. $\frac{d_1}{d_{\text{max}}}$ versus $\frac{Ep}{Es}$ versus hp.

(Wheel load = 9,000 lbs; tire pressure = 70 psi; tire contact radius = 6.4 inches)

Conversion factors:

- 1 inch = 2.54 cm
- 1 pound = 0.45 kg
- 1 psi = 0.69 kN/m²
CAUTION:  

a. Do not use for $\frac{d_2}{d_{\text{max}}}$ greater than 80.

b. Do not extrapolate.

Figure 4. $\frac{d_2}{d_{\text{max}}}$ versus $\frac{Ep}{Es}$ versus hp.

(Wheel load = 9,000 lbs; tire pressure = 70 psi; tire contact radius = 5.4 inches)

Conversion factors:  
- 1 inch = 2.54 cm
- 1 pound = 0.45 kg
- 1 psi = 0.69 kN/m$^2$
CAUTION:  

a. Do not use for values greater than 80.

b. Do not extrapolate.

Figure 5. Spreadability versus $\frac{EP}{Es}$ versus hp.

(Wheel load = 9,000 lbs; tire pressure = 70 psi; tire contact radius = 5.4 inches)

Conversion factors:  

1 inch = 2.54 cm  
1 pound = 0.45 kg  
1 psi = 0.69 kN/m$^2$
Choice of Design Chart

The choice of design chart would depend on the data obtained. For example, in the case of the dynaflect machine for which \(d_{\text{max}}\), \(d_1\), \(d_2\), \(d_3\), and \(d_4\) are measured, the charts in Figures 3 through 5 could be used.

The elastic theory assumes that the materials are homogeneous. In practice this is not so; therefore, the shape of the deflected basin and the deflections obtained in the deflected basin would not be the same as obtained by the theoretical approach used in the Chevron program. The following recommendations are, therefore, given.

1. When deflections \(d_{\text{max}}\) and \(d_1\) are given, Figure 3 could be used.

2. When deflections \(d_{\text{max}}\) and \(d_2\) are given (as in the case of the Benkelman beam), Figure 4 could be used.

3. When deflections \(d_{\text{max}}\), \(d_1\), \(d_2\), \(d_3\), and \(d_4\) are given, the mean value of \(\frac{E_p}{E_s}\) can be obtained by use of the chart in Figure 5, in which spreadability fully accounts for the nonhomogeneity of the materials in the layered system. It is, however, recommended that the average value of \(\frac{E_p}{E_s}\) as obtained from figures 3, 4, and 5 be used for pavement evaluation.

TECHNIQUE FOR DETERMINING THE MODULI OF EACH LAYER

The method of determining \(\frac{E_p}{E_s}\) has been described in the previous paragraph. Burmister's design chart, shown in Figure 6, could be used to determine the values of \(E_p\) and \(E_s\). In this chart the thickness of the top layer, \(h_p\), is correlated with \(\frac{E_p}{E_s}\) and a factor \(F_w\). The \(h_p\) is expressed in terms of the radius of the contact area, which is taken as 6.4 inches (16.3 cm.) in this investigation. Thus, given \(h_p\) and \(\frac{E_p}{E_s}\), the value of \(F_w\) could be determined from this chart.
Figure 6. Burmister's influence curves of the deflection coefficient $F_w$ for the two-layer system.

$$F_w = \frac{E_s \cdot d_{\text{max}}}{1.5 \cdot p \cdot a}.$$
Then using Burmister's equation for flexible plates,

$$Es = \frac{1.5 \, p \, a}{d_{\text{max}}} \cdot F_w,$$

(1)

where

- $p$ = tire pressure 70 psi (48 N/cm$^2$), and
- $a$ = radius of contact area, 6.4 inches (16.3 cm).

With $Es$ having been determined, the value of $Ep$ could be obtained from the ratio of $Ep/Es$.

Appendix 1 gives three examples of deflection data from which $Ep$ and $Es$ have been estimated by use of Figures 3, 4, 5 and 6. These three examples have $Ep/Es = 6$, 30, and 120; and $Ep = 30,000$ psi and $300,000$ psi ($20,700$ or $207,000$ kN/m$^2$); $Es = 2,500$, $5,000$, and $10,000$ psi ($1,725$, $3,450$ or $6,900$ kN/m$^2$); and $hp = 4$, $15$, or $16$ inches ($10.0$, $38.0$ and $40.6$ cm). Thus these three examples cover a wide range of values. As shown, the maximum deviation of the average estimated value of $Ep$ and $Es$ from the actual value is 4.3%. This deviation could be due to either (1) a lack of accuracy in reading the charts, or (2) the fact that the pavement is not elastic and homogenous as assumed in the Chevron program. Examples in this appendix therefore show that by use of the ratios of deflection or spreadability, the modulus of each layer could be estimated.

Appendix 2 gives an evaluation of a 5-mile (8-km) project by the dynaflect measurement technique. The pavement is 8 years old and consists of a 9.5-inch (24-cm) asphaltic concrete over an 8-inch (20.3-cm) untreated aggregate with 6 inches (15.2 cm) of soil cement underneath.

The asphaltic concrete modulus, $Ep$, of this pavement is 253,000 psi (1,745 MN/m$^2$). Maupin determined the modulus of a new asphaltic concrete in the laboratory at 70°F (48 N/cm$^2$) as 233,000 psi (1,607 MN/m$^2$). The author determined that the modulus of asphaltic concrete in a 1-year old pavement corrected for 70°F (17.8°C) was 300,000 psi (2,068 MN/m$^2$). This 8-year old pavement should show a much higher modulus because the pavement becomes brittle with age. The low value of the $Ep$ of this pavement indicates a failure of the asphaltic concrete layer. The pavement shows extreme longitudinal cracking and some alligator cracking. The asphaltic concrete samples taken from the pavement show that it had stripped adjacent to the cracks and also adjacent to its underlying aggregate layer, which was moist.
The combined modulus of the underlying layers and the sub-
grade, \( E_s \), of the pavement is 6,500 psi (45 MN/m\(^2\)). This value
is much lower (less than half) than is obtained for underlayers
consisting of an aggregate layer over 6-inches (15.2 cm) of soil
cement. It is speculated that the underlying layers failed be-
cause of the following two causes: (a) the aggregate contained
a lot of fines and mica (mica makes the material highly resilient);
and (b) a thick, weak and resilient aggregate layer sandwiched be-
tween two strong layers of soil cement and asphaltic concrete
results in a pavement receiving very little benefit of support
from the soil cement. The author has determined the optimum
thickness of nonresilient, untreated aggregate layer to be 4 inches
(10 cm) to prevent reflection cracks from soil cement and provide
a reasonable transfer of the load to the soil cement.\(^{(6)}\)

ADVANTAGES OF USING THIS METHOD

This method of evaluating pavements is highly useful as
follows:

1. It determines the modulus of the asphaltic
   concrete layer and its underlying layers by
   a nondestructive surface deflection technique.

2. It helps in maintaining case histories of
   pavements. By this method, changes in the
   modulus of the asphaltic concrete layer or
   changes in the modulus of each underlying layer
   can be determined. It can also help in de-
   termining the thickness of an overlay and the
   strength contributed by an overlay.

An example of an evaluation of an overlay is shown in
Appendix 3. This example has been particularly chosen to show
that the temperature corrected maximum deflection\(^{(3)}\) after the
overlay (0.017 in. = 0.043 cm) was higher than before the over-
lay (0.014 in. = 0.036 cm). This was so because, due to moisture
and other changes in the subgrade, the modulus of the underlying
layer decreased from 14,600 psi (10,100 kN/m\(^2\)) before the overlay
to 8,400 psi (5,800 kN/m\(^2\)) after the overlay. As shown in
Appendix 3, the maximum deflection after correcting the subgrade
modulus was 0.012 inch (0.031 cm) as compared to 0.014 inch
(0.036 cm) before the overlay.
The charts developed in this investigation could be used to determine the moduli of the pavement and the subgrade when two or more deflections in a deflected basin are known. The report explains the method to be used. The method will help in providing corrections needed because of changes in the moisture content of the subgrade and base materials.
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# APPENDIX 1

## EXAMPLES FOR EVALUATION OF MODULI OF LAYERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example No.</th>
<th>Fig. Used</th>
<th>Ep/Es Est. from Fig.</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>( F_W ) (Fig. 6)</th>
<th>Es (psi) Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Ep (psi) Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>4,836</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>29,983</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>4,977</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,862</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>5,133</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>29,771</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,946</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29,899</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>285,600</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>287,200</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2,523</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>302,750</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2,451</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>318,630</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>+6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2,523</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>302,750</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>308,043</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Units: 1 psi = 0.69 kN/m²; 1 in. = 2.54 cm.
APPENDIX 2

EVALUATION OF A PAVEMENT FROM DYNAFLECT MEASUREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milepost</th>
<th>$E_s$ (psi)</th>
<th>$E_p$ (psi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150 - 151</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>252,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 - 152</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 - 153</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>279,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 - 154</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 - 155</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>236,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>253,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Units: 1 psi = 0.69 kN/m².
APPENDIX 3

EXAMPLE OF CORRECTING DEFLECTION DATA FOR VARIATIONS IN MOISTURE OF A SUBLAYER

1. Field Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>$d_{max}$ (3) at 70°F (inches)</th>
<th>$d_1/d_{max}$</th>
<th>$d_2/d_{max}$</th>
<th>Spread</th>
<th>hp (inches)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Overlay</td>
<td>5-18-77</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Overlay</td>
<td>11-2-77</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Determining values of $E_s$ and $E_p$ by use of Figures 3, 4, and 5 as explained in Appendix 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>$E_s$ (psi)</th>
<th>$E_p$ at 70°F (psi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Overlay</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>253,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Overlay</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>320,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Correcting $d_{max}$ due to change in $E_s$ after the overlay

$$\frac{E_p}{E_s} \text{ after the overlay} = \frac{E_p \text{ after the overlay}}{E_s \text{ before the overlay}} = \frac{320,000}{14,600} = 21.9$$

$F_w$ for the corrected $\frac{E_p}{E_s}$ from Burmister's chart (Figure 6) = 0.25

Corrected $d_{max}$ of the overlaid pavement = $F_w (1.5 \text{ pa}) = \frac{0.25 \times 1.5 \times 70 \times 6.4}{14,600} = .012 \text{ inch}$

Units: 1 psi = 0.69 kN/m$^2$; 1 inch = 2.54 cm.