# Statistical Analysis of DCP Data to Evaluate Resilient Modulus of Reclaimed Stabilized Base

Jacob Wimett, P.E. GEODesign, Inc.



## Study Goals

- Determine if the Dynamic Cone Penetrometer (DCP) can be used to reliably measure resilient modulus (M<sub>R</sub>) of reclaimed stabilized bases.
- Determine if it is reasonable to develop a performance based specification for reclaimed stabilized base layers using the DCP.



# DCP Overview / Demonstration

- 8-kg hammer dropped 575mm. Drives a 60mm cone with a 60-degree angle.
- A "measurement" is number of blows and distance penetrated.
- Raw data is converted to a DCP Penetration Index (PI) in units of mm/blow
- 25mm of penetration between readings to prevent inaccurate readings in granular material.







### DCP – Resilient Modulus Correlation

- DCP to Resilient modulus is a "double correlation".
- CBR = 292/PI<sup>1.12</sup>
- M<sub>R</sub> = 2555 \* CBR<sup>0.64</sup>
- The above correlations are commonly used by AASHTO, USACOE, and FHWA. However, there is little published information available regarding the use of these correlations for stabilized materials.



## DATA AVAILABLE

- We received 821 individual DCP tests over 5 different reclamation projects. Data was collected at the time of constructed between 2018 and 2021.
- 490 individual FWD tests from three of these projects were later collected in the Spring of 2022 to use for a comparative analysis to the DCP data.





#### Data Review – Less Variation Observed with DCP Vs. FWD

PROJECT	DIRECTION	Length of	ALL DATA	OUTLIERS REMOVED <sup>2</sup>	ALL DATA	OUTLIERS REMOVED <sup>2</sup>
		Project	DCP M <sub>R</sub> RSB (psi)	DCP M <sub>R</sub> RSB (psi)	FWD M <sub>R</sub> RSB (psi)	FWD M <sub>R</sub> RSB (psi)
Cavendish- Weathersfield <sup>1</sup>	Eastbound	8.953 Miles (47,275 Ft.)	Mean = 23541	Mean = 24572	Mean = 959901	Mean = 959901
			SDev. = 3638	Sdev. = 2731	SDev. = 732904	Sdev. = 732904
			COV = 16%	COV = 11%	COV = 76%	COV = 76%
			Sample Size = 44	Sample Size = 38	Sample Size = 95	Sample Size = 95
	Westbound		Mean = 22516	Mean = 23217	Mean = 959901	Mean = 959901
			SDev. = 4267	SDev. = 3518	SDev. = 732904	SDev. = 732904
			COV = 19%	COV = 15%	COV = 76%	COV = 76%
			Sample Size = 58	Sample Size = 54	Sample Size = 96	Sample Size = 96
Richford-Jay	Eastbound	7.438 Miles (39,274 Ft.)	Mean = 23981	Mean = 24276	Mean = 36153	Mean = 25906
			SDev. = 3598	SDev. = 3352	SDev. = 36833	SDev. = 17520
			COV = 15%	COV = 14%	COV = 102%	COV = 68%
			Sample Size = 152	Sample Size = 146	Sample Size = 78	Sample Size = 71
	Westbound		Mean = 23935	Mean = 24332	Mean = 128857	Mean = 159652
			SDev. = 4047	SDev. = 3708	SDev. = 78841	SDev. = 35868
			COV = 17%	COV = 15%	COV = 61%	COV = 22%
			Sample Size = 150	Sample Size = 143	Sample Size = 55	Sample Size = 26
Stowe- Morristown	Northbound	7.550 Miles (39,861 Ft.)	Mean = 23457	Mean = 23803	Mean = 193356	Mean = 155450
			SDev. = 3562	SDev. = 2983	SDev. = 141926	SDev. = 104013
			COV = 15%	COV = 13%	COV = 73%	COV = 67%
			Sample Size =56	Sample Size = 53	Sample Size = 81	Sample Size = 70
	Southbound		Mean = 22290	Mean = 23413	Mean = 217699	Mean = 201431
			SDev. = 4586	SDev. = 3021	SDev. = 115393	SDev. = 98571
			COV = 21%	COV = 13%	COV = 53%	COV = 49%
			Sample Size = 54	Sample Size = 49	Sample Size = 79	Sample Size = 74

GEO DESIGN

#### Data Review –

Poor correlation observed between DCP and FWD for the reclaimed stabilized base. Expect this to be primarily due to variation in curing time for the stabilizing agent (months for FWD vs. hours for DCP).

DCP M<sub>R</sub> Vs. FWD M<sub>R</sub> Based On 3000' Stationing Averages



DESIGN

#### Data Review –

# Better Correlation when comparing DCP values to FWD values of underlying un-stabilized base material where curing time is not a factor.

DCP RSB M<sub>R</sub> Vs. FWD "SUBGRADE" M<sub>R</sub> Based On 3000' Stationing Averages



GEO DESIGN

# Key Takeaways:

- DCP testing was performed too soon after placement and compaction of the reclaimed stabilized base. (Insufficient curing time).
- DCP and FWD testing need to be performed at the same time, conditions, and locations for a suitable comparison.
- DCP is unlikely to be a reasonable tool to evaluate M<sub>R</sub> for a cement stabilization since expected values are above the useful range of DCP.
- DCP could potentially be used to evaluate M<sub>R</sub> of asphalt emulsion stabilizations, but additional testing is required. The outline of a suggested testing program has been provided.



## Key Takeaways:

- Use of DCP in a performance based specification for a reclaimed stabilized base may be impractical.
- For VTrans purposes, DCP use may be better suited to the characterization of existing unbound base, subbase, and subgrade materials at the design level.



## Questions?

