

# **Center for By-Products Utilization**

## **USE OF COAL COMBUSTION PRODUCTS IN PERMEABLE ROADWAY BASE CONSTRUCTION**

**By Tarun R. Naik, Rudolph N. Kraus, Rafat Siddique,  
and Paul Ziemkiewicz**

Report No. CBU-2002-24  
REP-477  
September 2002

For Presentation and Publication at the ACAA Fifteenth International Symposium on Management & Use of Coal Combustion Products (CCPs), Tampa, Florida, Jan 27-30, 2003.

**Department of Civil Engineering and Mechanics  
College of Engineering and Applied Science  
THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - MILWAUKEE**

# Use of Coal Combustion Products in Permeable Roadway Base Construction

By

**Tarun R. Naik<sup>\*a</sup>, Rudolph N. Kraus<sup>b</sup>, Rafat Siddique<sup>c</sup>, and Paul Ziemkiewicz<sup>d</sup>**

<sup>a</sup> Director   <sup>b</sup> Assistant Director   <sup>c</sup> Post-Doctoral Fellow  
UWM Center for By-Products Utilization, College of Engineering and Applied Science,  
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, P.O. Box 784, Milwaukee, WI 53201

<sup>d</sup> Director, Combustion Byproducts Recycling Consortium, West Virginia University, Box  
6064, Morgantown, WV 26506-6064

\* Director  
UWM Center for By-Products Utilization  
College of Engineering and Applied Science  
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee  
P.O. Box 784  
Milwaukee, WI 53201

**Tel:** (414)-229-6696  
**Fax:** (414)-229-6958  
**Email:** tarun@uwm.edu

## **Abstract**

This paper presents the results of an investigation carried out to develop permeable base course materials using coal combustion products (CCPs) for roadways, highways, and airfield pavements. Three sources of CCPs were selected for this investigation. These include two sources of high-carbon/sulfate-bearing CCPs, which did not meet ASTM C 618 requirements for coal fly ash for use as mineral admixture in concrete, and one source of variable carbon fly ash.

These CCPs were used for no-fines/low-fines concrete as a permeable base material. Two types of mixtures were developed using each of these by-products for base course materials. In these mixtures, the amount of fines was varied for the permeable base, one with open-graded and one with an intermediate-graded structure. Tests were performed for fresh concrete properties as well as for compressive strength, splitting tensile strength, flexural strength, etc. The performance of the permeable base mixtures containing CCPs was also compared with a reference mixture without any ash.

Test results up to 181 days of testing indicate that CCPs materials can be effectively used as a permeable base course material.

## Introduction

Presence of excess water in the pavement structure is known to be the primary cause of pavement distress. Extended exposure to water can lead to pumping, D-cracking, faulting, frost action, shrinkage, cracking, and potholes [1]. Out of these parameters, pumping is known to be the most dominating mechanism of pavement distress. The water that infiltrates through the pavement is trapped within the pavement structure when draining capabilities of the pavement base is low. Application of high pressure to the trapped water causes erosion of the base because fines are pumped out along with the water. Consequently, a loss in pavement support occurs, leading to early failure. This can be avoided by using free-draining pavement base [2-8]. Permeable bases are divided into two classes: treated and untreated. A treated permeable base employs a binder, which would typically consists of either cement ( $119-178 \text{ kg/m}^3$ ) or asphalt (2 – 5% by weight). An untreated subbase contains more small particles in order to provide stability through aggregate interlock. A permeable base must be capable of maintaining both permeability and stability. In order to improve stability, an untreated subbase should contain 100% crushed aggregate [2]. Grogan [5] reported that dense-graded subsurface pavement layers are virtually impermeable. Saturation of these layers will cause pumping, erosion, subgrade weakening, and freeze/thaw damage. Use of properly designed and constructed permeable bases reduces or practically eliminates these problems thus improving pavement performance. Hall [6] reported that factors such as cement content, truck traffic, sublayer stability, segregation, and surface irregularities are important in affecting performance of the permeable base. Kozeliski [7] reported successful application of open-graded cement treated base material in the construction of a parking lot for an office building, the driveway of a home, and a ground cover of a refinery. Kuennen [8] described construction of a high-quality, high-durability, drainable PCC pavement incorporating 18% fly ash of total cementitious materials. Naik and Ramme [9] presented the state-of-the-art information on permeable base road pavements. They reported the results from the demonstration project, and mentioned that fly ash can be used in the manufacture of permeable base concrete pavements.

In order to meet EPA air quality standards, utilities are utilizing supplemental flue gas treatments to reduce emissions. These treatments either alter the quality of the coal combustion by-products, or generate another type of "waste" material. Two processes typically used are flue gas desulfurization (FGD) to reduce SO<sub>x</sub> emissions and low-NO<sub>x</sub> burners to reduce NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. FGD by-products are high-sulfite and/or sulfate by-products, and low-NO<sub>x</sub> burners generate high-carbon CCPs. Approximately 28 million tons of FGD by-products were generated in 2001 in the USA with a utilization rate of less than 30 percent. Consequently, most FGD by-products are landfilled at high disposal costs and potential future environmental liabilities to the producer. To avoid these, there is a need to develop beneficial uses of these by-products.

## **Objective**

This investigation was conducted to develop permeable base course materials using coal combustion products (CCPs) for highways, roadways, and airfield pavement. Three types of CCPs, two flue-gas desulfurization (FGD) by-products, and a variable-carbon fly ash, are being evaluated for no-fines or low-fines concrete as a permeable base material. Use of FGD by-products and high-carbon or variable carbon CCPs in permeable base course is expected to utilize significant quantities of these by-products. It will also help to reduce the cost of installing permeable base materials for pavement, which will lead to increased use of such permeable bases for highways, roadways, and airfield pavement. Reducing the cost of permeable base materials is expected to expand its use in many other types of pavement construction with increased pavement life and increased utilization rate of CCPs and FGD by-products.

## **Experimental Procedure**

### **Materials**

Type I Portland cement was used. Its physical and chemical properties were determined per ASTM C 150 requirements. Both physical and chemical properties of the cement except available alkali met the ASTM standards. The cement had slightly higher available alkali content (0.9%) relative to the ASTM C 150 (0.6%) requirement.

Three sources of CCPs were used. These include two high-carbon/sulfate-bearing CCPs, designated as FGD-1 and FGD-2, and a variable carbon fly ash designated as FGD-3. Each ash source was tested for physical and chemical properties. The physical properties of CCPs are given in Table 1, and chemical analysis in Table 2.

One source of concrete sand and coarse aggregate was acquired from a local concrete producer. Physical properties of the sand and coarse aggregate were determined per ASTM C 33 requirements, and both met all the ASTM C 33 requirements for fine aggregate.

### **Mixture Proportions**

The mixture proportion for open-graded and intermediate-graded base course materials are given in Tables 3 and 4, respectively.

For open-graded base course mixtures, Mixture MO was proportioned without any ash. Three series of mixtures (MO1, MO2, and MO3) were proportioned using FGD-2 fly ash. These mixtures contained 15%, 30%, and 45% of FGD-2 fly ash, respectively as additional cementitious material (Table 3). Similarly, three series of mixtures (MO4, MO5, and MO6) were proportioned to contain 15%, 30%, and 45% of FGD-3 fly ash as a cement replacement (Table 3). Another, three series of mixtures, MO7, MO8, and MO9 (Table 3) contained 15%, 30%, and 45%, respectively, of FGD-1 ash by weight of cement; however, only half of the ash was considered to be cementitious, while the remaining half was considered to be filler, replacing sand.

For intermediate-graded base course mixtures, Mixture M2A was proportioned without any ash. Mixtures M21, M22, and M23 were proportioned using FGD-3 fly ash, to replace 15%, 30%, and 45% of cement with FGD-3 fly ash, respectively (Table 4). Three mixtures (M24, M25, and M26) were proportioned to contain 15%, 30%, and 45% of FGD-1 fly ash (Table 4). Half of the addition of FGD-1 ash was considered to be cementitious, while the remaining half was considered sand replacement. Three Series of mixtures, M27, M28, and M29, contained 15%, 30%, and 45%, respectively, of FGD-2 ash by weight of cement (Table 4).

### **Casting, Curing, and Testing of Specimens**

All concrete mixtures were mixed in a rotating drum concrete mixer in accordance with ASTM C 192. The resulting mixture was used in making concrete specimens. Fresh concrete was tested for air content (ASTM C 138), unit weight (ASTM 138), and temperature (ASTM C 1064). Ambient air temperature was also measured and recorded.

Specimens were prepared in accordance with ASTM C 1435. Freshly mixed concrete was molded in cylindrical steel molds (4 x 8 in.) for compressive strength (ASTM C 39) and splitting tensile (ASTM 496) strength measurements; and in beam molds (3 x 4 x 16 in.) for measurements of flexural strength (ASTM C 78). For each 4 x 8 in. cylinder, concrete in the mold was compacted in two lifts (layers) with the vibratory hammer. For each lift, enough concrete was placed in the mold to fill one-half of its volume after compaction. Each layer was compacted by placing a circular tamping plate on the concrete while the hammer was operated for 20 seconds. For each 3 x 4 x 16 in. beam specimen, concrete in the mold was compacted in one lift with the vibratory hammer. For each specimen, enough concrete was placed in the mold to fill its entire volume after compaction. The concrete layer in the mold was compacted by placing a rectangular tamping plate on the concrete while the hammer was operated for about 10 seconds. All test specimens were cured in their molds for one day and then demolded.

These specimens were then subjected to moist curing in accordance with ASTM C 192 until the time of test.

## **Results and Discussion**

### **Compressive Strength**

Compressive strength results of permeable base course (open-graded) mixtures are shown in Figs. 1-3, and compressive strength results of permeable base course (intermediate -graded) mixtures are shown in Figs. 10-12.

The compressive strength of the reference mixture for open-graded permeable base course was 970 psi at 28 days, and 1250 psi at 182 days. It is evident from Figs. 1-3 that compressive strength of mixtures containing FGD-2, FGD-3, and FGD-1 fly ash increased with increasing age. Compressive strength of mixtures with FGD-2 fly ash varied between 540 to 660 psi at 28 days, and 640 to 925 psi at 182 days. Similarly, Compressive strength of mixtures with FGD-3 fly ash ranged from 935 - 1010 psi at 28 days, and 1175 - 1570 psi at 182 days, whereas compressive strength of mixtures with FGD-1 fly ash ranged from 680 - 1135 psi at 28 days, and 955 - 1265 psi at 182 days. Compressive strength decreased with increased fly ash content.

For intermediate-graded permeable base course, compressive strength of the reference mixture varied from 1330 psi at 28 days to 1660 psi at 182 days. It can be seen from Figs.10-12 that compressive strength of mixtures containing FGD-3, FGD-1, and FGD-2 fly ash increased with increasing age. Compressive strength of mixtures with FGD-3 fly ash ranged from 1755 -2175 psi at 28 days, and 1870 - 2355 psi at 182 days. Similarly, Compressive strength of mixtures with FGD-1 fly ash ranged from 580 - 1215 psi at 28 days, and 600 - 1490 psi at 182 days, whereas compressive strength of mixtures with FGD-2 fly ash ranged from 705 - 1030 psi at 28 days, and 1030 - 1355 psi at 182 days the compressive strength decreased with increased fly ash content. It is evident from these data that compressive strength decreased with increase in fly ash content.

From Figs 1-3 and 1-12, it can be concluded that FGD fly ash contributes to the development of strength at later ages because of pozzolanic action.

### **Splitting tensile Strength**

Splitting tensile strength results of permeable base course (open-graded) mixtures are shown in Figs. 4-6, and splitting tensile strength results of permeable base course (intermediate -graded) mixtures are shown in Figs. 13-15.

Splitting tensile strength of reference mixture for open-graded permeable base course was 130 psi at 28 days, and 180 psi at 182 days. It is clear from Figs. 4-6 that splitting tensile strength of mixtures containing FGD-2, FGD-3, and FGD-1 fly ash increased with the increase in age. Splitting tensile strength of mixtures with FGD-2 fly ash varied between 65 and 155 psi at 28 days, and between 180 and 185 psi at 182 days. Similarly, splitting tensile strength of mixtures with FGD-3 fly ash ranged from 110 - 145 psi at 28 days, and 145 – 185 psi at 182 days, whereas splitting tensile strength of mixtures with FGD-1 fly ash ranged from 85 - 170 psi at 28 days, and 130 - 165 psi at 182 days. Splitting tensile strength decreased with increased fly ash content.

For intermediate-graded permeable base course, splitting tensile strength of the reference mixture varied from 220 psi at 28 days to 440 psi at 182 days. It can be seen from Figs.13-15 that splitting tensile strength of mixtures containing FGD-3, FGD-1, and FGD-2 fly ash increased with increasing age. Splitting tensile strength of mixtures with FGD-3 fly ash ranged from 220 -410 psi at 28 days, and 250 - 365 psi at 182 days. Similarly, Splitting tensile strength of mixtures with FGD-1 fly ash ranged from 100 - 225 psi at 28 days, and 100 - 350 psi at 182 days, whereas splitting tensile strength of mixtures with FGD-2 fly ash ranged from 140 - 205 psi at 28 days, and 165 - 355 psi at 182 days the splitting tensile strength decreased with increased fly ash content. It is clearly evident from these data that splitting tensile strength decreased with increasing fly ash content.

These results indicate that ,generally, the splitting tensile strength has increased with the increase in age, as has been compressive strength due to pozzolanic action.

### **Flexural Strength**

Flexural strength results of the permeable base course (open-graded) mixtures are shown in Figs. 6-9, and flexural strength results of permeable base course (intermediate -graded) mixtures are shown in Figs. 15-18.

Flexural strength of the reference mixture for open-graded permeable base course was 140 psi at 28 days, and 2150 psi at 182 days. It is evident from Figs. 6-9 that flexural strength of mixtures containing FGD-2, FGD-3, and FGD-1 fly ash increased with increasing age. Flexural strength of mixtures with FGD-2 fly ash ranged from 55 - 135 psi at 28 days, and 80 -190 psi at 182 days. Similarly, Flexural strength of mixtures with FGD-3 fly ash ranged from 135 - 185 psi at 28 days, and 185 - 240 psi at 182 days, whereas flexural strength of mixtures with FGD-1 fly ash ranged from 95 - 135 psi at 28 days, and 145 - 60 psi at 182 days. Flexural strength decreased with increased fly ash content.

For intermediate-graded permeable base course, flexural strength of the reference mixture varied from 290 psi at 28 days to 360 psi at 182 days. It can be seen from Figs.15-18 that flexural strength of mixtures containing FGD-3, FGD-1, and FGD-2 fly ash increased with increasing age. Flexural strength of mixtures with FGD-3 fly ash ranged from 320 -355 psi at 28 days, and 360 - 460 psi at 182 days. Similarly, Flexural strength of mixtures with FGD-1 fly ash ranged from 95 - 160 psi at 28 days, and 100 - 380 psi at 182 days, whereas flexural strength of mixtures with FGD-2 fly ash ranged from 195 - 225 psi at 28 days, and 160 -210 psi at 182 days the flexural strength decreased with increased fly ash content. It is clearly evident from these data that flexural strength decreased with increasing fly ash content. Flexural strength , like that of compressive and splitting tensile strength also increased with age.

## **Keywords**

Compressive strength, Flexural strength, FGD fly ash, Slump, Splitting tensile strength, Unit weight.

## **Conclusions**

Following conclusions are drawn from this investigation:


1. Compressive strength of open-graded permeable base concrete mixtures incorporating FGD-1, FGD-2 and FGD-3 fly ash ranged from 540 -1135 psi at 28-days, and 640 - 1570 psi at 182-days. The maximum compressive strength of 1135 psi was achieved at 28-days with FGD-1 fly ash.
2. Compressive strength of intermediate-graded permeable base concrete mixtures made with FGD-1, FGD-2 and FGD-3 fly ash varied between 580 and 2175 psi at 28-days, and between 600 and 2355 psi at 182-days. The maximum compressive strength of 2175 psi was achieved at 28-days with FGD-3 fly ash.
3. Splitting tensile strength of open-graded permeable base concrete mixtures incorporating FGD-1, FGD-2 and FGD-3 fly ash ranged from 65 -170 psi at 28-days, and 150 - 210 psi at 182-days. The maximum splitting tensile strength of 170 psi was achieved at 28-days with FGD-1 fly ash.
4. Splitting tensile strength of intermediate-graded permeable base concrete mixtures made with FGD-1, FGD-2 and FGD-3 fly ash ranged from 140 -410 psi at 28-days, and 100 - 365 psi at 182-days. The maximum splitting tensile strength of 410 psi was achieved at 28-days with FGD-3 fly ash.

5. Flexural strength of open-graded permeable base concrete mixtures incorporating FGD-1, FGD-2 and FGD-3 fly ash ranged from 75 -185 psi at 28-days, and 80 - 225 psi at 182-days. The maximum flexural strength of 185 psi was achieved at 28-days with FGD-3 fly ash.
6. Flexural strength of intermediate-graded permeable base concrete mixtures incorporating FGD-1, FGD-2 and FGD-3 fly ash ranged from 95 -410 psi at 28-days, and 160 - 460 psi at 182-days. The maximum flexural strength of 410 psi was achieved at 28-days with FGD-3 fly ash.
7. Compressive strength, splitting tensile strength and flexural strength of both open-graded and intermediate-graded base course mixtures have increased with increasing age which clearly indicates the pozzolanic behavior of FGD fly ashes.
8. Results of this investigation indicate that FGD fly ashes can be used in permeable base course mixtures


## **References**

1. Cedergren, H. R., "America's Pavement: World's Longest Bathtubs," Civil Engineering, American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, VA, September 1994, pp. 56-58.
2. Baumgardner, R. H., "Overview of Permeable Bases," Materials Performance and Prevention of Deficiencies and Failures, 92 Materials Engineering Congress, ASCE, New York, 1992, pp. 275-287.
3. Portland Cement Association (PCA), "Concrete Paving Technology," PCA, 1991, 22 pages.
4. Kozeliski, F. A., "Permeable Bases Help Solve Pavement Drainage Problems," Concrete Construction, September 1992, pp. 660-662.
5. Grogan, W. B., "User's Guide: Subsurface Drainage for Military Pavements," USAE Waterway Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS, a Final Technical Report submitted to US Army Corps of Engineers, 1992, pp. 1 to 23A.
6. Hall, M. J., "Cement Stabilized Permeable Bases Drain Water, Add Life to Pavements," Roads and Bridges, September 1994, pp. 32-33.
7. Kozeliski, F.A., "Open-graded Base as a Parking Lot Pavement," Presented at the ACI 1996 Spring Convention, Denver, Colorado, March 15 1996, 14 pages.


8. Kuennen, T., "Open-graded Drain Layer Underlies Thick PCC," *Roads and Bridges*, May 1993, pp. 28-29.
9. Naik, T. R. and Ramme, B. R., "Roller-Compacted No-fines Concrete for Road Base Course," *Proceedings of the Third CANMET/ACI International Symposium on Advances in Concrete Technology*, New Zealand, August 25-27, 1997, pp. 201-220.



**Fig. 1 Compressive Strength of Permeable Base Course (Open-graded) with FGD-2 Fly Ash**



**Fig. 2 Compressive Strength of Permeable Base Course (Open-graded) with FGD-3 Fly Ash**



**Fig. 3 Compressive Strength of Permeable Base Course (Open-graded) with FGD-1 Fly Ash**




Fig. 4 Splitting Tensile Strength of Permeable Base Course (Open-graded) with FGD-2 Fly Ash




Fig. 6 Splitting Tensile Strength of Permeable Base Course (Open-graded) with FGD-1 Fly Ash




Fig. 7 Flexural Strength of Permeable Base Course (Open-graded) with FGD-2 Fly Ash




Fig. 8 Flexural Strength of Permeable Base Course (Open-graded) with FGD-3 Fly Ash







Fig. 9 Flexural Strength of Permeable Base Course (Open-graded) with FGD-1 Fly Ash



**Fig. 10 Compressive Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-3 Fly Ash**



**Fig. 11 Compressive Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-1 Fly Ash**



**Fig. 12 Compressive Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-2 Fly Ash**




Fig. 13. Splitting Tensile Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-3 Fly Ash




Fig. 14 Splitting Tensile Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-1 Fly Ash







Fig. 15 Splitting Tensile Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-2 Fly Ash



**Fig. 16 Flexural Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-3 Fly Ash**



**Fig. 17 Flexural Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-1 Fly Ash**



**Fig. 18 Flexural Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-2 Fly Ash**

Table 1 - Physical Properties of CCPs

TEST PARAMETER	Ash Source Number			ASTM C 618 REQUIREMENTS	
	FGD-1	FGD-2	FGD-3	CLASS C	CLASS F
Retained on No.325 sieve (%)	23.7	29.5	21.7	34 max	34 max
Strength Activity Index with Cement (% of Control)					
3-day	--	--	107.6	--	--
7-day	60.3	87.3	109.5	75 min	75 min
28-day	60.6	115.5	129.5	75 min	75 min
Water Requirement (% of Control)	107.4	112.4	92	105 max	105 max
Autoclave Expansion (%)	0.05	0.26	0.05	±0.8	±0.8
Specific Gravity	2.64	2.17	2.58	-	-
Variation from Mean (%)					
Fineness	2.3	2.0	5.3	5 max	5 max
Specific Gravity	1.1	6.0	1.9	5 max	5 max

Table 2– Chemical Analysis of CCPs


Analysis Parameter	Ash Source Number			ASTM C-618 Requirements	
	FGD-1	FGD-2	FGD-3	Class C	Class F
SiO <sub>2</sub>	5.1	8.8	36.2	--	--
Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	2.5	7.8	19.4	--	--
Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	1.2	2.5	6.2	--	--
SiO <sub>2</sub> +Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> +Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	8.8	19.1	61.8	50.0 Min	70.0 Min
CaO	38.3	10.1	24.0	--	--
MgO	0.9	3.5	6.4	--	--
TiO <sub>2</sub>	0.1	0.5	1.3	--	--
K <sub>2</sub> O	0.2	0.6	0.5	--	--
Na <sub>2</sub> O	0.3	7.2	2.1	--	--
SO <sub>3</sub>	19.9	18.1	1.3	5.0 Max	5.0 Max
LOI (1000 <sup>o</sup> C)	14.4	33.2	1.7	6.0 Max	6.0 Max
Moisture (%)	0.03	0	0	3.0 Max	3.0 Max
Na <sub>2</sub> O, (ASTM C-311)	0.9	15.2	--	1.5 Max	1.5 Max

Table 3 – Mixture Proportions for Permeable Base (Open-graded) Course Mixtures  
Incorporating FGD-1, FGD-2 and FGD-3 Fly Ashes


Mixture No.	FGD-2 Fly Ash				FGD-3 Fly Ash			FGD-1 Fly Ash		
	MO	MO1	MO2	MO3	MO4	MO5	MO6	M07	MO8	MO9
Ash Content, %	0	15	30	45	15	30	45	15	30	45
Cement, C, (lb/yd <sup>3</sup> )	196	197	185	212	176	143	115	205	175	150
Fly Ash, A, (lb/yd <sup>3</sup> )	0	30	55	95	39	77	118	30	62	90
Water, W, (lb/yd <sup>3</sup> )	67	67	63	63	73	75	79	75	70	67
[W/(C+A)]	0.34	0.30	0.26	0.24	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34
SSD Fine Aggregate (lb/yd <sup>3</sup> )	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SSD Coarse Aggregate (lb/yd <sup>3</sup> )	273	269	257	290	283	280	287	286	289	272
Air Content (%)	2.0	4.8	2.5	4.2	1.2	2.6	4.6	1.6	2.2	1.4
Air Temperature (°F)	69	70	72	70	73	71	67	72	71	71
Concrete Temperature (°F)	70	73	74	72	70	69	66	69	72	67
Fresh Concrete Density (lb/ft <sup>3</sup> )	117	134	126	130	116	115	118	118	119	112

Table 4 – Mixture Proportions for Permeable Base (Intermediate-graded) Course Mixtures  
Incorporating FGD-1, FGD-2 and FGD-3 Fly Ashes


Mixture No.	FGD-3 Fly Ash				FGD-1 Fly Ash			FGD-2 Fly Ash		
	M2A	M21	M22	M23	M24	M25	M26	M27	M28	M29
Ash Content, %	--	15	30	55	15	30	45	15	30	45
Cement, C, (lb/yd <sup>3</sup> )	205	184	148	198	200	181	160	205	197	200
Fly Ash, A, (lb/yd <sup>3</sup> )	-	41	78	151	33	63	92	31	59	90
Water, W, (lb/yd <sup>3</sup> )	70	70	78	85	74	73	70	73	77	83
[W/(C+A)]**	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.33	0.34	0.34
SSD Fine Aggregate (lb/yd <sup>3</sup> )	600	625	605	630	610	585	545	620	580	590
SSD Coarse Aggregate (lb/yd <sup>3</sup> )	258 5	270 0	262 0	272 5	271 0	266 5	256 0	266 5	251 5	253 5
Air Content (%)	3.3	3.8	3.9	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.8	4.9	4.6	4.4
Air Temperature (°F)	74	75	75	75	75	75	78	76	80	78
Concrete Temperature (°F)	72	78	73	72	77	77	81	78	84	82
Fresh Concrete Density (lb/ft <sup>3</sup> )	128	134	131	137	134	133	127	133	127	130




**Fig. 1 Compressive Strength of Permeable Base Course (Open-graded) with FGD-2 Fly Ash**




**Fig. 2 Compressive Strength of Permeable Base Course (Open-graded) with FGD-3 Fly Ash**




**Fig. 3 Compressive Strength of Permeable Base Course (Open-graded) with FGD-1 Fly Ash**




**Fig. 4 Splitting Tensile Strength of Permeable Base Course (Open-graded) with FGD-2 Fly Ash**




**Fig. 5 Splitting Tensile Strength of Permeable Base Course (Open-graded) with FGD-3 Fly Ash**




**Fig. 6 Splitting Tensile Strength of Permeable Base Course (Open-graded) with FGD-1 Fly Ash**




**Fig. 7 Flexural Strength of Permeable Base Course (Open-graded) with FGD-2 Fly Ash**




**Fig. 8 Flexural Strength of Permeable Base Course (Open-graded) with FGD-3 Fly Ash**




**Fig. 9 Flexural Strength of Permeable Base Course (Open-graded) with FGD-1 Fly Ash**




**Fig. 10 Compressive Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-3 Fly Ash**




**Fig. 11 Compressive Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-1 Fly Ash**




**Fig. 12 Compressive Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-2 Fly Ash**




**Fig. 13. Splitting Tensile Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-3 Fly Ash**




**Fig. 14 Splitting Tensile Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-1 Fly Ash**




**Fig. 15 Splitting Tensile Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-2 Fly Ash**



**Fig. 16 Flexural Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-3 Fly Ash**



**Fig. 17 Flexural Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-1 Fly Ash**



**Fig. 18 Flexural Strength of Permeable Base Course (Intermediate-graded) with FGD-2 Fly Ash**