TECHNICAL REPORT STANDARD TITLE PAGE

1. Report No.	2. Government Acces	sion No.	3. Recipient's Catalog N	o.		
FHWA/TX-87/449-1F						
4. Title and Subtitle	L		5. Report Date			
			June 1987			
ASPHALT-RUBBER INTERLAYER	K FIELD PERFORM	IANCE	6. Performing Organizatio	n Code		
7. Author <sup>(</sup> s)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	8. Performing Organizatio	n Report No.			
Cindy K. Adams and Jorge G	Gonzales		Research Repor	t 449-1F		
9. Performing Organization Name and Addre Texas Transportation Insti			10. Work Unit No.			
The Texas A&M University S			11. Contract or Grant No.			
College Station, Texas 77			Study No. 2-9-	85-449		
			13. Type of Report and P			
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address			Final - Septem	ber 1984		
Texas State Department of			June 1	987		
Transportation; Transport	ation Planning	Division	·			
P.O. Box 5051			14. Sponsoring Agency Co	ode		
Austin, Texas 78763						
15. Supplementary Notes Research performed in coop	onation with [					
Research Study Title: Mor			Road Performance			
Research Study Intre. Not	ricoring Asphar	t Rubber rest	Roud i ci i ofiliance			
16. Abstract Test roads were constructed near El Paso, Buffalo and Brownsville under Study 2-9-83-347. All test roads were designed as statistical experiments such that analysis of effects due to asphalt-rubber formulation could be determined. Asphalt-rubber was formulated using various rubber concentration, rubber type, digestion conditions, and interlayers were applied at various shot rates. In addition, aggregate grade was varied, and single and double binder applications were studied. Based on field performance to date, the interlayer which is performing the best in the El Paso Test Road contains 26% rubber and was applied at 0.40 gallons per square yard. The Brownsville Test Road is experiencing bleeding from the interlayer in half of the test sections due to excessive interlayer binder application rates. The Buffalo Test Road is not experiencing any distress at this time. Long-term monitoring of these test roads will be continued under Study No. 1-10-77-187.						
<ul> <li>17. Key Words         Asphalt-rubber, stress absorbing membrane interlayers, field performance         18. Distribution Statement         No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 22161     </li> </ul>						
19. Security Classif, (of this report)	20. Security Class		21. No. of Pages	22. Price		
Unclassified	Unclassi		250			
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		L		

٠

\_!

Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-69)

# Asphalt-Rubber Interlayer Field Performance

by

Cindy Adams

and

Jorge Gonzales

Research Study Number 2-9-85-449

Report No. 449-1F

Sponsored by the

State Department of

Highways and Public Transportation

in cooperation

with the

United States Department of Transportation

Federal Highway Administration

Texas Transportation Institute

Texas A&M University

College Station, Texas 77843

June 1987

• •.

	Approximate Co	onversions to M	otric Measures		53 <u>6</u>	,	Approximate Com	versions from <b>P</b>	Aetric Measures	
Symbol	When You Know	Multiply by	To Find	Symbol	23	Symbol	When You Know	Multiply by	To Find	Symbol
		LENGTH						LENGTH		
in	inches	*2.5	centimeters	cm		mm	millimeters	0.04	inches	in
ft	feet	30	centimeters	CM		cm	centimeters	0.4	inches	in
γđ	yards	0.9	meters	m	7 - 2	m	meters	3.3	feet	ft
mi	miles	1.6	kilometers	km		m	meters	1.1	yards	γd
		ADEA				km	kilometers	0.6	miles	mi
		AREA						AREA		
in <sup>2</sup>	square inches	6.5	square centimeters	cm,	o					
ft <sup>2</sup>	square feet	0.09	square meters	m3	r <u>−</u> = = - ₽	cm3	square contimeters	0.16	square inches	in <sup>3</sup>
yd²	square yards	0.8	square meters	m³		m²	square meters	1.2	square yards	yd <sup>3</sup>
mi <sup>2</sup>	square miles	2.6	square kilometers	km²		km²	square kilometers	0.4	square miles	mi <sup>3</sup>
	acres	0.4	hectares	ha	<u> </u>	ha	hectares (10,000 m <sup>2</sup> )	2.5	acres	
	Ň	ASS (weight)					M	ASS (weight)		
02	ounces	28	grams	a		9	grams	0.035	ounces	oz
łb	pounds	0.45	kilograms	kg		kg	kilograms	2.2	pounds	lb
	short tons	0.9	tonnes	t	• <u>-</u> <u></u> =	t	tonnes (1000 kg)	1.1	short tons	
	(2000 lb)							VOLUME		
		VOLUME								
		_			3	mi	milliliters	0.03	fluid ounces	fi oz
tsp	teaspoons	5	milliliters	ml		I	liters	2.1	pints	pt
Tbsp	tablespoons	15	milliliters	mi		1	liters	1.06	quarts	qt
floz	fluid ounces	30	milliliters	ml	° °	',	liters	0.26	galions	gal
C	cups	0.24	liters	I.	: <u></u> :	m <b>3</b>	cubic meters	35	cubic feet	ft <sup>3</sup>
pt	pints	0.47 0.95	liters liters		° <u>– </u>	m,	cubic meters	1.3	cubic yards	٨q ،
qt gai	quarts galions	3.8	liters	-			TENAD	ERATURE (e)	(net)	
gan ft <sup>3</sup>	cubic feet	0.03	cubic meters	, m,			I EIVIP	ENATURE		
yd3	cubic yards	0.76	cubic meters	m <sup>3</sup>		°c	Celsius	9/5 (then	Fahrenheit	°F
	TEM	PERATURE (ex	lact)			C	temperature	add 32)	temperature	ſ
°F	Fahrenheit temperature	5/9 (after subtracting	Celsius temperature	°c			o		°F	:
		32)					°F 32 40 0  40	98.6 80   120	212 160 200	
*1 in - *	54 (exectly) En- net		ons and more detailed (	ables ec-	NDC				<b>60 80 100</b>	
			, Price \$2.25, SD Catal				°c	37	°c	

#### **METRIC CONVERSION FACTORS**

.

\*1 in = 2.54 (exactly). For other exact conversions and more detailed tables, see NBS Misc. Publ. 286, Units of Weights and Measures, Price \$2.25, SD Catalog No. C13.10:286. 1

·

#### SUMMARY

Test roads were constructed near El Paso, Buffalo and Brownsville under Study 2-9-83-347. All test roads were designed as statistical experiments such that analysis of effects due to asphalt-rubber formulation could be determined. Asphalt-rubber was formulated using various rubber concentration, rubber type, digestion conditions, and interlayers were applied at various shot rates. In addition, aggregate grade was varied, and single and double binder applications were studied.

Based on field performance to date, the interlayer which is performing the best in the El Paso Test Road contains 26% rubber and was applied at 0.40 gallons per square yard. The Brownsville Test Road is experiencing bleeding from the interlayer in half of the test sections due to excessive interlayer binder application rates. The Buffalo Test Road is not experiencing any distress at this time.

### IMPLEMENTATION STATEMENT

Laboratory test results obtained in Study 2-9-83-347 should provide information necessary to develop a state specification for asphalt-rubber based on performance. Two of the three test roads which have been monitored since construction are beginning to provide useful data concerning the construction of asphalt-rubber interlayers. However, monitoring should be continued until sufficient data is acquired to establish a correlation to laboratory properties.

# DISCLAIMER

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the Federal Highway Administration. This report does not constitute a standard, specification or regulation.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

			Page
DISCLAIN TABLE ON LIST OF	TATION STATEMENT.	• • • • • •	iii iv v vi viii x
CHAPTER			
Ι	INTRODUCTION	•••	1 1 2 3
II	MATERIALS	•••	4 4 12 16
III	EXPERIMENT DESIGN	· · · ·	17 17 18 21 23 26 28
IV	SITE SELECTION	•••	29 30 33 33
<b>V</b>	TEST ROAD CONSTRUCTION.El Paso - PreconstructionEl Paso - Construction.Buffalo - PreconstructionBuffalo - Construction.Buffalo - Construction.Brownsville - PreconstructionBrownsville - Construction.	• • •	38 38 43 53 53 61 61
VI	FIELD SURVEY DATA	• • •	69 69 72 81

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER																										Page
VII	ANALYSIS											90														
		Fie	eld	Res ille	рс	nse	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•							90 93
VIII	CONO Co Re	oncl	lus	NS A ions ndat	•		•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	94 94 94
REFEREN	CES.	•	••	••	, ,	••	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	95
APPENDI				olog																						97
APPENDI APPENDI	-			olog olog																						189 209

# LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Asphalt Cement Properties	5
2	Rubber Types	6
3	El Paso Rubber Gradations	7
4	Rubber Properties	9
5	Mineral Aggregate Properties	13
6	Asphalt Concrete Properties	14
7	El Paso Photolog Locations	39
8	Pavement Rating Deduct Values	41
9	El Paso Preconstruction Pavement Rating Scores	42
10	El Paso Mixing Observations and Test Results	47
11	El Paso Application Quantities	51
12	El Paso Overlay Thicknesses	52
13	Buffalo Photolog Locations	54
14	Buffalo Preconstruction Pavement Rating Scores	55
15	Buffalo Mixing Observations and Test Results	57
16	Buffalo Application Quantities	60
17	Buffalo Overlay Thicknesses	62
18	Brownsville Test Section Materials	63
19	Brownsville Photolog Locations	64
20	Brownsville Preconstruction Pavement Rating Scores	65
21	Brownsville Test Road Aggregate and Binder Application Rates	67
22	Pavement Rating Deduct Values	71
23	El Paso Pavement Rating Scores for February, 1984	73
24	El Paso Pavement Rating Scores for May, 1984	74
25	El Paso Pavement Rating Scores for July, 1985	75
26	El Paso Pavement Rating Scores for October, 1985	76
27	El Paso Pavement Rating Scores for May, 1986	77
28	Extent of Overlay Cracking Expressed as a Percentage of Cracking in the Original Pavement for the El Paso	
	Test Road	78
29	Brownsville Pavement Rating Scores for November, 1985.	82

# LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
30	Brownsville Pavement Rating Scores for May, 1986	83
31	Extent of Overlay Cracking Expressed as a Percentage of Cracking in the Original Pavement for the	
	Brownsville Test Road	84
32	Buffalo Pavement Rating Scores for October, 1985	88
33	Buffalo Pavement Rating Scores for May, 1986	89

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1	Rubber Gradations
2	Aggregate Gradations
3	Asphalt Concrete Resilient Modulus
4	El Paso Field Response Experiment
5	El Paso Lab Response to Field Mixed Material 20
6	El Paso Lab Response to Lab Mixed Material
7	Buffalo Field Response Experiment
8	Buffalo Lab Response to Lab Mixed Material
9	Buffalo Lab Response to Field Mixed Material 27
10	El Paso Test Road Location
11	El Paso Test Sections
12	Buffalo Test Road Location
13	Buffalo Test Sections
14	Brownsville Test Road - Test Section Locations 36
15	Pavement Rating Forms
16	Asphalt-Rubber Specific Gravity
17	El Paso Asphalt-Rubber Viscosity
18	El Paso Asphalt-Rubber Temperature Loss 50
19	Buffalo Asphalt-Rubber Viscosity
20	Buffalo Asphalt-Rubber Temperature Loss 59
21	Pavement Rating Forms
22	El Paso Transverse Cracking Versus Survey Date 79
23	El Paso Longitudinal Cracking Versus Survey Date 80 ·
24	Brownsville Transverse Cracking Versus Survey Date 85
25	Brownsville Longitudinal Cracking Versus Survey Date 86
26	Brownsville Test Road - Area of Bleeding Distress 87
27	Modified Factorial Model

### CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

#### History

Ground tire rubber has been used as an additive in various types of asphalt pavement construction in recent years. The use of rubber is an attempt to input additional elasticity to paving materials.

A blend of paving asphalt cement and gound tire rubber is called "asphalt-rubber". Rubber content of this blend is 18 to 26 percent by total weight of the blend (1). The blend is formulated at elevated temperature to promote chemical and physical bonding of the two components. Various petroleum distillates are sometimes added to the blend to reduce viscosity and promote workability.

Asphalt-rubber binders have been used in a number of Civil Engineering applications. Early observations of field installations indicated that asphalt-rubber bound materials reduced the occurance of reflection cracking. Thus, much use of asphalt-rubber has been in pavement rehabilitation systems where the reduction of reflection cracks is desired. An asphalt-rubber seal coat sandwiched between an existing cracked asphalt concrete pavement and new asphalt concrete overlay is called an asphalt-rubber "interlayer" (2). Historically, the design and construction of asphalt-rubber seal coats and interlayers has been identical, although recent research suggests modifications of old techniques are justified (3).

Field observations suggest asphalt-rubber interlayers may reduce reflection cracking in overlays (1,2,4). However, many types of formulations of asphalt and rubber are possible due to a wide assortment of constituents. Evidence suggests certain asphalt-rubber blends may produce undesirable results (5). Although some data is available regarding performance of asphalt-rubber in the laboratory (5,6,7,8,9) a correlation between laboratory data and field performance has not been developed.

#### Accomplishments in Study 2-9-83-347 (16)

In this study, three experimental test roads containing asphalt-rubber interlayers were constructed. Test pavements were designed as statistical experiments such that future performance analysis could be obtained. Precondition surveys were conducted prior to rehabilitation to provide documentation for future condition surveys.

One test pavement was constructed in the east and westbound travel lanes on Interstate Highway 10 east of El Paso, Texas between FM 34 and the McNary interchange. This pavement will be referred to as the "El Paso Test Road".

The second test pavement was constructed in the northbound travel lane of Interstate Highway 45 from the Leon-Freestone County Line north to the U.S. 84 overpass. This pavement will be referred to as the "Buffalo Test Road".

Test road number three was constructed in the north and southbound lanes of State Highway 4 from the International Bridge north approximately two miles. This pavement will be referred to as the "Brownsville Test Road".

Samples of asphalt-rubber were obtained during field mixing of asphalt and rubber for laboratory characterization. Samples of asphalt and rubber were obtained for mixing in the laboratory. A comparison was made between laboratory test results of field and laboratory prepared asphalt-rubber.

Three new laboratory tests were used to evaluate asphalt-rubber engineering properties. These included force ductility, double ball softening point, and torque fork viscosity.

Results of these laboratory tests indicate engineering properties of field prepared asphalt-rubber can be duplicated by laboratory prepared mixtures. This means future mixtures of asphalt-rubber can be designed in the laboratory prior to construction.

## Scope

The purpose of this research was to monitor the performance of these three test roads. Systematic condition surveys were conducted semi-annually at the El Paso, Buffalo, and Brownsville Test Roads following the guideline for pavement evaluation outlined by Epps, et. al. (13). This report documents the field survey data, procedures and performance data based on pavement condition prior to interlayer construction.

## CHAPTER II

### MATERIALS

### El Paso Test Road

Asphalt cements used in the preparation of asphalt-rubber binders and asphalt concrete was obtained from the Chevron refinery in El Paso, Texas. These asphalts meet the Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation (SDHPT) specification (12) requirements for AC-10 and AC-20 viscosity graded materials as shown in Table 1.

Three sources of rubber were used to produce asphalt-rubber binders investigated at the El Paso Road. These rubber materials were obtained from the suppliers shown in Table 2. Sieve analysis of rubber was accomplished following a modified ASTM C136 procedure (10). The procedure was changed by lightly rubbing the rubber particles by hand on each sieve to prevent rebound from the sieve surface. Undue force was not applied using this procedure to avoid pushing particles through the sieve.

It was desired to estimate the precision of the modified sieve analysis procedure. Therefore, ten random sieve analyses were performed by the same operator on each of the three rubber types. The percent rubber passing each sieve was measured and confidence intervals have been established for gradation of each rubber type based on average and standard deviation for percent passing each sieve size. Gradations with 95 percent confidence limits appear in Table 3. Average gradation for each rubber type is plotted in Figure 1. Further characterization of each rubber type following ASTM procedure D297 (11) provides data relating to physical and chemical properties as shown in Table 4.

Dolomite mineral aggregates used for construction of interlayer and asphalt concrete were obtained from the Esperanza Pit, Esperanza, Texas. Interlayer aggregates were precoated with approximately one percent Chevron AC-20 and stockpiled prior to application.

# Table 1. Asphalt Cement Properties.

	Ducnoutics	AC-10 Asphalt Spec						AC-20 Asphalt			
	Properties	El Paso	Buffalo	Brownsville	Spec Min. Max.	El Paso		Brownsville	Spec Min. Max.		
	Viscosity, 140F poises	1048	868	930	1000 <u>+</u> 200	1860	1755	1792	2000 <u>+</u> 400		
	Viscosity, 275F stokes	2.9	2.8	2.9	1.9 -	3.8	3.5	3.7	2.5 -		
	Penetration, 77F, 100g, 5 sec	92	150	136	85 -	69	70	88	55 -		
	Flash Point C.O.C., F	600+	N/A	530	450 -	600+	595	582	450 -		
ഗ	Specific Gravity, 77F	1.010	1.017	1.022	N/A	1.012	1.013	1.024	N/A		
	Tests on residues from thin film oven test:										
	Viscosity, 140F poises	2257	2445	2228	- 3000	4146	4485	3431	- 6000		
	Ductility, 77F, 5 cms per min., cms	141+	141+	141+	70 -	141+	]41+	141+	50 -		

# El Paso Test Road

Rubber	Source	Source Designation	Manufacturers Designation
A	Genstar Conservation Chandler, Arizona	C104	Whole Tire, Vulcanized, Ambient Grind
В	Atlos Manufacturing Los Angeles, CA	TPO 44	Tread Tire, Vulcanized, Ambient Grind
C	Midwest Elastomers Wapokonetta, Ohio	N/A	Whole Tire, Vulcanized, Cryogenic Grind
	Buffalo/Brownsvil	le Test Roads	
D	Genstar Conservation, Chandler, Arizona	C106	Whole Tire, Vulcanized Ambient Grind
E	Baker Rubber, South Bend, Indiana	1MAT-20	High Natural Rubber Content,

Rubber Content, Vulcanized, Ambient Grind

	% Passing							
<u>Sieve</u>	Rubber A	Rubber B	Rubber C					
8	100	100	100					
10	100	100	99 <u>+</u> 0.5					
16	65 <u>+</u> 5.6	38 <u>+</u> 2.1	67 <u>+</u> 3.9					
30	2 <u>+</u> 0.3	8 <u>+</u> 0.6	8 <u>+</u> 1.1					
40	0.5 <u>+</u> 0.4	4 <u>+</u> 0.4	3 <u>+</u> 0.9					
50	0	3 <u>+</u> 0.4	1 <u>+</u> 0.6					
100		0.4 <u>+</u> 0.5	0.2 <u>+</u> 0.4					
200		0	Ó					

•

Table 3. El Paso Rubber Gradations



Sieve Size

Figure 1. Rubber Gradations

ω

# Table 4. Rubber Properties.

		El Paso	
	A	B	<u> </u>
Specific Gravity	1.165	1.153	1.150
Total Extract, % by	15.45	19.47	24.50
weight			
Ash, % by weight	5.71	3.49	2.41
Free Carbon, % by	29.21	30.75	31.31
weight			
Total Sulfur, % by	1.17	1.02	1.10
weight			
Rubber Polymer:			
Natural Rubber,			
% by weight	30	20	0
Styrene butadiene, %	/		
by weight	60	80	55
Polybutadiene, % by			
weight	10	0	45
	100	100	100
Rubber Hydrocarbon, %	100	100	100
by volume	60.92	55.89	50.76

Table 4. Rubber Properties. (Continued)

	Buf	falo	Brownsville		
	D	D/E	D/E		
Specific Gravity	1.160	1.48	1.15		
Total Extract, % by	15.41	12.75	13.27		
weight					
Ash, % by weight	5.68	4.86	5.03		
Free Carbon, % by	29.00	28.35	28.53		
weight					
Total Sulfur, % by	1.15	1.17	1.18		
weight					
Rubber Polymer:					
Natural Rubber,					
% by weight	30	61	54		
Styrene butadiene, %					
by weight	60	35	40		
Polybutadiene, % by					
weight	10	4	6		
	100	100	100		
Rubber Hydrocarbon, %					
by volume	61.02	58.46	58,95		



Figure 2. Aggregate Gradations

Particle size gradations of interlayer and asphalt concrete aggregates appear in Figure 2. Both materials conform to Texas SDHPT Item 302 Grade 4 and Item 340 Type D specification limits, respectively. Physical properties of mineral aggregates conform to Texas SDHPT specifications as shown in Table 5.

Samples of the asphalt concrete overlay were obtained by coring each test section approximately two weeks after construction. Characteristics of the overlay asphalt concrete are as shown in Table 6. Figure 3 indicates the variation of asphalt concrete resilient modulus with temperature.

## Buffalo Test Road

Asphalt used for asphalt-rubber blending was an AC-10 asphalt cement supplied by Texas Fuel and Asphalt, Corpus Christi, Texas. Asphalt for asphalt concrete production was an AC-20 asphalt cement supplied by Trumbull Asphalt of Houston, Texas. These asphalts meet the Texas SDHPT specification requirements for AC-10 and AC-20 viscosity graded materials as shown in Table 1. A flux oil, Sundex 790, from Sun Oil Corporation, Houston, Texas, was blended with the AC-10 asphalt prior to blending with rubber.

One rubber source was used to produce the asphalt-rubber placed on the Buffalo Test Road. This material is described as Rubber A Designation C106 in Table 2. This rubber has the same chemical properties as Rubber Type A Designation C104 used at the El Paso Test Road. However, particle size gradation differs. Sieve analysis of the rubber is shown in Figure 1. Note the finer size gradation of the Buffalo Type A rubber compared with El Paso Type A.

Limestone mineral aggregates used for construction of interlayer and asphalt concrete were obtained from the Yelberton Pit near Mexia, Texas. Interlayer aggregates were precoated with approximately 0.50 percent AC-20 immediately prior to application.

Particle size gradations of aggregates are shown in Figure 2. Materials conform to Texas SDHPT Grade 3 Item 302 seal coat and Type C

		Seal Coat			Asphalt Concrete				
		El Paso	Buffalo	Brownsville	Spec	El Paso	Buffalo	Brownsville	Spec
13	Test	Grade 4	Grade 3	Grades 3 & 4	(12)	Type D	Туре С	Type D	(12)
	Unit Weight,pcf Tex-404A	84.6	81.5	N/A	N/A	91.4	85.2	N/A	35, min
	L. A. Abrasion,% Tex-410A	21	33	N/A	35, max	21	33	N/A	40, max
	Polish Value,% Tex-438A	- 35	45	N/A	N/A	35	45	N/A	N/A
	Decant.,% Tex-217F,II	0.4	0.8	•3	5, max	0.8	0.8	0.5	l, max
	Plasticity Index Tex-106E	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	1	1.5	6, max
	Sand Equivalent	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	60	45, min

Table 6. Asphalt Concrete Properties.

	<u>El Paso</u>	<u>Buffalo</u>	Brownsville
Hveem Stability (Texas Method)	33	19	46
Indirect Tensile Modulus, 77F,			
psi x $10^3$	34.9	11.8	10.4
Indirect Tensile Modulus after Lottman Freeze-Thaw, 77F,			
psi x 10 <sup>3</sup>	30.2	12.0	12.4
Resilient Modulus, 77F, psi x $10^3$	328	26 <b>6</b>	137
Resilient Modulus after Lottman			
Freeze-Thaw, psi x 10 <sup>3</sup>	242	188	155
Asphalt Content, % by weight	5.0	4.9	5.4
Unit Weight, pcf	144.7	139.5	136.9
Absorbed Asphalt, %	1.1	0.9	N/A
Effective Asphalt, %	3.9	4.0	N/A
VMA, %	14.6	19.6	N/A
Air Voids, %	5.5	9.2	9.4



Figure 3. Asphalt Concrete Resilient Modulus

Item 340 asphalt concrete specification limits, respectively, as shown in Table 4. Physical properties of the limestone are shown in Table 5.

Core samples of the asphalt concrete overlay were obtained within each test section approximately two weeks after construction. Laboratory properties of the asphalt concrete are summarized in Table 6 and represented graphically in Figure 3.

#### Brownsville Test Road

Asphalt used for asphalt-rubber blending was an AC-10 from Texas Fuel and Asphalt, Corpus Christi, Texas. An AC-20 was obtained from the same source for asphalt concrete production. These asphalts meet Texas SDHPT specification requirements as shown in Table 1. Sundex 790 from Sun Oil Corporation was blended with the AC-10 asphalt at 6 percent by volume. Control sections were placed with non-modified AC-10 and polymer modified emulsion, designated HFRS-2, from Texas Emulsions, Austin, Texas.

The rubber used to produce the asphalt-rubber was a blend of 60 percent Type A and 40 percent Type B as shown in Table 2. Properties of the blended rubber appear in Table 4. Sieve analysis of this rubber blend appears in Figure 1.

Mineral aggregates for asphalt concrete were obtained from the San Juan Plant. Seal coat aggregates were sampled from the Fordyce Company, Spaulding Pit. Approximately 1 percent lime from Redland Worth Corporation was added to the asphalt concrete.

Particle size gradation of aggregates appear in Figure 2. Asphalt concrete aggregates conform to Texas SDHPT Type D, and interlayer aggregates conform to Grades 3A and 4, respectively. Physical properties of aggregates appear in Table 5.

Laboratory properties of core samples obtained by District 21 personnel appear in Table 6 and Figure 3.

#### CHAPTER III

#### EXPERIMENT DESIGN

The following discussion relates to the statistical design of two experimental test roads. Subscripts within the mathematical models are associated with main factors and replicates.

A major portion of Study 2-9-83-347 was dedicated to establishing statistically designed field and laboratory experiments which could form the basis for future correlations between field performance and laboratory test results.

#### El Paso Test Road - Field Responses

This experiment was designed as a Latin Square (21) with three samples per treatment. The statistical model for the analysis of this design is formulated as follows:

 $Y_{i,ik} = \mu + R_i + C_i + A_k + e_{i,ik}$ 

where

Y<sub>ijk</sub> = response to ith rubber, jth concentration and kth application rate. µ = effect on response of the overall mean R<sub>i</sub> = effect on response of the ith rubber, i = 1,2,3 C<sub>j</sub> = effect on response of the jth concentration, j = 1,2,3 A<sub>k</sub> = effect on response of the kth application rate, k = 1,2,3 e<sub>ijk</sub> = random error

Note: This Latin Square was designed without replication. Therefore, estimation of interaction effects is not possible as the model above

reflects. As a first approximation, this experiment estimates main factor effects only, and assumes no interactions.

Levels of the independent variables are as follows:

I. Rubber Type, Ri

- A. Type A (Table 2)
- B. Type B (Table 2)
- C. Type C (Table 2)

II. Rubber Concentration, %, Cj

- A. 22 B. 24
- C. 26

III. Application Rate, gsy,  $A_k$ 

- A. 0.35
- B. 0.40
- C. 0.45

The matrix arrangement shown in Figure 4 depicts all combinations of variables investigated for field response at the El Paso Test Road.

#### El Paso Test Road - Laboratory Responses

Two experiments were designed for this phase of the research. One deals with asphalt-rubber material prepared in the field and the other deals with asphalt-rubber prepared in the laboratory. Both experiments are full factorial designs with fixed factors and three replicates.

Models for analysis of these respective experiment designs are as follows:

Field Mixed Asphalt-Rubber  $Y_{ijk} = \mu + R_i + C_j + RC_{ij} + e_{ijk}$ 

where terms are as indicated previously and RCij represents the

		Rubbe	er Concentra		
		22	24	26	
Ak	د بي کم کم		B Section 9	A Section 8	Rubber Type, R <sub>i</sub>
Application Rate, A	40	B Section 4	A Section 1	C Section 6	Control (No Interlayer)
Applic	45	A Section 5	C Section 7	B Section 3	Section 10

.

Figure 4. El Paso Field Response Experiment

•.

		Rubber, R <sub>i</sub>				
		А	В	С		
c,	22			  		
Concentration, C <sub>j</sub>	24			  _		
Ŭ	26		  	  _		


interaction effect of the ith rubber and jth concentration. A matrix representation is shown in Figure 5.

Laboratory Mixed Asphalt-Rubber Yijkm = µ + Rj + Cj + Dk + RCjj + RDjk + CDjk + RCKjik + ejikm

where:  $D_k$  = effect on response of the  $k_{th}$  digestion condition, k = 1,2,3

and other terms are as before with interactions occurring for all combinations of main effects. Figure 6 is a matrix representation of this experiment.

Three digestion conditions were produced in the laboratory. These digestion conditions were varied from low to moderate to high to provide a range from which simulation of field digestion could be approximated. The basis for this lab variation was an effort to provide asphalt-rubber lab mixes with properties of field prepared mixes.

#### Buffalo Test Road - Field Responses

This experiment was designed as a full factorial with two fixed factors and two replications. The model for analysis of this design is as follows:

 $Y_{i,ik} = \mu + C_i + D_j + CD_{i,i} + e_{i,ik}$ 

where terms are as before.

Levels of the independent variables are as follows:

I. Concentration of Rubber, Ci

- A. 18
- B. 22

Concent, Digestion	to er, Pr	·	<b>13 </b>							
CS F. On			A			В			C	
Digestion.		22	24	26	22	24	26	22	24	26
	Low									  
	Med		-					  		 
	High		-	-			-	_ _ _	 	  

-

• •

Figure 6. El Paso Lab Response to Lab Mixed Material

# II. Digestion, Dj

```
A. Low
```

B. High

In this experiment, rubber type and application rate are held constant. The resulting four treatments are replicated providing eight experimental test sections. Four additional test sections were included as control sections. Two sections were constructed using a conventional asphalt cement as the interlayer binder and the other two sections contain no interlayer.

#### Buffalo Test Road - Laboratory Responses

This experiment was designed to evaluate laboratory responses of field mixed and laboratory mixed asphalt-rubber materials as in the El Paso experiment. The experiment is a replicated, full factorial with fixed factors analyzed according to the model appearing below:

$$Y_{ijk} = \mu + C_i + D_j + CD_{ij} + e_{ijk}$$

where terms are as previously described. The matrix representation of the field and laboratory experiments for this model appear as shown in Figures 7 and 8.

The model used for analysis of the laboratory response to field prepared asphalt-rubber is shown below:

$$Y_{ijk} = \mu + C_i + D_j + R_k + CD_{ij} + CR_{ik} + DR_{ik} + CDR_{ijk} + \varepsilon_{ijk}$$

where terms are as previously described and,

 $R_k$  = effect on response to k<sup>th</sup> field replicate, k = 1,2

			Concentra	tion, C <sub>i</sub> , %	
_			18	22	Controls (AC Binder)
ſ			1	7	2
	D.	High	8	12	5
	ion,				(No Interlayers)
	Digestion, D <sub>j</sub>		9	6	3
		Гом	11	10	4

Note: Numbers shown are test section numbers noted on Figure 13.

Figure 7. Buffalo Field Response Experiment.

		Concentration, %			
		18	22		
		-	-		
	Low	-	-		
	Ľ	-	-		
uo		-	-		
esti	Med	-	-		
Digestion	2	-	-		
		-	-		
	ht	-	-		
	High	-	-		

Figure 8. Buffalo Lab Response to Lab Mixed Material

This third main effect is added to the model such that judgement regarding replicate batches of field mixed asphalt-rubber is possible. Matrix representation of this experiment is as shown in Figure 9. Field replicates of each treatment were fabricated to judge variability within each material type. For example, test sections 1 and 8 represent two separate batches, or truck loads, of High Digestion, 18 percent, asphalt-rubber. These replicates will allow future comparison of field performance within a given treatment such that variability can be judged between treatment types. In this study, it was desired to see whether laboratory responses differed significantly for replicate materials fabricated in supposedly the same manner.

## Brownsville Test Road - Field Responses

The Brownsville Test Road was designed to evaluate field performance of two aggregate grades in single and double applications as interlayers. Asphalt-rubber formulation was not varied in this experiment. Control sections are composed of interlayer binders of polymer modified asphalt and conventional asphalt cement.

All combinations of interlayers applied at the Brownsville Test Road are described in the following table:

Binder Application	Binder Type	Top Aggregate Grade	Bottom Aggregate Grade
Single	A-R	3	N/A
Single	A-R	4	N/A
Single*	A-R	4	4
Double	A-R	3	3
Double	A-R	4	3
Double	A-R	4	4
Double	AC	4	3
Double	Polymer	4	4

\*Grade 4 aggregate was applied two layers deep in one application over one appliction of binder.

18	22	2 18	
18	22	18	20
	I		22
-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-
_	_	_	-
-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-
-		     	

Figure 9. Buffalo Lab Response to Field Mixed Material.

# Brownsville Test Road - Laboratory Response

The asphalt-rubber binder at Brownsville Test Road is composed of the same asphalt and rubber as Buffalo Test Road for the Genstar/Baker blend except Brownsville contains a 60:40 ratio of Genstar to Baker compared with a 50:50 ratio at Buffalo.

The laboratory mixes are compared for low, moderate and high digestion, similarly to El Paso and Buffalo mixes.

## CHAPTER IV

# SITE SELECTION

Location of field test roads was accomplished in cooperation with the Texas SDHPT. A list of sites was obtained from highway districts planning asphalt-rubber interlayer construction and from this list potential test sites were selected. Criteria used to judge the adequacy of sites are listed in order of importance below:

- Willingness of district and contractors to participate in experiment.
- 2. Size of project.
- 3. Time until next planned rehabilitation.
- 4. Pavement substructure uniformity.
- 5. Overlay thickness and uniformity.
- 6. Distress uniformity.

A contract had been awarded on the project which would become the El Paso Test Road when initial contact with the El Paso Highway District was made. Since significant changes in the original contract were required to accomodate the planned experiments, it was crucial that a cooperative spirit exist between highway department, contractor, and research personnel. Planning the Buffalo Test Road began before there was a contract between the highway department and a contractor. Therefore, requirements of test section construction were included in job specifications and subject to competitive bidding.

A full distributor of asphalt-rubber was desired for use in application of each test section for both test roads. This was desirable for reasons listed below:

1. A more representative blend of asphalt-rubber could be expected compared with partial loads,

2. Test section length of approximately one lane-mile resulted from approximately 4200 gallon distributor loads. These lengths provided transitions before and after the 1500 feet of photologs contained in each

test section. This further enhanced the potential for representative materials placed over photologs.

3. Production rate was not appreciably slowed. This enhanced the desired cooperative spirit between contractor and research personnel.

Project size was an important factor for both test roads since it was desired to place test sections in lanes having consistent traffic volumes and loads. Both projects were of sufficient length to accomodate approximately nine lane miles for the El Paso Test Road and over ten lane miles for the Buffalo Test Road.

#### El Paso Test Road

The El Paso Test Road is part of Texas Project FR-10-1(168)079 located on Interstate Highway 10 (IH-10) in Hudspeth County, approximately 80 miles east of El Paso between the McNary interchange and FM 34 as shown on Figure 10. Test sections are each approximately 0.90 mile in length in the travel lanes as shown in Figure 11.

Original pavement structure for eastbound lanes was U. S. Highway 80 consisting of a 20 foot wide portland cement concrete pavement constructed in 1932. Conversion of the original highway to the interstate system in 1963 added westbound lanes consisting of 6 inches dense graded asphalt concrete over 6 inches cement treated base and 6 inches cement treated subgrade. An overlay of original portland cement concrete pavement in 1963 consisted of 6 inches dense graded asphalt concrete in which 3 inch by 6 inch Number 10 welded wire fabric was embedded in the lower 1-1/2 inches.

Distress consisted of slight to severe transverse cracking at random intervals, and combinations of longitudial and alligator cracking distributed throughout.

Traffic on the El Paso Test Road consisted of a total traffic volume of 7900 average daily traffic (ADT) in 1983. Truck volume was approximately 25 percent of this value with five axle semi-trucks accounting for approximately 60 percent of all trucks.



Figure 10. El Paso Test Road Location -



Figure 11. El Paso Test Sections

Subgrade soils on the El Paso Test Road are poorly graded sands and gravels, some containing plastic fines, classified by the Unified Soil Classification System as GP-GC and SP-SC for gravels and sands, respectively.

## Buffalo Test Road

Buffalo Test Road State project designation is FRI-45-2(68)180 located on Interstate Highway 45 (IH-45) in Freestone County, from the Leon county line to US 84 as shown in Figure 12. Test sections are each approximately 0.80 mile in length in the northbound travel lane as shown in Figure 13.

The Buffalo Test Road is constructed on 8 inches of continuously reinforced concrete pavement over 4 inches of asphalt treated basecourse and 6 inches lime treated subgrade. The original pavement structure was constructed in 1971.

Distress consisted of typical hairline random transverse cracks at 3 to 6 foot intervals, and infrequent punchouts.

Traffic on the Buffalo Test Road was measured by Texas SDHPT in 1983 at approximately 15,000 ADT. The total volume of trucks is approximately 20 percent, Volume by individual truck type has not been measured in this area and is therefore, not available.

Subgrade soil types along the Buffalo Test Road alignment were obtained from recently recorded Soil Conservation Service logs (23). Classification of subgrade soils by the Unified System are as low plasticity clays and silty clays, ML-CL, along much of the alignment with some clays bordering on high plasticity.

## Brownsville Test Road

Brownsville Test Road State project designation is MW 017(2) located on State Highway (SH4) in Cameron County from the International Bridge north approximately two miles. Test sections are located in travel and passing lanes both north and southbound as shown in Figure 14.



Figure 12. Buffalo Test Road Location



.



•.



Figure 14. Brownsville Test Road - Test Section Locations

The existing pavement structure prior to rehabilitation consisted of approximately 4 inches of asphalt concrete placed over 8 inches of crushed stone base over 8 inches of soils of ADT river sand.

Traffic on the Brownsville Test Road was measured in 1983 by Texas SDHPT at approximately 23,000 ADT.

Subgrade soil types along the Test Road alignment are classified as CL and ML from Station 15 + 00 to approximately 55 too. Soils become more plastic to the north, classified as CH and MH from Station 75 + 00 to 110 + 00.

## CHAPTER V

## TEST ROAD CONSTRUCTION

## El Paso-Preconstruction

Prior to construction three segments of pavement each 500 feet in length were located within each test section. These sections were surveyed by photographing the 12 foot wide and 500 foot long pavement section prior to rehabilitation. The locations of these photolog segments within each test section are as shown in Table 7.

Photolog equipment consisted of a test vehicle equipped with a motorized 35 mm camera mounted in front of the vehicle in a vertical position over the pavement. The camera and vehicle speed were synchronized such that each photographic frame recorded pavement measuring 8 by 12 feet with a six inch overlap for adjacent segments. All photgraphs are on file at Texas Transportation Institute, College Station, Texas. Each photograph of the test sections was studied to determine the extent of distress present prior to construction. Distress types and levels of severity were recorded for each test section following the criteria described by Epps, et al. (13). Results of the photolog summary appear in Appendix A. An index of pavement condition has been described (14) which quantifies all forms and levels of pavement distress. Based on maintenance costs, this index, or Pavement Rating Score (PRS), allows numerical comparison of pavement condition. A PRS value of 100 describes a pavement with no distress. Progressively lower PRS values describe pavement condition with more severe forms of distress. The form shown in Figure 15 is used to catalog distress observed on the pavement. Deduct values are assigned to each type and level of distress according to Table 8. The sum of deduct values is subtracted from 100 resulting in the pavement ratio score (PRS).

The results of this analysis for the ten El Paso test sections appear in Table 9.

Test		Sta	tion
Section	Photolog	From	То
1	1	68+65.5	73+65.5
	1 2 3	86+00	91+00
	3	104+00	109+00
2	4	136+00	141+00
	4 5 6	145+00	150+00
	6	150+00	155+00
3	7	180+00	185+00
	8	186+00	191+00
	9	191+00	196+00
4	10	485+00	490+00
	11	490+00	495+00
	12	520+00	525+00
5	13	510+00	505+00
	14	490+00	495+00
	15	480+00	475+00
6	16	460+00	455+00
	17	455+00	450+00
	18	450+00	,445+00
7	19	180+00	175+00
	20	175+00	170+00
	21	170+00	165+00
8	22	120+00	115+00
	23	115+00	110+00
	24	110+00	105+00
9	25	95+00	90+00
	26	80+00	75+00
	27	75+00	70+00
Control	28	238+55	243+55

Table 7. El Paso Photolog Locations.

Figure 15. Pavement Rating Forms

			1				-
	FOREMAN N	0	] [	DATE	RA	Sig	
	HICHWAY CL	ASS	]	TE	RATERS	DISTRICT	i
F	COUNTY NO	)	]		S	CT	
		··	1 1	MONTH	구구	δ	
				i ≨ t		Ų	
	HIGHWAY NO	).			귀 뭐		
<u>├</u> ┼							
			i č		$\neg$	Я	-
			1 3 1	DAY		L.J	
	CONTROL		LOCATION		3 8		
	CECTION		<b>*</b>				
<b>F</b>	SECTION		{		$\Box \Box$		
	FR			YEAR			
	FROM				$\Box \Box$		ĺ
<b></b>			4 1	┝┤╝┝	-1  -1		
┝╼╂╼┥	5						•
	0		1 1		H		
<b>├</b> ─ <b>┤</b> ─	LANE		1 1	t	가 다	1	1
	MAYS METE	ER	البريستين			T	5
	MAYS METE	DERATE C	SEVER	E PUMPI	NĞ	-	POR
	()SLIGHT (2) MC () 1-5 (2) 6-1	0 (5) > 10	FAILU	E PUMP	NG LE		PORTL
	(1)SLIGHT (2) M (1) 1-5 (2) 6- SLIGHT	DERATE ( 0 (3) > 10 U Q Q ⊖	FAILU	RES 7M SURFA			PORTLAN
	()SLIGHT (2) MC ()]-5 (2) 6- SUGHT MODERATE SEVERE	0 (3) > 10	FAILU	RES 7M SURFA	LE	NĽ	PORTLAND
	()SLIGHT (2) MC (1) 1-5 (2) 6-1 SLIGHT MODE RATE SEVERE SLIGHT	0 (3) > 10	FAILU	SURFA	LE ICE INORATIO	NĽ	
	()SLIGHT (2) MC ()]-5 (2) 6- SUGHT MODERATE SEVERE	0 (3) > 10	FAILU	RES 7M SURFA	LE ICE INORATIO	NĽ	
	()SLIGHT (2) MC ()]-5 (2) 6- SLIGHT MODERATE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT	0 (3) > 10	FATRANEA JOINTS	SURFA	LE ICE INORATIO	NĽ	
	()SLIGHT (2) MC ()1-5 (2) 6- SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SLIGHT MODERATE	0 (3) > 10	FAILU	SURFA	LE INGRATIO	NĽ	PORTLAND CEMENT
	()SLIGHT (2) MC ())I-5 (2) 6- SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SEVERE GOOD	0 (3) > 10	ATRAPEA JOINTS PER	SURFA DE TEF SPALI LONGIT CRACI	LE ICE NORATIO LING TUDINAL KING		CEMENT
	()SLIGHT (2) MC ()1-5 (2) 6- SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE GOOD FAIR	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	ATRAPEA JOINTS PER	SURFA DE TER SPALI	LE ICE NORATIO LING TUDINAL KING	NĽ	CEMENT
	()SLIGHT (2) MC ()]-5 (2) 6- SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE GOOD FAIR POOR	DDERATE     C       0     10  1	AREA JOINTS PER SAREA	RES 7MI SURFA DE TER SPALI LONGIT CRACI PATCI	LE ICE INORATIO LING TUDINAL KING	NĽ	CEMENT
	()SLIGHT (2) MC ())I-5 (2) 6- SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE GOOD FAIR POOR MODERATE SEVERE	DEFATE     C       0     0 <td>ATRAPEA JOINTS PER</td> <td>SURFA DETER SPALL LONGIT CRACE PATCE FAULT</td> <td>LE ICE HORATIO LING TUDINAL KING HING</td> <td>PAVEMENTS</td> <td>CEMENT CONCRE</td>	ATRAPEA JOINTS PER	SURFA DETER SPALL LONGIT CRACE PATCE FAULT	LE ICE HORATIO LING TUDINAL KING HING	PAVEMENTS	CEMENT CONCRE
	()SLIGHT (2) MC ()]-5 (2) 6- SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE GOOD FAIR POOR MODERATE SEVERE CLOSED	DDE FRATE     C       0     (1)	AREA JOINTS PER SAREA	RES 7M SURFA DE TER SPALL LONGIT CRACE FAULT	LE ICE RORATIO LING TUDINAL KING TING	PAVEMENTS	CEMENT CONCRE
	()SLIGHT (2) MC ())I-5 (2) 6- SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE GOOD FAIR POOR MODERATE SEVERE	DEFATE     C       0     0 <td>AREA JOINTS PER SAREA</td> <td>RES 7M SURFA DE TEF SPALL LONGIT CRACI PATCI FAULT CRACI SPACI</td> <td>LE ING ING ING ING KING RSECTINE</td> <td>PAVEMENTS</td> <td>CEMENT CONCRETE</td>	AREA JOINTS PER SAREA	RES 7M SURFA DE TEF SPALL LONGIT CRACI PATCI FAULT CRACI SPACI	LE ING ING ING ING KING RSECTINE	PAVEMENTS	CEMENT CONCRETE
	()SLIGHT (2) MC ())I-5 (2) 6- SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE GOOD FAIR POOR MODERATE SEVERE CLOSED OPEN MODERATE SEVERE	DEFATE     C       0     5>10       0     5>10       0     5>10       0     5	AREA JOINTS PER SAREA	RES 7M SURFA DE TER SPALL LONGIT CRACI PATCI FAULT CRACI SPACI SINTE CRACI	LE ING ING ING ING KNG RSECTING (S	PAVEMENTS CRU	CEMENT CONCRETE
	()SLIGHT (2) MC ())1-5 (2) 6- SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE GOOD FAIR POOR MODERATE SEVERE CLOSED OPEN MODERATE SEVERE SAWED	DDE RATE     C       0     (5)>10       0     (5)>10       0     (5)>10       0     (5)>10       0     (5)>10       0     (5)       0     (5)       0     (5)       0     (5)       0     (5)       0     (5)       0     (5)       0     (5)       0     (5)       0     (5)       0     (5)       0     (5)       0     (7)       0     (7)       0     (7)       0     (7)       0     (7)       0     (7)       0     (7)	AREA JOINTS PER SAREA	RES 7M SURFA DE TEF SPALL LONGIT CRACI FAULT CRACI SPACI SINTE CRACI SINTE CRACI	LE ING ING ING ING SECTING	PAVEMENTS CRUZ	CEMENT CONCRETE
	()SLIGHT (2) MC ()]-5 (2) 6- SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE GOOD FAIR POOR MODERATE SEVERE CLOSED OPEN MODERATE SEVERE SAWED CONSTR	DEFATE     C       0     10       0     10       0     10       0     10       0     10       0     10       0     10       0     10       0     10       0     10       0     10       0     10       0     10       0     10	A LIN FT AAREA NO.	RES 7M SURFA DE TER SPALL LONGIT CRACE PATCI FAULT CRACE SPACI \$ INTE CRACE SPACI	LE ICE RIORATIO LING TUDINAL KING 1ING C NG RSECTING (S NG	PAVEMENTS	CEMENT CONCRETE PAVE
	()SLIGHT (2) MC ()]-5 (2) 6- SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE GOOD FAIR POOR MODERATE SEVERE CLOSED OPEN MODERATE SEVERE SAWED CONSTR SLIGHT MODERATE	DEFATE     C       0     0	A LIN FT AAREA NO.	RES 7M SURFA DE TER SPALL LONGIT CRACI PATCI FAULT CRACI SPACI SINTE CRACI SPACI JOINT SPACI TRANS	LE ICE RORATIO LING TUDINAL KING HING CNG RSECTING CS NG SVERSE	PAVEMENTS CRUZ	CEMENT CONCRETE
	()SLIGHT (2) MC ()]-5 (2) 6- SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE SLIGHT MODERATE SEVERE GOOD FAIR POOR MODERATE SEVERE CLOSED OPEN MODERATE SEVERE SAWED CONSTR. SLIGHT	DEFATE     C       0     0 </td <td>A RAPEA JOINTS PER SAFEA PER DATE NO. NO PER DATE A DOINTS PER SAFEA PER DATE PER PAREL</td> <td>RES 7M SURFA DE TER SPALL LONGIT CRACI PATCI FAULT CRACI SPACI SINTE CRACI JOINT SPACI TRANS CRACI</td> <td>LE ICE RORATIO LING TUDINAL KING HING CNG RSECTING SVERSE KING</td> <td>PAVEMENTS CRCC JOINTED</td> <td>CEMENT CONCRETE PAVE</td>	A RAPEA JOINTS PER SAFEA PER DATE NO. NO PER DATE A DOINTS PER SAFEA PER DATE PER PAREL	RES 7M SURFA DE TER SPALL LONGIT CRACI PATCI FAULT CRACI SPACI SINTE CRACI JOINT SPACI TRANS CRACI	LE ICE RORATIO LING TUDINAL KING HING CNG RSECTING SVERSE KING	PAVEMENTS CRCC JOINTED	CEMENT CONCRETE PAVE



Type of Distres	S	Degre	ss of Dis	tress	Extent (1)	or Am	ount ( (2)	of Di	stress (3) *
Rutting			Slight Moderate Severe		0 5 10		2 7 12		5 10 15
Raveling	aveling		Slight oderate Severe		5 10 15		8 12 18		10 15 20
Flushing	Flushing		Slight oderate Severe		5 10 15		8 12 18		10 15 20
Corrugations		M	Slight oderate Severe		5 10 15		8 12 18		10 15 20
Alligator Crack	ing	Μ	Slight oderate Severe		5 10 15		10 15 20		15 20 25
Patching			Good Fair Poor		0 5 7		2 7 15		5 10 20
Deduct Points f	or Cra	cking	•						
Longitudinal Cr	acking								
	(1)	Sealed (2)	(3)	Par (1)	tially S (2)	Sealed (3)	No (1)	t Sea (2)	aled * (3)
Slight Moderate Severe	2 5 8	5 8 10	8 10 15	3 7 12	7 12 15	12 15 20	5 10 15	10 15 20	15 20 25
Transverse Crac	king								
Slight Moderate Severe	2 5 8	5 8 10	8 10 15	3 7 10	7 10 15	10 15 20	3 7 12	7 12 15	12 15 20

Table 8. Pavement Rating Deduct Values.

\* Numbers in parentheses refer to quantity of distress observed as indicated on Figure 1.

Test Section	Photolog	( Trans.	Cracking PRS Long.	Allig.	Overall PRS
1	1	85	90	65	40
	2	82	97	85	59
	3	76	97	100	68
2	4	77	80	85	40
	5	90	97	100	82
	6	93	97	100	85
3	7	81	97	80	43
	8	76	97	80	48
	9	93	97	95	78
4	10	79	92	60	-1
	11	86	98	100	84
	12	90	92	70	32
5	13	90	97	60	33
	14	88	97	80	60
	15	90	97	80	57
6	16	92	92	65	35
	17	86	97	80	51
	18	90	92	80	49
7	19	97	92	85	49
	20	97	98	100	85
	21	93	97	90	68
8	22	93	98	95	76
	23	92	100	95	79
	24	98	97	95	80
9	25	90	97	85	67
	26	98	91	80	57
	27	76	97	85	43
10	28	90	85	85	37

Table 9. El Paso Preconstruction Pavement Rating Scores.

Table 9 contains the PRS values obtained by measuring all combined forms of distress present in each test section. PRS values are also shown which were obtained by measuring individual types of cracking. These cracking PRS ratings are presented such that a more precise comparison may be made between test sections for crack related distress. The asphalt-rubber interlayer is intended to reduce the rate at which cracks in the underlying pavement propagate the new asphalt concrete overlay. The "cracking PRS" values, therefore, will provide a basis for which future condition surveys can be compared. By comparing PRS values for transverse, longitudiual and alligator cracks, a measure of interlayer performance within and between test sections can be obtained based on percent original PRS.

# El Paso-Construction

Asphalt-rubber interlayers were placed on June 23, 24 and 27, 1983 by International Surfacing, Inc., Phoenix, Arizona. Sections 5 to 9 were placed June 23, 1983, followed by sections 1 to 3 on June 24, 1983. Section 4 was placed June 27, 1983. Environmental conditions during construction were favorable with early morning temperatures of approximately 70F and afternoon temperatures of 100F.

Observations and tests made during construction included the following:

- I. Asphalt-rubber mixing
  - A. Assuring desired rubber types were used in asphalt-rubber to be placed over selected test section locations.
  - B. Proportion of asphalt and rubber.
  - C. Blending time.
  - D. Blending temperature.
  - E. Viscosity prior to application.
  - F. Sampling of asphalt and rubber.

II. Asphalt-rubber application.

A. Asphalt-rubber spray rate.

B. Aggregate spread rate.

C. Asphalt-rubber cooling rate.

D. Sampling of asphalt-rubber.

Considerable coordination was necessary during construction to assure that the desired asphalt-rubber combinations and application rates, as shown in Figure 4, were placed over photolog locations appearing in Table 7. This required adjusting distributor volumes such that materials could be placed contiguously with minimum disruption to construction procedures.

Asphalt arrived at the mixing site by highway transport where it was pumped into a storage container. Granulated rubber was shipped from the three manufacturers in 50 or 60 pound bags.

Blending of the asphalt and rubber required two pieces of equipment. Initial mixing of asphalt and rubber occurred in a pre-blending device which combines asphalt and rubber in the approximate pre-blend proportions desired. After the asphalt and rubber are pre-blended, the material is pumped to the asphalt distributor. The flow of blended asphalt and rubber are continuous from pre-blender to distributor in the approximate proportions desired. Final proportioning is accomplished after all of the rubber is in the distributor by adding additional asphalt.

A sample calculation follows which describes how the number of bags of rubber and gallons of asphalt cement are determined to achieve a blend containing 22 percent rubber by weight of blend.

Assumption:

Distributor volume	4500 gallons
Rubber Bag Weight	50 pounds
Unit Weight Asphalt Cement	
@ 350F	7.54 pounds/gallon
Unit Weight Asphalt-Rubber	
@ 350F	7.54 pounds/gallon

Find: Number of bags of rubber and gallons of asphalt cement to yield a 4500 gallon asphalt-rubber blend at 22% rubber by weight of blend.

Rubber: 
$$\frac{4500 \times 7.54 \times .22}{50} = 149.3$$
 bags

Asphalt Cement: 
$$\frac{4500 \times 7.54 \times .78}{7.54}$$
 = 3510 gallons

Specific gravity of asphalt-rubber was measured at various temperatures in the laboratory following procedures described by ASTM D70 (25). Weight to volume conversions were done with a high boiling point oil such that specific gravity could be measured above 212F. The graph shown in Figure 16 of asphalt-rubber specific gravity was used in the calculation above for the required volume to weight conversion. Note the difference in asphalt-rubber specific gravity as measured and that calculated from cubical coefficient of expansion data. A 95 percent confidence limit on measured values encompasses calculated values. This seems to indicate volume change in asphalt-rubber is due to combined thermal expansion of the constituents. The large variation in specific gravity results shown in Figure 16 indicates this test is probably of limited use for quality control unless more precise results can be achieved.

Results of observations and tests performed during mixing of the asphalt-rubber appear in Table 10. Note that the field viscosity of the asphalt-rubber blend appears to depend on rubber content as shown in Table 10 and plotted in Figure 17. Note that the type of rubber affects the viscosity of the blend as shown in Figure 17. Viscosity tests were performed using a portable Haake rotational viscometer on samples of asphalt-rubber obtained directly from the distributor truck approximately 50 minutes after all rubber had been added to the truck.

Rubber Type C in addition to generating the lowest asphalt-rubber viscosity relationship, also caused a considerable volume increase in the blend as mixing progressed. This was manifested in overflows of asphalt-rubber from the top hatch of the 4500 gallon distributor truck



Figure 16. Asphalt-Rubber Specific Gravity

Test Section	Begin Date	ning Time	Time Req'd to Fill Truck w/ Blend, min.	Time Between Full Truck & Application, min.	Temp. Prior to App- lication	Viscosity Prior to Application, poises	Rubber Type	Rubber Content, %
1	6/24/83	4:35am	40	105	320	20	A	24
2	6/24/83	5:20am	40	95	390	9	С	22
3	6/24/83	6:02am	53	90	320	35	В	26
4	6/27/83	11:40am	35	110	338	18	В	22
5	6/23/83	5:25am	55	85	340	15	Α	22
6	6/23/83	6:25am	55	90	330	15	C	26
7	6/23/83	11:20am	30	160	345	10	С	24
8	6/23/83	1:15pm	30	135	325	23	Α	26
9	6/23/83	1:50pm	30	125	330	25	В	24

Table 10. El Paso Mixing Observations and Test Results.



\* TEMPERATURES SHOWN ARE VALUES CORRESPONDING TO VISCOSITY MEASUREMENTS

Figure 17. El Paso Asphalt - Rubber Viscosity

for test section mixes 6 and 7. The overflows occurred during routine pumping of the blend after approximately 2300 gallons had been loaded. Overflow was avoided for the third blend containing Rubber C by loading the first half of the blend at a slower rate. Moisture contained in the rubber is thought to be the cause of this adverse reaction and may be related to the cryogenic processing technique.

Asphalt-rubber temperature measurements were obtained to determine the rate at which the binder loses heat prior to aggregate application. Temperatures were measured using a Fluke digital thermometer under varying ambient temperature conditions. These data are plotted on Figure 18 with calculated theoretical values (15).

Temperature loss in the asphalt-rubber binder is rapid as shown by Figure 18. Binder temperature decreases to near the initial pavement temperature in approximately 90 seconds under the conditions of the test.

Verification of binder aggregate application quantities was accomplished by Texas SDHPT personnel. During construction, measurement of the application quantity was accomplished at approximately 1000 to 3500 foot intervals until the proper application rate was achieved. Measurement of application rate was accomplished using calibrated metering rods accompanying each distributor truck. Measurement of aggregate spread quantity was accomplished at similar intervals by volume of aggregate. Rates of binder and aggregate within each test section are shown in Table 11.

Research binders as shown in Figure 4 were applied over photologs in appropriate test sections at the rates shown in Table 11. However, the distributor truck emptied its contents before reaching photolog 12 in Test Section 4 and therefore, no research binder is present over photolog 12.

Placement of overlay asphalt concrete began July 18, 1983, approximately four weeks after asphalt-rubber application. Core specimens were obtained from each test section to determine overlay thickness and provide samples for evaluation of physical properties as reported in Tables 6 and Figure 3. Results of thickness measurements are shown in Table 12.



Figure 18. El Paso Asphalt - Rubber Temperature Loss

			λ
Test Section	Photolog	Measured Asphalt Rubber Rate, gsy	Desired
1	1 2 3	.36 .41 .41	.40
2	4 5 6	.35 .38 .38	.35
3	7 8 9	.45 .45 .45	.45
4	10 11 12	.38 .38 *	.40
5	13 14 15	.44 .44 .44	.45
6	16 17 18	.41 .41 .41	.40
7	19 20 21	.44 .44 .44	.45
8	22 23 24	.36 .36 .36	.35
9	25 26 27	.36 .36 .35	.35
Control	28	0	0

Table 11. El Paso Application Quantities.

\* Distributor truck emptied before reaching photolog No. 12.

Note: Aggregate spread quantities were uniform throughout project ranging from 116 sq.yd./cu.yd. to 117 sq.yd./cu.yd. (19.5 to 19.7 lb./sq.yd.).

Test Section	Photolog	Overlay Thickness, in.
1	1 2 3	1.75 1.25 1.25
2	4 5 6	1.25 1.25 1.25
3	7 8 9	1.50 1.50 1.25
4	10 11 12	1.75 2.25 *
5	13 14 15	1.75 2.75 2.00
6	16 17 18	0.75 0.75 0.50
7	19 20 21	1.75 1.50 1.25
8	22 23 24	1.50 1.50 1.50
9	25 26 27	1.50 1.50 1.25
Control	28	1.50

# Table 12. El Paso Overlay Thicknesses.

\* Photologged, but no research binder in this area.

Locations of test sections were preserved after construction for future reference. Monuments consisting of 4 inch by 4 inch by 8 feet cedar posts were located at the beginning of each test section along the highway right-of-way. Posts were painted white and contain black lettering denoting stationing shown on Figure 11 of specific locations of test section boundaries. Location of photologs within test sections for future condition surveys will be simplified by reference to these monuments.

#### Buffalo-Preconstruction

Eight sections of pavement each approximately 0.80 lane mile in length were selected to receive the various asphalt-rubber blends shown in Figure 7. Four additional pavement sections, each 750 feet in length, were selected as control sections. Three segments of pavement each 500 feet in length were selected in each of the eight test sections for photolog surveys as previously described for El Paso Test Road. The entire length of the control sections were photologged. Locations of photologs are as shown on Table 13. Photolog equipment was as used on the El Paso Test Road.

Condition surveys on site were combined with cracking data obtained from photologs to provide PRS values for test and control sections. Table 14 contains PRS values obtained after completing the condition survey and photolog interpretation. All photographs obtained during surveys are on file at Texas Transportation Institute, College Station, Texas.

۰.

## Buffalo-Construction

Asphalt-rubber was placed over test sections August 20, 21 and 22, 1984 by Arizona Refining Company, Phoenix, Arizona. Environmental conditions during construction were favorable with early morning temperatures of approximately 70F and afternoon temperatures approaching 100F.

Test Section	Photolog	Station From	То
1	1 to 3	188+30	201+24
2	4 to 5	205+00	212+50
3	6 to 7	212+50	220+00
4	8 to 9	587+80	595+30
5	10 to 11	595+30	604+40
6	12 to 14	631+20	645+50
7	15 to 17	683+00	698+50
8	18 to 20	714+15	729+50
9	21 to 23	755+60	770+70
10	24 to 26	810+00	825+00
11	27 to 29	860+00	875+00
12	30 to 32	889+00	904+00

۰.

.

Table 13. Buff	alo Photolog	Locations.
----------------	--------------	------------

.

;

•

Test	Photolog	Overall PRS
Test Section		90 90
1	1 2 3	90
2	4	90 100
3	6 7	100 90
4	8	90 100
5	10 11	100 100
6	12 13 14	100 100 90
7	15 16 17	90 90 90
8	18 19 20	90 90 90
9	21 22 23	90 100 90
10	24 25 26	80 90 90
11	27 28 29	90 10 10
12	30 31 32	10 9 10

Table 14. Buffalo Preconstruction Pavement Rating Scores.

Note: Much of the distress on Buffalo Test Road consisted of random transverse cracks at less than 5 foot intervals. In most cases cracks were closed and not "working" significantly. This results in a deduct score of 10. Deduct scores of 0 resulted from closed cracks occurring at between 5 and 10 intervals.
Observations and tests made during construction were identical to those for the El Paso Test Road. Similar coordination was required of contracting efforts such that asphalt-rubber combinations desired as shown in Figure 7 were placed in appropriate locations over photologs as shown in Table 13. Distributor volumes were adjusted as for El Paso such that the desired asphalt-rubber mixes were placed at appropriate locations on test sections.

Blending of asphalt and Sundex 790 at 6 percent Sundex by blend volume was accomplished prior to blending with rubber. Pre-blending of asphalt-rubber was accomplished as on the El Paso project prior to pumping the blend into distributor trucks. Here the asphalt-rubber blend remained in the trucks for the desired digestion period prior to application.

Digestion was varied as a control variable in this experiment as explained previously for laboratory prepared mixes. Two levels of digestion were achieved. "Low" digestion describes blends of 2 to 2 3/4 hours. "High" digestion describes blends of 16 to 16 1/2 hours.

Rubber concentrations of 18 and 22 percent by weight of the blend were used.

Results of observations and tests performed during mixing of the asphalt-rubber appear in Table 15. Viscosity and rubber content appear to be directly proportional as occurred for El Paso blends. However, viscosity appears to be inversely proportional to digestion period. The results of these tests are plotted in Figure 19.

Temperature loss of the asphalt-rubber was measured as for the El Paso Test Road. Results of these tests are shown on Figure 20. Results are similar to those observed at El Paso. Texas SDHPT personnel verified binder and aggregate quantities as part of routine quality control procedures. However, unlike El Paso, binder quantities were determined by weight rather than volume. Each asphalt-rubber distributor was weighed prior to, and after application. The difference in weight was converted to volume and the corresponding application rate determined for the measured pavement area covered. Therefore, application rates shown in Table 16 reflect averages throughout each test section.

Test	Begin	ning	Time Reg'd to	Time Between	Temp, F	Viscosity	Rubber	Rubber	Digestion
Section	Date	Time of Day	Fill Truck w/ Blend, min.	Full Truck & Application, hrs-min.	Prior to App- lication	Prior to Application, poises	Туре	Content, Percent	Time
1	8/22/84	5:30pm	50	15-40	390	11	A	18	High
6	8/21/84	7:05am	35	2-55	400	48	A	22	Low
7	8/20/84	7:07pm	45	15-53	400	21	A	22	High
8	8/20/84	8:21pm	40	15-14	400	6.50	Α	18	High
9	8/20/84	11:45am	45	2-5	400	14	A	18	Low
10	8/21/84	1:00pm	105	2-5	390	45	A	22	Low
11	8/21/84	:45pm	35	2-10	380	13	Α	18	Low
12	8/21/84	6:30pm	40	15-50	390	<b>19</b> . 7	A	22	High

•

Table 15. Buffalo Mixing Observations and Test Results.



Figure 20. Buffalo Asphalt-Rubber Temperature Loss

Test Section	Binder Rate, gsy	Aggregate Rate, sy/cy
1	•58	95
2	•57	90
3	No Binder	No Aggregate
4	No Binder	No Aggregate
5	•55	80
6	•57	77
7	•56	79
8	•57	77
9	•52	75
10	•59	80
11	•54	78
12	•56	79·

# Table 16 - Buffalo Application Quantities



Figure 19. Buffalo Asphalt-Rubber Viscosity

Buffalo overlay asphalt concrete consists of a Texas Type C leveling course and a one-inch Texas Type D surface course. Placement of the levelling course began September 10, 1984 and was completed November 16, 1984. Each test section was sampled by coring to obtain laboratory specimens and to verify overlay thickness. Physical properties of the asphalt concrete are reported in Table 6 and Figure 3. Results of thickness measurements of core samples are shown in Table 17.

Locations of photologs within test sections are permanently marked using raised reflective pavement buttons positioned on the right shoulder of the northbound lane. Precise location of photologs for future condition surveys is therefore possible by reference to these pavement markers.

#### Brownsville - Preconstruction

Twelve pavement sections were selected to receive asphalt-rubber and various combinations of aggregates. The asphalt-rubber binder formulation was held constant for this experiment. Rubber was blended at 60 percent Type D and 40 percent Type E as described in Tables 2 and 4. Six additional sections were selected as controls. Control sections consisted of: 1) no treatment, 2) asphalt cement interlayer, 3) polymer asphalt interlayer. All sections were replicated to provide a statistical bsis for later analysis of performance betwen sections. A description of all materials used is shown in Table 18.

A 500 foot photolog was recorded in each test section. Locations of photologs are as shown in Table 19. Photolog equipment and technique was used at Buffalo and El Paso.

Condition surveys on site were combined with cracking data from photologs to provide PRS values. Table 20 contains these PRS data.

### Brownsville - Construction

Asphalt-rubber was first placed over non-experimental pavement sections such that binder shot rate and aggregate spread rates could be

Test Section	Photolog	Overlay Thickness, in
1	1 2 3	2.4 2.5 2.3
2	<b>4</b> 5	2.5 2.6
3	6 7	2.6 3.3
4	8 9	3.5 3.8
5	10 11	3.8 3.8
6	12 13 14	3.8 3.5 3.3
7	15 16 17	3.4 3.5 3.5
8	18 19 20	3.3 3.3 3.1
9	21 22 23	3.4 3.5 3.8
10	24 25 26	3.4 3.4 3.4
11	27 28 29	3 3.1 3.1
12	30 31 32	4 4 4

# Table 17. Buffalo Overlay Thickness.

# Table 18. Brownsville Test Section Materials

Test Section	Binder	Aggregate Application	Aggregate Size Bottom/Top	Overlay Thickness,in
1	A-R	Double	Grade 3/Grade 3	N/A
2	A-R	Single	Grade 3	N/A
3	A-R	Double	Grade 3/Grade 4	N/A
4	AC	Double	Grade 3/Grade 4	N/A
5	A-R	Double	Grade 3/Grade 3	1.4
6	A-R	Single	Grade 3	1.2
7	A-R	Double	Grade 3/Grade 4	1.1
8	AC	Double	Grade 3/Grade 4	1.3
9	A-R	Double	Grade 4/Grade 4	1.3
10	A-R	Single	Grade 4	1.0
11	A-R	Single	Grade 4 Two deep	1.1
12	None	None	N/A	1.2
13	Polymer	Double	Grade 4/Grade 4	1.6
14	A-R	Double	Grade 4/Grade 4	N/A
15	A-R	Single	Grade 4	N/A
16	A-R	Single	Grade 4 Two deep	N/A
17	None	None	N/A	N/A
18	Polymer	Double	Grade 4/Grade 4	N/A

۰.

Test Section/Photolog	Location
1	25+00 to 30+00
2	40+00 to 45+00
3	64+00 to 69+00
4	80+00 to 85+00
5	85+00 to 80+00
6	69+00 to 64+00
7	45+00 to 40+00
8	30+00 to 25+00
9	25+00 to 30+00
10	40+00 to 45+00
11	64+00 to 69+00
12	77+50 to 82+50
13	82+50 to 87+50
14	85+00 to 80+00
15	69+00 to 64+00
16	45+00 to 40+00
17	32+50 to 27+50
18	27+50 to 22+50

۰.

# Table 19. Brownsville Photolog Locations

Note: Stations are south to north.

ť

Test Section	Trans.	Cracking PRS Long.	Allig.	Overall PRS
1	97	97	85	79
2	97	97	95	89
3	97	95	95	87
4	97	95	100	92
5	93	95	95	83
6	97	95	95	87
7	97	97	95	89
8	98	97	85	80
9	97	95	100	92
10	97	95	100	92
11	97	95	100	92
12	97	85	100	82
13	97	95	100	92
14	97	95	100	92
15	100	95	100	95
16	97	95	100	92
17	97	95	100	92
18	97	95	100	92

Table 20. Brownsville Preconstruction Pavement Rating Scores.

adjusted. After calibration was completed, test section construction began. Asphalt-rubber was placed on all test sections by October 12, 1984 by Arizona Refining Company, Phoenix, Arizona. Control sections were placed by SDHPT personnel by October 26, 1984.

Observations and tests made during construction were identical to those for the El Paso and Buffalo Test Roads. Similar coordination was required of contracting efforts such that asphalt-rubber seal coat combinations desired were placed in appropriate locations over photologs.

Blending of asphalt and Sundex 790 at 6% Sundex by blend volume was accomplished prior to blending with rubber. Pre-blending of asphalt-rubber was accomplished as on the El Paso and Buffalo projects prior to pumping the blend into distributor trucks. Here the asphalt-rubber blend remained in the trucks during digestion prior to application.

Digestion remained constant in this experiment. Rubber and asphalt were blended for approximately 1 hour after all rubber was added to the blend for each test section.

Rubber concentration remained constant at 18 percent by weight of the asphalt-rubber blend. Texas SDHPT personnel verified binder and aggregate quantities as part of routine quality control procedures. At the beginning of the project, binder quantities were intended to be determined by volume. However, the trucks supplied by the asphalt-rubber contractor had not been calibrated, and some difficulty was experienced while attempting calibration on the job site. Therefore, shot rates were determined by weight. Each asphalt-rubber distributor was weighed prior to, and after application. The difference in weight was converted to volume and the corresponding application rate determined for the measured pavement area covered. Therefore, application rates shown in Table 21 reflect averages throughout each test section.

Brownsville overlay asphalt concrete consists of approximately 1 1/4 inches Texas Type D asphalt concrete. Placement of the overlay began after asphalt-rubber and control section seal coats had been in service at least one week. Each test section was core drilled to obtain labora-

Test Section	Design Aggregate Rate, sy/cy	Measured Aggregate Rate, sy/cy	Design Binder Rate, gsy	Measured Binder Rate, gsy	Measured Embedment Depth, %	Comments
1	80/80	56/56	0.71/0.69	0.77/0.85	38/40	Severe
2	80	56	0.69	0.78	-	Flushing Severe
3	115/80	83/56	0.53/0.69	0.48/0.71	-/52	Flushing Slight
4	115/80	56	0.27/0.36	0.60	-	Flushing Severe
5	80/80	56/56	0.71/0.69	0.67/0.65	14/43	Flushing No
6	80	56	0.69	0.76	48	Distress Slight
7	115/80	80/56	0.58/0.69	0.59/0.71	26/48	Flushing Severe
8	115/80	80/56	0.27/0.36	0.45/0.58	-	Flushing Severe
9	115/115	83/83	0.53/0.69	0.49/0.51	-/51	Flushing Severe
10	115	83	0.51	0.58	50	Flushing Severe
11	57	80	0.51	0.65	70	Flushing Severe
12	None	None	None	None	-	Flushing
13	115/115	83 *	0.27/0.25	0.48 *	-	Severe
14	115/115	83/80	0.53/0.51	0.56/0.52	24/47	Flushing Slight
15	115	83	0.51	0.56	53	Flushing Severe
16	57	80	0.51	0.66	50	Flushing No
17	None	None	None	None	-	Distress
18	115/115	83	0.27/0.25	0.53 *	-	Severe Flushing

Table 21. Brownsville Test Road Aggregate and Binder Application Rates.

.

tory specimens and to verify overlay thickness. Physical properties of the asphalt concrete are reported in Table 6 and Figure 3.

Locations of photologs are permanently marked using raised reflective pavement buttons position on the right shoulder. Precise location of photologs for future condition surveys is therefore possible by reference to these pavement markers. 

## CHAPTER 6

### FIELD SURVEY DATA

Each of the three test roads were surveyed annually as a minimum to evaluate field performance. Types of distress and levels of severity were recorded for each test section following the criteria described by Epps, et al (13). Results for each test road are presented in the Appendices. All forms and levels of pavement distress were quantified using the Pavement Rating Score (PRS). Based on maintenance costs, this index, or PRS, allows numerical comparison of pavement condition. A PRS value of 100 describes a pavement with no distress. Progressively lower PRS values describe pavement conditions with more severe form of distress. The form shown in Figure 21 is used to catalog distress observed on the pavement. Deduct values are assigned to each type and level of distress according to Table 22. The sum of deduct values is subtracted from 100 resulting in the PRS.

## El Paso Test Road

The El Paso Test Road was constructed in July of 1983. Pavement condition surveys were conducted on the following dates:

February, 1984 May, 1984 July, 1985 October, 1985 May, 1986

The data from these surveys as well as pre-construction data are documented in Appendix A.

Cracking began to appear in all sections by the time of the first survey in February of 1984. Some of these cracks healed during the following summer. By the next year maintenance crews had sealed the cracks; however, the cracks were open again by October, 1985.

Figure 21. Pavement Rating Forms

FOHEMAN NO.     Prime     Prim     Prime     Prime								
COUNTY NO.       HIGHWAY NO.       GO       CONTROL       SECTION       SECTION       TI       SECTION       TI       SECTION       TI       SECTION       TI       SECTION       TI       TI       TI       SECTION       TI       TI       TI       TI       TI       TI       TI       SECTION       TI		FOREMAN N	<b>O</b> .		8	R	Dig	
COUNTY NO.       HIGHWAY NO.       GO       CONTROL       SECTION       SECTION       TI       SECTION       TI       SECTION       TI       SECTION       TI       SECTION       TI       TI       TI       SECTION       TI       TI       TI       TI       TI       TI       TI       SECTION       TI		HICHWAY CL	ASS	]	TE	I ER	TRI	
HIGHWAY NO.     Image: Sector of the sector	$\square$	COUNTY NO		1		Ś	4	
HIGHWAY NO.				1 1	δĘ	ÌΠ	Z	
HIGHWAY NO.								
CONTROL CONTROL SECTION SEC	-+	HIGHWAY NO	).			Η		
SECTION TI R O SECTION TI R O SECTION TI R A SECTION TI R A SECTION TI R A SECTION TI R A SECTION TI R A SECTION TI R A SECTION TI R A SECTION TI R A SECTION TI R A SECTION TI TI TI TI TI TI TI TI TI TI				5		1 🏾		-
SECTION TI R O SECTION TI R O SECTION TI R A SECTION TI R A SECTION TI R A SECTION TI R A SECTION TI R A SECTION TI R A SECTION TI R A SECTION TI R A SECTION TI R A SECTION TI TI TI TI TI TI TI TI TI TI					8 L		P	-
SECTION TI R O SECTION TI R O SECTION TI R SECTION TI R SECTION TI R SECTION TI R SECTION TI R SECTION TI R SECTION TI R SECTION TI R SECTION TI R SECTION TI R SECTION TI R SECTION TI R SECTION TI R SECTION TI R SECTION TI TI SECTION TI TI SECTION TI TI TI TI TI TI TI TI TI TI		CONTROL		3		$\left  \right $		
Till   Till     Till   Till <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>ž</td><td></td><td>1 []</td><td></td><td></td></t<>				ž		1 []		
Image: Several constraints     Image: Several constraints     Image: Several constraints       Image: Several constraints     Image: Several constraints     Image: Several constraints     Image: Several constraints       Image: Several constraints     Ima		SECTION			E	1 H		
Image: Several constraints     Image: Several constraints     Image: Several constraints       Image: Several constraints     Image: Several constraints     Image: Several constraints     Image: Several constraints       Image: Several constraints     Ima	++	1			Teg	i H		
J   J     LANE     MAYS     MODERATE     V     SLIGHT     V     SLIGHT     V     SLIGHT     V     SEVERE	[+]	Õ				1日		
LANE MAYS METER OSLIGHT @ MODERATE @ SEVERE PUMPING OSLIGHT @ MODERATE @ SEVERE PUMPING OSLIGHT @ O O SEVERE PUMPING SUGHT @ O O SEVERE PUMPING SEVERE & S = D SEVERE PUMPING SUGHT @ O O SEVERE PUMPING SEVERE & S = D SEVERE PUMPING SUGHT @ O O SEVERE PUMPING SUGHT @ O O SEVERE PUMPING SEVERE & S = D SEVERE PUMPING DETERIORATION SEVERE & S = D SEVERE PUMPING DETERIORATION DETERIORATION SEVERE & S = D SEVERE PUMPING DETERIORATION SEVERE & S = D SEVERE PUMPING DETERIORATION SEVERE & S = D SEVERE SEVERE SUBSTITUTION SEVERE SEVE	FT			4	┝┛	H		
LANE MAYS METER ()SLIGHT @ MODERATE @ SEVERE PUMPING ()11-5 (2) 6-10 (3) >10 FAILURES / MILE SUGHT @ 0 0 SEVERE PUMPING SUGHT @ 0 0 SEVERE PUMPING SEVERE & 8 ST PUMPING SEVERE & 8 ST PUMPING SUGHT @ 0 0 SEVERE PUMPING CRACKING TO SEVERE & 8 ST PUMPING SEVERE		7		1	ΠF	I FI		
LANE     MAYS   METER     ()SLIGHT   ()DODERATE     ()I-5   ()DODERATE     ()J-5   ()DODERA	FF	0			ΥE			
USLIGHT     Ø MODERATE     Ø SEVERE     PUMPING       (1)1-5     Ø 6-10     (1) > 10     FAILURES / MILE     P       SLIGHT     Ø 9     Ø     Ø     Ø     P     SURFACE       MODERATE     V #     Ø     Ø     Ø     Ø     Ø     Ø     Ø       SLIGHT     Ø 9     Ø     Ø     Ø     Ø     Ø     Ø     Ø       SEVERE     Ø 8     Ø <td></td> <td>LANE</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><u>L_</u></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		LANE			<u>L_</u>			
SLIGHT OO O O SS SPALLING MODERATE SEVERE SS T AUT SEVERE SS T AUT SLIGHT OO O O T T LONGITUDINAL MODERATE S S T SPALLING T T SLIGHT O O O T T CRACKING T			-					8
SLIGHT OO O O SS SPALLING MODERATE SEVERE SS T AUT SEVERE SS T AUT SLIGHT OO O O T T LONGITUDINAL MODERATE S S T SPALLING T T SLIGHT O O O T T CRACKING T								1Ž
SLIGHT OO O O SS SPALLING MODERATE SEVERE SS TALLING SEVERE SS TALLING MODERATE SEVERE SS TALLING CRACKING CACKING CAC		(1) 1-5 (2) 6-		HAILU				2
SLIGHT OO O O SS SPALLING MODERATE SEVERE SS T AUT SEVERE SS T AUT SLIGHT OO O O T T LONGITUDINAL MODERATE S S T SPALLING T T SLIGHT O O O T T CRACKING T			Å Å Å	l È				2
SLIGHT OO O O SS SPALLING MODERATE SEVERE SS T AUT SEVERE SS T AUT SLIGHT OO O O T T LONGITUDINAL MODERATE S S T SPALLING T T SLIGHT O O O T T CRACKING T			885	S S	DETERK	DRATION	<b> </b>	lб
		SLIGHT		95	1		1ĕ	ł
				8ž×	SPALLI	NG	<b>M</b>	ဂြ
			58 ä	60			I	Ιz
			600	10pf	LONGIT	DINAL	12	lū
			8 8 8	1235			17	Ľ
FAIR S T PATCHING		SEVENE			+	<del></del>	S	[ ]
NODERATE S B BE FAULTING		FAIR	V .	5	PATCHI	NG		2
NODERATE Y HERE FAULTING		POOR						Ĭž
I I CEVEDE I X S ISHO I I MARINA I I D		MODERATE	ÅÅ	ZRZ	FAUL TI	NG	1	Q
CLOSED US-10' CRACK		SEVERE		40.4				乳
CLOSED (05-10' CRACK OC-	<b>}}</b> _	and the second se		ł		a	<b>b</b> d	E
	+						Fa	ייז
MODERATE U 1-10 SINTERSECTING			•	}			hud a	1-10
SEVERE 2 >10 CRACKS 5 SAWED () 1-20 JOINT 6	<b></b>	the state of the s		<u> </u>				PAV
		and the second design of the s	-	•		IC.	La	m
CONSTR. 20 > 20' SPACING OG							О	Z
SUGHT OO O BRZ TRANSVERSE			999	283			EE	P
		SEVERE	~				ď	A
JOINT & CRACK (I)SEALED (2)PARTIALLY (SINO SEAL	- Andrewski -						. 1	I A

FORE MAN NO.   B   A   OSTROL     HIGHWAY CLASS   COUNTY NO.   S   V   NO.     HIGHWAY NO.   S   V   NO.   S     CONTROL   OC   A   TO   S     CONTROL   OC   A   TO   S     SECTION   V   S   S   S     T   SECTION   V   S   S     T   SECTION   S   S   S     MAYS   METER   S   S   S     SUGHT   O O O   S   S   S     SLIGHT   O O O   S   S   <	<b></b>					
COUNTY NO.     S     S     S     S       HIGHWAY NO.     S     S     S     S     S       CONTROL     OC     A     T     S     S     S       CONTROL     OC     A     T     S <td></td> <td>FOREMAN NO</td> <td><b>)</b>.</td> <td></td> <td>DA A</td> <td></td>		FOREMAN NO	<b>)</b> .		DA A	
COUNTY NO.     S     S     S       HIGHWAY NO.     S     S     S     S       CONTROL     OC     A     T     S     S       CONTROL     OC     A     T     S     S     S       SECTION     Y     S     S     S     S     S     S       NODERATE     Y     S     S     S     S     S     S     S       MODERATE     Y     S		HIGHWAY CL	ASS		TE RE	
HIGHWAY NO.     Image: Solution of the solution of t	FF	COUNTY NO				
HIGHWAY NO     Image: Section sector					ð HH	z I
HIGHWAY NO     Image: Section sector	-+-1				\$ H H '	~
CONTROL   OC     SECTION     TO     TO     TO     SECTION     TO     TO     TO     TO     SECTION     TO     TO     TO     TO     TO     SEVERE      SE						
SECTION       77       78       00       8       10       10       10       10       10       10       11       12       13       14       15       16       17       18       19       10       11       12       13       14       15       16       17       18       19       19       11   <		HIGHWAT NU				
SECTION       77       78       00       8       10       10       10       10       10       10       11       12       13       14       15       16       17       18       19       10       11       12       13       14       15       16       17       18       19       19       11   <				8		
SECTION       77       78       00       8       10       10       10       10       10       10       11       12       13       14       15       16       17       18       19       10       11       12       13       14       15       16       17       18       19       19       11   <			میں <sup>پرین</sup> اور پرین میں میں شاہر کا			머
SECTION       77       78       9       9       9       9       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       11       12       13       14       15       16       17       18       19       10       11       11       11       12       12       13       14       15       15       16       17       17       18       19       11       11       12       13       14       15       16       17       18       18       18       18       18       18       18       18       18 <td></td> <td>CONTROL</td> <td></td> <td>=</td> <td></td> <td>- 1</td>		CONTROL		=		- 1
7     7       0     8       1     0       1		CONTROL		2	HHH	
7     7       0     8       1     0       1		SECTION				1
Z     J		32011011			<sub>→</sub> H H	
Z     J		71			s H H	ł
Image: Severe     Image: Severe<		õ				
LANE     Image: Second		2				<b>]</b>
LANE     Image: Second	<b>}-+-</b>	~			ННН	
MAYS     METER       SLIGHT     000     000       SEVERE     000     000       SLIGHT     000     000       SLIGHT     000     000       SLIGHT     000     000       SEVERE     000     000		5				
MAYS     METER       SLIGHT     000     000       SEVERE     000     000       SLIGHT     000     000       SLIGHT     000     000       SLIGHT     000     000       SEVERE     000     000					HH	
SLIGHT     OOOR     OOOR     RUTTING       SEVERE     SST     D     RUTTING     D       SEVERE     SST     D     RUTTING     D       SLIGHT     OOOR     D     RAVELING     D       SEVERE     SST     D     CORRUGATIONS     D       SEVERE     ST     D     CORRUGATIONS     D       SLIGHT     OOOR     OO     D     CRACKING     D       SLIGHT     OOOR     ST     D     CRACKING     CRACKING       SLIGHT     OOOR     ST     D     CRACKING     CRACKING       SLIGHT     OOOR     ST		LANE				-
SLIGHT     OOO     OO     MODERATE     V T     P     RAVELING     PA       SEVERE     S S J     P     RAVELING     T     PA       SEVERE     S S J     P     P     P     P     P       MODERATE     V T     OO     P     P     P     P     P       SEVERE     S S J     P     P     P     P     P     P     P       SEVERE     S S J     P <td><b></b></td> <td>MAYS METE</td> <td></td> <td>•</td> <td></td> <td>1</td>	<b></b>	MAYS METE		•		1
SLIGHT     OOO     OO     MODERATE     V T     P     RAVELING     PA       SEVERE     S S J     P     RAVELING     T     PA       SEVERE     S S J     P     P     P     P     P       MODERATE     V T     OO     P     P     P     P     P       SEVERE     S S J     P     P     P     P     P     P     P       SEVERE     S S J     P <td></td> <td></td> <td>. <u>00</u> 6</td> <td>S S</td> <td>DUTTING</td> <td></td>			. <u>00</u> 6	S S	DUTTING	
SLIGHT     OOO     OO     MODERATE     V T     P     RAVELING     PA       SEVERE     S S J     P     RAVELING     T     PA       SEVERE     S S J     P     P     P     P     P       MODERATE     V T     OO     P     P     P     P     P       SEVERE     S S J     P     P     P     P     P     P     P       SEVERE     S S J     P <td>-+-1</td> <td></td> <td>5 8 5</td> <td>Ř</td> <td>RUTTING</td> <td>S</td>	-+-1		5 8 5	Ř	RUTTING	S
SLIGHT OO O CRACKING SEVERE O O O CRACKING SEVERE O O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING CRACKING T CRACKS IIISEALED (2)PARTIALLY SEALED (3.1-27 SEALED GOOD O O O O CRACKING T CRACKS IIISEALED (2)PARTIALLY SEALED (3.1-27 SEALED GOOD O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O			000	2		1꼬
SLIGHT OO O O CRACKING SEVERE O O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING				<b>A</b>	RAVELING	⇒
SLIGHT OO O O CRACKING SEVERE O O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING	┝╼┽╼┥			<u> </u>		님니
SLIGHT OO O O CRACKING SEVERE O O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING				Å	FLUSHING	
SLIGHT OO O CRACKING SEVERE O O O CRACKING SEVERE O O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING CRACKING T CRACKS IIISEALED (2)PARTIALLY SEALED (3.1-27 SEALED GOOD O O O O CRACKING T CRACKS IIISEALED (2)PARTIALLY SEALED (3.1-27 SEALED GOOD O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O		SEVERE	88 9	<u> </u>		-ió
SLIGHT OO O CRACKING SEVERE O O O CRACKING SEVERE O O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING CRACKING T CRACKS IIISEALED (2)PARTIALLY SEALED (3.1-27 SEALED GOOD O O O O O FAIR V T T P O O O CRACKING TO CRACKS IIISEALED (2)PARTIALLY SEALED (3.1-27 SEALED O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	┟╼╁╼┥		V 0 -	۶.	CORRIGATION	1Z
SLIGHT OO O CRACKING SEVERE O O O CRACKING SEVERE O O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING CRACKING T CRACKS IIISEALED (2)PARTIALLY SEALED (3.1-27 SEALED GOOD O O O O O FAIR V T T P O O O CRACKING TO CRACKS IIISEALED (2)PARTIALLY SEALED (3.1-27 SEALED O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O				MA A	CONTROL	15
SLIGHT OO O CRACKING SEVERE O O O CRACKING SEVERE O O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING CRACKING T CRACKS IIISEALED (2)PARTIALLY SEALED (3.1-27 SEALED GOOD O O O O O FAIR V T T P O O O CRACKING TO CRACKS IIISEALED (2)PARTIALLY SEALED (3.1-27 SEALED O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O		SLIGHT	000	8 A 6	ALLIGATOR	
SLIGHT OO O CRACKING SEVERE O O O CRACKING SEVERE O O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING SLIGHT OO O CRACKING CRACKING T CRACKS IIISEALED (2)PARTIALLY SEALED (3.1-27 SEALED GOOD O O O O O FAIR V T T P O O O CRACKING TO CRACKS IIISEALED (2)PARTIALLY SEALED (3.1-27 SEALED O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	- + - + - + - + - + - + - + - + - + -		V 6. 2	AE.		
CRACKS IIISEALED IZIPARTIALLY SEALED IS NOT SEALED Z GOOD GOU GOU GU			000		LONGITUDINA	1-0
CRACKS IIISEALED IZIPARTIALLY SEALED IS NOT SEALED Z GOOD GOU GOU GU		MODERATE	× 00	N S ST		P
CRACKS IIISEALED IZIPARTIALLY SEALED IS NOT SEALED Z GOOD GOU GOU GU			8 9 3			-[m]
CRACKS IIISEALED IZIPARTIALLY SEALED IS NOT SEALED Z GOOD GOU GOU GU			V	223		S
		SEVERE				5
FAIR VIE PATCHING O				LY SEALE	D 13-NOT SEALED	
POOR Jau C	<b>}</b>			Å	PATCHING	N
and the second				I A	1	1

• • •

Type of Distress	Degre	ss of Dist	ress	Extent (1)	or Am	nount (2)	of	Distress (3) *
Rutting		Slight Moderate Severe		0 5 10		2 7 12		5 10 15
Raveling	M	Slight oderate Severe		5 10 15		8 12 18		10 15 20
Flushing	M	Slight oderate Severe		5 10 15		8 12 18		10 15 20
Corrugations	M	Slight oderate Severe		5 10 15		8 12 18		10 15 20
Alligator Cracking	M	Slight oderate Severe		5 10 15		10 15 20		15 20 25
Patching		Good Fair Poor		0 5 7		2 7 15		5 10 20
Deduct Points for Cra	cking							
Longitudinal Cracking								
(1)	Sealed (2)	(3)	Part (1)	tially Se (2)	aled (3)	Nc (1)	ot S (2	ealed *
Slight 2 Moderate 5 Severe 8	5 8 10	8 10 15	3 7 12	7 12 15	12 15 20	5 10 15	10 15 20	20
Transverse Cracking								
Slight 2 Moderate 5 Severe 8	5 8 10	8 10 15	3 7 10	7 10 15	10 15 20	3 7 12	7 12 15	15

•

Table 22. Pavement Rating Deduct Values.

\* Numbers in parentheses refer to quantity of distress observed as indicated on Figure 1.

The predominant type of distress was transverse cracking and the second main type of distress was longitudinal cracking. Pavement Rating Scores (PRS) are presented in Tables 23 through 27 for each survey conducted. The asphalt rubber interlayer is intended to reduce the rate at which cracks in the underlying pavement propagate the new asphalt concrete overlay. "Cracking PRS" values are presented so that a more precise comparison may be made between test sections for crack related distress.

Even though there is a substantial amount of cracking that is now being exhibited in the El Paso Test Road, the PRS still reflects that the pavement is in reasonably good condition. Most of the photologs had a PRS above 90. The scores in the 60's and 70's are due to "pumping" that was observed in some of the transverse cracks. Since all of the cracking PRS's were 93 or above, differences between the performance of the sections based on PRS could not be detected. For example, a photolog could have anywhere from 60 to 240 linear feet of transverse cracking and still have a PRS of 97. Therefore, actual linear feet of cracking observed was compared with the linear feet of cracking prior to construction. These data are presented in Table 28.

Figures 22 and 23 show the data in Table 28 graphically. The extent of transverse cracking is shown in Figure 22. Transverse cracking was the predominant distress and was most useful in the analysis of performance. The bold line in Figure 22 is the control section, 100 percent of the cracks in the underlying pavement have reflected to the surface while most of the sections with the asphalt-rubber interlayer have less than 50 percent of original cracking. Also, between February and May of 1984, many of the asphalt-rubber sections exhibited "crack healing"; whereas, this was not observed in the control section.

#### Brownsville Test Road

The Brownsville Test Road was constructed by October of 1984. This test road was designed to evaluate field performance of two aggregate grades in single and double applications as interlayers. Control

Test		(	racking PRS		0veral]
Section	Photolog	Trans.	Long.	Allig.	PRS
1	1	97	100	100	97
	2	97	100	100	77
	3	97	100	100	77
2	4	97	100	100	97
	5	100	100	100	100
	6	97	100	100	97
3	7	100	100	100	100
	8	100	100	100	100
	9	97	100	100	97
4	10	100	100	95	95
	11	100	100	100	100
	12	100	100	95	95
5	13	100	95	100	95
	14	100	100	100	100
	15	97	100	100	97
6	16	100	100	100	100
	17	100	100	100	100
	18	100	100	100	100
7	19	100	100	100	100
	20	97	100	100	97
	21	97	95	100	92
8	22	97	100	100	97
	23	100	100	100	100
	24	97	100	100	97
9	25	97	100	100	97
	26	97	95	100	92
	27	97	95	100	92
10	28	100	100	100	100

Table 23. El Paso Pavement Rating Scores for February, 1984.

.

Test		C	Cracking PRS				
Section	Photolog	Trans.	Long.	Allig.	PRS		
1	1	97	100	100	97		
	2	90	100	100	70		
	3	90	100	100	70		
2	4	100	100	100	100		
	5	100	100	100	100		
	6	100	100	100	100		
3	7	100	100	100	100		
	8	100	100	100	100		
	9	97	100	100	100		
4	10	100	100	100	100		
	11	100	100	100	100		
	12	100	100	100	100		
5	13	100	100	100	100		
	14	100	100	100	100		
	15	100	100	100	100		
6	16	100	100	100	100		
	17	100	100	100	100		
	18	100	100	100	100		
7	19	100	100	100	100		
	20	97	100	100	97		
	21	97	95	100	92		
8	22	100	100	100	95		
	23	100	100	100	100		
	24	100	100	100	100		
9	25	100	100	100	100		
	26	97	100	100	97		
	27	100	100	100	100		
10	28	100	100	100	100		

Table 24. El Paso Pavement Rating Scores for May, 1984.

Test		C	Cracking PRS					
Section	Photolog	Trans.	Long.	Allig.	Overall PRS			
1	1	97	100	100	92			
	2	97	100	100	77			
	3	93	100	100	73			
2	4	97	100	100	97			
	5	97	100	100	97			
	6	97	100	100	97			
3	7 8 9	100 100	100 100	100 100	100 100			
4	10 11	100	100	100	100			
	12	100	100	100	100			
5	13	100	100	100	100			
	14	100	100	100	100			
	15	100	100	100	100			
6	16	100	100	95	95			
	17	100	100	100	100			
	18	97	100	100	. 97			
7	19	100	100	100	100			
	20	100	100	100	100			
	21	97	100	100	97			
8	22	100	100	100	100			
	23	100	100	100	100			
	24	100	100	100	100			
9	25	97	100	100	97			
	26	97	100	100	97			
	27	100	100	100	100			
10	28	97	100	100	97			

Table 25. El Paso Pavement Rating Scores for July, 1985.

Test		C	Cracking PRS					
Section	Photolog	Trans.	Long.	Allig.	Overall PRS			
1	1	97	100	100	97			
	2	97	100	100	77			
	3	93	100	100	73			
2	4	97	100	100	97			
	5	97	100	100	97			
	6	97	100	100	97			
3	7	100	100	100	100			
	8	97	100	100	97			
	9	97	100	100	97			
4	10	100	100	100	100			
	11	100	100	100	100			
	12	100	100	100	100			
5	13	97	95	100	92			
	14	100	100	100	100			
	15	97	100	100	97			
6	16	100	100	100	100			
	17	100	100	100	100			
	18	100	100	100	100			
7	19	100	100	100	100			
	20	97	100	100	97			
	21	97	95	100	92			
8	22	97	100	100	97			
	23	97	100	100	97			
	24	100	100	100	100			
9	25	97	100	100	97			
	26	97	100	100	97			
	27	97	100	100	97			
10	28	97	100	100	97			

Table 26. El Paso Pavement Rating Scores for October, 1985.

.

.

Test		(	Cracking PRS	,	0veral1
Section	Photolog	Trans.	Long.	Allig.	PRS
1	1	97	100	100	97
	2	97	95	100	72
	3	93	100	100	73
2	4	97	95	100	72
	5	97	100	100	77
	6	97	100	100	77
3	7	97	100	100	97
	8	97	100	100	97
	9	97	100	100	77
4	10	97	95	100	72
	11	97	100	100	77
	12	100	100	100	100
5	13	97	95	95	67
	14	100	100	100	100
	15	97	100	100	97
6	16	97	100	100	97
	17	97	100	100	77
	18	97	100	100	97
7	19	97	100	100	97
	20	97	100	100	97
	21	97	95	100	92
8	22	97	100	100	97
	23	97	100	100	97
	24	97	100	100	97
9	25	97	100	100	97
	26	97	95	100	92
	27	97	100	97	77
10	28	97	100	100	100

Table 27. El Paso Pavement Rating Scores for May, 1986.

			% of Original Cracking													
Test	Photolog	Fo	eb., 198	34	F	lay, 198	4	J	uly, 19	85	0	ct., 198	35	M	<b>ay, 198</b>	6
Section		Trans.	Long.	Allig.	Trans	Long.	Allig.	Trans.	Long.	Allig.	Trans.	Long.	Allig.	Trans.	Long.	Allig.
1	1	37	24	0	41	36	0	59	6	0	57	0	0	105	0	0
	2	30	0	0	24	0	0	56	0	5	34	0	0	43	95	0
	3	30	0	0	37	7	0	83	7	0	51	0	0	61	16	0
2	4	8	0	0	8	0	0	13	12	0	17	12	0	22	29	0
	5	7	0	0	6	0	0	34	0	0	42	29	0	57	73	0
	6	26	0	0	16	0	0	32	0	0	41	0	0	48	0	0
3	7	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	13	0	0	16	17	0
	8	3	0	0	3	4	0	2	4	0	21	12	0	30	38	0
	9	13	0	0	16	0	0	15	0	0	33	0	0	30	0	0
4	10	0	5	6	0	5	3	0	4	2	5	4	0	13	34	0
	11	1	0	600	0	0	0	6	0	0	10	0	0	23	102	0
	12	3	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	8	31	0
5	13	20	75	0	21	3	0	19	16	0	38	100	0	51	126	11
	14	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	8	0	0
	15	31	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	14	6	0	24	7	0
6	16	5	0	0	13	0	1	10	0	8	8	11	0	24	23	0
	17	3	7	0	0	0	0	14	13	2	2	13	0	9	21	0
	18	3	0	0	0	6	0	21	16	0	13	4	0	19	5	0
7	19	8	6	0	3	0	9	2	0	0	19	1	0	21	3	0
	20	36	7	0	27	9	0	25	9	0	37	0	0	37	0	0
	21	28	89	0	23	103	0	27	13	0	46	112	0	56	121	0
8	22	26	0	0	6	0	0	5	0	0	16	0	0	36	0	0
	23	18	0	0	2	0	0	4	0	0	33	0	0	46	12	0
	24	48	0	0	6	0	0	14	0	0	15	0	0	66	0	0
9	25	56	0	0	30	0	0	41	0	0	38	7	0	52	7	0
	26	79	11	0	33	7	0	25	0	0	56	7	0	78	16	0
	27	19	17	0	13	0	0	1	0	0	22	5	0	32	13	0
10	28	30	0	0	45	0	0	90	0	0	100	0	0	106	0	0

.

Table 28. Extent of Overlay Cracking Expressed as a Percentage of Cracking in the Original Pavement for the El Paso Test Road.

.



Figure 22. El Paso Transverse Cracking Versus Survey Date.

•



Figure 23. El Paso Longitudinal Cracking Versus Survey Date.

sections consisted of: 1) no treatment, 2) asphalt cement interlayers, and 3) polymer asphalt interlayer.

The pavement was surveyed in November of 1985 and May of 1986. PRS values for each survey are shown in Tables 29 and 30. This test road is exhibiting very little cracking; however, the predominant type of distress is bleeding. This accounts for the relatively low overall PRS values in Table 30. The extent of cracking expressed as a percentage of cracking in the original pavement is shown in Table 31. These data are presented graphically in Figures 24 and 25. A bar graph showing the amount of bleeding in each section is given in Figure 26. It appears that the bleeding occurs once a crack has developed and the binder from the interlayer comes up through the crack; however, this is difficult to determine because the crack is completely obscured by the bleeding.

#### Buffalo Test Road

The Buffalo Test Road was constructed in August of 1984. Rubber concentration and digestion time were the independent variables in this experiment. Control sections consisted of: 1) no treatment, and 2) asphalt cement interlayer.

The pavement was surveyed in October of 1985 and May of 1986 at which times no distress was observed in any of the sections. This is also reflected in the PRS shown in Tables 32 and 33.

Test		Cracking PR		Overall
Section	Trans.	Long	Allig.	PRS
1	100	100	100	100
2	100	100	100	100
3	100	100	100	95
4	100	95	100	90
5	100	100	100	100
6	100	100	100	100
7	100	100	100	90
8	100	100	100	90
9	100	100	100	100
10	100	100	100	100
11	100	100	100	100
12	100	100	100	100
13	100	100	100	100
14	100	100	100	100
15	100	100	100	100
16	100	100	100	100
17	100	100	100	100
18	100	100	100	100

Table 29. Brownsville Pavement Rating Scores for November, 1985.

Test	· · ·	Cracking PRS						
Section	Trans.	Long.	Allig.	PRS				
1	100	100	100	100				
2	93	90	100	75				
3	100	90	100	80				
4	100	90	100	80				
5	100	100	100	100				
6	100	100	100	100				
7	100	90	100	80				
8	100	100	100	88				
9	100	100	100	100				
10	100	100	100	100				
11	100	100	100	90				
12	100	100	100	100				
13	100	100	100	100				
14	100	100	100	100				
15	100	100	100	100				
16	100	100	100	100				
17	97	95	100	92				
18	97	100	100	97				

Table 30. Brownsville Pavement Rating Scores for May, 1986.

	% of Cracking							
Test Section	Trans.	November, Long.	1985 Allig.	Trans.	May, 1986 Long.	Allig.		
1	1	2	0	1	4	0		
2	0	11	0	33	84	0		
3	0	22	0	10	47	8		
4	0	43	0	13	113	100		
5	0	0	0	0	0	8		
6	10	0	0	10	8	7		
7	0	0	0	10	22	0		
8	0	0	0	0	0	0		
9	0	0	0	0	0	0		
10	0	0	0	0	0	0		
11	0	0	0	13	0	0		
12	0	0	0	0	0	0		
13	0	0	0	0	0	0		
14	0	0	0	0	0	0		
15	100	0	0	120	0	0		
16	0	0	0	20	0	0		
17	0	0	0	58	300	0		
18	0	0	0	87	14	100		

Table 31. Extent of Overlay Cracking Expressed as a Percentage of Cracking in the Original Pavement for the Brownsville Test Road.



Figure 24. Brownsville Transverse Cracking Versus Survey Date.



•





Test		Cr	Overall		
Section	Photolog	Trans.	Long.	Allig.	PRS
]	1	100	100	100	100
	2	100	100	100	100
	3	100	100	100	100
2	4	100	100	100	100
	5	100	100	100	100
3	6	100	100	100	100
	7	100	100	100	100
4	8	100	100	100	100
	9	100	100	100	100
5	10	100	100	100	100
	11	100	100	100	100
6	12	100	100	100	100
	13	100	100	100	100
	14	100	100	100	100
7	15	100	100	100	100
	16	100	100	100	100
	17	100	100	100	100
8	18	100	100	100	100
	19	100	100	100	100
	20	100	100	100	100
9	21	100	100	100	100
	22	100	100	100	100
	23	100	100	100	100
10	24	100	100	100	100
	25	100	100	100	100
	26	100	100	100	100
11	27	100	100	100	100
	28	100	100	100	100
	29	100	100	100	100
12	30	100	100	100	100
	31	100	100	100	100
	32	100	100	100	100

Table 32. Buffalo Pavement Rating Scores for October, 1985	Table	32.	Buffalo	Pavement	Rating	Scores	for	October,	1985
--	-------	-----	---------	----------	--------	--------	-----	----------	------

Test	Photolog	<u>Cr</u>	acking PR	<u>RS</u>	Overall
Section		Trans.	Long.	Allig.	PRS
1	1	100	100	100	100
	2	100	100	100	100
	3	100	100	100	100
2	4	100	100	100	100
	5	100	100	100	100
3	6	100	100	100	100
	7	100	100	100	100
4	8	100	100	100	100
	9	100	100	100	100
5	10	100	100	100	100
	11	100	100	100	100
6	12	100	100	100	100
	13	100	100	100	100
	14	100	100	100	100
7	15	100	100	100	100
	16	100	100	100	100
	17	100	100	100	100
8	18	100	100	100	100
	19	100	100	100	100
	20	100	100	100	100
9	21	100	100	100	100
	22	100	100	100	100
	23	100	100	100	100
10	24	100	100	100	100
	25	100	100	100	100
	26	100	100	100	100
11	27	100	100	100	100
	28	100	100	100	100
	29	100	100	100	100
12	30	100	100	100	100
	31	100	100	100	100
	32	100	100	100	100

.

.

Table 33. Buffalo Pavement Rating Scores for May, 1986.
## CHAPTER 7

## ANALYSIS

## El Paso Test Road - Statistical Analysis of Field Responses

The purpose of this section is to present the results from the statistical analysis of data obtained from the El Paso Test Road regarding the field performance of asphalt-rubber interlayers. The responses of interest are the following types of distress: transverse cracking, longitudinal cracking and alligator cracking. Each distress type was further classified according to the degree of severity. However, for the purposes of this analysis, a combined measure of types of distress and all degrees of severity was used.

The original experimental design model consisted of a Latin Square with rubber type, concentration of rubber and binder application rate as factors. Mathematically, the model can be written as follows:

 $Y_{i,ik} = \mu + R_i + C_j + A_k + \varepsilon_{i,jk}$ 

where:  $Y_{ijk}$  = response to i<sup>th</sup> rubber, j<sup>th</sup> concentration and k<sup>th</sup> application rate  $\mu$  = effect on response of the overall mean  $R_i$  = effect on response of the i<sup>th</sup> rubber  $C_j$  = effect on response of the j<sup>th</sup> concentration  $A_k$  = effect on response of the k<sup>th</sup> application rate  $\epsilon_{ijk}$  = random error

Three levels of each factor were considered:

1. rubber types - A, B and C.

2. concentrations - 22 percent, 24 percent and 26 percent.

3. application rates - 0.35, 0.40 and 0.45 gallon/square yard. Even though the application rates were not exactly as planned, they were sufficiently close to be considered equal to the specified rates. Distress data were collected for each of three different photologs within each of nine different test sections. Since the same treatment was used within the same section, the responses of the three photologs were considered as independent samples. Since the application rate and thickness for photolog 12 were not available, they were estimated as 0.4 and 2.0 (average of thicknesses for section 4), respectively.

Distress data were collected for five time periods after the application of the asphalt-rubber binder and overlay. The analysis was made independently for each time period.

Two other factors were later included in the model since they were thought to have a significant effect on the response. They were the original distress of the photolog before the application of the treatment and the overlay thickness. Since these factors were not controllable by the experimenter, a new analysis of covariance model, having overlay thickness and original distress as covariates, was constructed.

Since no significant occurrence of alligator cracking was found, only transverse and longitudinal cracking were included in the analysis.

Preliminary analyses indicated that the rubber-type factor was not significant in most cases. In addition, it was of interest to investigate the effect of interaction between concentration and application rate. Consequently, a modified model disregarding rubber type was used. The new model was a  $3^2$  factorial, which is shown in Figure 27, with original cracking and overlay thickness as covariates.

Concentration

0.35 Application rate 0.40





The new model allowed the analysis of interaction between concentration and application rate. It also allowed more degrees of freedom for the error, increasing the accurancy of the analysis at the expense of dropping one factor. Mathematically, the new analysis of covariance model was:

$$Y_{i,ik} = \mu + C_i + A_j + CA_{i,i} + \beta I(X_{i,ik} - X) + \beta 2(T_{i,ik} - T) + \varepsilon_{i,ik}$$

where:  $Y_{ijk}$  = response to i<sup>th</sup> concentration, j<sup>th</sup> application rate,

k<sup>th</sup> original distress and kth overlay thickness

 $\mu$  = effect on response of the overall mean

 $C_i$  = effect on response of the i<sup>th</sup> concentration

 $A_i$  = effect on response of the j<sup>th</sup> application rate

 $CA_{ij}$  = effect on response of the interaction of the i<sup>th</sup> concentration and the j<sup>th</sup> application rate

 $\beta_1$  = true linear regression coefficient between response and original distress

- $\beta_2$  = true linear regression coefficient between response and overlay thickness
- X<sub>iik</sub> = original distress of photolog k

X = mean of original distress

T<sub>ijk</sub> = overlay thickness of photolog k

 $\overline{T}$  = mean of overlay thickness

 $\varepsilon_{iik}$  = random error.

Assuming a significance level of 10 percent, all transverse cracking models were highly significant. From the least squares mean estimates, the concentration appears to be the most significant factor, with higher concentrations tending to perform better. Also, there is a significant interaction between concentration and application rate. It appears that, for the highest concentration, the application rate equal to 0.40 gave the best results. Even though the results for the longitudinal cracking data were not as consistent as the ones for transverse cracking, the highest concentration rate appears to perform better as in the transverse cracking case. In the only case where interaction was significant, it appears that, for the highest concentration rate, the application rate equal to 0.40 performs better.

## Brownsville Test Road

After construction of the interlayers, the test road was opened to traffic before being overlayed. During that time period, almost all of the seal coat interlayers were exhibiting flushing, as noted in Table 21. This distress was hoped to be insignificant since the pavement would be overlayed; however, this was not the case since the pavement is exhibiting bleeding. The fact that the interlayers were too rich in binder was also thought to have a positive effect on retarding crack propagation.

Overall, there is little cracking occuring in the test sections; however, there is an unacceptable level of bleeding being exhibited. It appears that most of the bleeding is coming from the interlayer through the cracks.

There is insufficient cracking in the test sections to do a detailed analysis and to draw any conclusions at this time on the performance of the test sections in terms of reflective cracking. Even though only half of the test sections are flushing at this time, it appears that the interlayer binder rates (Table 21) were excessive in all test sections. It is expected that as the amount of cracking increases in the pavement, bleeding will progress to extreme levels.

.

## CHAPTER 8

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Test roads containing asphalt-rubber interlayers were constructed near El Paso, Buffalo and Brownsville. All test roads were designed as statistical experiments such that analysis of effects due to asphalt-rubber formulation could be determined. Asphalt-rubber was formulated using various rubber concentration, rubber type, digestion conditions, and interlayers were applied at various shot rates. In addition, aggregate grade was varied, and single and double binder applications were studied. Based on field performance to date the following conclusions were made.

#### Conclusions

- Based on field performance to date, the interlayer which is performing the best in the El Paso Test Road contains 26% rubber and was applied at 0.40 gallons per square yard.
- The Brownsville Test Road has insufficient cracking to draw conclusions on field performance of the test sections in terms of reflective cracking.
- The Brownsville Test Road is experiencing bleeding from the interlayer in half of the test sections due to excessive interlayer binder application rates.
- 4. The Buffalo Test Road is not experiencing any distress at this time. .

#### Recommendations

 These three test roads are already producing valuable information about asphalt-rubber interlayers. Monitoring should be continued until sufficient data is obtained to correlate field performance to laboratory properties.

# APPENDIX A

.

Photolog Summaries - El Paso

#### REFERENCES

- Shuler, T. S., Pavlovich, R. D. and Epps, J. A., "Field Performance of Rubber Modified Asphalt Paving Materials," paper submitted to Transportation Research Board for presentation at annual meeting, Washington, D.C., January, 1985.
- Way, G. B., "Prevention of Reflective Cracking at Minnetonka East (1979 Addendum Report)," Report ADOT-RS-15(130), Arizona DOT, August, 1979.
- 3. Shuler, T. S., Pavlovich, R. D., Epps, J. A. and Adams, C. K., "Investigation of Materials and Structural Properties of Asphalt-Rubber Paving Mixtures," FHWA Project DTFH61-82-C-0074, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, D.C., March, 1985.
- 4. Shuler, T. S., Gallaway, B. M. and Epps, J. A., "Evaluation of Asphalt-Rubber Membrane Field Performance," Texas Transportation Research Report 287-2, May, 1982.
- 5. Oliver, J. W. H., "A Critical Review of the Use of Rubbers and Polymers in Bitumen Bound Paving Materials," Interim Report AIR-1037-1, Australian Research Board, 1977.
- Pavlovich, R. D., Shuler, T. S. and Rosner, J. C., "Chemical and Physical Properties of Asphalt-Rubber," Report ADOT-RS-15(133), Arizona DOT, November, 1979.
- 7. Green, E. and Tolonen, W. J., "Chemical and Physical Properties of Asphalt-Rubber Mixtures," Report ADOT-RS-14(162), ADOT, July, 1977.
- 8. Shuler, T. S. and Hamberg, D. J., "A Rational Investigation of Asphalt-Rubber Properties," University of New Mexico Engineering Research Institute, August, 1980.
- 9. Jimenez, R. A., "Testing Methods for Asphalt-Rubber," Report ADOT-RS-15(164), ADOT, January, 1978.
- 10. American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM Annual Book of Standards, Part 14, "Concrete and Mineral Aggregates," 1980.
- American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM Annual Book of Standards, Volume 09.01, "Rubber, Natural and Synthetic-General Test Methods, Carbon Black," June, 19.
- 12. Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation, 1982 Standard Specifications for Construction of Highways, Streets and Bridges, September 1, 1982.

- 13. Epps, J. A., Meyer, A. H., Larrimore, I. E., Jr. and Jones, H. L., "Roadway Maintenance Evaluation User's Manual," Texas Transportation Institute Research Report 151-2, September, 1974.
- 14. Epps, J. A., Larrimore, I. E., Jr., Meyer, A. H., Cox, S. G., Jr., Evans, J. R., Jones, H. L., Mahoney, J., Wootan, C. V. and Lytton, R. L., "The Development of Maintenance Management Tools for Use by the Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation," Texas Transportation Institute Research Report 151-4F, September, 1976.
- 15. Corlew, J. S. and Dickson, P. F., "Methods of Calculating Temperature Profiles of Hot-Mix Asphalt Concrete as Related to the Construction of Asphalt Pavements," Association of Asphalt Paving Technologists, Volume 37, p. 101, 1968.
- Shuler, T. S., Adams, C. K. and Lamborn, M., "Asphalt-Rubber Binder Laboratory Performance," Texas Transportation Institute Research Report 347-1F, March, 1985.

El Paso

Preconstruction Survey

.\_

	Sevening Sevening	Preco	Preconstruction Photolog 1. El Pa				
$\langle $	Stress Not	Slig	ht	Mode	rate	Sev	vere
	ress Nor	F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.	27	106	6	21		74
	Long., ft.	9	59	33	11		10
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		358		322		56
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

~



	Stress Not N	Preconstruction Photolog 3. El						
< "	Stress Hot	Slig	Slight .		Moderate		vere	
	3'S	∕ F	N	F	N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.	155	130	90	3	4	196	
	Long., ft.	80	27					
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		8		10			
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>	79	93					
	Pumping, ft.							

Distress Not.	Pre	econ
Distress Not		S1i
	· 1	;
Transv., ft.	ł	12
Long., ft.		36
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>		
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>		8
	1	

nstruction Photolog 4. El Paso.

Stress Nor. N	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.	112	16	332	41	72	194
Long., ft.	36	56	47		9	30
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		278		129		
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>	8	06				
Pumping, ft.						

	Rijjed. C. Nor. N	Preco	nstruct	g 5. El Paso.			
Orse,	R. K.	Slig	Slight Mod		Moderate		ere
	35 OF. 1	F	N	F	N	F	N
	ransv., ft.	265	8	52			11
L	ong., ft.	56	11				
A	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		15				
F	lushing, ft <sup>2</sup>	4	94				
P	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
P	Pumping, ft.						

/	Preconstruction Photolog 6. El Paso.										
	Stress Not . W	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re				
		ΎF	N	F	N	F	N				
	Transv., ft.	195	155								
	Long., ft.	89	21				•				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		31								
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>		.97								
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>										
	Pumping, ft.										

	stress Not. N	Pred	construc	tion	Ph	otolo	og 7. El Paso.		
$\langle $	Stress Not	S1i	Slight Mode		derat	erate		vere	
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	, F	N	F		N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.	203	107	20				60	
	Long., ft.	61	31	2					
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		1149			232			
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>		120 378		318				
-	Pumping, ft.								

0.	Severity rijiled. S. Not. N	Pro	econ	strı
$\langle $	Eress Not. N		Slig	ght
	1	ŕF		N
	Transv., ft.	23	35	12
	Long., ft.		29	5
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>			76
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>		6	67
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>			

.

.

uction

Photolog 8. El Paso.

		j	5	<u> </u>		1			
Eress Nor	Slig	jht	Moderate				Severe		
Eress Nor, N	F	N	F	-	1	١	F		N
Transv., ft.	235	125	10	)3					35
Long., ft.	29	52		2					
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>	والمراجع المراجع الم	763			(	91			
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>	66	57		2	.7				
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>									
Pumping, ft.									

	rijied. r. Not. N	Pred	construct	ion	Photolo	og 9. El Paso.		
$\langle $	Stress Hot	Sli	ght	Moderate		Sev	vere	
	35 V. A	• F	N	F	N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.	301	106	20			9	
	Long., ft.	49	35					
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		84					
	Flushing, $ft^2$ .	2	260					
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>		578					
	Pumping, ft.							

r;;;;;ed,r;e,r;e,r;e,r;e,r;e,r;e,r;e,r;e,r;e,r;e	Preconstruction Photolog 10. El Paso							
Eress Nor	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Severe			
	ŕF	N	F	N	F	N		
Transv., ft.	76	128	287	4	21	43		
Long., ft.	109	69		8	31			
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		178		704	- -	496		
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>	4	22	4	6	3	5		
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>	6	24						
Pumping, ft.								

103

 $\sim$ 

	Severic, Nor. N	Preco	Preconstruction			g 11. I	El Paso.
$\langle $	Stress Nor	Slight		Moder	rate	Severe	
	35 OF - M	F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.	137	174	61	79		
	Long., ft.	37					
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

r;;;;eq.er;r;		structio	n	P	notolo	og í	12.	El	Paso.	
Erress Hor, N	Sli	ght	Moderate			Seve		^e		
	F	N		F	N		F		N	
Transv., ft.	70	76	11	12	39		4		24	   
Long., ft.	35	10	6	58	4		2			
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		255			218				225	
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>	58	4	20		02			. <u></u>		
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>				20	00					
Pumping, ft.										

Severic, Moz. N	Preconstruction Photolog				13. E	1 Paso.
Seress Hor	Slig	ht	Moder	rate	Sev	rere
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	FN		F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.	143	45	39-	19	31	
Long., ft.	102	13	11		4	
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		302		363		113
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>	3:	33				
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>	4	19	4	0		
Pumping, ft.						

-



.

Severity Severity Severity Not Not Not	Preco	nstructi	15. E	l Paso.			
Stress Not	Slig	ht	Moder	ate	Severe		
35 V. A	, F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.	394	31	60				
Long., ft.	286	37	30				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		744		136			
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>	34	2					
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>	96	3					
Pumping, ft.							

~

Eress Not. N	Precons	on	n Photolog				16. El Paso.			
Eress Nor	Sli	ght	м	loder	ate		S	ieve	re	
	ŕF	N		FN		١	F		N	
Transv., ft.	112	93	1	10		6				
Long., ft.	67	14		38				;		
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		122			77	9			19	94
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>	26	50		14						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>	82	20		72	5					
Pumping, ft.									_	

	Stress Not. W	Preco	onstruct	ion	Photolo	g 17. El Paso			
$\langle $	Stress Nor	Slig	ht	Mode	rate	Sev	ere		
	3'5 F. A	• F	N	F	N	F	N		
	Transv., ft.	153	187	37	6				
	Long., ft.	134	17						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		542		188				
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>		<u>75</u> 28	2	12				
	Pumping, ft.								

Eress Not. N	Preconstruction Photolog 18. El										Pas	0.
Eress Nor		Slig	, jht		M	oder	ate		S	eve	re	
1	Ύ F		N		F		١	4	F		N	
Transv., ft.	10	109		1	16	59	31_					
Long., ft.	7	76		_35		37						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>			331				149					
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>		103										
Patching, ft.		12				1	34					
Pumping, ft.												

	Stree Crist	Preco	onstruct	ion	Photolo	g 19.	El Paso.
$\langle , $		Slig	ht	Moder	rate	Sev	ere
	tress to the	F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.	86	179				8
	Long., ft.	184	184 30		7		
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		71		38		
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>	12	19	1	19		
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>	3	35	1	09		
	Pumping, ft.						



Photolog 20. El Paso.

thes the		Slig	ght		М	oder	ate		Severe			
1	ŕF		N			F	N		F	F		
Transv., ft.	20	00	2	6		25						
Long., ft.	28			1		8						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		203		2								
		24	42									
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>		19	55			2	65					
Pumping, ft.									!			
	Transv., ft. Long., ft. <u>Allig., ft.<sup>2</sup></u> Flushing, ft. <sup>2</sup> Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>	Transv., ft. 20 Long., ft. 28 Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup> Flushing, ft. <sup>2</sup> Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>	Transv., ft.       200         Long., ft.       283         Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup> 283         Flushing, ft. <sup>2</sup> 24         Patching, ft. <sup>2</sup> 19	F       N         Transv., ft.       200       2         Long., ft.       283       1         Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup> 1         Flushing, ft. <sup>2</sup> 242         Patching, ft. <sup>2</sup> 155	F       N         Transv., ft.       200       26         Long., ft.       283       11         Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup> 2         Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> 242         Patching, ft <sup>2</sup> 155	FNTransv., ft.20026Long., ft.28311Allig., ft.22Flushing, ft.242Patching, ft.155	$\checkmark$ F       N       F         Transv., ft.       200       26       25         Long., ft.       283       11       8         Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup> 2       2         Flushing, ft. <sup>2</sup> 242       242         Patching, ft. <sup>2</sup> 155       2	i $F$ $N$ $F$ $I$ Transv., ft.       200       26       25         Long., ft.       283       11       8         Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup> 2       2         Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> 242       242         Patching, ft <sup>2</sup> 155       265	F       N       F       N         Transv., ft. $200$ $26$ $25$ Long., ft. $283$ $11$ $8$ Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup> $2$ $242$ Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> $242$ $265$	F       N       F       N       F         Transv., ft.       200       26       25         Long., ft.       283       11       8         Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup> 2       2         Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> 242       242         Patching, ft <sup>2</sup> 155       265	F       N       F       N       F         Transv., ft.       200       26       25       25         Long., ft.       283       11       8       11         Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup> 2       2       11         Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> 242       155       265	F       N $F$ N $F$ N $F$ N         Transv., ft.       200       26       25       25       25       26       25       26       27       26       27 </td

	Stress Not. N	Preco	onstruct	ion	Photolo	g 21.	El Paso.
$\langle $	Stress Not	Slig	ht	Mode	rate	Sev	vere
	35 J. M	× F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.	191	155	13			
	Long., ft.	103	18				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		447				
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>	26	51	6	583		
	Pumping, ft.						

Severity Fress Not N	Preco	nstru	ctio	n	PI	noto <sup>-</sup>	log	22.	E1	Pasc	).
ed . r	S1	ight		Moderate				Severe			
	ΎF	Ν		F N		4	F		N		
Transv., ft.	274		71		14						
Long., ft.	80	5								- <u></u>	
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		1	134						<del>و</del>	_	
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>		219									
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>		70			7	2					
Pumping, ft.											

	rijied. r. Not. N	Preco	onstruct	ion	Photolog	g 23. E	El Paso.
< ",	Stress Not	Slig	ht	Mode	rate	Sev	rere
	35 V. A	F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.	131	68	57			4
	Long., ft.	26	7				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		130				
	Flushing, $ft^2$ .	10	28				
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

/	rjijler iz	Precons	struc <sup>.</sup>	tion	PI	notol	og å	24.	E1	Paso	).
	Seress Not .	S1i	ght		Moder	ate		Severe			
		ΎF	N		F	Ν		F		N	
	Transv., ft.	145	2	2	4						
	Long., ft.	32	11								
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		333	3		1			Annual Parts of		
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>	3	72								
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>	1	.78		14	40					
	Pumping, ft.					_					

	Stree ARTING	Prec	construc	tion	Photo1	og 25.	El Paso.
< "		Slig	ht	Moder	rate	Sev	ere
	ress hor w	F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.	81	49	117	17	14	
	Long., ft.	38	30	10			
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		213		59		
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>	5	78				
r	Pumping, ft.						

	rjijieo rity	Ρ	Preconstruction					Pho	Photolog 26. El Paso.				aso.
	Eress Nor	<u></u>	Slig	ght		M	oder	ate		Severe			
		ŕF		N			F	!	V	F		N	
-	Transv., ft.	2	24	1	.6		5						
	Long., ft.	3	26	1	.0	12	9		18	]	.4		
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>	-		45	58			1	97				
	Flushing, $ft^2$ .		3	01									
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>			11			68	30					
	Pumping, ft.												

Stress Not. W	Preco	Preconstruction Phot				El Paso.
Stress Not	Slig	ht	Moder	ate	Sev	ere
	, F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.	302	78	64	4		51
Long., ft.	282	36	19			
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		314	57			
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>		) <u>21</u> )23				
 Pumping, ft.						

0.	Severity rijilea	Pre	cons	truc	ctio	on Photolog				28. El Paso.			<b>.</b>
	Eress Nor.		Slig	ght		М	oder	ate		Severe		re	
		F		N			F	١	١	F		N	
	Transv., ft.	24		1	8	!	54	]	.2		12		
	Long., ft.				4			12	28				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>			18	5	75		75					
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>		127			540							
	Patching, ft.			30			1	20					
	Pumping, ft.												



;

,



. .

Drseress Nor	Slig	ht	Moderate		Severe	
Drstress Not	y F	N	F	N	F	N
<u>Transv., ft.</u>		87				
Long., ft.		30				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, $ft^2$ .	11 1					

r;;;eter;		ate 2/84	Pho	tolog 2	. El Pa	SO.
ea. S. Nor		ight	Moder	ate	Sever	re
	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		160				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft						
Patching, ft2						
Pumping, ft.		6				

A ji kenje	Survey	Date 2/84	4 Pho	otolog 3	El Paso.		
Dr. tea the	Slig	jht	Mode	rate	Severe		
is lite	r F	N	F	N	F	N	
<u>Transv., ft.</u>		178					
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
Patching, $ft^2$ .							
Pumping, ft.	3	6					

/	Severies Su	rvey Da	te 2/84	Pho	tolog 4.	. El Paso.		
	severies seress Not. M	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re	
		F	N	F	N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.		61					
·	Long., ft.					, ,		
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Patching, ft.							
	Pumping, ft.							

Orseress Nor	Slig	ght	Mode	Moderate		ere
Distress Not	₩ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		26				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft	2					
Patching, ft						

(r) elerit	irvey Da	te 2/84	Pho	tolog 6	. El Pa	150.
Stress Nor	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Sever	re
	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		93				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

rij, erj	iurvey [	) <b>ate</b> 2/8	4 Pho	tolog 7.	. El Paso.		
Distress Not	Slig	ht	Moder	ate	Severe		
35 101.1	, F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		8					
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

	r;;;euer;	irvey Da	<b>te</b> 2/84	Pho	tolog 8	. El Pa	so.
$\langle $	Stress Nor	STi	ght	Moder	ate	Sever	e
		F	N	F	N	F	Ń
	Transv., ft.		15				
	Long., ft.	<b>_</b>					•.
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

Seress Nor	Slig	ght	Mode	Moderate		ere
Seress Nor.	6 F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		60				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

	rij erg	). El P	aso.				
	Stress Nor	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
		F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		0				
·	Long., ft.		18				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		88				
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

rij, erj	Survey D	ate 2/84	l Pho	tolog 1	. El Paso.	
Diseress Nor	Slig	ht	Moderate		Severe	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	> F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		6				
Long., ft.		6				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

Dr. seress No	Survey	Date 2/84	Pho	tolog 12	2. El Paso.	
Distress No	s s	light	Moder	ate	Seve	re
	· ↓ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., f	t.	12				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft	.2	84				
Flushing,	_1 1					
Patching,	ft <sup>2</sup>					
Pumping, f	t.					

ri, eteri	Survey I	Date 2/8	4 Pho	otolog 1:	3. El F	Paso.
Dr. res. Nor.	Slig	jht	Moderate		Severe	
35 OF	> F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		48				
Long., ft.		98				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$						
Patching, $ft^2$ .						
Pumping, ft.						

	Sever Su Sever je	rvey Da	<b>te</b> 2/84	Photolog 14. El Paso.					
	Stress Notion	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re		
		F	N	F	N	F	N		
	Transv., ft.		36						
·	Long., ft.								
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>								
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>			 					
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>								
	Pumping, ft.								
Arij, ere	Survey D	ate 2/84	l Pho	otolog 1	5. El Paso.				
---------------------------	----------	----------	-------	----------	-------------	-----			
Diseress Nor	Slig	ht	Moder	Moderate		ere			
35 V. N	• F	N	F	N	F	N			
Transv., ft.		151							
Long., ft.									
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>									
Flushing, $ft^2$ .									
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>									
Pumping, ft.									

	Sever Su	rvey Da	te 2/84	Pho	tolog 16	5. El F	`aso.
Or,	Sevenity Filled Stress Roting	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
		ŕF	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		18				
	Long., ft.						
	_Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, $ft^2$ .			 			
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

r <sub>j</sub> , e <sub>rj</sub>	Gurvey D	)ate 2/8	4 Pho	otolog 1	7. El Paso.	
Orseress Nor	Slig	ht	Moder	Moderate		ere
35 64.4	, F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		12				
Long., ft.		12				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

^r;;;er;		<b>te</b> 2/84	<b>Photolog</b> 18 El Paso.				
ea s	S1i	ght	Moder	ate	Sever	re	
	F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		12					
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

Filled Fill			<b>r</b>				
iseress tor	Slig	Slight		Moderate		Severe	
	y F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		_24					
Long., ft.		26					
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
Patching, $ft^2$ .							
Pumping, ft.							

	ring er ing	rvey Da	<b>te</b> 2/84	<b>Photolog</b> 20. El Paso.				
Distres	s · r.	Slig	ght	Moder	ate	Sever	.e	
		F	N	F	N	F	N	
Tr	ansv., ft.		92					
Lo	ong., ft.		_24	- <u></u>				
AI	llig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
1	lushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pa	atching, $ft$ .							
Pu	umping, ft.							

rij, er,	urvey	Date 2/8	4 Pho	tolog 2	1. El Paso.		
Orseress Nor	Slig	jht	Moder	ate	Severe		
35 St. 4	F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		103					
Long., ft.		108					
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

	^^`` <sup>e</sup> ler;	rvey Da	te 2/84	Photolog 22. El Paso.				
$\langle  \rangle$	east in the second seco	S11	ght	Moder	ate	Sever	re	
		F	N	F	N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.		96					
	Long., ft.							
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Pumping, ft.							

Seress Nor	Sli	ght	Mode	Moderate		ere
Filled Files	∦ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		47				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						

	^^`;;;ever;	rvey Da	<b>te</b> 2/84	Pho	tolog 24	. El Paso.	
$\langle , \rangle$	Eress Not	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Sever	re
		ŕF	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		73				
	Long., ft.						
1	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft.						
	Pumping, ft.						

Seress Nor	Slig	Slight		Moderate		ere
Severity Severity Severity Notion	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		158				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						

	Survey Date 2/84 Photolog 26. El Paso										
	rijjed. r. Not.	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re				
		Ý F	N	F	N	F	N				
	Transv., ft.		194								
-	Long., ft.		58								
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>										
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>										
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>										
	Pumping, ft.										

(Ary) (ery)	urvey I	Date 2/8	4 Pho	otolog <sup>: 2</sup>	<sup>7</sup> . El Paso.	
Diseress Nor	Slig	, ht	Mode	rate	Sev	ere
	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		97			_	
Long., ft.		58				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, $ft^2$ .						
Pumping, ft.						

	r;;;ever;	rvey Da	<b>te</b> 2/84	Photolog 28. El Paso.				
$\langle \gamma_{3}$	ea st		ght	Moder	ate	Sever	re	
		F	N	F	N	F	Ń	
	Transv., ft.		36					
	Long., ft.							
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Pumping, ft.							

El Paso

May, 1984 Survey

Orseress No	S1i	ght	Mode	rate	Sev	ere
Diseress No	F F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft	•	84		12		
Long., ft.		44				
Allig., ft.	2					
Flushing, f						
Patching, f	t <sup>2</sup>					
Pumping, ft					-	

.

.

/	rijjerrity Su	rvey Da	te 5/84	Pho	tolog 2	. El Paso.		
	Finess Not. N	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re	
		Ý F	N	F	N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.		75		50			
-	Long., ft.						•	
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Pumping, ft.			2	6	12	2	

•

•.

c.,

	Slig	Slight		Moderate		Severe	
Stress Not N	× F	N	F	N	F	Ň	
Transv., ft.		40		177			
Long., ft.		8					
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft$ .							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup> Pumping, ft.				38			

	^^``;;eter;	urvey Da	Photolog 4. El Paso.				
	Seress Nor.		ght	Moder	ate	Sever	re
		V F	N	F	N	F	Ń
	Transv., ft.		54		12		
·	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft						
	Patching, ft	2					
	Pumping, ft.						

Orseress No.	511	ght	Mode	Moderate		ere
Distress Not	₽ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		22				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft	2					
Patching, ft	11 1					

r;;;;euer;;EJ	Surve	y Dat	<b>te</b> 5/84	Ph	otolog	6. El P	aso.
Drstress N		Slig	ght	Mode	erate	Seve	re
	· / /	-	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., f	t.		56				
Long., ft.							
Allig., fi	.2						
Flushing,							
Patching,	ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping,	ft.						

Dyseress	N. M.	Slig	ht	Mode	rate	Severe	
	Active to the N	F	N	F	N	F	N
Trans	v <u>.,</u> ft.						
Long.	, ft.						
Allig	., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flush	ing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	ing, ft <sup>2</sup>						

/	Sever Su	rvey Da	<b>te</b> 5/84	Photolog 8. El Paso.				
/ 0 <sub>73</sub>	Eress Not N	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re	
	· · · ·	F	N	F	N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.							
	Long., ft.							
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						 	
-	Flushing, $ft$ .							
	Patching, ft.							
	Pumping, ft.							

Seress Hor	Slig	ht	Mode	rate	Severe	
filles, is to a set of the set of	> F	N	F	N	F	Ň
Transv., ft.		72				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						

	Sever it Su	irvey Da	<b>te</b> 5/84	Pho	tolog 1	0. El 1	Paso.
	rinner, rich	S1i	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
		¥ F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		2				
-	Long., ft.		18				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		44				
	Flushing, ft						
	Patching, ft	×					
	Pumping, ft.						

Orseress Nor	Slig	Slight Mod		Moderate		ere
Distress Nor.	¢ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.						
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

		)ate 5/8	4 Pho	otolog 12	. El Pa	350.
Eress Not	<u></u>	ight	Mode	rate	Seve	re
	V F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.						
Long., ft.	<u> </u>					
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft	_					
Patching, ft	2					
Pumping, ft.						

Drseress Nor	Slig	ht	Mode	Moderate		ere
Drseress Nor	v F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		22		28		
Long., ft.		4				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						

	Survey	Date	5/84
$\mathbf{i}$	·		
<u> </u>			
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~			
(C. \			

,

Photolog 14. El Paso.

Or,	Eress Not N						
$\langle \rangle$	Erress Hor	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Sever	re
	1	F	N	F	N	F	Ń
	Transv., ft.						
	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

Distress Not	Survey	Date 5/8	Photolog 15. El Paso.			
Orseress Not	Slig	ght	Mode	Moderate		ere
	∧ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.						
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

	r; eter;	Photolog 16. El Paso.					
	Erress Nor	Sli	ght	Moder	rate	Severe	
,		ŕF	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		43				
-	Long., ft.						•.
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		16				
	Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
-	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

Diseress	(internet to the second	Slig	Slight		erate	Severe	
	A	F	N	F	N	F	N
<u>Transv.</u>	, ft.						
Long.,	ft.						
Allig.,	ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushin	g, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patchin	g, ft $^2$						

.

^r;; eter;	rvey Da	<b>te</b> 5/84	Photolog 18. El Paso				
Stress Nor	\$1i	ght	Moder	ate	Sever	re	
	F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.							
Long., ft.				_12			
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
Patching, ft.							
Pumping, ft.							

•.

Ary tery	Survey [	)ate 5/8	4 <b>Ph</b> (	otolog	19. El Paso	
O's rress Nor	Slig	ht	Moderate		Severe	
	y F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		9				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		10				
Flushing, $ft^2$						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>	<b>n</b>					
Pumping, ft.						

0	^rijper;	urvey Da	te 5/84	Pho	tolog 20	O. El Paso.		
$\langle \langle \rangle$	Stress Nor	S1i	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re	
		V F	N	F	N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.		69					
	Long., ft.		30					
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, ft							
	Patching, ft							
	Pumping, ft.							

OF Stress Nor	Slight		Moderate		Severe	
Distress Nor	y F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		88				
Long., ft.		125				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>					· _	

Survey Date 5/84

## Photolog 22. El Paso.

Distress Not		ght	Moderate		Severe	
	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		24				
Long., ft.		 				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>	1	00				
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

Drseress Nor	Slig	Slight		Moderate		ere
Drseress Nor	y F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		6				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						

	r;;er;	rvey D	ate 5/84	Pho	tolog 2	24. E1	Paso.
	Seress Nor	S1	ight	Moder	ate	Seve	re
		F	N	F	N	F	Ń
	Transv., ft.		10				
-	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

AT THE PICT	iurvey D	)ate 5/8	4 Ph	otolog	25. El Paso.		
Orseress Nor	Slig	Slight		Moderate		ere	
35 V. N.	, F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		49		36			
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

/	Sever it	irvey Da	te 5/84	Photolog 26. El Paso.				
	Filled. F. Nor.	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Severe		
		F	N	F	N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.		83					
·	Long., ft.		35					
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Pumping, ft.							

Orseress Nor	Survey	Date 5/8	4 Pho	otolog 2	7. El Paso.	
Orseress Nor	Slig	Slight		Moderate		ere
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	1/ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		57		8		
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft						
Patching, ft	n – – –					
Pumping, ft.						

	(r) etery	rvey Da	te 5/84	Pho	tolog 28	3 Contro	150.	
	Stress Nor	S1 i	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re	
		F	N	F	N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.		43		12			
-	Long., ft.							
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Patching, ft.							
	Pumping, ft.							

El Paso

July, 1985 Survey

Seress Nor	Slig	ht	Mode	rate	Severe	
Stress Not N	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		139			-	
Long., ft.		8				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>			4(	00		
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

x i i j reterije	rvey Da	te 7/85	Pho	tolog 2	. El Paso.		
red Stress Not	Slig	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re	
	ŕF	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.	56	200		37			
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		10					
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
Patching, ft.							
Pumping, ft.	41						

r, iterix	Survey D	) <b>ate</b> 7/8	5 <b>Photolog</b> 3. El Paso.			
Drstress Nor	Slig	Slight		Moderate		ere
	× F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.	271	195	12	6		
Long., ft.		8				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$						
Patching, $ft^2$ .						
Pumping, ft.	6	;				

/	Seler Su Seler Je	rvey Da	<b>te</b> 7/85	Pho	tolog 4.	. El Paso.		
	Seress Not. N	Slig	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re	
		ŕF	N	F	N	. F	N	
	Transv., ft.	18	71		12			
•	Long., ft.		22				•	
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
	Patching, ft.							
	Pumping, ft.							

Seress Nor	Slig	Slight		rate	Severe	
Filled Stress Not A	, F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		116				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

	Seven Su	rvey Da	<b>te</b> 7/85	Photolog 6. El Paso.				
or;	Stress Not N	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Sever	^e	
		F	N	F	N	F	Ń	
	Transv., ft.		112					
•	Long., ft.							
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, $ft$ .							
Ĭ	Patching, ft.							
	Pumping, ft.							

rij eteri	Survey [	) <b>ate</b> 7/8	5 Ph	otolog 7	. El Paso.		
Drseress Nor	Slig	Slight		Moderate		ere	
55 OF	× F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		4					
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
Patching, $ft^2$ .							
Pumping, ft.							

0.	r;;;er;	rvey Da	<b>te</b> 7/85	Pho	tolog 8.	El Pa	SO.
	Stress Nor	Sli	ght	Moderate		Sever	·e
		ΎF	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		6		6		
-	Long., ft.		4				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

(rij) erje	Survey I	Date 7/8	. El Paso.			
Distress Nor	Slig	jht	Mode	erate	Severe	
	¢ F	N	F	N	F	N
<u>Transv., ft.</u>		36		30		
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$						
Patching, $ft^2$ .	7					
Pumping, ft.		6				

			<b>te</b> 7/85	Pho	tolog 10	). El P	aso.
0,	Severity Severity Stress Not N						
$\langle $	Stress Not	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
	1	F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.						
	Long., ft.		15				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		40				
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft.						
	Pumping, ft.						

Ari, ker,	urvey [	)ate 7/8	5 <b>Ph</b> o	otolog 1	1. El F	aso.
Distress Not	Slig	Slight		Moderate		ere
35 E. M	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		30				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.	6	;				

/	r;;;ever;	rvey Da	<b>ate</b> 7/85	Pho	tolog 12	2. El P	aso.
	Stress Nor. N	S1 <sup>-</sup>	ight	Moder	ate	Seve	re
	) · N	F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.						
	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

rij, eri,	urvey l	Date 7/8	5 <b>Ph</b>	otolog 1	3. El Paso.	
Drstress Nor	Slig	ht	Mode	Moderate		ere
	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		32		12		
Long., ft.		22				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

		<b>te</b> 7/85	Photolog 14. El Paso				
Stress Not N	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Sever	re	
1	F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.							
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Patching, ft.							
Pumping, ft.							

seress Nor	Slig	jht	Mode	rate	Severe	
rillear ist seress Not N	F	N	F.	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		18		16		
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

Seven in Su	rvey Da	<b>te</b> 7/85	<b>Photolog</b> 16. El Paso.				
Eress Not. N	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re	
	F	N	F	N	F	Ń	
Transv., ft.		34					
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		90					
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

ATTIC REAL	Survey [	)ate 7/8	5 <b>Ph</b>	otolog 1	9. El Paso.	
Orseress Nor	Slig	Slight		Moderate		ere
35 O.	, F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		7				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft$ ?						
Patching, $ft^2$ .						
Pumping, ft.						

Distree		Survey Date 7/85			Photolog 20. El Paso.			
Diseress .	Kor.	Slight		Moderate		Severe		
	· · ·	F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv.,	ft.		53		12			
Long., ft	·		30					
Allig., f	t. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing,								
Patching,	ft2							
Pumping,	ft.							

Orseress Nor	Slight		Moderate		Severe	
Orseress Nor	6 F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		98				
Long., ft.		16				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						

Selerier Su	Survey Date 7/85			Photolog 22. El Paso.				
Distress Not	Slight		Moderate		Severe			
	F	N	F	N	F	N		
Transv., ft.		18						
Long., ft.						 		
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>	L					 		
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>								
Patching, ft								
Pumping, ft.								
rij, evenie	Survey [	)ate 7/8	5 Pho	otolog 1	7. El P	aso.		
-------------------------------	----------	----------	-------	----------	---------	------		
Drseress Nor	Slig	ht	Mode	rate	Sev	ere		
	F F	N	F	N	F	N		
Transv., ft.		54			-			
Long., ft.		20						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		20						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .								
Patching, ft. Pumping, ft.								

rij err	irvey Da	te 7/85	Pho	tolog 18	. El Pa	150.
ed	Sli	ght	Modera	ate	Sever	°e
	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		83				
Long., ft.		32				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

<u>A</u>	Survey [	) <b>ate</b> 7/8	5 Ph	otolog 2	3. El Paso.		
Drstress Not	Slig	ht	Mode	Moderate		ere	
	× F	N	F	N	F	Ň	
Transv., ft.		12			-		
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$							
Patching, $ft^2$ .							
Pumping, ft.							

r;;;erer;		<b>te</b> 7/85	Pho	tolog 24	. El P	aso.
ed st	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
	Ý F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		22				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft.						
Pumping, ft.						

$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Drseress Nor	Slig	jht	Mode	rate	Sev	ere
Long., ft. Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup> Flushing, ft. <sup>2</sup>		• F	N	F	N	F	N
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup> Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>	Transv., ft.		102		12		
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, $ft^2$ .				×		
	f i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i						

^^``, eyen ;	rvey Da	<b>te</b> 7/85	Pho	tolog 26	5. El P	aso.
ed st	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Sever	re
	F	N	F	N	F	Ń
Transv., ft.		62				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching, ft.						
Pumping, ft.						

seress Nor S	light	Mode	rate	Sev	ere
Survey Survey	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.	7				
Long., ft.					
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>					
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>					
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>					
Pumping, ft.					

r;;;euer;eu		te 7/85	Pho	tolog 28	3 Contro	1. El I	Paso.
Seress Nor.	S1i	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re	]
	F	N	F	N	F	N	]
Transv., ft.	-	108					
Long., ft.	<b> </b>						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>	J						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

El Paso

.

October, 1985 Survey

servess Nor	Slig	Slight		rate	Severe	
Severit, Nor. N	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		134				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

		rvey Da	ate 10	/85 Phc	tolog 2.	. El Paso.		
	Stress Not. N	S11	ight	Moder	ate	Seve	re	
		Ύ F	N	F	N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.		177					
•	Long., ft.							
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, $ft$ .							
	Patching, ft.							
	Pumping, ft.		50					

rij, erj,	Survey [	ate 10/3	85 Pho	otolog <sup>.</sup> 3	. El Paso.		
Drseress Nor	Slig	ht	Mode	rate	Severe		
	× F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		298					
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		-					
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Patching, $ft^2$ .							
Pumping, ft.	10	)					

rijer,	urvey Da	<b>te</b> 10/8	5 Pho	tolog 4.	. El Pa	so.
Stress Nor	S1i	ght	Moder	ate	Sever	re
	¥ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		131				
Long., ft.		22				•
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft						
Patching, ft2						
Pumping, ft.						

servess tor	Slig	ht	Mode	Moderate		ere
rillerich seressingen in	F	N	F	N	F	N
<u>Transv., ft.</u>		142				
Long., ft.		20				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.					·	

Distress No.	Survey	Date 10/85	Pho	tolog 6.	El Pa	so.
Distress No.		light	Moder	ate	Seve	re
	₩ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft		144				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft.	2					
Flushing, t						
Patching,	ft <sup>2</sup>					
Pumping, f	t.					

Drseress Not	S11	ght	Mode	rate	Severe	
Drseress Nor	N F	N	F	N	F	N
<u>Transv., ft.</u>		52				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						

Survey Date 10/85 Photolog 8. El Paso. Severius L'illed. L. Nor. N Distress Severe Slight Moderate F N F F Ν Ν Transv., ft. 108 10 Long., ft. Allig., ft.<sup>2</sup> Flushing, ft. Patching,  $ft^2$ Pumping, ft.

Orseress Nor.	Slig	jht	Mode	Moderate		Severe	
riller its	¢ F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		147					
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Patching, $ft^2$ .							

/	Seven re Su	rvey Da	te 10/85	Pho	tolog 10	). El P	aso.
	Stress Notion	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
	,	F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		32				
	Long., ft.		14				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

Orseress Nor	Slig	Slight		Moderate		Severe	
Drstress Not N	, F	N	F	N	F	. N	
Transv., ft.		46					
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							

/	Selerier Su	irvey Da	te 10/85	Pho	tolog 12	2. El Pa	aso.
0,	Filled, K. Not.		ght	Moder	ate	Sever	re
		F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		28				
-	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

Orseress Nor	Slig	Slight		rate	Severe	
Distress Nor.	י <b>א</b>	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		90				
Long., ft.		130				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, $ft^2$ .						

	rijer,	Severity Severity			tolog <sup>14</sup>	. El Paso.	
$\langle $	Stress Nor	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Sever	re
		F	N	F	N .	F	N
	Transv., ft.		36				
	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
	Patching, ft.						
	Pumping, ft.						

Drseress Not. M						
Drstress Not	Slig	ght	Mode	rate	Severe	
	, F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		70			-	
Long., ft.		22				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

	Sever Su	Sole 10/85			5 <b>Photolog</b> 16. El Paso.			
Or,	rijjed. r. Not. N	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re	
		Ý F	N	F	N	F	N	
·	Transv., ft.		26					
	Long., ft.		14					
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>			-				
	Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
	Patching, ft.							
	Pumping, ft.							

serress Hor	Slig	ht	Mode	Moderate		Severe	
Krijjearich Iseress Nor. A	> F	N	F	N	F	N	
<u>Transv., ft.</u>		8			-		
Long., ft.		20					
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							

	rijer,	rvey Da	te 10/85	5 <b>Photolog</b> 18. El Paso.			
	stress Nor	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Sever	.e
		F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		50				
•	Long., ft.		8				•
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

Distress Nor	Slig	jht	Moder	rate	Sev	ere
Distress Nor.	у F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		52				
Long., ft.		6				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, $ft^2$ .						

	Sever Jer Su	irvey Da	te 10/8	5 Pho	tolog 20	). El P	aso.
0,	rijjea, riky						
$\mathbf{i}$	ress hor	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
		F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		94				
	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft			 			
	Patching, ft						
	Pumping, ft.						

$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Dr. ied r. hor	Slig	ht	Mode	rate	Sev	ere
Long., ft. $136$ Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup> Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>		¢ F	N	F	N	F	N
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup> Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>	Transv., ft.		168				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup> Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>	Long., ft.		136				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, $ft^2$ .						

Survey	Date	10/85
--------	------	-------

## Photolog 22. El Paso.

Diseress Nor.	S1i	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		59				
Long., ft.	<b>_</b>					
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>				······	<u> </u>	
Flushing, ft						
Patching, ft						
Pumping, ft.	1					

Orseress Nor	Slig	iht	Mode	rate	Sev	ere
Drstress Nor	y F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.	<u> </u>	88				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching, ft. Pumping, ft.						_

rijjed vit	irvey Da	te 10/8	5 Pho	tolog 24	•. El P	aso.
Orseress Not.		ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		24				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>	 					
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

seress Nor	Slig	jht	Moder	ate	Sev	ere
Fillen Fitt	/ F	N	F	N	F	Ň
Transv., ft.		108				
Long., ft.		6				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						

Survey Date 10/85 Photolog 26. El Paso. Severies Killed. K. Nor. N Distress Severe Slight Moderate F F Ν F Ν Transv., ft. 138 Long., ft. 36 Allig., ft.<sup>2</sup> Τ £+2 T 1 F1

Flushing, ft.		
Patching, $ft$ .		
Pumping, ft.		

Ν

Orseress Nor	Slig	jht	Mode	rate	Sev	ere
Distress Nor.	> F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		114				
Long., ft.		18				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						

	rijjer is	rvey Da	i <b>te</b> 10/8	5 Pho	tolog 28	3 Contro	aso.	
	Seress Nor	S1i	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re	
		F	N	F	N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.		120					
·	Long., ft.		<u> </u>					
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Patching, ft.							
	Pumping, ft.							

El Paso

.

.

## May, 1986 Survey

Seress Nor.	Slig	Slight		Moderate		ere
riller ist	у F	N	F	N	F	N
<u>Transv., ft.</u>		247				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

0.	Arijer,	irvey Da	<b>te</b> 5/86	Pho	tolog 2.	El Pas	;0.
$\langle \rangle$	erress Nor	S1i	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
		F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		226				
	Long., ft.		153				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>	<u> </u>					
	Flushing, ft	-					
	Patching, ft						
	Pumping, ft.	120	)				

Orstress Not	Survey [	Date 5/86	5 <b>Ph</b>	otolog 3	El Paso.		
Orseress Nor	Slig	Iht	Moderate		Sev	ere	
35 V.	1/ F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		357					
Long., ft.		18					
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>	11 1						
Pumping, ft.	g	0					

	Sever yer	irvey Da	<b>te</b> 5/86	Pho	tolog 4.	. El Pa	SO.
	rijlea, r. Nor.	Sli	ght	Moder	Moderate		re
		¥ F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		168				
-	Long., ft.		52				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>	<u> </u>					
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>			 			
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.	2	8				

Ary ery	Gurvey [	)ate 5/80	5 Ph	l <b>otolog</b> 5	. El Paso.	
Drseress Nor	Slig	Slight		Moderate		ere
	~ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		192				
Long., ft.		36				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.		2				

/	Survey Date 5/86 Photolog 6. El Paso.									
	sevenie Sevenie Stress Notin	Sli	Slight		Moderate		re 💦			
		F	N	F	N	F	N			
	Transv., ft.		168							
	Long., ft.						•			
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>									
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>									
	Patching, ft.									
	Pumping, ft.	2	6							

Diseress Nor	Slig	Slight		Moderate		ere
Diseress Nor.	6 F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		66				
Long., ft.	[ 	16				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

	rij er in		<b>te</b> 5/86	Photolog 8. El Paso.			
	Stress Nor	S1i	Slight		ate	Seve	re
		F	N	F	N	F	Ń
	Transv., ft.		152				
·	Long., ft.		32				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

rij, erj,	Survey D	)ate 5/86	5 Pho	otolog 9.	. El Paso.	
Distress Nor.	Slig	ht	Moder	Moderate		ere
35 82.4	> F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		132				
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, $ft^2$						
Pumping, ft.	3	2				

/	Sever su Sever se	rvey Da	te 5/86	<b>Photolog</b> 10. El Paso			
	Fijjed, F. Not.	Sli	Slight		ate	Sever	·e
		ΎF	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		74				
-	Long., ft.		103				<u></u> _
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.	9	5				

Distress Nor	Slig	Slight		Moderate		ere
Diseress Nor. N	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		106				
Long., ft.		38				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.		30				

			te 5/86	Pho	tolog 12	2. El P	aso.
	Filled, F. Not. W	Sli	Slight		ate	Seve	re
		ΎF	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		22				
•	Long., ft.		38				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft.						
	Pumping, ft.						

Distress Not	Slig	Slight		Moderate		ere
seress Hor A	, F	N	F	N	F	N
<u>Transv., ft.</u>		120				
Long., ft.		165				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		90				
Flushing, $ft^2$ . Patching, $ft^2$ .						
Pumping, ft.	5	0				

	rij, er,	rvey Da	<b>te</b> 5/86	<b>Photolog</b> 14. El Paso.				
	Stress Not	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re	
		Ý F	N	F	N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.		36					
-	Long., ft.							
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Patching, ft.							
	Pumping, ft.							

rij, ere	Survey [	)ate 5/80	otolog 1	5. El Paso.		
Distress Not	Slig	Slight		Moderate		ere
	≻ F	N	F	N	F	N
<u>Transv., ft.</u>		118			-	
Long., ft.	- -	26				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

		<b>te</b> 5/86	Photolog 16. El Paso.					
sevenies Seress Nor.	Sli	ght	Moderate		Sever	^e		
	F	N	F	N	F	N		
Transv., ft.		78						
Long., ft.		28						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>								
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>								
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>								
Pumping, ft.								

ied in the second	Slig	ht	t Moder		Severe	
Severit, Stress Nor. N	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		38		!		
Long., ft.		32				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.		4				

/	Severies Su	irvey Da	<b>te</b> 5/86	Pho	350.		
	Stress Not.	Sli	Slight		ate	Seve	re
		F	N	F	N	F	Ń
	Transv., ft.		74				
	Long., ft.	ļ	10				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

rij ere	Survey [	)ate 5/8	5 Pho	tolog 19	9. El Paso.		
Drstress Nor	Slig	Slight		Moderate		ere	
35 02.	> F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		60					
Long., ft.		14					
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ . Patching, $ft^2$ .							
Pumping, ft.							

Survey Date 5/86 Photolog 20. El Paso.									
$\langle \circ,$	Servess Nor	S1i	ght	Moder	ate	Sever	re		
		F	N	F	N	F	N		
	Transv., ft.		69		24				
·	Long., ft.								
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>								
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>								
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>								
	Pumping, ft.								

( i j kerj	Survey	Date 5/80	6 <b>Ph</b> (	otolog 2	1. El Paso.		
Drstress Not	Slig	Slight		Moderate		ere	
	> F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		203					
Long., ft.		147					
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

A. J. C. L.	irvey Da	<b>te</b> 5/86	Pho	tolog 22	2. El Paso.		
Distress Nor	S1i	ght	Moderate		Severe		
	F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.	·	130					
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

rij, even,	Survey [	Date 5/80	otolog	1 <b>og</b> 23. El Paso		
Distress Nor	Slig	iht	Mode	rate	Severe	
15 10 K	× F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		122				
Long., ft.		4				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

	rijer,	irvey Da	te 5/86	<b>Photolog</b> 24. El Paso.			
	er ss Nor	S1i	ght	Moder	ate	Sever	re
		F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		_101				
·	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft						
	Patching, ft						
	Pumping, ft.						

rij, er;	Survey [	)ate 5/80	5 Pho	<b>hotolog</b> 25. El Paso.			
Orseress Nor	Slig	Slight		Moderate		Severe	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		146					
Long., ft.		6					
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

			<b>te</b> 5/86	Photolog 26. El Paso.				
	Filled. F. Not.	Slight		Moderate		Severe		
		F	N	F	N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.		192					
·	Long., ft.		80					
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Pumping, ft.							

Distress Nor.	Slig	Slight		Moderate		Severe	
Diseress Nor	¢ F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.	<b></b> _	146					
Long., ft.		6					
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							

	r;;;er;		Photolog 26. El Paso.				
$\langle , \rangle$	Stress Nor.	Slight		Moderate		Severe	
		F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		192				
·	Long., ft.		80				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
-	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						
A J J Constant	Survey D	ate 5/8	7. El Paso.				
--------------------------	----------	---------	-------------	-----	-----	-----	
Dr. ied. r.	Slig	ht	Moder	ate	Sev	ere	
	> F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		163					
Long., ft.		44					
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
Patching, $ft^2$ .							
Pumping, ft.	2	6					

0.	^^°etery	rvey Da	<b>te</b> 5/86	Pho	tolog 28	5. El Pa	350.
$\langle $	Seress Nor	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Sever	^e
		Ý F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		128				
	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, $ft^2$						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

.

•

### APPENDIX B

# Photolog Summaries - Buffalo

Buffalo

## Preconstruction Survey

Severicy Sere	Preco	nstructi	on	Photolog	1. Buffalo.		
い ママン ゴ	Slig	ht .	Moderate		Sev	ere	
tress . Nor. N	F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		1912		192			
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

/	rijjerity	Precons	tructio	n Photolog'2. Buffalo.				
Or, s	Eress Nor	Slig	ght	Moder	1	Seve		
		F	N	F	N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.		1954		63			
	Long., ft.							
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Patching, ft. <sup>2</sup>						· ·	
	Pumping, ft.							

Distress Not. M	Preco	nstructi	on	Photolog	<b>3.</b> Buffalo.		
Distress Not	Slig	ht	Mode	rate	Severe		
35 OF	, F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		1849		127			
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

/	rijie arity	Precons	structio	on Photolog 4. Buffalo.				
	Erress Nor	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve		
	1	Γ F	N	F	N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.		1819		41			
	Long., ft.							
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Pumping, ft.							

	Severity Stress Nor. N	Preco	nstructi	on	Photolog	g 5. Buffalo.	
$\langle \gamma$	Stress Hor	Slig	ht	Moder	Moderate		ere
	35 OF. 1	F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		793		5		
	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						



	Stress Not N	Preco	onstruct	ion	Photolo	g 7. Buffalo.	
< "	Stress Hor	Slig	ht	Mode	Moderate		ere
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		1518		49		
	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
-	Pumping, ft.						

	Seress Nor. N		istructio	on P	hotolog	8. Buffalo.		
$\langle  \rangle$	Stress Nor	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re	
		ŕF	N	F	N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.		1452		58			
	Long., ft.							
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>			 				
	Patching, ft.							
	Pumping, ft.							

Drs. ress Nor. N	Precor	nstructi	on	Photolog	9. Buffalo.	
Orseress Nor	Slig	ht .	Moder	ate	Sev	ere
35 OF. M	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		575		37		
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

Preconstruction Photolog 10. Buffalo. Severity Killed, K. Nov. W Distress Slight Moderate Severe F Ν F F Ν Ν Transv., ft. 592 51 Long., ft. Allig., ft.<sup>2</sup> Flushing,  $ft^2$ Patching, ft. Pumping, ft.

l

	Severity Stress Not N	Preco	onstruct	ion	Photolo	g 11.	Buffalo.
$\langle , \rangle$	Stress Hor	Slig	ht	Moderate		Sev	vere
	35 OF. 1	F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		1156		41		
	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup> Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

	S	Precon	structi	on Photolog 12. Buffalo.			
0,	rijjederity						
$\langle , \rangle$	eress Nor	Slig	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
	1	ŕF	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		917		37		
	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>					ļ	
	Patching, ft.						
-	Pumping, ft.						

r;;;;eve	11:13 C No	Precor	istructi	on	Photolog	13. Buffalo.	
Drs. ress	(in the second s	Slig	ht	Mode	rate	Sev	ere
200	E.M.	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv.	)]		997		95		
Long.,	ft.						
Allig.,	ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushin							
Patchin	ıg, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping	, ft.						

,

	ATTITE ATTE	Preconstruction Photolog 14. Buffalo.							
0,	Stress Not. N		ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re		
		F	N	F	N	F	N		
	Transv., ft.		1192		99				
	Long., ft.								
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>								
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>								
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>			 		 			
	Pumping, ft.								

	Filled. F. Nor. N	Preco	nstructi	on	Photolog	15. Buffalo.	
$\langle \rangle$	Stress Nor	Slig	ht	Moderate		Sev	ere
	25° 25°	F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		1092		180		
	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, $ft^2$						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup> Pumping, ft.						

0.	Severity Finess Not. N		truction	n Pł	notolog :	16. Buffalo.	
	Stress Nor	Slie	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
		F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		1232		144		
	Long., ft.					ļ	
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>	 					
	Pumping, ft.						

	Severity istress Not N	Preco	nstructi	on	Photolog	17. Buffalo.	
$\langle \rangle$	is the s	Slig	ht	Moderate		Sev	ere
	35 OF . W	F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		1339		55		
	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, $ft^2$ . Patching, $ft^2$ .						
-	Pumping, ft.						

r, elerit	Precons	falo.				
Erress Nor	Sli	ght .	Moder	ate	Seve	re
1	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		1257		33		
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

	rillea rich	Preco	nstructi	on	n Photolog		uffalo.
Orse,	- / A Y	Slig	ht .	Moderate		Sev	ere
$\mathbf{i}$	ress Horn	F	N	F	N	F	N
Ţ	ransv., ft.		1279		54		
	.ong., ft.						
A	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
F	lushing, $ft^2$ .						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
P	Pumping, ft.						



Sever in the sever is the several sev	Preco	onstruct <sup>.</sup>	ion	Photolo	g 21. Buffalo.	
Stress Hor	Slig	ht	Mode	rate	Sev	ere
teress tor. w	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		1181		47		
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

rijijea. c. Not. N		structio	n Pł	Photolog 22. Buffalo.		
Eness Nor	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
	ΎF	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		1158		22		
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

Drstress		Precon	Istructio	on :	Photolog	23. Buffalo.	
Distress	1/2 C	Slig	ight Mc		Moderate		vere
20	N. N.	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv.,	ft.		1210		8		
Long., ft							
Allig., f	t. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing,	ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching,	1.4						
Pumping,	ft.						



Distress		Prec	onstruct	ion	Photolo	g 25.	Buffalo.
Drstress	k -	Slig	ht	Moder	ate	Sev	ere
, vi	N. N.	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., f	t.		1223		19		
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft	.2						
Flushing,							
Patching,	11						
Pumping, 1	t.						

Severred Severred Stress Not Not Not		structic	on P	hotolog .	26. Buffalo.	
Seress Hor	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
	ŕF	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		1159		62		
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

Dis creek	Preconstruction Photolog 27. Buffa						
	Slig	Slight		Moderate		ere	
stress tor	· F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		1251		12			
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

/	^^°°́eeery	Precons	truction	Pho	tolog 28	B. Buff	alo.
	Stress Nor		ight	Moder	ate	Seve	re
		₽ F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		1063		5		
	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft	2					
	Patching, ft	2		 			
	Pumping, ft.						

Distress Not. N	Preco	onstruct	ion	Photolog	g 29. Buffalo.		
Distress Nor	Silig	ht	Moderate		Sev	ere	
35 J. A	× F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		1118		6			
Long., ft.	-						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>		5					
Pumping, ft.							

/		Preconstruction Photolog 30. Buff					
	Erress Not . N	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
		F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		1038		28		
	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>					·	
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

Stree A. S.	Precor	istructi	on l	Photolog	31. Buffalo.		
Stress Not	Slig	ht	Moder	rate	Severe		
teress Hor. N	F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		1258		7			
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.		2					



## Buffalo

.

.

#### October, 1985 Survey

There was no distress in the Buffalo Test Road in October, 1985.

## Buffalo

#### April, 1986 Survey

There was no distress in the Buffalo Test Road in April, 1986.

,

• •. APPENDIX C

.

Photolog Summaries - Brownsville

.

. .

Brownsville

.

## Preconstruction Survey

۰.

.

tress to the	Slight		Moder	ate	Sev	ere
ATTICO IN TO THE T	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.	60	120				
Long., ft.	25	85		10		
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		60		60		
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

t

÷

Preconstruction Photolog 2. Brownsville. Severicy Filled, F. Nor. W Distress Severe Slight Moderate F Ν. F F Ν Ν Transv., ft. 120 30 210 30 · Long., ft. Allig., ft.<sup>2</sup> 180 Flushing, ft. Patching,  $ft^2$ Pumping, ft.

Stress Not. M	Precons	structio	n P	hotolog	3. Brownsville		
Stress Not	Slig	ht .	Moderate		Sev	vere	
55 OF.	× F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		120					
Long., ft.		115		20			
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		60					
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

Ż



Distress Nor.	Precons	structio	n P	hotolog	5. Brownsville		
Distress Nor	Slig	ht .	Mode	Moderate		vere	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	י	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		300					
Long., ft.		420		5			
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		60					
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

ż

,

Preconstruction Photolog 6. Brownsville. Severity Filled. F. Nor. Distress Severe Slight Moderate N F F F Ν. Ν Ν 120 Transv., ft. Long., ft. 300 15 <u>Allig., ft.<sup>2</sup></u> 60 Flushing,  $ft^2$ Patching, ft. Pumping, ft.

Distree, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1,	Precon	structio	7. Brownsvi			
Y YAL	Slight		Mode	Moderate		ere
Stress Nor. N	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.	60	60				
Long., ft.	205	210		30		
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		180				
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						



Severic, Nor. No.	Precons	tructio	n Pł	notolog	9. Brownsville		
Seress Nor	Slig	ht .	Moder	Moderate		ere	
	, F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.		180					
Long., ft.	25	395		10			
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

.

,

/		Preconstruction			Ū.			
	Stress Notion	Slig	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re	
	1	Ý F	N	F	N	F <sub>.</sub>	Ν.	
	Transv., ft.	60	60					
	Long., ft.	10	205					
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Pumping, ft.							

Severic, ristress Not Not Not Not Not Not Not Not	Precons	struction	n Pl	notolog (	11. Br	1. Brownsvill		
Distress Nor.	Slig	ht .	Mode	rate	Severe			
	e F	N	F	N	F	N		
Transv., ft.		60						
Long., ft.		170						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>			-					
Flushing, $ft^2$ .								
Patching, $ft^2$ .								
Pumping, ft.								



ł.

l
Severies Stress Not	Precon	structio	on P	hotolog	13. Br	le.	
Stress Nor	Slig	ht	Moderate		Severe		]
-35 - 25 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 -	- F	N	F	N	F	Ν	•
Transv., ft.		60		i			
Long., ft.	-	85		5			
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							-
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

		ruction	Pho	tolog 14	4. Brownsville		
rinned, r. Mor.	Slie F	ght N	Moder	ate N	Seve F	re	
			1				
Transv., ft.		60					
Long., ft.	20	165		5			
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

	Severic, Nor. M	Precons	structio	15. Br	15. Brownsvil			
< ",	Seress Nor	Slig	Slight		Moderate		vere	]
	35	× F	N	F	N	F	N	
	Transv., ft.							
	Long., ft.		55					
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
	Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
	Pumping, ft.							

,

	$\mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{V}$	reconst	ruction	Pho	tolog 16	Brow	nsville.
0,	Erress Not	Slie	gnt	Moder	ate	Seve	re
	1	Ý F	N	F	N	F.	Ν.
	Transv., ft.		60				
	Long., ft.		45				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

Discress No	Precon	structio	on P	hotolog	17. Br	le.	
Disseress No		jht .	Mode	Moderate		vere	]
	F F	N	F	N	F	N	1.
<u>Transv., ft</u>		60	5 5 1				
Long., ft.		75		5			]
Allig., ft.	2						
Flushing, f	t <sup>2</sup>						-
Patching, f	t <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft							

,

0,	rijler itj		ruction	Pho	tolog 18	. Brow	msville.
	Eress Nor	S1i	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
		F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		60				
	Long., ft.		180		30		
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

## Brownsville

November, 1985 Survey

.

ASTICO TIL	Survey D	)ate No	v. 1985	Photol	og 1 Bi	rownsvil
Ciseres Not	Slig	ht	Mode	rate	Severe	
	∧ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		2				
Long., ft.		2			1	
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft	2					
Patching, ft						
Pumping, ft.						

/	Sever yer Su	rvey Da	te Nov	. 1985	Photolog	12 Bro	wnsville
	sevenie Sevenie Seress Not. M		ght	Moder	rate	Seve	re
		ΎF	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.						
*	Long., ft.		30				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>		2				
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

rijje arity	Survey Date Nov. 1985 Photolog 3 Brownsvill Orservess Nor F N F N F N											
Diseress Nor	Slig	ht	Moderate		Severe							
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	¢ F	N	F	N	F	N						
Transv., ft.												
Long., ft.		30										
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>												
Flushing, $ft^2$ .	6	0										
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>												
Pumping, ft.												

(^;;) er;	rvey Da	te Nov	. 1985	Photolog	g 4 Bro	wnsville
Eress Not. N	Sli	ght	Moder	rate	Seve	re
	ΎF	N	F	N	F	N
 Transv., ft.						
Long., ft.		45				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>	29	90	 			
Patching, ft.						
Pumping, ft.						

<b>A</b>	Survey [	)ate No	ov. 1985	Photo1	og 5 B	rownsv	
Drstress Not	Slight Moderate Severe						
35 (S.	6 F	N	F	N	F	N	
<u>Transv., ft.</u>							
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$							
Patching, $ft$ .							
Pumping, ft.							

	Sever su Su	rvey Da	te Nov	. 1985	Photolog	j6 Bro	wnsville.
	Finess Not N	Sli	ght	Moder	rate	Seve	re
		F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		12				
·	Long., ft.						•
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, $ft^2$ .		2		-		
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>		· · ·				
	Pumping, ft.						

Arstress Not	Slig	ht	Moder	Moderate		Severe	
Aiseress Not	V F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.							
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ .			1	50			
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>	11 1						
Pumping, ft.							

^

	See Su	rvey Da	te Nov	1985 .	Photolo	ng 8 Br	ownsville.
0,	Severity Severity Stress Not	<b></b>	<u></u>				
$\langle \rangle$	stress Nor	<b>S</b> 1i	ght	Mode	rate	Seve	re
		F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.						
·	Long., ft.		 				
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>			<u> </u>			
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>			9	00		
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

Ary Kery	Survey [	ate No	v. 1985	Photo1	og 9 B	rownsvil
Orseress Nor	Slig	ht	Mode	rate	Sev	ere
	y F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.	<u> </u>					
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, $ft$ .						
Pumping, ft.						

Su Su	rvey Da	te Nov	1985	Photolog	10 Br	ownsville.
rijjer ry						
rijjed. r. Eress Not. N	51i	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
1	F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.						
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

eness Hor	Sli	ght	Mode	rate	Sev	Severe		
Fritzerics Eress	₩ F	N	F	N	F	N		
Transv., ft.								
Long., ft.								
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>								
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>								
Patching, $ft$ .								

	Sey S	urvey Da	te Nov	. 1985	Photolog	ј 12 В	rownsville
0,	severity stress Notion	<u> </u>					
$\langle \rangle$	red C.	S1i	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
		₩ F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.						
	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft						
	Patching, ft	2					
	Pumping, ft.						

c

Cristress Not	Survey [	Date No	ov. 1985	Photol	og 13	Brownsv
Orseress Nor	Slig	iht	Moder	Moderate		ere
55 V.	∧ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.						
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

	urvey Da	ite Nov	. 1985	Photolo	g 14 Bi	rownsvil
Distress Not.		ght	Moder	ate	Seve	 re
35 OF.	A∕ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.						
Long., ft.					<b></b>	
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>			<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>
Flushing, ft	2					
Patching, ft	2					
Pumping, ft.						

Orseress Nor	Slig	jht	Moderate		Severe	
Diseress Nor	₩ F	N	F	N	F	Ň
Transv., ft.		12				 
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

		rvey Da	te Nov	. 1985	Photolog	g 16 Br	ownsville.
0,	rijjer, er						
$\langle \langle \rangle$	seress Nor.	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
		F	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.						
	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

seress Hot	Slig	jht	Moder	Moderate		Severe	
Filled F. Hor	y F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.							
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ .							
Patching, $ft^2$ .							

	Su Su	rvey Da	te Nov.	1985	Photolog	18 Br	ownsville.
0,	Sevenie, Noting				•		
$\langle $	Stress Nor	Slie	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
		F	N	F	N	F	Ň
	Transv., ft.						
	Long., ft.						<u> </u>
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>	 					
	Patching, ft.						
	Pumping, ft.						

•

Brownsville

May, 1986 Survey

ATTILE ATTIL	Survey D	ate Ma	y, 1986	Photolc	og 1. B	rowns <b>vi</b> l
Distress Nor	Slight		Moderate		Severe	
	¢ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.				2		
Long., ft.				5		
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$		3				
Patching, $ft$ .						
Pumping, ft.	, ,					

Survey Date May, 1986 Photolog 2. Brownsville. Severius L'ITTRED. L. NOL. N Distress Severe Moderate Slight F F Ν F Ν Ν Transv., ft. 39 Long., ft. 226 Allig., ft.<sup>2</sup> Flushing,  $ft^2$ 38 Patching, ft. Pumping, ft.

A Sevenies	Survey [	)ate May	<b>,</b> 1986	Photolo	og 3. B	rowns
rijieric, rseress Hote	Slight		Moderate		Severe	
	N F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		12				
Long., ft.				64		
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		5				
Flushing, $ft^2$ .		15		80		
Patching, $ft^2$ .						
Pumping, ft.						

.

Survey Date May, 1986 Photolog 4. Brownsville.

	Arije en je	rvey Da	te May,	1986	Photolog	4. Bro	ownsville
	Eress Nor.	Sli	ght	Mode	rate	Seve	re
		ΎF	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.				16		
-	Long., ft.				119		•
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		25				
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>				485		
	Patching, $ft$ .						
	Pumping, ft.						

AT I PRATIC	Survey D	)ate May	<b>,</b> 1986	Photolo	ig 5. B	rownsvil
Orseress Nor	Slig	ht	Moderate		Severe	
	× F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.						
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		5				
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, $ft^2$ .						
Pumping, ft.						

/	Sever Su Sever re	rvey Da	te May,	1986	Photolog	6. Bro	ownsville.
	Stress Not N	Sli	ght	Moder	ate	Seve	re
	1	ŕF	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.				12		
·	Long., ft.				25		
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						4
	Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>				12		
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.	-					

A TITLES	Survey [	)ate Ma	y, 1986	Photolc	og 7. E	Brownsvi	
Drseress Not			Mode	rate	Severe		
	₽ F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.				12			
Long., ft.				100			
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, $ft^2$ .			3	10			
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.	1						

Λ

Severity Survey Date May, 1986 Photolog 8. Brownsville. Filled. F. Nov. W Orseress Severe Slight Moderate F F F Ν Ν Ν Transv., ft. Long., ft. Allig., ft.<sup>2</sup> Flushing,  $ft^2$ 1800 Patching, ftPumping, ft.

•.

is eress to the	Slight		Moderate		Severe	
rijjed rich rstress Not.	× F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.						
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .			2	8		
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

Survey Date May, 1986 Photolog 10. Brownsville.

Diseress Not. M	S1i	ght	Mode	rate	Seve	re
	Ý F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.						
Long., ft.			-			
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>		   				
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>				.2		
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

Iseress Nor	Slight		Moder	Moderate		Severe	
rijjed i tot	F	N	F	N	F	N	
Transv., ft.				8			
Long., ft.							
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>							
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>			12	0			
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>							
Pumping, ft.							

Survey Date May, 1986 Photolog 12. Brownsville. Severius rilled . r. Nov. N Distress Moderate Slight Severe F F Ν F Ν Ν Transv., ft. Long., ft. ft 2

Allig., ft				
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>				
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>				
Pumping, ft.				

. .

Distress Noz.	Survey I	Date May	/, 1986	Photol	og 13.	Brownsvi
Distress Nor	Slight		Moder	rate	Sev	ere
l 2 let	∧ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.						
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

Distres	Selectics	51 i	Slight Mo		Moderate		ere
		F	N	F	N	F	N
Tr	ansv., ft.						
Lo	ng., ft.						·
<u>A1</u>	lig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
1	ushing, ft.						

c.

Critica Contraction	Survey [	Date May	, 1986	Photolo	g 15. I	3rownsvill
Orstress Nor	Slight		Mode	Moderate		ere
, s ki	₩ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.				12		
Long., ft.						
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, ft	2			8		
Patching, ft	2					
Pumping, ft.						

/	Sever Su Sever ry	rvey Da	te May,	1986 F	hotolog	16. Br	ownsville
	Stress Not N	Slight		Moderate		Severe	
	1	ΎF	N	F	N	F	N
	Transv., ft.		12				
	Long., ft.						
	Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
	Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
	Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
	Pumping, ft.						

AT THE PIE	Survey [	Date Ma	y, 1986	Photol	og 17.	Brownsvi
Orseress Nor	Slight		Moderate		Severe	
	₽ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., ft.		35				
Long., ft.		240				
Allig., ft. <sup>2</sup>						
Flushing, $ft^2$ .						
Patching, ft <sup>2</sup>						
Pumping, ft.						

rijjer its	Survey	Date Mag	y, 1986	Photolo	g 18. E	Brownsvil
Distress N		51ight	Mode	Moderate		ere
	₩ F	N	F	N	F	N
Transv., f	t.	52				
Long., ft.		30				
Allig., fi	.2	6				
Flushing,	_					
Patching,	ft <sup>2</sup>					
Pumping,	ft.					

.