# DEVELOPMENT OF TESTING PROTOCOLS AND PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR PEDESTAL-SET CONCRETE PAVING SLABS





Foundation for **Education and Research** 

Project Nos. 20-322 & 22-110 August 1, 2023

CONDUCTED FOR: Interlocking Concrete Pavement Institute Foundation for Education and Research 13750 Sunrise Valley Drive Herndon, VA 20171

CONDUCTED BY:

NATIONAL **CONCRETE MASONRY** ASSOCIATION





#### **RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY**

The NCMA Research and Development Laboratory is devoted to the scientific research and testing of concrete masonry products and systems. The Laboratory is staffed by professional engineers and technicians with many years of experience in the concrete masonry industry. The Laboratory is equipped to perform nearly any physical research or testing of concrete masonry units and assemblages. The Laboratory performs research and development work for both the Association and individual companies.

#### **NATIONAL CONCRETE MASONRY ASSOCIATION**

The National Concrete Masonry Association (NCMA) is a non-profit organization whose mission is to support and advance the common interests of its members in the manufacture, marketing, research, and application of concrete masonry products. The Association is an industry leader in providing technical assistance and education, marketing, research and development, and product and system innovation to its members and to the industry.

#### Research and Development Laboratory Staff

Nicholas Lang, *Vice President of Engineering and Advocacy, Masonry* Timothy Jones, *Manager, Research and Development Laboratory*  Robert Spitler, *Materials Research Assistant* Stanley Smith, Senior *Laboratory Technician*  Thierry Arthur, *Laboratory Technician* Abubeker Kemal, *Laboratory Technician* Pablo Hidalgo Rojas, *Laboratory Technician* Elijah Jones, *Laboratory Technician* Kyuin Shin, *Laboratory Technician* 

> National Concrete Masonry Association Research and Development Laboratory 13750 Sunrise Valley Drive Herndon, Virginia 20171 (703) 713-1900 www.ncma.org

**THIS PUBLICATION IS INTENDED FOR USE BY PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL COMPETENT TO EVALUATE THE SIGNIFICANCE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDED HEREIN, AND WILLING TO ACCEPT TOTAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE APPLICATION OF THIS INFORMATION IN SPECIFIC INSTANCES. RESULTS FROM TESTS MAY VARY AND THE NATIONAL CONCRETE MASONRY ASSOCIATION (NCMA) DOES NOT WARRANT THE RESULTS CONTAINED HEREIN FOR SPECIFIC USES OR PURPOSES AND THE FINDINGS ARE NOT A SUBSTITUTE FOR SOUND ENGINEERING EVALUATIONS, JUDGMENT AND OPINIONS FOR SPECIFIC PROJECTS OR USES. THE NCMA IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR THE USE OR APPLICATION OF THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS PUBLICATION AND DISCLAIMS ALL RESPONSIBILITY THEREFORE**

The measured and calculated values provided in this report are the official values resulting from this body of work. Values in parenthesis are mathematical conversions provided for reference only and may differ slightly from the official values due to conversion rounding.

This report was prepared for Interlocking Concrete Pavement Institute Foundation for Education and Research, by the National Concrete Masonry Association Research and Development Laboratory based upon testing, analyses, or observations performed by the National Concrete Masonry Association Research and Development Laboratory. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, or manufacturer does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement or recommendation by the National Concrete Masonry Association or its staff. The contents of this report have been reviewed by the following individuals, who believe to the best of their ability that the observations, results, and conclusions presented in this report are an accurate and true representation of the services provided. Initial data analyses and report drafting by Jason Thompson, Coltivomae, LLC.

The NCMA Research and Development Laboratory is accredited in accordance with the recognized International Standard ISO/IEC 17025:2017. This accreditation demonstrates technical competence for a defined scope and the operation of a laboratory quality management system (refer to the joint ISO-ILAC-IAF Communiqué dated April 2017). All test results presented here that are based on standardized test methods are within the scope of accreditation for the NCMA Research and Development Laboratory. Other tests are of a research nature to support the development of standardize testing protocols.

Timothy Hones, Manager, Research and Development Laboratory Date

August 1, 2023

August 1, 2023

Nicholas Lang, Vice President of Engineering and Advocacy, Masonry Date

**This report shall not be reproduced, except in full, without the written authorization of the National Concrete Masonry Association Research and Development Laboratory.** 

# Table of Contents





Appendix D.12: Set 12 – FSS-Slabs 50 mm Dry-Cast Face-Mix Flexure Results .... 102

# Development of Testing Protocols and Performance Criteria for Pedestal-Set Concrete Paving Slabs

# 1.0 PROJECT OVERVIEW

Pedestal-set concrete paving slabs have become a popular decking system for pedestrian plaza and rooftop applications as facility owners look to expand usable space and create functional outdoor places. While testing protocols currently exist in ASTM C140/C140M, *Standard Test Methods for Sampling and Testing Concrete Masonry Units and Related Units* (Ref. 1), for evaluating the flexural strength of concrete paving slabs, these established protocols test slabs under conditions that do not replicate the in-situ loading and support conditions of pedestal-set slabs. This project was initiated to investigate alternative support and loading conditions to simulate those seen in the field for pedestal-set applications. In turn, the results and observations from this program were used to develop testing protocols for consideration as a future ASTM standard test method when assessing the performance characteristics of pedestal-set slabs.

## **1.1 Scope of Investigation**

ASTM C140/C140M Annex A8, *Test Procedures for Segmental Concrete Paving Slabs*, was originally developed with the assumption that concrete paving slabs would meet the requirements of ASTM C1782/C1782M, *Standard Specification for Segmental Concrete Paving Slabs* (Ref. 2), and predominately be installed over a base that provides continuous support similar to conventional pavements. As such, given the size, configuration, and conventional installation practices of paving slabs at the time, qualification testing was predicated on modulus of rupture (flexural strength) testing. Using the ASTM C140/C140M testing protocols, the modulus of rupture of a paving slab was determined by applying a line load to the mid-span of a simply-supported slab as illustrated in Figure 1. These testing protocols are functionally the same as those for concrete paving slabs produced to comply with, and tested under, CSA A231.1, *Precast Concrete Paving Slabs* (Ref. 3).



**Figure 1 – ASTM C140/C140M Modulus of Rupture Test Setup (Ref. 1)** 

To better replicate the support, loading conditions, and potential failure mechanisms of pedestal-set paving slabs illustrated in Figure 2, this investigation explored alternative testing protocols using ASTM C140/C140M Annex A8 as a baseline with the following modifications:

 The wood and rubber loading strip was replaced with a nominal 2 in. (50 mm) diameter vulcanized rubber loading pad positioned at the center of the slab. While no standardized loading condition

can replicate all possible loading conditions that may be encountered in the field, a concentrated load at the center of the slab would represent a more conservative loading scenario. (Early pilot testing reviewed in Section 1.2 used a 2.8 in. (71 mm) steel loading disk, which was replaced with the rubber pad as this was felt to provide a more uniform loading area, particularly in cases were a surface texture on the face of the slab was present.)

 The steel support rollers on opposite edges of the slab were replaced with vulcanized rubber pads placed at each corner of the slab to simulate pedestal supports, as illustrated in Figure 3.



**Figure 2 – Pedestal-Set Concrete Paving Slabs (Ref. 4)** 



**Figure 3 – Corner Supported, Center Point Loading Testing Conditions** 

While the testing configuration shown in Figure 3 mimics the support and potential loading conditions a paving slab may see in service, this test setup would present challenges to most testing laboratories that may not have the space or equipment necessary to test full-size slab specimens. As such, a secondary objective to this investigation was to determine if a correlation could be established between the strength of full-size slabs and the strength of slabs reduced in size to facilitate routine quality control testing. Finally, a tertiary objective of this research project was to compare the flexural strengths measured through the corner-supported specimens of this study to the flexural strengths that would be obtained through conventional flexural testing in accordance with ASTM C140/C140M, Annex A8. This last goal is intended to provide a degree of benchmarking between previously established and vetted testing procedures and those used as part of this research investigation.

This project was structured such that testing was completed in multiple phases, thus allowing for the potential refinement and ongoing verification of the testing protocols as data is collected and knowledge is generated and analyzed. The end objectives of the testing reported here include:

- Develop accurate, repeatable, and representative testing protocols for corner supported, center point loaded slabs.
- Establish and validate a minimum loading criteria for testing full-size slabs intended for pedestal set applications.
- Establish and validate a scaling factor for reduced-size slabs when full-size testing cannot be performed.
- Correlate test results to existing modulus of rupture testing procedures defined by ASTM C140/C140M.
- Determine if there is a difference in the performance of pedestal-set paving slabs with different thicknesses when tested under center point loading and corner support conditions.
- Determine if there is a difference in the performance of paving slabs produced by the three most common manufacturing methods: dry-cast, hydraulically-pressed, and hermetically-pressed.
- Applying the results of the testing and analyses, develop a new standardized test method specific to pedestal-set paving slabs.

#### **1.2 Pilot Investigation**

#### *1.2.1 Pilot Investigation – Scope*

Prior to the initiation of the testing associated with this project, a small-scale preliminary investigation was conducted to vet the proposed testing protocols. This pilot testing was conducted on a limited number of paving slabs to compare the novel approaches to testing employed in this investigation to existing standardized testing procedures and engineering mechanics. Variables assess in the pilot investigation include:

- Four sets of two slabs each were tested. Each slab set was produced by a different manufacturer or using a different mix design.
- Each slab measured nominally 24x24 in. (610x610 mm) in plan dimensions and either 50 mm or 60 mm in thickness.
- One slab from each set was tested full-size using corner supports and center point loading. The second slab from each set was quartered into approximately 12x12 in. (305x305 mm) reduced-size slabs and tested using corner supports and center point loading.
- Each corner was supported by a nominal 1 in. (25 mm) thick vulcanized rubber pad shown in Figure 4. The support pads had a reported hardness range of 65-70 on the Shore A durometer scale.
- To preclude premature failure due to inadequate support, the orthogonal width and length of the support pad bearing dimensions were equal to the thickness of the slab being tested. This assumes that shear-induced corner cracking would follow a failure line approximately 45 degrees from the horizontal as illustrated in Figure 5.
- The center point load was applied through a steel disk with a diameter of approximately 2.8 in. (71) mm) located at the geometric center of the slab per Figure 6.
- Load was applied to each specimen at a rate consistent with ASTM C140/C140M, Annex A8 and the failure load and mechanism was recorded.





**Figure 4 – Vulcanized Rubber Support Pads** 



**Figure 5 – Corner Support Layout and Dimensioning** 



**Figure 6 – Center Point Steel Loading Disk (Pilot Testing)** 

# *1.2.2 Pilot Investigation – Test Results*

The results of the pilot study are summarized in Table 1, which includes:

- The slab compressive strength, absorption, and density as determined in accordance with ASTM C140/C140M.
- The full-size slab flexural strength as determined in accordance with Annex A8 of ASTM C140/C140M, with the exception that the span length was set to 90% of the slab length similar to the protocols of ASTM C1491, *Standard Specification for Concrete Roof Pavers* (Ref. 5).
- The full-size slab flexural strength with corner supports and center point loading.
- The average of the four quartered slab flexural strength with corner supports and center point loading.

# *1.2.3 Pilot Investigation – Findings and Recommendations*

Given the limited scope and number of specimens tested in the pilot investigation, the results presented in Table 1 are by no means considered definitive. These early results do however, support the following theories predicted by engineering and material mechanics:

 The quartered specimens exhibited the largest failing load, a result primarily driven by the reduced span length of these reduced-size slabs.

- The simply-supported slabs tested per the modified procedures of Annex A8 of ASTM C140/C140M would have a higher flexural strength than corresponding full-size slabs tested with corner supports and center point loading given the differences in support and loading conditions.
- Whereas the simply-supported slabs exhibited classic flexural failures associated with simple span elements, the corner-supported slabs exhibited more complex 'yield line' failures as well as classic flexural failure as depicted in Figure 7.



#### **Table 1 – Summary of Pilot Investigation Findings**

<sup>A</sup> Slab specimens tested full-size using the procedures of ASTM C140/C140M, Annex A8 except the span length was set at 90% of the slab length.

<sup>B</sup> Testing configuration used corner supports and a concentrated load applied at the center of the slab.



**Figure 7 – Corner-Supported Failure Modes Seen in Pilot Study** 

The testing protocols used in the pilot study were adopted for the remainder of this investigation, with the exception that the steel loading disk was replaced with a 2 in. (50 mm) diameter loading pad made with the same vulcanized rubber as the support pads. The rubber loading pad is shown in Figure 8. Based on some of the failure modes seen in the initial testing, the rubber loading disk was felt to provide a more uniform loading area, particularly in cases were a surface texture on the face of the slab was present.





**Figure 8 – Vulcanized Rubber Loading Pad** 

# 2.0 RESEARCH TEST MATRIX

Twelve different sets of concrete paving slabs were solicited and received from nine different production facilities across the U.S. and Canada. To minimize the influence of production-related variables, each set was manufactured on the same machine during the same run. As detailed in subsequent sections of this report, more robust testing was conducted on Sets 1, 2, and 3 to quantify with higher precision intraproduction variables that may influence test results. As such, more slab specimens were tested for these three sets than for the remaining sets of slabs. All slabs had nominal widths and lengths equal to 24x24 in. (610x610 mm) with other test variables associated with each set of slabs summarized in Table 2.





#### **2.1 Specimen Designations and Nomenclature**

Three different flexural testing protocols were investigated as part of this project using the information gleaned from the pilot testing. The three testing designations used in reporting these results are as follows:

 F-Slabs – These specimens included all corner-supported, full-size slabs with center point loading as illustrated in Figure 9. The purpose of these tests was to establish performance criteria of full-size slabs under pedestal-set conditions.

- Q-Slabs These specimens included all corner-supported, quartered slabs with center point loading saw-cut from full-size specimens a typical example of which is shown in Figure 10. The purpose of these tests was to develop a correlation between the full-size slab strength and the reduced-size slab strength recognizing not all laboratories have the means to test full-size slabs.
- FSS-Slabs These specimens include simply-supported, full-size slabs with mid-span line loading using a span length equal to 90% of the slab length as shown in Figure 11. The purpose of these tests was to establish a correlation between the corner support, center loading testing configuration and conventional modulus of rupture testing similar to ASTM C1491 and ASTM C1782/C1782M.



**Figure 9 – F-Slab Testing Set-Up** 



**Figure 10 – Q-Slab Testing Set-Up** 



**Figure 11 – FSS-Slab Testing Set-Up** 

For the dry-cast slabs, the direction the slabs were manufactured was tracked to isolate potential nonhomogeneous material properties resulting from inconsistent feed, fill, or compaction across the slabs. These markings, as shown in Figure 12, indicate the position of the slabs relative to the front of the machine during production. Hydraulically-pressed and hermetically-pressed slabs were not marked and tracked in this manner as these production methods were considered to have no bias for production orientation.



**Figure 12 – Marking for Direction of Front of the Machine** 

To identify potential failure mechanisms associated with each slab's manufacturing orientation, the corners of each full-size and quartered slab specimen was marked "A", "B", "C", or "D" starting from the top left of each slab and working clockwise around the perimeter as shown in Figure 13. This same corner labeling was applied to the quartered slabs as well with the added descriptor identifying the row (1 or 2) and column (1, 2, 11, or 12) each quartered specimen was obtained as illustrated in Figure 14. Within each set, all slabs from the left side of production (marking on the upper right) were assigned an odd specimen number whereas all slabs from the right side of production (marking on the upper left) were assigned an even specimen number.



**Figure 14 – Quartered Slab Corner Markings and Row/Column Designations**

Using these description protocols, the full-size, corner-supported, center point loaded slab specimens (F-Slabs) were each identified using the designation XX-SY-F, where XX refers to the Set Number and Y is the slab number within the set (even for production marking on the upper left and odd for production marking on the upper right). For example, 02-S5-F is the full-size F-Slab (corner-supported, center point loaded) from Set 2 consisting of a slab with the marking on the upper right (odd numbered slab).

The quartered slabs (Q-Slabs) used a similar specimen designation protocol with the exception that each specimen was future identified by the row and column number (Figure 14) from which it was obtained from the full size slabs: XX-SY-Q-R/C. For example, 03-S2-Q-1/12 is the quartered Q-Slab (cornersupported, center point loaded) from Set 3 taken from the upper right side of an even numbered slab (production marking on the upper left).

Likewise, the simple-supported, mid-span loaded (FSS-Slabs) used a designation similar to the F-Slabs with the exception of introducing 'PL' (the direction of span is parallel to the direction of production) or

'PR' (the direction of span is perpendicular to the direction of production) as illustrated in Figure 15. The solid blue line in Figure 15 represents the loading strip and the dashed green lines are the roller supports. For example, 02-S1-FSS-PL is the full-size, simply supported F-Slab from Set 2 consisting of a slab with the marking on the upper right (odd numbered slab) having span length parallel to the direction of production. Approximately half of the FSS slabs were tested in the 'PL' orientation with the other haft tested in the 'PR' orientation to capture any potential influence the direction of manufacturing may have on the measured flexural strength.



**Figure 15 – FSS-Slab Support and Loading Orientation Designations** 

Although the hydraulically-pressed and hermetically-pressed slabs were not considered to have a production orientation bias, this designation system was applied to all slab specimens in this study for consistency.

## *2.1.1 Sets 1, 2, and 3 Compression and Absorption Testing*

To capture the profile of the possible variations in compressive strength, density, and absorption across the surface of the slabs, which in turn can potentially influence the flexural strength of the slabs, two slabs from Sets 1, 2, and 3 set were cut into 70 coupons as illustrated in Figure 16. Each coupon was alternatively designated "D" or "C", where "D" refers to coupons tested for density/absorption and "C" refers to coupons tested for compressive strength. Eighteen density coupons and 17 compression coupons were harvested from each slab resulting in a total of 36 density coupons and 34 compression coupons from each of the three sets of slabs. The size of each coupon was approximately 4.6x3.2 in. (117x81 mm) to comply with the compression coupon testing criteria of ASTM C140/C140M, Annex A4 as well as to afford the ability to obtain as many coupons as possible from each slab.

The coupons are identified with the XX-C/D-R/C nomenclature where:

- XX represents the Set number, which varies from 01 to 03;
- C/D stands for compression coupon or density coupon; and
- R/C refers to the row number  $(R)$  and the column number  $(C)$  from where the coupon was obtained. Row numbers vary from 1 to 7 whereas column numbers vary from 1 to 5 for Slab 1 (the slab produced with directional production marking on the upper right) and 11 to 15 for Slab 2 (the slab produced with the directional production marking on the upper left).

For example, specimen 01-C-3/12 is a coupon from Slab Set 1, tested in compression, and obtained from Row 3/Column 12.



**Figure 16 – Compression and Density Coupon Profiling: Sets 1-3** 

#### *2.1.2 Sets 4 Through 12 Compression and Absorption Testing*

Compression and density testing was conducted on slab Sets 4-12 in addition to Set 1-3, however, far fewer coupons were harvested from Sets 4-12 as the property profiling obtained from Sets 1, 2, and 3 were felt to provide a representative example of the range of physical characteristics across a typical concrete paving slab.

Compression and absorption coupons were obtained from the slabs tested as full-size, simply-supported (FSS-Slabs) as the flexural testing of these specimens would reliably result in a single crack located at approximately mid-span of the slab following testing. The coupon harvesting schematic for Sets 4-12 is illustrated in Figure 17.

As the FSS-Slabs were rotated 90 degrees relative to their production orientation (FSS-PL and FSS-PR) this allowed compression coupon sampling from each of the four edges of the slabs. Individual compression and absorption samples were designated using the A-B-C-D corner markings on each slab. Absorption specimen A was taken from the upper left of each slab in its production orientation, absorption specimen B was taken from the upper right, and so on. As each absorption specimen had a cracked surface along the flexural failure plane, this edge was squared-up by saw-cutting prior to absorption testing being completed.

Compression coupons were obtained along the edges (away from the flexure crack failure plane) and again designated based on the corner A-B-C-D markings. Compression coupon A-D was sampled from the middle of the edge of the slab between the A and D corners, compression coupon B-C from the edge between the B and C corners, and so on. Each compression coupon was cut to produce a length-to-width ratio of approximately 2 and a thickness-to-width of approximately 0.62. Even with these targeted dimensions, aspect ratio correction factors were applied to the measured compressive strength.



**Figure 17 – Compression and Density Coupon Profiling: Sets 4-12**

# **2.2 Failure Mechanism Designations**

During flexural testing, three types of failure modes were observed:

- Compound: Failure mechanism characterized by multiple lines of cracking emanating from approximately the center of the slab, an example of which is shown in Figure 18.
- Flexure 1: Failure mechanism characterized by simple flexure with a single crack running perpendicular to the direction of slab production through approximately the center of the slab, an example of which is shown in Figure 19.
- Flexure 2: Failure mechanism characterized by simple flexure with a single crack running parallel to the direction of slab production through approximately the center of the slab, an example of which is shown in Figure 20.

Using the A, B, C, and D corner labeling also facilitated capturing the failure cracking observed with each specimen. Examples of failure line cracks are illustrated in Figure 21 where the blue lines indicate crack locations within the slab following testing.



**Figure 18 – Typical 'Compound' Failure Mechanism** 



**Figure 19 – Typical 'Flexure 1' Failure Mechanism** 



**Figure 20 – Typical 'Flexure 2' Failure Mechanism** 



**Figure 21 – Failure Line Designations** 

# 3.0 TEST RESULTS

To inform and refine the testing variables investigated and the subsequent analyses associated with this project, physical testing of the twelve sets of paving slabs was conducted in two phases. Testing on Slab Sets 1, 2, and 3 conducted first, and based on those results, revisions to the testing protocols were introduced and applied to Slab Sets 4-12 as discussed here. Detailed discussion of Sets 1-3 is provided in Section 3.1 with Section 3.2 summarizing the results from Sets 4-12. The analyses and discussions presented in Section 4.0 combines the results and observations from all twelve sets of slabs.

## **3.1 Slab Sets 1, 2, and 3**

The 40 slabs from each of the first three sets of slabs were subdivided and the following tests conducted on each set:

- Material Properties: Two slabs from each set were cut into compression and absorption coupons as shown in Figure 16. The large number of coupons was intended to capture the profile of the possible variations in compressive strength and density across the surface of the slabs, which in turn can potentially influence the flexural strength of the samples.
- F-Slabs: Eighteen full-size slabs (F-Slabs) from each set were tested under corner support and center point loading as illustrated in Figure 9. The purpose of these tests was to establish performance criteria of full-size slabs in service under pedestal-set conditions.
- Q-Slabs: Forty quartered slabs (Q-Slabs) saw cut from ten full size slabs were tested under corner support and center point loading as illustrated in Figure 10. The purpose of these tests was to develop a correlation between the full-size slab strength and the reduced-size slab strength recognizing not all laboratories have the means to test full-size slabs.
- FSS-Slabs: Ten full size slabs (FSS-Slabs) were tested using simple support conditions and a span length equal to 90% of the slab length as shown in Figure 11. Half of these slabs were tested with the span length parallel to the direction of production with the other half tested setting the span length perpendicular to the direction of production. The purpose of these tests was to establish a potential correlation between the corner support, center loading testing configuration and conventional modulus of rupture testing similar to ASTM C1491, *Standard Specification for Concrete Roof Pavers*, and ASTM C1782/C1782M, *Standard Specification for Segmental Concrete Paving Slabs*.

## *3.1.1 Compression, Density, and Absorption*

Testing for the compressive strength, density, and absorption of each harvested coupon was conducted in accordance with Annex A4 of ASTM C140/C140M, *Standard Test Methods for Sampling and Testing Concrete Masonry Units and Related Unit* (Ref. 1). The results of these tests are summarized in Table 3 with detailed results of the individual coupons for each set of slabs included in Appendix A.

Precision, bias, and uncertainties associated with any testing notwithstanding, some variation in material properties was anticipated at different locations across each slab's surface. To gain a better understanding of how the physical properties change within a single slab for each slab set, the individual coupon properties are mapped to their respective location within the full-size slabs as shown in Figures 22 through 27. The potential impact(s) of these property variations are discussed further in the analyses of the flexural strength data.

	<b>Compressive Strength,</b> $lb/in.^2$ (MPa)			<b>Absorption</b>			Density, $lb/ft^3$ (kg/m <sup>3</sup> )		
	Set $1^A$	Set $2^B$	Set 3 <sup>C</sup>	Set $1^A$	Set $2^B$	Set $3^C$	Set $1^A$	Set $2^B$	Set $3^C$
Average	7,570 (52.2)	11,290 (77.8)	11,430 (78.8)	4.1%	3.5%	4.1%	131.1 (2,100)	137.9 (2,210)	143.8 (2,300)
Standard Deviation	856 (5.9)	923 (6.4)	745 (5.1)	$0.3\%$	$0.1\%$	$0.1\%$	2.1 (34)	1.5 (24)	1.7 (27)
Coefficient of Variation	11.3%	8.2%	$6.5\%$	6.4%	3.9%	3.6%	1.6%	$1.1\%$	1.2%

**Table 3 – Average Physical Properties: Sets 1, 2, and 3**

ASet 1: 50 mm dry-cast slabs.

<sup>B</sup>Set 2: 60 mm dry-cast slabs.

CSet 3: 50 mm hydraulically-pressed slabs.



**Figure 23 – Set 1: Slab Density Profiles (lb/ft<sup>3</sup> )**   $(1 \text{ lb/ft}^3 = 16 \text{ kg/m}^3)$ 

Slab 1

Slab<sub>2</sub>

	1	2	3	4	5		11	12	13	14	15
1		11,080		11,320		1		12,380		12,340	
2	10,420		9,890		8,880	2	11,940		10,620		11,420
3		10,870		10,690		3		11,330		10,670	
4	12,340		11,040		12,500	4	13,030		8,800		12,360
5		11,140		11,070		5		10,910		10,890	
6	12,190		11,340		11,790	6	11,220		11,030		11,690
7		11,610		11,980		7		11,570		11,640	
			Slab <sub>1</sub>						Slab <sub>2</sub>		

**Figure 24 – Set 2: Slab Compressive Strength Profiles (lb/in.<sup>2</sup> )**   $(100 \text{ lb/in.}^2 = 0.69 \text{ MPa})$ 



**Figure 25 – Set 2: Slab Density Profiles (lb/ft<sup>3</sup> )**   $(1 \text{ lb/ft}^3 = 16 \text{ kg/m}^3)$ 





#### *3.1.2 F-Slabs (Full-Size, Center Loaded, Corner Supported Slabs)*

Table 4 summarizes the peak flexure load of the F-Slabs under corner support and center point loading conditions. Detailed results of the individual slabs including slab dimensions and warpage, slab weight, peak load, and failure mechanisms for each of the three sets of slabs are included in Appendix B. Each set of F-Slabs consisted of 18 full-size slabs with the exception of Set 1, which exhibited a premature corner failure of Specimen 01-S5-F and therefore only included 17 individual test results. While one of the goals of this investigation is to develop testing protocols that can identify the potential failure mechanisms seen in Slab 01-S5-F (e.g., corner failure), for the purposes of this study, which includes

establishing correlations between full-size and reduced-size slabs, this data point was excluded from subsequent analyses.

	Set 1	Set 2	Set 3					
	$(50 \text{ mm Dry-Cast})^A$	$(60 \text{ mm Dry-Cast})$	(50 mm Hydraulically- Pressed)					
<b>Flexural Load Summaries</b>								
Average	$2,245$ lb	$2,525$ lb	3,285 lb					
	$(10,000\ N)$	(11,225 N)	(14,625 N)					
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	136 lb	349 lb	1181 <sub>b</sub>					
	(605 N)	(1,550 N)	(525 N)					
Coefficient of Variation	$6.1\%$	13.8%	3.6%					
<b>Summary of Failure Modes</b>								
Compound	3		5					
Flexure 1		16	$\mathcal{D}$					
Flexure 2	10		11					

**Table 4 – Summary of F-Slabs Test Results: Sets 1, 2, and 3** 

<sup>A</sup>Flexural load summary data does not include the measured load from Specimen 01-S5-F, which exhibited a premature corner failure resulting in a peak load of 1,397 lb (6,214 N). See Appendix B.1.

The failure mode of the Set 2 slabs was dominated by cracking perpendicular to the direction of production (Flexure 1). This observation is explored further in Section 3.1.5.

## *3.1.3 Q-Slabs (Quartered, Center Loaded, Corner Supported Slabs)*

With the understanding that testing full-size slabs having nominal dimensions of 24 in. (610 mm) or greater is not always practical or feasible, 10 full-size slabs from each set were saw-cut into quarters measuring nominally 12x12 in. (305x305 mm) to determine if a correlation could be established between the failing loads of full-size slabs and their reduced-size counterparts. Table 5 summarizes the applied peak flexure load results of the Q-Slabs under corner support and center point loading conditions. Detailed results of the individual slabs for each of the three sets of slabs are included in Appendix C along with photographs of example failure mechanisms.

Each set of Q-Slabs consisted of 40 full-size slabs with the exception of Set 1, which exhibited a premature failure of Specimen 01-S9-Q-2/1. Therefore, Set 1 only included 39 individual test results. While one of the goals of this investigation is to develop testing protocols that can identify these potential failure mechanisms, for the purposes of this study, which includes establishing correlations between full-size and reduced-size slabs, the 01-S9-Q-2/1 data point was excluded from subsequent analyses.

As with the F-Slabs, Set 2 of the Q-Slabs showed a propensity to exhibit a 'Flexure 1' failure mode, whereby the direction of cracking ran perpendicular to the direction the slabs were manufactured. Potential reasons for this are explored in Section 3.1.5.



#### **Table 5 – Summary of Q-Slabs Test Results: Sets 1, 2, and 3**

<sup>A</sup>Flexural load summary data does not include the measured load from Specimen 01-S9-Q-2/1, which exhibited a premature failure resulting in a peak load of 625 lb (2,780 N). See Appendix C.1.

#### *3.1.4 FSS-Slabs (Full-Size, Simply-Supported Slabs)*

To provide a baseline comparison between conventional simply-supported flexural testing and cornersupported flexural testing, 10 slabs from each set were tested using the procedures of ASTM C140/C140M, Annex A8, with the exception that the span length was set to 90% of the slab length/width. For this investigation, the test span length was approximately 21.6 in. (548 mm) for each of the three sets. Table 6 summarizes the test results of the FSS-Slabs. Appendix D contains detailed information on each FSS-Slab test specimen.



#### **Table 6 – Summary of FSS-Slabs Test Results: Sets 1, 2, and 3**

Observing the compound failure mechanisms in the Set 3 slabs was unexpected for the FSS support and loading conditions. It is likely that these multiple failure planes were not a result of the applied load, but instead occurring in the moments immediately after failure when these slabs cracked and fell to the base of the supporting equipment.

## *3.1.5 Analysis Set 2 – Centered-Quartered Slab Flexure Results*

Considering the failure modes of the F-Slabs and Q-Slabs (Tables 4 and 5), Set 2 does appear to show bias for failing in 'Flexure 1' mechanisms. Given that this trend does not extend to the F- and Q-Slabs of Sets 1 and 3, it is unlikely this a result of the testing protocols, but more likely an inherent manufacturing characteristic of Slab Set 2. If this was a manufacturing defect that was located in the middle of the slab and ran perpendicular to the direction of production, it would not manifest in the test results of the Q-Slabs of Set 2 as this was essentially the saw-cut location for the quartering of the slab.

To explore this concept further, the flexure results of each of the FSS-Slabs were compared considering the direction of span running perpendicular and parallel separately as summarized in Table 7. While the direction of loading did not have a significant impact on the measured flexural strength of Sets 1 and 3, the Set 2 slabs that were tested with the loading strip perpendicular to the direction of production exhibited a significantly lower (approximately 25%) flexural failure load, particularly considering the compressive strength and larger thickness of the Set 2 slabs relative to the other sets.



#### **Table 7 – Summary of FSS-Slabs Test Results by Direction of Span: Sets 1, 2, and 3**

This gave rise to the theory that the Set 2 slabs may have had a defect or other preexisting distress that was oriented perpendicular to their direction of production, which was not captured in the testing of these slabs parallel to the direction of production. To test this theory, four of the untested Set 2 slabs were saw-cut, this time obtaining a 12x12 in. (305x305 mm) reduced-size specimens from the center of the full-size slab as illustrated in Figure 28 and tested using the Q-Slab testing protocol (cornersupported, center loaded). Two of these slabs were from the left side of production cycle and two from the right. Each of the centered-quartered slabs failed in 'Flexure 1' (crack perpendicular to the direction of production) and had a failing load less than half of Q-Slabs of Set 2 (Table 5) as summarized in Table 8. It should be noted that prior to cutting the reduced-size specimens from the center of the full-size slabs, the slabs were closely examined and a micro-crack oriented perpendicular to the direction of production was observed in the middle of the bottom side of each slab. While the cause of these microcracks could not be determined, it supports the theory that this preexisting condition contributed to the lower flexural failure loads for the slabs loaded in the perpendicular direction and the lower failing loads for the center-quartered slabs compared to the corner-quartered slabs.

These observations coupled with the testing results of the centered-quartered flexure specimens sampled from the Set 2 slabs spurred revisions to the second phase of testing associated with this project. While

the general testing protocols from Phase I were carried into Phase II, centered-quartered samples (CQ-Slabs) were obtained from Slab Sets 4-12 in addition to the quartered corner samples (Q-Slabs) in an effort to identify and isolate potential flexural failure mechanisms that would not otherwise be captured with the Q-Slabs.



#### **Table 8 – Set 2 Centered-Quartered Flexure Results**



#### **Figure 28 – Location of Centered-Quartered Reduced-Size Specimen**

#### **3.2 Slab Sets 4 through 12**

Mirroring the testing program for Sets 1-3 to characterize the absorption, compressive strength, flexural strength under simple-support conditions, and flexural strength under corner-supported, center loaded of both full-size and reduced-size slab, nine additional sets of slabs were sourced from various producers and tested. Each set consisted of fifteen individual full-size slabs tested as follows:

- 4 full-size slabs tested with corner supports and center point loading (F-Slabs);
- 4 full-size slabs tested with simple supports and mid-span loading (FSS-Slabs);
- 4 full-size slabs with samples saw-cut from the center of each slab and tested with corner supports and center point loading (CQ-Slabs); and
- 3 full-size slabs quartered into 12 samples and tested with corner supports and center point loading (Q-Slabs).

Production methods employed for Slab Set 4-12 included dry-cast (with and without a face-mix), hermetically-pressed, and hydraulically-pressed. All slabs had nominal lengths and width of 24 in. (610 mm) with varying nominal thicknesses.

## *3.2.1 Compression, Density, and Absorption*

Testing for the compressive strength, density, and absorption of each harvested coupon was conducted in accordance with Annex A4 of ASTM C140/C140M, *Standard Test Methods for Sampling and Testing* 

*Concrete Masonry Units and Related Unit* (Ref. 1). The results of these tests are summarized in Table 9 with detailed results of the individual coupons for each set of slabs included in Appendix A.



#### **Table 9 – Average Physical Properties: Sets 4 through 12**

#### *3.2.2 F-Slabs (Full-Size, Center Loaded, Corner Supported Slabs)*

Table 10 summarizes the peak flexure load of the F-Slabs under corner support and center point loading conditions for Sets 4 through 12 as an average of the four slabs tested per set. Detailed results of the individual slabs including slab dimensions and warpage, slab weight, peak load, and failure mechanisms for each slab set are included in Appendix B.





#### *3.2.3 Q-Slabs and CQ-Slabs (Quartered, Center Loaded, Corner Supported Slabs)*

As with the Phase I testing, four specimens from each set where saw-cut by quartering about the plan centroid of each slab and tested with corner-support, center loaded conditions. In addition, three other reduced-size specimens were saw-cut from the center of full-size slabs as shown in Figure 28. The test results of these reduced-size specimens (Q-Slabs and CQ-Slabs) are provided in Table 11 with detailed results provided in Appendix C.







Comparing each set of reduced-size specimens, there was generally good correlation in measured strength between the quartered (Q-Slabs) and center-quartered (CQ-Slabs) with the exception of Set 10 where the centered-quartered specimens were significantly lower in strength compared to the quartered specimens. As reviewed in Section 3.1.5, it is likely this set had an unidentified inherent weakness in the slabs that only manifested in the testing of the centered-quartered specimens.

#### *3.2.4 FSS-Slabs (Full-Size, Simply-Supported Slabs)*

To round out the testing matrix, four full-size slabs were tested under simple support, strip loading conditions to assess the modulus of rupture and provide a baseline for comparison to historical slab quality control testing. The results of these tests are summarized in Table 12 with detailed results provided in Appendix D.





The observations from Set 10 noted from Table 11 carry over to the FSS-Slab testing for this set as well with a notable drop in flexural strength indicating a preexisting weakness. This measured modulus of rupture is lower than would have been predicted for the corresponding compressive strength of 9,460  $lb/in.<sup>2</sup>$  (65.2 MPa) associated with Set 10.

# 4.0 ANALYSES

## **4.1 Determination of Minimum Concentrated Load Performance Criteria**

In addition to developing a testing protocol for assessing the strength and performance of pedestal set slabs, this project set out to determine an appropriate minimum load paving slabs installed in pedestal set applications should be capable of carrying. As discussed, applying a concentrated load to slabs during testing may not replicate all loading conditions such slabs will see in service, but it is a possible loading scenario and conservatively captures more extreme loading events. It is also relatively easy to apply in a laboratory setting compared to other loading types, such as uniformly distributed loads, and therefore affords better intra-laboratory repeatability.

For benchmarking purposes, ASCE/SEI 7, *Minimum Design Loads and Associated Criteria for Buildings and Other Structures* (Ref. 6), defines minimum live load design criteria for a number of applications. While these minimum design loads vary considerably based on the intended use of a system or structure, for applications where pedestal set slabs would commonly be used, including office buildings, lobbies, and similar areas not subject to vehicular traffic, ASCE/SEI 7 requires a minimum concentrated load of 2,000 lb (8,900 N) to be accounted for in design.

While directly comparing the slab strengths under concentrated center loading (F-Slabs) to simply supported strip loading (FSS-Slabs) is not possible due to the differences in loading and support conditions, it does provide a means of comparing relative performance against an established minimum strength criterion. In accordance with ASTM C1782/C1782M, the minimum average modulus of rupture for paving slabs is 725 lb/in.<sup>2</sup> (5.0 MPa), which if used as a benchmark, only Sets 2, 8, and 10 exhibited modulus of rupture values below this threshold. Accounting for the previously noted discrepancies of Sets 2 and 10, the slabs tested as part of this project would have for the most part met the minimum requirements under ASTM C1782/C1782M. As summarized in Table 13, comparing the concentrated failure loads to the modulus of rupture values, only Set 7 had an average concentrated failing load less than 2,000 lb (8,896 N), but it's modulus of rupture was only slightly above the minimum ASTM C1782/C1782M value.

While such comparisons should be taken with caution given that flexural strength is dependent on not only compressive strength, but also method of manufacturing (wet-cast vs. dry-cast), aggregate size and shape, and specimen moisture content at the time of testing, it does provide a secondary means of indirectly supporting an average minimum concentrated loading criteria of 2,000 lb (8,896 N).

In addition to a minimum average modulus of rupture, ASTM C1782/C1782M also stipulates that no unit exhibit a modulus of rupture less than  $650$  lb/in.<sup>2</sup> (4.5 MPa). This allowance for an individual unit to have a strength up to 10% less than the average tested strength is relatively common throughout ASTM standards addressing performance criteria for manufactured concrete products. If applied here, then the average concentrated failing load would be a minimum of 2,000 lb (8,896 N) with no individual unit failing at less than 1,800 lb (8,007 N). Finally, rather than exact metric conversions, it is recommended that a dual unit ASTM standard require the following strength criteria:

*At the time of delivery to the job site, the average concentrated failing load of the test specimens shall be a minimum of 2,000 lb [8,900 N] with no individual unit less than 1,800 lb [8,000 N] when tested using the protocols as outlined in Appendix E of this report.* 

TUNIV IV Comparison of F blab and FDD blab buttleting							
Set No.	<b>Average Concentrated Failure</b>	Average Modulus of Rupture,					
	Load, F-Slabs, $lb(N)$	FSS-Slabs, $lb/in.^2$ (MPa)					
Set 1 (Dry-Cast Through-Mix)	2,245 (10,000)	745 (5.15)					
Set 2 (Dry-Cast Through-Mix)	2,525 (11,225)	700 (4.85)					
Set 3 (Hydraulically-Pressed)	3,285 (14,625)	1,215 (8.40)					
Set 4 (Hermetically-Pressed)	2,175 (9,675)	830 (5.70)					
Set 5 (Dry-Cast Face-Mix)	2,700 (12,000)	1,035(7.15)					
Set 6 (Hydraulically-Pressed)	3,110 (13,850)	1,330(9.15)					
Set 7 (Hydraulically-Pressed)	1,790 (7,975)	735(5.05)					
Set 8 (Dry-Cast Through-Mix)	2,270 (10,100)	710 (4.90)					
Set 9 (Dry-Cast Through-Mix)	3,040 (13,525)	900(6.20)					
Set 10 (Dry-Cast Face-Mix)	2,180 (9,700)	530 (3.65)					
Set 11 (Hermetically-Pressed)	2,570 (11,450)	925 (6.40)					
Set 12 (Dry-Cast Face-Mix)	2,930 (13,025)	1,100(7.55)					

**Table 13 – Comparison of F-Slab and FSS-Slab Strengths** 

## **4.2 Determination of Reduced-Size Specimen Correction Factor**

Given that it is not always practical to test full-size slabs, another aspect of this investigation was to develop testing protocols, and if possible, a relationship between the strength of slabs tested full-size and the same slabs tested in a reduced-size configuration. As previously noted in the review of the test data, testing reduced-size slabs presents its own challenges as harvesting smaller specimens can artificially increase the tested strength by inadvertently removing planes of weakness present in full-size specimens. While this can be addressed by testing both the corners and centers of full-size slabs, it does result in a large number of tests required to be conducted.

Table 14 summarizes the strengths of each slab set under concentrated loading conditions for both fullsize and reduced-size specimens. The average ratio of the reduced-size to full-size strength for all sets is 1.37 with a standard deviation of 0.20. If, however, Sets 2 and 10 are removed from the data set, the average ratio is 1.29 with a standard deviation of 0.07. (See Sections 3.15, 3.2.3 and 3.2.4 for further discussion on Sets 2 and 10.)



\* 'All Q-Slabs' is the average value for all of the reduced size specimens within each set and is equal to (4[Q-Slabs] + [CQ-Slabs])/5 which reflects the number of specimens tested in each set.

Accounting for the standard deviation of 0.07, applying a correction factor of 1.35 between the full-size and reduced-size specimen strength is reasonably conservative. Applying this correction factor to the minimum load of 2,000 lb (8,896 N) reviewed in Section 4.1 results in a minimum average reduced-size strength of 2,700 (12,010 N). Similarly, applying a 10% reduction to address a lower bound minimum strength would require no reduced-size specimen testing less than 2,450 lb (10,898 N). Like the fullsize slab criteria, rather than exact metric conversions, it is recommended that a dual unit ASTM standard require the following strength criteria:

*At the time of delivery to the job site, the average concentrated failing load of the test specimens if tested as reduced-size specimens shall be a minimum of 2,700 lb [12,000 N] with no individual unit less than 2,450 lb [10,900 N] when tested using the protocols as outlined in Appendix E of this report.* 

# 5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Appendix E converts the testing protocols developed in this investigation into mandatory language testing criteria through proposed modifications to Annex A8 of ASTM C140/C140M. While testing of full-size specimens is encouraged, there are options to test reduced-size samples saw-cut from full-size slabs. Given the theoretically infinite number of slab geometries that could conceivably be manufactured, however, there are constraints on reduced-size specimen geometry. Further, given that these testing protocols only accommodate slab sizes up to 24 in. (610 mm), a prescriptive limit on the spacing of support pedestals of 24 in. (610 mm) should also be considered. These constraints should not be construed to preclude unique slab geometries or support configurations, but acknowledge that such conditions would require additional design analysis.

For minimum slab strength under concentrated loads, the following is recommended for pedestal-set slabs. Rather than exact metric conversions, it is recommended that a dual unit ASTM standard require the following strength criteria for ease of application:

*At the time of delivery to the job site, the average concentrated failing load of the test specimens shall be a minimum of 2,000 lb [8,900 N] with no individual unit less than 1,800 lb [8,000 N] when tested using the protocols as outlined in Appendix E of this report.* 

*If the specimens are tested as reduced-size specimens the average concentrated failing*  load shall be a minimum of 2,700 lb [12,000 N] with no individual unit less than 2,450 lb *[10,900 N].* 



# 6.0 REFERENCES

- 1. ASTM C140/C140M-22b, *Standard Test Methods for Sampling and Testing Concrete Masonry Units and Related Units*, ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA, www.astm.org.
- 2. ASTM C1782/C1782M-21, *Standard Specification for Segmental Concrete Paving Slabs*, ASTM International, ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA, www.astm.org.
- 3. CSA A231.1-19, *Precast Concrete Paving Slabs*, CSA Group, Toronto, ON, www.csagroup.org.
- 4. Tech Spec 14, *Segmental Concrete Paving Units for Roof Decks*, Interlocking Concrete Pavement Institute, Chantilly, VA, www.icpi.org.
- 5. ASTM C1491-19, *Standard Specification for Concrete Roof Pavers*, ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA, www.astm.org.
- 6. ASCE/SEI-7-16, *Minimum Design Loads and Associated Criteria for Buildings and Other Structures*, American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, VA, www.asce.org.

# APPENDIX: DETAILED TEST RESULTS AND RECOMMENDED TESTING PROTOCOLS
## **Appendix A: Compression, Density, and Absorption Test Results**

*Appendix A.1: Set 1 – 50 mm Dry-Cast Slab Specimens* 







## *Appendix A.2: Set 2 – 60 mm Dry-Cast Slab Specimens*













## *Appendix A.4: Set 4 – 50 mm Hermetically-Pressed Slab Specimens*



## *Appendix A.5: Set 5 – 50 mm Dry-Cast Face-Mix Slab Specimens*



## *Appendix A.6: Set 6 – 50 mm Hydraulically-Pressed Slab Specimens*



## *Appendix A.7: Set 7 – 45 mm Hydraulically-Pressed Slab Specimens*



## *Appendix A.8: Set 8 – 55 mm Dry-Cast Through-Mix Slab Specimens*



## *Appendix A.9: Set 9 – 60 mm Dry-Cast Through-Mix Slab Specimens*



# *Appendix A.10: Set 10 – 60 mm Dry-Cast Face-Mix Slab Specimens*



## *Appendix A.11: Set 11 – 50 mm Hermetically-Pressed Slab Specimens*



## *Appendix A.12: Set 12 – 50 mm Dry-Cast Face-Mix Slab Specimens*



## **Appendix B: F-Slabs (Full-Size, Center Loaded, Corner Supported) Test Results**

*Appendix B.1: Set 1 – 50 mm Dry-Cast Slab Specimens* 



**Compound Failure Mode Count = 3** 





SI Conversions: 1 in. = 25.4 mm  $1 lb = 0.454 kg$ 1 lbf =  $4.44$  N

**Standard Deviation (lb)\* =** 136 Coefficient of Variation (%)\* =  $6.0$ 

\*Summary excludes 01-S5-F as an outlier.

Simple Flexure 1 Failure Mode Count = 5



Simple Flexure 2 Failure Mode Count = 10



#### *Appendix B.2: Set 2 –60 mm Dry-Cast Slab Specimens*



Average (lb) = 2,526 **Standard Deviation (lb) =** 349

Coefficient of Variation (%) = 13.8

#### **Compound Failure Mode Count = 1**



Simple Flexure 1 Failure Mode Count = 16



#### Simple Flexure 2 Failure Mode Count = 1



SI Conversions:  $1$  in.  $= 25.4$  mm 1 lb =  $0.454$  kg  $1$  lbf = 4.44 N

#### *Appendix B.3: Set 3 – 50 mm Hydraulically-Pressed Slab Specimens*



Compound Failure Mode Count = 5



 $\subset$ 

 $303 - S16 - F$ 

Simple Flexure 1 Failure Mode Count = 2

03-56-F  $\overline{B}$  $\subset$ D  $303 - 56 - F$ 

Standard Deviation (lb) =

Coefficient of Variation (%) =

118

 $3.6$ 

Simple Flexure 2 Failure Mode Count = 11





*Appendix B.4: Set 4 – 50 mm Hermetically-Pressed Slab Specimens* 





*Appendix B.5: Set 5 – 50 mm Dry-Cast Face-Mix Slab Specimens* 





*Appendix B.6: Set 6 – 50 mm Hydraulically-Pressed Slab Specimens* 







*Appendix B.7: Set 7 – 45 mm Hydraulically-Pressed Slab Specimens* 







*Appendix B.8: Set 8 – 55 mm Dry-Cast Through-Mix Slab Specimens* 





*Appendix B.9: Set 9 – 60 mm Dry-Cast Through-Mix Slab Specimens* 

	09-S1-F	$09-S2-F$	09-S3-F	09-S4-F
Width $1$ (in.) =	23.52	23.57	23.48	23.46
Width $2$ (in.) =	23.50	23.57	23.51	23.53
Height $1$ (in.) =	2.400	2.343	2.340	2.315
Height $2$ (in.) =	2.414	2.335	2.370	2.314
Height $3$ (in.) =	2.386	2.343	2.393	2.332
Height $4$ (in.) =	2.361	2.311	2.366	2.297
Length $1$ (in.) =	23.54	23.56	23.50	23.51
Length $2$ (in.) =	23.54	23.54	23.51	23.54
Full-Size Slab Weight (lb) =	109.59	107.40	108.74	107.06
Top Concave $(in.) =$	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012
$Top Convex (in.) =$	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Bottom Concave (in.) =	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012
Bottom Convex (in.) =	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Failing Load (lb) =	2879	2925	3160	3196
Failure Mechanism =	AB-CD	$AD-BC$	AB-CD	AD-BC
Failure Mode =	Flexure 2	Flexure 1	Flexure 2	Flexure 1
Average Width (in.) =	23.51	23.57	23.50	23.50
Average Height (in.) =	2.390	2.333	2.367	2.315
Average Length (in.) =	23.54	23.55	23.51	23.53
Average Failing Load (lb) =	3040			

SI Conversions:  $in. = 25.4$  mm  $1 b = 0.454 kg$ 1  $\text{lbf} = 4.44 \text{ N}$ 



*Appendix B.10: Set 10 – 60 mm Dry-Cast Face-Mix Slab Specimens* 



SI Conversions: 1 in. = 25.4 mm 1 lb =  $0.454$  kg 1  $\text{lbf} = 4.44 \text{ N}$ 



Development of Testing Protocols and Performance Criteria for Pedestal-Set Concrete Paving Slabs

*Appendix B.11: Set 11 – 50 mm Hermetically-Pressed Slab Specimens* 



SI Conversions: 1 in. = 25.4 mm 1 lb =  $0.454$  kg 1  $\text{lbf} = 4.44 \text{ N}$ 



Development of Testing Protocols and Performance Criteria for Pedestal-Set Concrete Paving Slabs

*Appendix B.12: Set 12 – 50 mm Dry-Cast Face-Mix Slab Specimens* 





SI Conversions: 1 in. = 25.4 mm 1 lb =  $0.454$  kg 1 lbf =  $4.44$  N

#### **Appendix C: Q-Slabs (Reduced-Size, Center Loaded, Corner Supported) Test Results**

*Appendix C.1: Set 1 – Q-Slabs (Quartered) 50 mm Dry-Cast Flexure Results* 





# **Slab Set Coefficient of Variation (%)\* = 9.4**

\*Summary excludes 01‐S9‐Q‐2/1 as an outlier.

SI Conversions:

1 in. = 25.4 mm 1 lb =  $0.454$  kg

 $1 \text{ lbf} = 4.44 \text{ N}$ 

Compound Failure Mode Count = 2



Simple Flexure 1 Failure Mode Count = 30



Simple Flexure 2 Failure Mode Count = 8



**Set 1 – Typical Failure Mechanisms** 



## *Appendix C.2: Set 2 – Q-Slabs (Quartered) 60 mm Dry-Cast Flexure Results*



**Slab Set Standard Deviation (lb) = 322**

**Slab Set Coefficient of Variation (%) = 7.6**

SI Conversions: 1 in. = 25.4 mm 1 lb =  $0.454$  kg 1  $\text{lbf} = 4.44 \text{ N}$ 

Compound Failure Mode Count = 0



Simple Flexure 1 Failure Mode Count = 39



Simple Flexure 2 Failure Mode Count = 1

**Set 2 – Typical Failure Mechanisms** 

*Appendix C.3: Set 3 – Q-Slabs (Quartered) 50 mm Hydraulically-Pressed Flexure Results* 







SI Conversions:  $1$  in.  $= 25.4$  mm 1 lb =  $0.454$  kg

1  $\text{lbf} = 4.44 \text{ N}$ 

Compound Failure Mode Count = 0



Simple Flexure 1 Failure Mode Count = 21

**Set 3 – Typical Failure Mechanisms**
# *Appendix C.4: Set 4 – Q-Slabs (Quartered) 50 mm Hermetically-Pressed Flexure Results*

**SHE STATES** 

 $\omega$ 







B

 $\ddot{\mathcal{L}}$ 

B

 $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ 

Ω

 $16$ 

 $\overline{e}$ 

 $\hat{C}$ 

 $Q1 - 12$ 

04-57-02-12

 $612$ 

04-51-02-2

D

04



1 in. = 25.4 mm

1 lb =  $0.454$  kg  $1 \text{ lbf} = 4.44 \text{ N}$ 

 $\mathcal{A}$ 

# *Appendix C.5: Set 5 – Q-Slabs (Quartered) 50 mm Dry-Cast Face-Mix Flexure Results*

05-S2-Q1- 05-S2-Q1- 05-S2-Q2- 05-S2-Q2-

12

11.78

11.80

2.042

2.021

11.80

11.80

24.12

3368

AD-BC

Flexure 1

11.79

2.032

11.80

11

11.75

11.80

2.000

2.030

11.78

11.80

23.66

3235

AB-CD

Flexure 2

11.78

2.015

11.79

12

11.80

11.85

1.997

2.003

11.80

11.85

24.10

3524

AB-CD Flexure 2

11.83

2.000

11.83



11

11.78

11.80

2.036

2.030

11.80

11.85

24.30

3213

AD-BC

Flexure 1

11.79

2.033

11.83

3335

Width  $1$  (in.) =

Width  $2$  (in.) =

Height  $1$  (in.) =

Height  $2$  (in.) =

Length  $1$  (in.) =

Length  $2$  (in.) =

Failing Load (lb) =

Failure Mode =

Failure Mechanism =

Average Width (in.) =

Average Height (in.) =

Average Length (in.) =

Average Failing Load (lb) =

Reduced Slab Weight (lb) =



SI Conversions: 1 in. = 25.4 mm 1 lb =  $0.454$  kg  $1$  lbf = 4.44 N







 $\overline{B}$ 











*Appendix C.6: Set 6 – Q-Slabs (Quartered) 50 mm Hydraulically-Pressed Flexure Results* 







SI Conversions:

1 in. = 25.4 mm

 $1 lb = 0.454 kg$ 

 $1$  lbf = 4.44 N















# *Appendix C.7: Set 7 – Q-Slabs (Quartered) 45 mm Hydraulically-Pressed Flexure Results*

Development of Testing Protocols and Performance Criteria for Pedestal-Set Concrete Paving Slabs

12.02

22.08

1916

AB-CD

**NA** 

11.98

1.812

12.01

2253

12.08

21.74

2409

AD-BC

**NA** 

11.94

1.821

11.94

12.03

21.78

2307

AB-CD

**NA** 

11.90

1.814

12.03

11.80

21.04

2381

AB-CD

**NA** 

11.81

1.798

11.79

 $O7 - 53$ 

Length  $2$  (in.) =

Failing Load (lb) =

Failure Mode =

Failure Mechanism =

Average Width (in.) =

Average Height (in.) =

Average Length (in.) =

Average Failing Load (lb) =

Reduced Slab Weight (lb) =









1 in. = 25.4 mm

1 lb =  $0.454$  kg

 $1 \text{ lbf} = 4.44 \text{ N}$ 



### *Appendix C.8: Set 8 – Q-Slabs (Quartered) 55 mm Dry-Cast Through-Mix Flexure Results*

SI Conversions:

 $1$  in.  $= 25.4$  mm

1 lb =  $0.454$  kg

 $1$  lbf = 4.44 N























 $\Delta$ 

 $\eta$ .

 $SNQY-1$ 

D

 $\mathbb{A}$ 





Development of Testing Protocols and Performance Criteria for Pedestal-Set Concrete Paving Slabs

Page 83 of 102 Project Number: 20-322 & 22-110 August 1, 2023









 $1 \text{ in.} = 25.4 \text{ mm}$ 

1 lb =  $0.454$  kg

 $1 \text{ lbf} = 4.44 \text{ N}$ 

# *Appendix C.10: Set 10 – Q-Slabs (Quartered) 60 mm Dry-Cast Face-Mix Flexure Results*





 $33 - Q1$  $10 10$ s C D B  $153 - 022 - 2$ 

Development of Testing Protocols and Performance Criteria for Pedestal-Set Concrete Paving Slabs



1 in. = 25.4 mm

1 lb =  $0.454$  kg

1 lbf =  $4.44$  N

 $\overline{\mathbf{B}}$ 

 $\mathbf{c}$ 

# *Appendix C.11: Set 11 – Q-Slabs (Quartered) 50 mm Hermetically-Pressed Flexure Results*



11.87

2.036

11.86





 $11 - 53$ 

D

 $O<sub>1</sub>$ 

B

 $\subset$ 

B

C

B

 $\varsigma$ 

 $\mathbf{B}$ 

 $\overline{z}$ 



1.987

2.023

11.83

2.003

11.86

Development of Testing Protocols and Performance Criteria for Pedestal-Set Concrete Paving Slabs

Page 87 of 102 Project Number: 20-322 & 22-110 August 1, 2023

 $14 - 53 - 0.2.2$ 

Ç



 $1$  in.  $= 25.4$  mm

1 lb =  $0.454$  kg  $1 \text{ lbf} = 4.44 \text{ N}$ 

# *Appendix C.12: Set 12 – Q-Slabs (Quartered) 50 mm Dry-Cast Face-Mix Flexure Results*



Development of Testing Protocols and Performance Criteria for Pedestal-Set Concrete Paving Slabs

Page 89 of 102 Project Number: 20-322 & 22-110 August 1, 2023



1 in. = 25.4 mm

1 lb =  $0.454$  kg

 $1 \text{ lbf} = 4.44 \text{ N}$ 

### **Appendix D: FSS-Slabs (Full-Size, Simply-Supported) Test Results**

*Appendix D.1: Set 1 – FSS-Slabs 50 mm Dry-Cast Through-Mix Flexure Results* 



Standard Deviation with Load Perpendicular to Direction of Production (lb) = 261



Compound Failure Mode Count = 0

ŀ

#### Simple Flexure 1 Failure Mode Count = 6



SI Conversions:  $1$  in.  $= 25.4$  mm 1 lb =  $0.454$  kg  $1$  lbf = 4.44 N

#### Simple Flexure 2 Failure Mode Count = 4



### *Appendix D.2: Set 2 – FSS-Slabs 60 mm Dry-Cast Through-Mix Flexure Results*



2,557

Standard Deviation with Load Perpendicular to Direction of Production (lb) = 215



#### Compound Failure Mode Count = 0

Simple Flexure 1 Failure Mode Count = 6



SI Conversions: 1 in. = 25.4 mm 1 lb =  $0.454$  kg 1 lbf =  $4.44$  N





#### *Appendix D.3: Set 1 – FSS-Slabs 50 mm Hermetically-Pressed Flexure Results*



Standard Deviation with Load Perpendicular to Direction of Production (lb) = 386

- Slab Set Average (lb) = 3,470 Slab Set Standard Deviation (lb) = 320
- Slab Set Coefficient of Variation (%) =  $9.2$

Compound Failure Mode Count = 3

 $03 - 56 - 555 - PR$ 



Simple Flexure 2 Failure Mode Count = 4



 $03 - 310 - F55 - F$  $2^{3 \cdot 54 \cdot F5 \sum_{n=1}^{5} PR}$  $\infty$ 





SI Conversions: 1 in. = 25.4 mm 1 lb =  $0.454$  kg  $1 \text{ lbf} = 4.44 \text{ N}$ 

*Appendix D.4: Set 4 – FSS-Slabs 50 mm Hermetically-Pressed Flexure Results* 





SI Conversions: 1 in. = 25.4 mm 1 lb =  $0.454$  kg 1 lbf = 4.44  $\overline{N}$ 







SI Conversions:  $1$  in.  $= 25.4$  mm 1 lb =  $0.454$  kg 1  $\text{lbf} = 4.44 \text{ N}$ 

*Appendix D.6: Set 6 – FSS-Slabs 50 mm Hermetically-Pressed Flexure Results* 











 $1$  in.  $= 25.4$ 













 $1$  in.  $= 25.4$ 

 $1$  lbf = 4.44

















