

LIBRARY Michigan State
University

a **Ka**rlanda San

THESIS

A REPORT

ON THE PAVELENTS

 $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{H}$

LANSING, MICHICAN.

I.D. ANGELL

 $\bar{\mathbf{r}}$

 $\mathcal{R}\bullet\mathbf{B}\bullet\mathbf{MLLR}$

MICHICAN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

 M_X 4, 1907.

 $\ddot{}$

THES:9

đ,

A REPORT ON THE PAVEMENTS OF LANCING, HICH.

The object of this thesis is to report the recults of an investigation of the pavement of Lansing, Wichigan, and from their construction, present condition. and the amount of trafic passing over them to present some conclusions as to the relative merits of different forms of pavements and different methods of pavement construction as found in the city.

There is in all about six miles of pavement in Lansing (for actual dimensions and cost see Table I) whose total first cost is about $(250,000.00$. All data concerning the dimensions and cost, also a blue-print map of the city, showing the paved streets, and one showing the grade profile and a cross section of the east end of Franklin Ave. now being paved, were obtained from the records of the city engineer. We also show a copy of the spocifications for this section of pavement, which is fairly representative of all.

These pavements - with the exception of the Franklin Ave. bridge, which is 5^{μ} x 9^{μ} wood blocks,- are brick, cither on sand or concrete foundations, as shown in Table II. This table also shows the present condition of each section of pavement. About 83% of the total length of pavement is laid on a so called gravel foundation, but as the gravel is from 60-70% sand these foundations will be refered to hereafter as (see Table II) as sand.

93784

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{$

 \mathcal{L}_{max} and \mathcal{L}_{max} and \mathcal{L}_{max} and \mathcal{L}_{max} $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{2\alpha} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{\alpha} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

TABLE I.

Showing cost of pavements, No. yds. in each section, and date of laying.

 \sim

We were unable to find any data at to the depth of either the sand of the concrete foundations, nor were we able to measure the same, as the pavements did not happen to be torn up while the investigation was being made. However, some idea can be obtaine! of the present practice by an examination of the blueprint and the specifications, already mentioned, of the Franklin Ave. pavement.

The grades of the streets are fairly uniform, the steepest grades not paved being one of 5.28% at the north end of the Washinton Ave. bridge and one of 5.02% on Franklin Ave. East, between the Lake Shore R.R. and the foot of Turner St., both of which are very reasonable grades for brick pavements.

There is very little uniformity in these pavements as regards the amount of crown, either on different portions of the same pavement or on different pavements. This lack of uniformity was determined by taking the relative elevations of the orown and gutter, (see Tables III \in IV .) with a leveling instrument at intervals of about half a block along each individual section of the pavement. One of the noticable features of the newer pavoment is that they are nearly always given a greater crown than the old and this seems to be one of the good features, as it throws the water to the gutter more quickly. This data on crewn also enabled us to form more accurate to conclusions as to the manner and thoroughness of the preparation of the foundations. This is shown more particularly in Table IV as this table gives the actual relative elevations

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \,$ $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{$

TABLE II

Showing construction, and present condition of each

section of pavement.

 $\overline{}$

 $\overline{}$

Table II (continued)

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}) \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z})$ $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{dx}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\,dx\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{dx}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\,dx$ $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\,d\mu$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \begin{split} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}) \,, \end{split}$ $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) \otimes \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$

as copied from the ori inal noted. All of the new pave ents indicate a slackness of preparation of the foundation, shown by variation of as much as .17 ft. in the anount of crewn en different portions of the same pavement, and also by mumerous depressions, which indicate irregular setting of the foundation.

In order to common the different paverents as to efficiency, relative to their methods of construction, it was necessary to guther some data in the comparative amounts of traffic passing over them. And as it was impossible, due to lack of time, to spend a full day on sich street, a full day's traffic was taken at what was thought to be the point of maximum traffic, namely, on Mashington Ave. South at the corner of Lashington Ave. and Ealamazoo St., and from one to three hours traffic was talen on each of the other streets. Then to obtain an approximate idea of a days traffic on e ch of the other streets, we assumed that the ratio of traffic per hour on any street, to that on Washington Ave. for the same hour, was constant throughout the whole day. The traffic per day on each street was determined in the following way, (for results see Table V)

Let $A =$ the traffic per day on Washington Ave., South. Let $a =$ the traffic per any hour on Cashington Ave., South. Let $x =$ the traffic per fame hour on street to be determined. To find $X = tr$ ffic per day on said street. a = percontage of whole days traffic that passes on Washington Ave. South in the hour whose traffic is represented by (a) then $\frac{x}{s}$ the percentage of the amount for a given time on Wash. Ave. that pusse offer the other street in the same time Therefore $X = \frac{x}{a} \cdot A$

TABLE III

Ehowing crown of pavement.

 $\textbf{TASE} = \textbf{IV} \tag{3}$

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$

 \sim \sim

 $\overline{}$

 \sim

TABLE \mathbf{V}

 \mathcal{A}_1

 \mathcal{A}_c

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}))$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}})))))$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}),\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}))$ $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \,$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

The results remarding traffic are, of Course, from the manner of obtaining them, inaccurate.No consideration was given to the variation from day to day nor from season to season, and the assumption upon which we based our method of computing traffic is not exactly true. Allowing a liberal margin for errors, hetever, still leaves the results, good approximations, and of much practical value in the comparison of paverents.

From a study of the data collected we draw the following $conclusions -$

First: That for heavy traffic such as drayage, a brick pavement should always have a concrete foundation, with either grout of tar filler.

Second; That for a parge amount of light traffic, while a conorete foundation is to be preferred, a good grade of gravel will make an effective foundation if it is prepared very carefully. On this type of pavement a tar filler should be used. Third: That for a comparatively small amount of traffic a carefully laid foundation of gravel is sufficient and that the filler should be preferably tar, and if sand is used it should be carefully swept into the joints.

Cur last and most general conclusion is that the inefficiency of a pavement can mearly always be traced to a lack of proper construction rather than to a lack of proper design.