Research on
Engineering
Structures & Materials
journal homepage: http://jresm.org

RESEARCH
GROUP



Influence of drainage on flexible road pavement design

George Kollaros, Antonia Athanasopoulou

Online Publication Date: 30 Jan 2017
URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.17515/resm2016.76ma0726.html
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17515/resm2016.76ma0726

Journal Abbreviation: *Res. Eng. Struct. Mat.*

To cite this article
Kollaros G, AthanasopoulouA. Influence of drainage on flexible road pavement design. *Res. Eng. Struct. Mat.*, 2017; 3(3): 228-236.

Research on Engineering Structures & Materials
journal homepage: http://jresm.org
MIM RESEARCH GROUP

Research Article

Influence of drainage on flexible road pavement design

George Kollaros*[1], Antonia Athanasopoulou[1]

[1] *Department of Civil Engineering, Democritus University of Thrace, Greece*

Article Info

Article history:
Received 26 July 2016
Revised 17 Jan 2017
Accepted 26 Jan 2017

Keywords:
Flexible pavement, Thickness design, Drainage conditions software

Abstract

Road pavement serviceability is primarily governed by the type of vehicles anticipated to use the facility. Along with the size of traffic loads, climatic conditions affect the behavior of the materials in a pavement structure. The relative strength loss in a layer due to its drainage characteristics and the total time it is exposed to near-saturation moisture conditions is represented by drainage coefficients. There is a need for computerized methodologies for thickness design of flexible asphalt pavements (granular base course) for a wide variety of pavement uses providing users the capability to conduct structural analysis of special pavement structures. An algorithm for a computer-based procedure towards the calculation of the layer thickness of flexible pavements has been developed. The design equation used is that described by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. The present work deals with the effect of drainage on the total thickness of the structure as it directly influences the cost of large infrastructure projects like roads. The output of different cases solved is presented in table and schematic form. Changes in technology related to pavement design and construction practices will necessitate revisions to currently used computing techniques. Improvements in computing times which will affect the cost of computerized methods available to engineers are to be suggested in the near future. Empirically supported pavement designs used nowadays in Greece require modifications based on regional experience and on a better assessment of the drainage conditions prevailing in each area crossed by a roadway project. Since design considerations constantly change, it is obligatory to shift towards more sophisticated design methods.

1. Introduction

Under the influence of various factors, the bearing capacity of an in service pavement weakens, thereby downgrading its service level. Such factors, beyond the engineering characteristics of the materials, are the effects of traffic volume (especially the percent of trucks and buses) as well as the environmental and climatic conditions, which contribute to the aging of materials.

The AASHTO flexible pavement design method has been compared with other design methods to check the appropriateness of its predictions on the performance of pavements in their service-life. Such a comparison has been made against the National Cooperative Highway Research Program - NCHRP Project 1-37A mechanistic-empirical approach for a variety of locations with different climate, subgrade properties, and materials [1]. This research effort has shown that the AASHTO guide overestimates performance (suggesting reduced distress) when the traffic volumes are high and the places crossed by the road projects are warm.

In a recent research work [2] the author has suggested that it is possible to estimate equivalent single-axle loads (ESALs) values through the use of artificial neural networks.

*Correspondingauthor: gkoll@civil.duth.gr
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17515/resm2016.76ma0726

As a massively parallel distributed processor, a neural network has a natural tendency to store experiential knowledge and make it available for use. Thus, the complex design equation of American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) which over-estimates the number of ESALs would not be necessary and the coefficients given in this way could obtain the actual load values (better calculation of design traffic input).

The KENLAYER software [3] from the KENPAVE suite of programs for pavement analysis and design has been used [4] along with the results of AASHTO design guide and the Mechanistic-Empirical based computer program Road Note 31 which has been developed by the Transport Research Laboratory, TRL, UK and predicts fatigue cracking of the pavement [5]. The conclusion of that research was that although there has been a good agreement for the predicted capacity of the pavement structure with the two methods, significant difference appeared when the KENLAYER was employed.

Different ideas to improve the concept of flexible pavement design posed by AASHTO have been proposed [6, 7]. Some of them have been realized both in experimental stages and in everyday practice [8, 9]. The use of specialized software makes it easier to compare the results, find any drawbacks or highlight the positive options of these newer design procedures.

In 2013, Purvis [10] analyzed the output of StreetPave, WinPas and I-Pave software packages in order to define the sensitivity of pavement thickness due to various design factors used as input parameters. For the aforementioned work –that was limited to low volume roads- the AASHTO design was used as a guide. The ARA (Applied Research Associates, Inc.) is an employee-owned scientific research and engineering company. They have evaluated the I-Pave Low Volume Road Design Software, having AASHTO design method as a standard for comparison [11]. As a result, it came up that the thickness for flexible pavement calculated by the I-Pave Software is identical to that from the AASHTO design equation.

Results have been presented with the application of a developed calculation framework called MULTI-PAVE based on MATLAB modules for flexible and rigid pavements [12] through the implementation of the AASHTO pavement design procedures.

The sensitivity of the various variables in AASHTO 1993 flexible pavement empirical equation was investigated using statistical tools [13]. The % variation of each variable was plotted against percentage change in W_{18}, the predicted number of 80 KN Equivalent Single Axle Loads.

A method for determining AASHTO drainage coefficients (m_i) for flexible pavements has been previously presented [14]. Ratios of the layer coefficients of the AASHO road test granular base material under any given drainage and climate condition to the layer coefficient of the road test base material under road test site conditions helped to develop the drainage coefficients. The outcome of the abovementioned analysis was a set of tables whereby a road engineer can properly select m coefficients and can judge the pavement performance as influenced by its drainage condition.

In an effort to study the effect of the moisture condition in the unbound layers of a pavement structure, the drainage coefficients of base and sub-base have been considered as dependent variables and computer software has been constructed in Democritus University of Thrace Transportation laboratory. Some of the applications are described in the following sections and the output is presented in graphical form.

2. Structure of Software Concept

In 1962, the AASHO Road Test, run in USA by the Highway Research Board, established a correlation equation for the pavement structure as a function of traffic, soil condition, and change in pavement condition. With the AASHTO design the pavement performance is related to downgrading of the pavement ride quality or serviceability caused by the increase of traffic volumes or by aging over time.

In Eq. (1) the traffic is represented by the W_{18} term which is expressed as Equivalent Single Axle Loads 18,000 lb (80 kN). The terms Z_R and S_0 have been added later as reliability and variability factors, respectively, in order to describe the pavement's ability to function under the design conditions given as inputs. Both terms act in reality as safety factors. The soil condition is quantified by its resilient modulus, M_R.

$$\log_{10}\left(W_{18}\right)=Z_R\cdot S_0+9.36\cdot\log_{10}\left(SN+1\right)-0.20+\frac{\log_{10}\left(\frac{\Delta PSI}{4.2-1.5}\right)}{0.40+\frac{1094}{\left(SN+1\right)^{5.19}}} \qquad (1)$$
$$+2.32\cdot\log_{10}\left(M_R\right)-8.07$$

where W_{18}: estimated 18-kip (80 kN) ESALs accumulated over the life of the project, Z_R: standard normal deviate, S_0: standard deviation, SN: structural number, ΔPSI: change in serviceability, and M_R: resilient modulus.

The quantities taking part in the Eq. (1) are regression coefficients which can be altered if newer data become available through in situ testing and different prevailing conditions. These regression coefficients provide the best fit between SN, ΔPSI and M_R on one hand and the expected performance of the pavement on the other hand. The performance is expressed in ESALs.

The required Structural Number (SN) or the associated pavement layer thickness is based on the relationship in Eq. (2). SN determines the total number of ESALs that can be borne by a particular pavement structure. In the design process, the quality of drainage is incorporated through the introduction of coefficients, m_i, into the structural number equation.

$$SN=\alpha_1\cdot D_1+m_2\cdot\alpha_2\cdot D_2+m_3\cdot\alpha_3\cdot D_3 \qquad (2)$$

where: a_i= layer coefficient of the i-th layer (i=1, 2, 3), D_i= layer thickness of the i-th layer (i=1, 2, 3), and m_2, m_3= drainage coefficient of the base and sub-base layers respectively.

For the greatest accuracy possible, Eq. (1) and Eq. (2) should be solved simultaneously.

In general, the drainage coefficients are thought to be representative of the strength loss in a pavement layer because of its drainage characteristics, as well as of the total time the material of the layer is exposed to near-saturation moisture levels. An engineer designing a proper pavement may take into consideration a value higher than the commonly assumed for routine materials when drainage conditions are favorable; on the other hand a decreased drainage coefficient would cover poor drainage conditions.

For the materials of base and sub-base, two different drainage coefficients are to be used. A pavement system with good drainage characteristics will be assigned with m_i values higher than 1.0. Good characteristics are those permitting the pavement to be drained quickly, a day or less will be enough time, while it is near the saturation for a little time-period (<1%). Obviously, this time depends on the mean annual rainfall and the prevailing drainage conditions. In a scenario where the water drains in a day and the period of saturation conditions is 1%, the drainage coefficient could be assumed taking a value of 1.3. In the case where the water will take 1 month to drain and the pavement is exposed to moisture levels approaching the saturation more than 25% of the time, then the drainage coefficient will be well smaller than 1.0, let's say 0.60. The value of 1.0 could be assigned to a material needing a week to drain.

3. Influence of the Drainage Coefficients on the Layer Thickness

In order to study the effect of drainage coefficients on the thickness of unbound base and sub-base layers a software algorithm has been constructed which solves for the basic AASHTO Eq. (1) when it is supplied with input data consisted by the expected traffic volume for a 20 year design period reduced to 80 kN equivalent ESALs. The pavement terminal serviceability index, P_t, the reliability, R, and the standard deviation, S_0, are also required. Next, the user provides the resilient moduli of the layers as well as the drainage coefficients estimated for the unbound base and sub-base layers. The moduli are converted inside the program to layer coefficients, α_i. The program using an iterative procedure calculates and presents as outputs the individual thicknesses, D_i, and the respective structural numbers for the different layers based on Eq. (3), (4) and (5).

$$D_1^* \geq \frac{SN_1}{\alpha_1} \qquad SN_1^* = \alpha_1 \cdot D_1 \geq SN_1 \tag{3}$$

$$D_2^* = \frac{SN_2 - SN_1^*}{\alpha_2 \cdot m_2} \qquad SN_1^* + SN_2^* \geq SN_2 \tag{4}$$

$$D_3^* \geq \frac{SN_3 - \left(SN_1^* + SN_2^*\right)}{\alpha_3 \cdot m_3} \tag{5}$$

where the asterisk indicates the really used value of the quantity after its rounding to the next half of the unit used and which has to be greater or equal to required one.

In Fig. 1 the calculation concept is depicted defining the individual structural numbers, SN_i, for the different layers along with the thicknesses, D_i where i=1,2,3.



Fig. 1 Pavement system components for the implementation of the equation

The procedure for the calculation of the layer thicknesses takes into account the limitations posed by fiscal and construction distresses as a function of the traffic volume to be served during the service life of a road project. The minimum thickness values for the expected traffic intensity presented in Table 1 have been suggested by AASHTO [15].

Table 1 Minimum thickness values as a function of traffic

Traffic (ESALs)	Asphalt concrete (mm)	Aggregate Base (mm)	Sub-base (mm)
<50,000	25	100	100
50,001-150,000	50	100	100
150,001-500,000	65	100	100
500,001-2,000,000	75	150	150
2,000,001-7,000,000	90	150	150
> 7,000,000	100	150	150

In order to simplify the calculations, in this work the hypothesis has been made that the base and sub-base drainage coefficients are equal to each other and that they range between 0.5 and 1.4 (higher value of the drainage coefficient means better drainage conditions).

In Fig. 2 the effect of drainage coefficients, m_i, on the base and sub-base thicknesses D_2, and D_3, respectively is presented. The influence on the total thickness of the pavement structure is also depicted in Fig. 3. The problem solved in the presented case included a subgrade modulus, M_R, equal to 5,000 psi (34 MPa), the expected traffic volume in 18-kip (80 kN) ESALs equal to 5,000,000, the terminal serviceability index, P_t=2.5, reliability R=95% and standard deviation, S_0=0.35. The Marshal stability value is taken equal to 2,000, while the base and sub-base moduli 50,000 psi (344 MPa) and 15,000 psi (103 MPa), respectively.



Fig. 2 Thickness variation of unbound layers as a function of drainage conditions

Keeping the input data used in the case of Fig. 2, the value of the expected volume was varied between the limiting values in Table 1, namely $5x10^4$, $15x10^4$, $5x10^5$, $2x10^6$ and $7x10^6$ equivalent single axle loads 18 kip (80 kN). The total thickness of the pavement variation as a function of the values of drainage coefficients, m_i, for these different cases is shown in Fig. 3.

The slope of the curves in Fig. 3 is similar in all ranges of coefficients mi. At the extremely good drainage conditions, the curves are almost parallel to the axis of the coefficients, and only in the case of very high volumes (≥5,000,000 equivalent single axle loads 80 kN) drainage coefficients in the order of 1.3 to 1.4 have a practical significance.



Fig. 3 Traffic volume effect on the relationship of drainage coefficient, m, and total structural thickness

The pavement design-performance process is largely dependent on reliability; this term as used by AASHTO is the probability a pavement section will perform satisfactorily under the traffic and environmental conditions for the design period (usually 20 years). Typical reliability values range between 50% and 99.9%. It is commonly accepted that a high reliability value may increase the asphalt thickness dramatically.

For a traffic volume value W_{18}=5,000,000 and the rest of the input data identical to that of the Fig. 2, the effect of the reliability *R* on the relationship of the total thickness of the structure and drainage coefficients m_i was examined. The extreme values of 50% and 99% have been taken into account as well as rates of 70%, 90% and 95%. Up to *m* value equal to 1.2, the variation is almost linear affected very strongly by the value of Z_R in the basic design equation, Eq. (1), which expresses the reliability level. The results of this correlation are shown in Fig. 4.

In Table 2, the effect of the standard deviation S_0 (values of 0.30, 0.35, and 0.40) on the base, sub-base and total construction thickness is depicted. The rest input data is the same used in Fig. 1. For the particular traffic volume size and other conditions set for this case, the total thickness obtained for S_0=0.35, and Z_R=0.40 is the same because the thickness of the asphalt concrete has been found greater by 0.50 when S_0=0.40 thus reducing the influence of the *mi* of unbound base and sub-base layers. In cases of smaller volumes, higher S_0 value yields an overall thickness increase.



Fig. 4 Reliability effect on the relationship of drainage coefficient, m_i, and total structural thickness

There aren't any data available for a direct comparison with the results of other layer thickness estimation methods. Nevertheless, different recent research efforts could be found in the literature. Uljarević and Šupić [16] have presented results of trials to determine the thickness of pavement layers designed for heavy vehicle loads. Perpetual pavements remain a goal for engineers. The S8 project in Poland has been designed with a course of special polymer modified bitumen (PMB) binder and the thickness of the layer was taken as 15 cm [17]. Using the Group Index Method, California Bearing Ratio Method, and Indian Road Congress Method for the design of flexible pavements the thickness of flexible pavement was estimated [18]. The results showed that CBR method is more efficient than the GI method in designing flexible pavements. The design methods that are traditionally being followed are discussed through example pavement structures in a paper on the design and cost analysis of pavements [19].

Table 2 Thickness variation of the individual pavement layers

m	S_0=0.30			S_0=0.35			S_0=0.40		
	D_1 (cm)	D_2 (cm)	D_3 (cm)	D_1 (cm)	D_2 (cm)	D_3 (cm)	D_1 (cm)	D_2 (cm)	D_3 (cm)
0.5	12.7	31.8	74.9	12.7	34.3	76.2	14.0	31.8	77.5
0.6	12.7	26.7	62.2	12.7	27.9	64.8	14.0	26.7	64.8
0.7	12.7	22.9	53.3	12.7	24.1	55.9	14.0	22.9	55.9
0.8	12.7	20.3	45.7	12.7	21.6	48.3	14.0	20.3	48.3
0.9	12.7	17.8	41.9	12.7	19.1	43.2	14.0	17.8	43.2
1.0	12.7	15.2	39.4	12.7	17.8	38.1	14.0	15.2	40.6
1.1	12.7	15.2	33.0	12.7	15.2	35.6	14.0	15.2	34.3
1.2	12.7	15.2	27.9	12.7	15.2	30.5	14.0	15.2	29.2

1.3	12.7	15.2	24.1	12.7	15.2	26.7	14.0	15.2	25.4
1.4	12.7	15.2	20.3	12.7	15.2	22.9	14.0	15.2	21.6

4. Conclusion

The dimensioning of flexible pavements consisting of base and sub-base layers made up by unbound aggregates is influenced by the drainage conditions. These have been incorporated in the thickness design equation in the form of drainage coefficients mi. Proper assessment of these coefficients should be based on rainfall height measurements in the area of a highway project and on technical details of devices and arrangements for the free water removal from the pavement granular layers.

The AASHTO equation used for the design of flexible pavements is an empirical equation, based on experimental results and experience. Due to its empirical character, the AASHTO equation does not imply any direct physical relation between the variables and its outcome. Therefore, the description of phenomena occurring outside the range of data used to develop the original relationship may not make any sense.

The drainage feature in the AASHTO flexible pavement design that needs more research is the pair of drainage coefficients m_2 and m_3 being approached rather empirically. As it has been shown the total thickness, hence the cost, of the structure is significantly affected by the quality of the drainage. Drainage coefficients are a way to make a specific layer thicker. Probable underestimation of the m_i values is on the side of safety in view of the service time of the construction. However, the construction cost is very high due to the required layer thicknesses, particularly in projects of high value and priority where the expected traffic volumes will be very increased.

The influence of the drainage coefficients is more pronounced in the region of values from 0.5 to 1.0. This can be attributed to the limitations for the minimum base and sub-base thicknesses. Special care is needed when layer drainage coefficients not equal to 1.0 are used. In cases of fundamental drainage problems, thicker layers may only offer a little benefit. The use of very dense layers minimizing water infiltration would better address the actual drainage problem.

The slope of the total thickness-drainage coefficient curves is similar in all ranges of coefficients m_i. At the extremely good drainage conditions, the curves are almost parallel to the axis of the coefficients, and only in the case of very high volumes (≥5,000,000 equivalent single axle loads 18 kip) drainage coefficients in the order of 1.3 to 1.4 have a practical significance.

Empirically based designs used nowadays on a national level may possibly require modifications based on regional experience and on a better assessment of the drainage conditions prevailing in each area crossed by a roadway project. Because design considerations are constantly changed, the necessity for a shift towards more sophisticated design methods is considered obligatory.

References

[1] Carvalho R and Schwartz C. Comparisons of flexible pavement designs: AASHTO Empirical versus NCHRP Project 1-37A Mechanistic-Empirical. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, 2006; 1947(16), 167-174. https://doi.org/10.3141/1947-16

[2] Tiğdemir, M. Re-evaluation of the AASHTO-flexible pavement design equation with neural network modeling. PLoS One, 2014; 9(11), e113226. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0113226

[3] Huang YH. Pavement analysis and design 1993, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

[4] Mirza WM, Hafeez I and Kamal MA. Comparative study of empirical and mechanistic-empirical pavement design methodology using Kenlayer Software. International Journal of Pavement Engineering and Asphalt Technology, LJMU, Liverpool, UK, 2011; 12(2), 50-62.

[5] Transportation Research Laboratory, TRL. Overseas Road Note 31, "A guide to the structural design of bitumen-surfaced roads in tropical and sub-tropical countries". 4th Edition, Transport Research Laboratory, Overseas Centre, Crowthorne, Berkshire, UK, 1993.

[6] Colorado Department of Transportation. 2015 M-E Pavement Design Manual - Part II. Materials and Geotechnical Branch of the Colorado Department of Transportation, 199 p., 2015.

[7] Picolli S. Unpaved & paved road design. CORIX High Performance Geosynthetic Symposium, Wascana Country Club, 6500 Wascana Parkway, Regina, SK, 2015.

[9] Abaza KA and Ashur SA. Investigating the accelerated deterioration of flexible pavement using two-stage design analysis approach. European Transport Research Review, 2011; 3(1), 23-34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12544-011-0047-4

[10] Purvis J. Sensitivity analysis of pavement thickness design software for local roads in Iowa. MS (Master of Science) Thesis, University of Iowa, 137 p., 2013.

[11] Darter MI, Vavrik WR and Ayyala D. Final report: Evaluation of I-Pave Low Volume Road Design Software. Applied Research Associates, Inc. (ARA), 36 p., 2015.

[12] Bekele A. Implementation of the AASHTO pavement design procedures into MULTI-PAVE. MS (Master of Science) thesis, Department of Civil and Architectural Engineering Royal Institute of Technology SE-100 44 Stockholm, 57 p., 2011.

[13] Afzal M, Hafeez I, Zaidi B, Riaz K, Khitab A, Hayat A, Khan I, Farooqi U and Asif A. Sensitivity analysis of design variables of flexible pavement design equation in the AASHTO 1993 design guide. Life Science Journal 2013; 10(12s), 878-882.

[14] Richardson DN. AASHTO drainage coefficients for flexible pavements. Transportation Research Record No. 1778, Design and Rehabilitation of Pavements, 2001; 73-80.

[15] AASHTO. AASHTO Guide for design of pavement structures. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, 444 N. Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 249 Washington, D.C. 20001, 1993.

[16] Uljarević M, and Šupić S. Comparative analysis of flexible and rigid pavement design. 4th International Conference Contemporary achievements in civil engineering, Subotica, Serbia, 2016; 591-601

[17] Ruttmar I, Grajewska A and Pełczyńska K. Perpetual pavement design and construction using anti-fatigue base layer on expressway S8 in Poland. E&E Congress 6th Eurasphalt & Eurobitume Congress, Prague, Czech Republic, 2016.

[18] Kankhar NT, Rathod NY, Tawar B, Warankar A, Karangale S and Nilakh D. Design of flexible pavement by various methods: Case study. International Journal of Research in Advent Technology (IJRAT) (E-ISSN: 2321-9637) Special Issue National Conference "Convergence", 06th-07th April 2016; 52-54.

[19] Jain S, Joshi YP and Goliya SS. Design of rigid and flexible pavements by various methods & their cost analysis of each method. International Journal of Engineering Research and Applications (IJERA), 2013; 3(5), 119-123.