



<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

ResearchSpace@Auckland

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the Library Thesis Consent Form.

**The Development of Pavement Deterioration Models on the
State Highway Network of New Zealand**

Theunis F.P. Henning

Supervised by

Associate Professor Roger C.M. Dunn

and

Dr. Seósamh Costello

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in Engineering, The University of Auckland, 2008

Abstract

This thesis presents the results of developing road pavement deterioration models for the State Highway network in New Zealand pavement deterioration models are an integral part of pavement management systems, which are used to forecast long-term maintenance needs and funding requirements on a road network.

As part of this research, a Long-term Pavement Performance (LTPP) programme has been established on 63 sections of the State Highways. These sections are representative of typical road sections and climatic conditions on New Zealand roads. Data collection on these sections is undertaken on an annual basis and consists of high accuracy manual measurements. These measurements include road roughness, rutting, visual defect identification and strength testing with a Falling Weight Deflectometer.

Based on the LTPP data, new model formats for New Zealand conditions were developed including a crack initiation model and a three-stage rut progression model. The rut progression model consists of three stages, initial densification, stable rut growth and a probabilistic model to predict accelerated rut progression. The continuous probabilistic model developed predicts the initiation of pavement failure events such as crack initiation and accelerated rutting. It has been found that this model type has a strong agreement with actual pavement behaviour as it recognises a distribution of failure on roads rather than failure occurring at an particular point in time, namely, a year.

The modelling of rut progression in the three stages including, initial densification, stable rut progression and accelerated rutting has resulted in a significant increased understanding of this defect, especially for thin flexible chip seal pavements. It has been established that the in-service performance of these pavements is relatively predictable. However, incorporating both the in-service performance and the failure of pavements into one model was unrealistic. Therefore, by having the different stages of rutting, resulted into a more accurate forecasting of this defect.

Although this research has covered the two priority pavement models including cracking and rutting prediction, it has established the model framework for other pavement models to be developed. As more data become available, further work can be undertaken to

refine the models and to extend the research into the performance of alternative construction materials.

Dedication

For my wife:

“Dankie Tania, sonder jou was dit nie moontlik nie.”

Proverbs 31:29

Acknowledgements

The following people and organisations are acknowledged for their contributions and input to the research:

PhD Supervisors

Associate Professor Roger C.M. Dunn

Dr. Seósamh Costello

Research Assistance

Derek Roux

Imedla Muljadi

Dr. Tim Watson

PhD Steering Committee

Prof. Bruce Melville

Dr. Christopher Bennett

Chris Parkman

Gordon Hart

Dr William Paterson

Dr. Gustav Rohde

Funding Organisations

New Zealand Transport Agency (formally Transit and Land Transport New Zealand)

Foundations for Research Science and Technology

MWH New Zealand Ltd.

Glossary of Terms

AAADT	Annual average daily traffic
Distress modes	The method or process of failure of pavements, e.g. Cracking of the cemented base course normally occurs due to the tensile stresses at the bottom of the layer.
Calibration Coefficients	Constants applied to a numeric equation (model) to adjust the development of the model in order to make provision for external factors such as climatic or environmental conditions
ESA	Equivalent Standard Axles – the number of equivalent 80 kN axles
Falling Weight Deflectometer (FWD)	A stiffness test performed on pavement as an indicator of strength. A standard load is dropped from a standard height and resulting deflection is measured at given offsets.
Flexible Pavements	Pavements constructed with granular or asphalt materials.
HDM-III	World Bank Highway Design and Maintenance Standards Models
HDM-4	World Bank Development and Management Model
High-speed Data (HSD)	Various condition measurement instruments installed on a vehicle (e.g. roughness, rutting, texture and friction). The recorded measurements are automatically stored in electronic format based on a referencing system (e.g. linear or global positioning)
IRI	International Roughness Index (in mm/km)
Load associated cracking	Appears within the wheel tracks and is an indication of the induced traffic loading is starting to cause damage to the pavement
LTPP Sections	Long-Term Pavement Performance monitoring sections – designed to monitor pavement behaviour as a function of (amongst others) traffic, climate and maintenance.
Model	A numeric equation that quantifies the change of an outcome as a function of different input parameters
Pavement Deterioration	The decay of a pavement or surface as a result of traffic or environmental induced failure modes.
Pavement Management Systems (PMS)	A computer integrated system that incorporates network condition data with Long-Term maintenance planning processes. Most modern systems also include some form of pavement prediction capabilities
Repeatability	An indication of a measuring system being able to measure a consistent value when the measurements are repeated in the same location

Reproducibility	An indication that a measurement in one location would be statistically the same as a measurement undertaken in the same location after some time has past and the equipment had re-established in the same location
Sterilised Sites	A site that will received minimum maintenance only to ensure safety

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1	The Context of Pavement Deterioration Models.....	1-1
1.2	The Historical Development of Pavement Modelling in New Zealand	1-2
1.3	Problem Statement	1-3
1.4	Objectives of the Research	1-5
1.5	Scope and Structure of the Research Report	1-6
2	LITERATURE REVIEW	2-1
2.1	Literature Review - Long-Term Performance Studies	2-1
2.2	World Bank HDM-III LTPP Studies in Kenya and Brazil.....	2-1
2.3	North Americas – SHRP Study	2-7
2.4	Australia – Development of New Pavement Models	2-12
2.5	Australia – Calibration of HDM-4 Pavement Models.....	2-15
2.6	South African (Gautrans) HDM-III and HDM-4 Calibration Studies.....	2-20
2.7	Guidance for the Research	2-24
3	EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN - ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STATE HIGHWAY CALIBRATION SECTIONS	3-1
3.1	Introduction	3-1
3.2	Climatic Stratification	3-2
3.3	Traffic/Loading	3-6
3.4	Pavement Strength/Pavement Types	3-7
3.5	Condition / Age	3-8
3.6	Experimental Design for this research	3-10
3.7	Site Identification and Selection Criteria	3-11
3.8	Statistical Summary of LTPP Sections Established	3-12

4	LTPP DATA COLLECTION.....	4-1
4.1	Introduction	4-1
4.2	Theoretical Definitions and Considerations Related to the Data Collection	4-2
4.3	Roughness Measurements	4-8
4.4	Rutting Measurements.....	4-15
4.5	Visual Surveys.....	4-21
4.6	Survey Specifications	4-24
4.7	Discussion on Appropriateness of Data Collection Regime	4-27
5	PREDICTING CRACK INITIATION.....	5-1
5.1	Introduction	5-1
5.2	Calibration of the HDM-4 Model.....	5-4
5.3	Adjustment of HDM-4 Default Model Coefficients	5-10
5.4	Development of an Alternative Crack Initiation Model.....	5-18
5.5	Discussion	5-37
5.6	Crack Initiation Summary	5-40
6	PREDICTING RUT PROGRESSION.....	6-1
6.1	Introduction	6-1
6.2	Analysis Objectives and Data Use	6-3
6.3	HDM Rut Models.....	6-8
6.4	Predicting Initial Densification	6-9
6.5	Rut Progression	6-20
6.6	Accelerated Rutting.....	6-29
6.7	Rut Progression Summary	6-35
7	THIS RESEARCH IN CONTEXT	7-1
7.1	Purpose of this Chapter	7-1

7.2	LTPP Experimental Design.....	7-1
7.3	Data Collection.....	7-4
7.4	New Pavement Prediction Models	7-6
7.5	Past and Future Use of the LTPP Data from a National Perspective	7-12
8	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	8-1
8.1	Conclusions	8-1
8.2	Recommendations – Models Developed	8-3
8.3	Further Work.....	8-5
8.4	Lessons Learnt from this Research	8-8
9	REFERENCE LIST	9-1

List of Figures

Figure 1.1: ‘Building Blocks’ of a Pavement Management System.....	1-1
Figure 1.2: Structure of this Research Report.....	1-6
Figure 2.1: Components of HDM-III	2-2
Figure 2.2: Factorial Matrix for Paved Roads in the Brazil Study	2-3
Figure 2.3 Stationary Rut Depth Gauge	2-5
Figure 2.4: Types of Cracks and Measurement Method Used in Brazil.....	2-6
Figure 2.5: LTPP Strategic Plan Objectives and Analysis Outcomes	2-8
Figure 2.6: Comparison of Roughness Predictions for Various Models	2-15
Figure 2.7: Example of Maintenance Treatments Applied on ARRB’s LTPPM Study Sections.....	2-18
Figure 3.1: Climatic Regions of NZ According to Subgrade Strength/ Moisture Ratio (Cenek, 2001).....	3-5
Figure 3.2: Illustration of Pavement Deterioration Stages.....	3-9
Figure 3.3: Distribution of Pavement Strength for LTPP Sections.....	3-14
Figure 3.4: Plotting the Pavement Strength as a Function of Heavy Vehicles	3-16
Figure 3.5: Distribution of LTPP Section Pavement and Surface Age (years).....	3-17
Figure 3.6: Distribution of Mean Rut Depth for LTPP Sections (Year 1 Survey).....	3-18
Figure 3.7: Distribution of Annual Change in Rutting (Henning, et al., 2004a)	3-18
Figure 4.1: Information Quality Levels in Road Management (Bennett and Paterson, 2000).....	4-4
Figure 4.2: Bias and Precision (Bennett and Paterson, 2000).....	4-7
Figure 4.3: Example of Range of Profiler Measurements from Comparative Study (Karamihas, 2004).....	4-8
Figure 4.4: Quarter-car Computer Simulation (Sayers & Karamihas, 1998)	4-9
Figure 4.5: Road Profile (Sayers & Karamihas, 1998).....	4-11
Figure 4.6: Comparison of Measurement Footprint from Different Instruments	4-14
Figure 4.7 Comparing Incremental Roughness Change Measured for Different Equipment Types (Henning and Furlong, 2005).....	4-14
Figure 4.8: Effects of Sampling from Three Different Instruments (Mallela and Wang, 2006).....	4-18
Figure 4.9: Transverse Profile Beam	4-19
Figure 4.10: Transverse Profile Analysis Methods (Bennett et al, 2006).....	4-20
Figure 4.11: Comparing Rut Change for the Different Survey Periods.....	4-21
Figure 4.12: Typical Visual Rating Form (Henning, 2001).....	4-23
Figure 4.13 Comparing HSD Roughness and Calibration Walking Profilometer Measurements (Henning et al, 2004).....	4-27
Figure 4.14: Comparing HSD Roughness Measurements with Manual LTPP Data (Henning et al, 2004).....	4-28
Figure 4.15 Comparing HSD Rutting and Calibration Transverse Profilometer Measurements (Henning et al, 2004).....	4-29

Figure 5.1: Long-Term Behaviour of Lightly Cemented material (Theyse. et al, 1996).....	5-2
Figure 5.2: Mechanisms of Cracking Due to Traffic Loading.....	5-3
Figure 5.3: Comparing Actual Cracking with Predicted Cracking (Transit, 2004).....	5-10
Figure 5.4: Distribution of Crack Initiation for the Two Regions	5-15
Figure 5.5: Resulting Model Coefficients for Existing HDM Model Format.....	5-16
Figure 5.6: Crack Initiation for Different Resurfacing Cycles and Status Prior to Resurfacing.....	5-20
Figure 5.7: Relationship between Thickness of New Surface and Total Surface Thickness with the Crack Initiation Period.....	5-21
Figure 5.8: Crack Initiation as a Function of Structural Number for Different Combinations of Surface Thickness and Cracked Status	5-23
Figure 5.9: Observed Crack Initiation Period as a Function of Traffic Loading and Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)	5-24
Figure 5.10: Crack Initiation as a Function of Traffic Loading and SNP.....	5-25
Figure 5.11: Inter-Relationships of Crack Initiation Variables.....	5-26
Figure 5.12: Inter-relationship between Total Surface Thickness and Log Traffic (AADT)	5-29
Figure 5.13: Comparing Predicted Versus Actual Crack Initiation for New Model Format	5-30
Figure 5.14: Output from the Logit Model - Probability of Cracking for a Given Year	5-35
Figure 5.15: Probability of Crack Initiation Times for Different Traffic Levels.....	5-36
Figure 6.1: Plot of Deflection and Rut Depth Indicating the Cause of Pavement Failure (Jordaan, 1984).....	6-2
Figure 6.2: Deterioration Phases for Sealed Granular Pavements (based on Martin, 2003).....	6-4
Figure 6.3: Elevation view of the CAPTIF testing equipment (Alabaster and Fussell, 2006).....	6-6
Figure 6.4: Diagram of the key components of the CAPTIF SLAVE unit (Alabaster and Fussell, 2006)	6-6
Figure 6.5: Comparing Predicted versus Actual Initial Rut Depths on LTPP Section – CAL-19 (decreasing chainage)	6-10
Figure 6.6: CUSUM Plot for the Rut Development on CAPTIF Data	6-11
Figure 6.7: Plots of Significant Factors Identified for Initial Rut Depth	6-13
Figure 6.8: Initial Rut Depth as a Function of CBR and Moisture Content.....	6-14
Figure 6.9: Residual Plots for the Linear Model Predicting Initial Rut Densification.....	6-16
Figure 6.10: Residual Plots for the Linear Model Predicting Initial Rut Densification (Logarithmic Transformed Data).....	6-17
Figure 6.11: Residual Plot for the Predicted Initial Rut Depth.....	6-18
Figure 6.12: Plot of the Initial Rut Model Developed on the CAPTIF Data (Plotted Against LTPP Observed Data).....	6-19
Figure 6.13: Comparing the Calibrated Rut Progression Model with Observed Data.....	6-22
Figure 6.14: Example of Exploratory Plots Investigating Trends with Stable Rut Progression Slope.....	6-23
Figure 6.15: Rut Progression Slope for Different Thicknesses and Structural Number (SNP)	6-24
Figure 6.16: Residual Plots for the Rut Progression Slope Linear Regression.....	6-25

Figure 6.17: Residual Plots for the Rut Progression Slope Logarithmic Regression.	6-27
Figure 6.18 Testing the Stable Rut Progression on a Complete Network Dataset (Hatcher, 2007).....	6-28
Figure 6.19: Stages in Road Deterioration (South African Department of Transport, 1997).....	6-29
Figure 6.20: Accelerated Rut Progression versus Structural Number and Moisture Content Based on the CAPTIF Data	6-31
Figure 6.21: Final Logistic Model for Predicting the Initiation Point of Accelerated Rut Progression (SNP = 3).....	6-34
Figure 6.22: Comparing Predicted and Actual Accelerated Rut Rate on Network Level (Accelerated Rut Rate >1.5 mm/year).....	6-35
Figure 7.1: Probability of cracking due to decreased funding levels (Transit, 2007).....	7-7
Figure 7.2: Comparing Predicted Failure versus Actual Behaviour	7-8
Figure 8.1: New Zealand Model Development Status and Priorities	8-7

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Pavement Monitoring Performed on SHRP-LTPP Sections	2-11
Table 2.2: Pavement Samples Used in the ARRB Model Study	2-14
Table 2.3: ARRB LTPPM Site Details.....	2-17
Table 2.4: Summary of ARRB-LTPP Section Characteristics (Martin, 2003).....	2-19
Table 2.5: Range of the LTPP Section Characteristics in the Gautrans Experiment (Rohde, et. al, 1998).....	2-22
Table 2.6: Relative Issues from International LTPP Studies.....	2-24
Table 3.1: Preliminary Regional Distribution of State Highway Calibration Sections	3-6
Table 3.2 Traffic Classification System Used for Experimental Design.....	3-7
Table 3.3: Strength Classification Used for the Transit LTPP Study (Henning et al, 2004)	3-8
Table 3.4: Resulting Design Matrix Summary	3-10
Table 3.5: Factors Considered During Site Establishment (Henning, et. al, 2004b)	3-12
Table 3.6: Descriptive Statistic for the State Highway LTPP Sections	3-13
Table 4.1: Classification of IQL Levels in Detail (Bennett and Paterson, 2000)	4-4
Table 4.2: Potential Roughness Measurement Errors and Mitigation Adopted.....	4-11
Table 4.3: Potential Rutting Measurement Errors and Mitigation Adopted	4-16
Table 4.4: Calibration Survey Contract Specification (Henning, 2001b & Henning, et. al, 2004b).....	4-25
Table 5.1: Summary of Calibration Result for Different Climatic Regions (Transit, 2004)	5-9
Table 5.2: Default Coefficients forHDM-4 Cracking Models (NDLI, 1995).....	5-12
Table 5.3: Variables Considered for Predicting Crack Initiation.....	5-19
Table 5.4: Results of Regression Analysis for Predicted Crack Initiation.....	5-28
Table 5.5: Results of Regression Analysis for Predicted Crack Initiation.....	5-33
Table 5.6: Summary of the Crack Initiation Calibration Results.....	5-37
Table 6.1: Pavement Sections Tested with the CAPTIF Experiment (based on Alabaster et al, 2006).....	6-7
Table 6.2: CAPTIF Data Variables Used in Model Development	6-12
Table 6.3: Linear Model Regression for Rutting Initial Densification.	6-15
Table 6.4: Linear Model Regression for Initial Rut Densification (based on CAPTIF Data).	6-18
Table 6.5: Calibration Result of the HDM-4 Rut Progression Model	6-21
Table 6.6: Regression Results Obtained for the Linear Model on the CAPTIF Rut Rate data.....	6-25
Table 6.7: Accelerated Rut Rate Regression Results Obtained for the Logistic Model Based on the CAPTIF Rut Rate data.	6-32
Table 7.1: A Summary of Some Changes Adopted with the Data Collection.....	7-5
Table 7.2: A Summary of the Research Model Limitations and Recommendations.....	7-11
Table 7.3: Practical Application of LTPP data.....	7-13
Table 8.1: Crack Initiation Model Developed During this Research.....	8-3

Table 8.2: Rut Progression Models Developed During this Research.....	8-4
Table 8.3: Addressing Limitations of Completed Research.....	8-5
Table 8.4: Further Research and Monitoring.....	8-6