CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The status of the department's highway condition rating efforts is reviewed. Great progress has been made in the past 3 years in improving the consistency, accuracy, and quality of the highway condition data collected by New York and in providing it to a variety of clients in rapid and relevant fashion. Virtually all aspects of the highway condition assessment and data processing effort have been reviewed and streamlined. The big effort, in terms of methodology development, is over, and the procedure is now moving into an implementation and "shake-out" phase in which refinements to the methodology are becoming more detailed and fewer changes are occurring from year to year. Overall, the department is pleased with the methodology, and is placing greater reliance on the results of the survey and on the analyses that are conducted from it.

No highway condition assessment procedure should be static. Issues, highway conditions, and concerns change. The procedure being developed by the department is flexible and is capable of undergoing change to meet evolving needs, while at the same time retaining consistency in data so that trends may be computed. A fully integrated and static data base is probably beyond the need of the department, but it can be reasonably well approximated by the application of consistent measurement principles and a tightened rating and data provision process. This is the goal that the department is working toward, and it is the goal to which the department believes it has made considerable progress.
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Use of Pocket Computers for Rehabilitation of Rural Roads in Dominica

LOUIS BERGER and JACOB GREENSTEIN

ABSTRACT

A 50-km rural road that connects Roseau-Pont Casse and Hatton Garden in Dominica was evaluated by means of the Benkelman beam in February 1983. The rebound deflection basin obtained under a dual-wheel axle load was interpreted by means of a pocket computer with 8-K RAM. The subgrade modulus, subgrade California bearing ratio, base modulus, asphalt modulus, and the required asphalt concrete overlay were calculated for each point while performing the nondestructive testing (NDT) survey. Although measurement of deflection basins with the Benkelman beam is not common practice, satisfactory results were obtained. A team composed of the truck driver and his assistant, an experienced engineer and his assistant, and two traffic control men was able to measure 80 to 100 deflection basins, or about 10 km of road, in a typical working day. By using the pocket computer, all calculations, including the overlay thickness of each tested point, can be completed in about 1 min. Therefore, the road rehabilitation design can be completed while conducting the NDT. In Dominica both the NDT and the strengthening design of the 50-km road were done simultaneously and completed in 1 week. The detailed methodology and computer programs are presented in this paper. The program is based on the theory of linear elastic systems and written in BASIC language. It can be easily adjusted and implemented with other nondestructive pavement evaluation devices such as the road rater or the falling weight deflectometer.

In the evaluation process of pavement systems by means of nondestructive testing (NDT), the response of the pavement is observed and material properties can be back-calculated. Among the different responses of the pavement to load, the only practical measurements are elastic deflections. Two methods
for determining the elastic deflections are generally used. According to the first method (1-3), in each location only the center or the standard maximum deflection is determined. The magnitude of this deflection is interpreted to predict pavement performance.

In the second procedure, which is a rational one, the deflection basin (i.e., the center deflection) and at least one offset deflection are determined (4-7). The deflection basin is used to back-calculate the elastic modulus of the subgrade and pavement system. These strength parameters and the projected traffic loading are used to design pavement strengthening.

This rational procedure was implemented in Dominica by means of a pocket computer (Sharp PC-1500) to upgrade 50 km of low-volume road between Roseau-Pont Casse and Hatton Garden (see Figure 1). The computer program (Figure 2) is written in the BASIC language and can be implemented on any personal or pocket computer that has 8-K RAM. Because the program is based on the theory of the linear elastic system, it can be easily adjusted and used with other nondestructive pavement evaluation devices such as the road rater (pavement profiler) or the falling weight deflectometer.

BENKELMAN BEAM DEFLECTION PROCEDURE

The Benkelman beam is a widely used device to measure surface deflections in all types of pavement structures. The beam operates on the lever principle, as shown schematically in Figure 3. Every vertical movement of the tip of the beam generates a rotation of the beam through the pivot. A proportion of the tip movement is read with the dial gauge installed at the far end of the beam. The ratio of the rotating lengths of the beam is generally 1:4 (including the beam used in Dominica); thus the dial gauge (Figure 1d) at the end of the beam moves one-fourth of the vertical movement at the tip of the beam. Often the dial gauge is already calibrated to read the full tip movement (i.e., no multiplication by four is required).

The truck used in Dominica had a single dual-wheel rear axle weighing 7174 kg and a tire pressure of 4.9 kg/cm². This load was chosen instead of the commonly used 8200-kg axle load because Dominica truck loads seldom reach the 8200-kg level. The dual-wheel load (PP) (in kg) is specified in line 5050 in the program, and any value of PP can be used.

The so-called "rebound method" was used in the Benkelman beam measurements. The truck moved away from the testing point at creep speed, and the rebound deflections were measured. This method was used to measure not only the maximum deflection under the rear axle (D~), but also to measure two additional deflections—D40 and D80—at 40 and 80 cm away from the maximum, respectively. This nonroutine Benkelman beam deflection procedure was used to characterize the whole deflection basin that is needed in the structural evaluation methodology explained in the following sections.

The choice of 40 and 80 cm was not arbitrary. The goal was to choose one distance where the deflection would be about 50 percent of the maximum deflection. In Dominica this distance was between 30 and 40 cm.
FIGURE 2 Computer program printouts.

FIGURE 3 Schematic of Benkelman beam deflection procedure.
and 40 was chosen for routine measurements. With little practice it is possible to measure the offset deflections without having to stop the moving truck. A team composed of the truck driver and his assistant, an experienced engineer and his assistant, and two traffic control men was able to measure 80 to 100 deflection basins, or about 10 km of road, in a typical working day. It is desirable that a small pickup truck is used to carry the men, the beam, and miscellaneous equipment.

DETERMINATION OF THE SUBGRADE MODULUS

In this section the subgrade modulus ($E_\text{s}$) and the California bearing ratio (CBR) are determined [see lines 1000 to 1023 of the program (Figure 2)]. The modulus of the subgrade $E_\text{s}$ is determined by using the Hogg model (4-6) with a finite subgrade at a depth of $H = 10 \times L_\text{f}$ (see Figure 4) or at a depth of infinity.

$$r_{50} = \text{RS} = (\frac{1}{A})^{1/C} - B$$

Thus Equations 2 and 3 give

$$R5 = R \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{A} \right)^{1/C} - B \right\}$$

The values for $A$, $B$, and $C$, as obtained for the Hogg model, are given in Table 1. For example, for $\mu = 0.4$, $H/L_\text{f} = 0$, $D_\text{f} = 0.085 \text{ cm}$, $DR = 0.034 \text{ cm}$, and $DR/D_\text{f} = 0.034/0.085 = 0.40$, use Equation 4 to find $R5 = 32.4 \text{ cm}$.

Step 2: Determination of Characteristic length $l(L_\text{f})$

Figure 6 shows the theoretical relationships between $l/r_{50}$ and $a/l$ for different values of $H/L_\text{f}$ and $\mu$. Table 1

### Table 1. Curve-Fitting Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$H/L_\text{f}$</th>
<th>$DR/D_\text{f}$</th>
<th>$\mu$</th>
<th>$A$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$C$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H/L_\text{f} = \infty$</td>
<td>Any value</td>
<td>Any value</td>
<td>1.3210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$&gt;0.7$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4065</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$&gt;0.7$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.6947 $\times 10^{-3}$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$&gt;0.426$</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3804</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$&lt;0.426$</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.3795 $\times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 shows a graphical verification of the computerized solution. Enter the figure with $DR/D_\text{f} = 0.40$ and $r = R = 40 \text{ cm}$. Draw a line parallel to the $L_\text{f}$ lines until meeting the $DR/D_\text{f} = 0.5$ horizontal line. Read $r_{50}$ on the horizontal axis ($R5 = r_{50} = 32.4 \text{ cm}$). The methodology for determining $r_{50}$ is described in lines 1040 and 1050 of the computer program (see Figure 2).

Step 2: Determination of Characteristic length $l(L_\text{f})$

Figure 6 shows the theoretical relationships between $l/r_{50}$ and $a/l$ for different values of $H/L_\text{f}$ and $\mu$. The relationship can be expressed as:

$$l = R \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{A} \right)^{1/C} - B \right\}$$

$$R5 = R \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{A} \right)^{1/C} - B \right\}$$

where $A$, $B$, and $C$ are curve-fitting coefficients (see Table 1) and $R$ is the distance offset of DR. For $DR/D_\text{f} = 0.5$, $R5 = 32.4 \text{ cm}$.
is the radius of the contact area between the tire and the surface. The equation shown in Figure 5 gives the same relationships in analytical form. Each different line in Figure 6 (1, 2, or 3) is described in the equation by different values of the parameters \(Y_0\) and \(m\) for different values of \(\mu\) and subgrade depth \(H/L\). Isolated values are:

- \(Y_0 = 0.620\)
- \(m = 0.183\)

The equation is used in the personal computer program to determine \(l(L\)). As an example, use the data that were used to determine \(r_50\): \(H/L = 10\), \(\mu = 0.4\), \(a(A) = 11.5\) cm, \(\delta_0 = 0.085\) cm, \(r_50 = 32.4\) cm, and \(PP = 3587\) kg. Thus by using Code 2 in Figure 6, \(l(L)\) is

\[
l = \left(0.602 \times 32.4 + [(0.602 \times 32.4)^2 - 4 \times 0.192 \times 11.5 \times 32.4]^{1/2}\right)/2.
\]

\(l = 14.6\) cm.

The methodology for determining \(l(L)\) is described in lines 1070 and 1080 of the computer program.

**Step 3: Determination of Ratio \(S_0/S\)**

To develop numerical solutions of the subgrade modulus that are programmable in pocket computers, it is necessary to use this intermediate step. This step finds the theoretical relationship between point load \((S_0)\) and area load \((S)\) stiffnesses for a given ratio \(a/l\). This relationship is shown in Figure 7. Stiffness is defined as the ratio of the load to the deflection. The different lines (1, 2, and 3) in Figure 6 have an analytical expression that is also shown in Figure 7. A different value of the parameter \(m\) is used for different values of \(H/L\) and \(\mu\). In the numerical example,

- \(A/L = a/l = 11.5/14.6 = 0.79\);

thus

\[
S_0/S = 1.0 - 0.48(0.79 - 1.0) = 0.67.
\]

The ratio \(S_0/S\) is determined in the computer program between lines 1100 and 1110.

**Step 4: Calculation of \(E_0\)**

\(E_0\) is finally found by using the following equation (see lines 1120 to 1200 of the program):

\[
E_0 = \left\{\left[(1 + \mu)(3 - 4\mu)/2(1 - \mu)\right] \times (PP/lL\delta_0)^2 \times (S_0/S)\right\} \times \left[0.1689 \times 3587/(14.6 \times 0.085)\right] \times 0.67 = 534\ kg/cm^2.
\]

**Determination of Subgrade CBR**

The subgrade modulus can be used to calculate the CBR \(C_{BR}\):

\[
C_{BR} = E_0/CE\ (in\ kg/cm^2)/CE\ (6)
\]

(see lines 1202 and 1203), where \(CE\) is an empirical factor that varies between 100 and 160 for in situ CBR between 2 and 30 (4). \(CE = 130\) (see data lines 5200 to 5210) was used and found to be appropriate for the subgrade of the Roseau to Hatton Garden road in Dominica.
DETERMINATION OF PAVEMENT MODULUS ($E^*$)

The combined modulus $E^*$ of the asphalt concrete and the base layers with a combined thickness of $H_C = H_1 + H_2$ (see Figure 8) is determined by using the Ode- mark-Ullidtz equations (10) for equivalent thickness ($H_C$). The equivalent thickness is determined according to the following equation:

$$HE = 0.9 HC (E^*/E(1))^1/3$$

(7)

The relationship between the center deflection $D_0$ (between the dual wheels), the elastic modulus of the subgrade ($SB$), and the pavement ($E^*$) is given in the following equation:

$$D_0 = [(1 + \mu PP/2E) \left\{ \left(\frac{Z(1)}{R(1)}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{Z(2)}{R(2)}\right)^2 \right\} \frac{1}{R(1)} + \left(\frac{Z(3)}{R(3)}\right)^2 \frac{1}{R(3)} - \frac{1}{R(3)} \left(\frac{Z(1)}{R(1)}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{R(1)} \left(\frac{Z(2)}{R(2)}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{R(2)} \left(\frac{Z(3)}{R(3)}\right)^2]$$

(8)

where

$$r = 1.5A = 1.5a$$

$$Z(1) = HC + 0.6 (A^2)/HC$$

$$R(1) = \left\{ \left(\frac{Z(1)}{R(1)}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{1.5A^2}{HC}\right)^2 \right\}^{1/2}$$

$$Z(2) = HE + 0.6 (A^2)/HE$$

$$HE = 0.9 HC (E^*/E(1))^1/3$$

(9a)

$$R(2) = \left\{ \left(\frac{Z(2)}{R(2)}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{1.5A^2}{HE + NN}\right)^2 \right\}^{1/2}$$

$$Z(3) = (HE + NN) + 0.6(A^2)/(HE + NN)$$

$$R(3) = \left\{ \left(\frac{Z(3)}{R(3)}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{1.5A^2}{HE + NN}\right)^2 \right\}^{1/2}$$

$$N = 10 \text{ for rigid bottom at finite depth,}$$

$$N = 100 \text{ for infinite subgrade, and}$$

$$PP = VA \text{ p = tire pressure}.$$}

Equations 7, 8, and 9-9g are used iteratively to determine the pavement modulus $E^*$ for any given combination of subgrade modulus (SB), pavement thickness (HC), load (PP), tire pressure (p), and center deflection (D0). This calculation is done automatically by the computer (see lines 1210 to 1610 in Figure 2).

DETERMINATION OF ASPHALT MODULUS $E_I$

Guidelines to determine the asphalt modulus are given, among other sources, in several reports ([12-16]). The Shell methodology ([15,16]) was found to be practical; it is implemented here for low-cost roads. According to this methodology, the stiffness of the bitumen (asphalt cement) can be calculated according to the following equation quoted from Ullidtz and Peattie ([11]):

$$SB = 1.157 \times 10^{-8} \times T_s^{0.368} \times e^{-91} \times (TRB - TC)^3$$

(10)

where

$$SB = \text{stiffness of bitumen (kg/cm²)}; \text{ the term stiffness is used to denote the modulus or instantaneous relationship between the stress and the strain, which corresponds to particular values of temperature and of loading;}$$

$$T_s = \text{time of loading (sec);}$$

$$TRB = \text{softening point, ring and ball (ASTM) of bitumen (°C);}$$

$$TC = \text{temperature of the bitumen (°C);}$$

$$PI = \text{penetration index of the bitumen, i.e.,}$$

$$PI = \left[20 (TRB) + 500 \text{ LOG (PEN)} - 1,951.55\right]$$

$$\left[\left(\text{TRB} - 50 \text{ LOG (PEN)} + 120.15\right)\right]$$

(11)

where PEN is the bituminous penetration at 25°C.

For the analysis of pavements, the properties of the bitumen in the road must be used. It may be convenient to recover bitumen from the road and measure its penetration directly. The following approximate relationship ([11]) has been found to apply to many road bitumens:

$$PEN = 0.65 \times \text{original PEN}$$

(12)

It may also be convenient to measure TRB directly. Measurements of a wide range of road bitumens led to the development of the following empirical relationship ([11]):

$$TRB (°C) = 99.13 - 26.35 \times \text{LOG (PEN)}$$

(13)

Equation 10 gives reasonable results when the loading time is between 0.01 and 0.1 sec, the PI is between -1 and +1, and the TRB - TC is between 20° and 60°C. The detailed procedure to calculate PI and SB is given in the program (see lines 2000 to 2040). For example, if $TS = 0.01$ and $TC = 27°C$ (data line 5050), and if field penetration $PEN = 50$ and $TRB = 55°C$ (data line 5090), then using Equation 11 (lines 2020 and 2030 in the program) gives $PI = 2.3 \times 10^{-2} = 0$, and using Equation 10 (line 2040) gives $SB = 110$ kg/cm².

The elastic modulus ($E_I$) of the asphalt concrete (AC) mix is a function of the stiffness of the bitumen, the amount of mineral aggregate, and the air void percentage. $E_I$ can be calculated according to the following equations ([11]):

$$E_I = SB \times \left\{1 + (2.5/N) \times \left[CV/(I - CV)\right]\right\}^N$$

(14a)

$$N = 0.83 \text{ LOG (4 \times 10^5/SB)}$$

SB in kg/cm²

$$CV = \left\{ VG/(l - VA) \times (0.97 + VA) \right\} \text{ when VA} < 0.03$$

$$\text{ and } CV = \left\{ VG/(l - VA) \right\} \text{ when VA} > 0.03$$

(14b)

$$VG = \left\{ \left(1 - MB) / GB \right) \times (l - VA) \right\} \left\{ MB / GB \right\} + \left\{ l - MB)/GB \right\}$$

(14c)

where

$$GS = \text{specific gravity of the mineral aggregate (see lines 5100 and 5110, GS = 2.65),}$$

$$VA = \text{percentage of air voids (see lines 5100, 5110, VA = 0.035), and}$$

$$MB = \text{specific gravity and percentage of the bitumen, respectively (see lines 5120 and 5130, GB = 1.04 and MB = 0.06).}$$

For the specific case presented in Figure 2 (computer program), $SB = 110.9$, $VG = 2.65$, $VA = 0.035$, $E_I = 22 289$ kg/cm².

The following concluding remarks summarize the determination of $E_I$ (AC elastic modulus).

1. $E_I$ is determined mainly from the engineering properties of the bitumen, the aggregate, and the AC mix.

2. $E_I$ is used to determine $E_2$ (granular material) based on the NDT methodology, as described in the following section. In the event that $E_I$ is overestimated or underestimated, this will be reflected in the value of $E_2$ in such a way that the total flexural stiffness ($E_I^2$) remains constant as back-calculated from the NDT data.

3. The methodology presented herein is applica-
DETERMINATION OF BASE MODULUS E2

The modulus of the base layer is determined according to Nijboer's equation (Equation 15), which is based on the theory of strength of materials [16];

\[
\frac{E^*}{E_1} = \frac{2}{H/H_1} + \frac{4}{H/H_1^2} (E_1/E_2) + \frac{6}{H/H_1^2} (E_1/E_2)^2 + \frac{8}{H/H_1^2} (E_1/E_2)^3 + \frac{10}{H/H_1^2} (E_1/E_2)^4 + \frac{12}{H/H_1^2} (E_1/E_2)^5
\]

Equation 15 is based on the assumption that the flexural rigidity \( EI \) of the two layers \( H_1 \) and \( H_2 \) is equal to the \( EI \) of the composite pavement \( E^* \) and \( HC \), or

\[
EI = (E_1 \cdot H_1 + E_2 \cdot H_2) = E_1 (E^* \cdot HC)
\]

It is also assumed that there is full friction between the asphalt and the base layers. The input data are

- \( H_1 \) = asphalt layer thickness,
- \( E_1 \) = asphalt modulus,
- \( H_2 \) = base thickness,
- \( E_2^* \) = composite pavement modulus of the asphalt plus base,
- \( HC \) = total pavement thickness of asphalt and base materials.

The only unknown is the elastic modulus of the granular material \( E_2 \), which is determined iteratively by using the personal computer (see lines 2500 to 2610 in the computer program).

DETERMINATION OF OVERLAY THICKNESS DH'

The required overlay thickness \( DH' \) is determined by using the following procedure:

\[
DH' = H - HEQ
\]

where \( DH' \) is the required additional thickness of gravel material (subbase or base), and \( H \) is the required total pavement thickness, subbase (CBR = 30) + base (CBR = 80) + thin layer of asphalt (usually less than 2 in.). \( H \) can be determined by using any pavement design methodology for low-volume roads (17-21) that presents the relationship between the subgrade CBR, the projected traffic loading, and \( H \).

Figure 9 (21) shows the thickness design curves used for the rehabilitation program of the Roseau-Hatton Garden road in Dominica; the curves are based on the Transport and Road Research Laboratory (TRRL) method (21). As an example, the projected traffic loading of the road section from Pont Casse to Hatton Garden is 16,000 equivalent axle loads (EALs). In this case, the required thickness for CBR = 6 is \( H = 10.5 \) in. The mathematical relationship between \( H \) and CBR for the Roseau-Hatton Garden road [TRRL method (21)] is given in the following equation (see also Figure 9):

\[
H = (MJ) + (CBR)^{-0.59}
\]

where \( H \) is the required thickness (in.) and \( MJ \) is a constant for a given traffic loading:

Road Section (in Dominica) MJ1 MJ2
Roseau-Hillsborough Bridge 16,000 30.0
Hillsborough Bridge-Pont Casse 36,000 32.0
Pont Casse-Hatton Garden 45,000 33.0

The existing pavement is a nonuniform granular waterbound macadam covered by a thin asphalt layer. The thickness of the granular material varies between 1 and 2 in., and the asphalt thickness is less than 1 in. The elastic modulus of the pavement \( E^* \) varies mainly between 0.5 to 2 times the \( E_2 \) of the subgrade. The lower values \( (E^* = 0.5 \) to 2\( E_2) \) generally correspond to failed-to-poor sections. For cases such as Dominica, where there is a large variability between the back-calculated \( E^*/E_2 \) ratios, it is necessary to bring the different sections to the same comparative basis. This is done by introducing the flexural stiffness concept. Flexural stiffness is a function of the thickness of the pavement and its modulus of elasticity and Poisson's ratio. Poisson's ratio is assumed to be constant for low-cost roads and to vary between 0.35 and 0.45. If the existing pavement with elastic modulus \( E^* \) and thickness \( HC \) is equivalent to a new pavement with elastic modulus \( E_2^* \) and thickness \( HEQ \), the following relationship between the flexural strength of the existing and the new pavement holds:

\[
(E_2^*) (HC)^3 = (E_2) (HEQ)^3
\]

\( HEQ \) in Equations 16 and 18 is the equivalent thickness of the new pavement.

The pavement structure of low-cost roads is constructed mainly from granular material such as subbase or base. The thickness of the AC is usually less than 2 in. In these cases the elastic modulus of the pavement structure \( E_p \) is derived from the elastic modulus of the granular material and must lie between 2 and 4 times \( E_2 \) (11). In Dominica, the relationship of \( E_p = 3E_2 \) was used to determine \( HEQ \) and \( DH' \), as defined in Equations 16 and 18. In simpler terms, if \( E_2^* \) is found equal to 3 times \( E_2 \), then \( HEQ \) is equal to \( HC \). Finally, if \( E_2^* \) is greater than 3 times \( E_2 \), then \( HEQ \) is greater than \( HC \). The value of \( HEQ \) gives credit to the flexural strength of the existing pavement.

\( DH' \) determined according to Equations 16-18 is in inches of granular material. When asphalt is used to overlay the pavement, \( DH' \) should be divided by an equivalency factor. This factor varies mainly between 1.5 and 4.0. According to the FAA (22), 1 in. of AC is equivalent to 1.5 in. of high quality base. According to the Asphalt Institute (3) and the Transportation Research Board (21), 1 in. of asphalt might be equivalent to 2 to 3 in. of granular mate-
rial. The AASHTO (23) practice is that 1 in. of asphalt is equivalent to 3.2 in. of unslabbed base course or 4 in. of subbase. In the case of Dominica, it was found that the AC produced from the local aggregates has high strength and durability values. The Marshall stability is more than 2,000 lb, flow is 10 to 15, and CBR is greater than 85 percent. Therefore, for this project in Dominica, where a high quality AC is designed, 1 in. of asphalt is equivalent to 3.5 in. of granular material, or the DH in thickness of AC is as follows:

\[ DH = \frac{(H - HEQ)/3.5 = \left[(MJ) \times (CRB)^{0.59} - HEQ\right]}{3.5} \tag{19} \]

The methodology for determining DH is described between lines 2900 and 3300 of the computer program.

**SUMMARY**

The computerized rational methodology of road rehabilitation presented in this paper was implemented in upgrading 50 km of a low-volume road in Dominica. A pocket computer (Sharp PC-1500) with 8-K RAM was used in the field to determine the minimum required AC overlay to carry 16,000 to 45,000 EALs. The following engineering parameters were calculated (see calculation example in Figure 2):

1. RS0 (r50), the offset distance R at which the deflection ratio DR/DH = 0.5 (see Figure 4);
2. L0(4), the characteristic length (Hogg model);
3. E0, the subgrade elastic modulus;
4. CBR, the subgrade CBR;
5. E', the combined modulus of the asphalt and the base layers;
6. E1 and E2, the modulus of the asphalt and the base, respectively;
7. HEQ, the equivalent thickness of a new pavement with E' = 3E0; and
8. DH, the required AC overlay thickness.

The calculations of the AC overlay are done with a finite subgrade at a depth of h = 10x (see Figure 4) or at infinity, h = \infty. The finite subgrade case is more often implemented and always results in lower values of the subgrade modulus and higher values of the pavement modulus in comparison with the infinite subgrade model. The AC overlay thickness of DH is not sensitive to the subgrade depth. The use of the computer enables all the calculations, including the overlay thickness, to be completed in about 1 min. Therefore the rehabilitation or the overlay design can be completed while conducting the NDT. In Dominica, the NDT and the strengthening design of 50 km of rural roads were carried out simultaneously and completed in 1 week.

**REFERENCES**


Publication of this paper sponsored by Committee on Low Volume Roads.