



Cairo University

IMPACT OF DIFFERENT PERFORMANCE  
PREDICTION MODELS ON MECHANISTIC-EMPIRICAL  
FLEXIBLE PAVEMENT DESIGN

By

Momen Ragab Mousa Mohamed

A Thesis Submitted to the  
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University  
in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE  
in  
Civil Engineering-Public Works

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY  
GIZA, EGYPT

2015

IMPACT OF DIFFERENT PERFORMANCE  
PREDICTION MODELS ON MECHANISTIC-EMPIRICAL  
FLEXIBLE PAVEMENT DESIGN

By

Momen Ragab Mousa Mohamed

A Thesis Submitted to the  
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University  
in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE  
in  
Civil Engineering-Public Works

Under the Supervision of

**Prof. Dr. Ahmed Atef Gadallah**

Professor of Highway and Airports Engineering  
Public Works Department  
Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

**Prof. Dr. Mostafa Amin Abo-Hashema**

Professor of Highway Engineering  
Civil Engineering Department  
Faculty of Engineering, Fayoum University

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY  
GIZA, EGYPT

2015

IMPACT OF DIFFERENT PERFORMANCE  
PREDICTION MODELS ON MECHANISTIC-EMPIRICAL  
FLEXIBLE PAVEMENT DESIGN

By

Momen Ragab Mousa Mohamed

A Thesis Submitted to the  
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University  
in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE  
in  
Civil Engineering-Public Works

Approved by the

Examining Committee

**Prof. Dr. Ahmed Atef Gadallah (Thesis Main Advisor)**

Professor of Highway and Airports Engineering  
Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

**Prof. Dr. Mostafa Amin Abo-Hashema (Member)**

Professor of Highway Engineering  
Faculty of Engineering, Fayoum University

**Prof. Dr. Laila Salah Eldin Radwan (Internal Examiner)**

Professor of Highway and Airports Engineering  
Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

**Prof. Dr. Hassan Abd El-zaher Hasan Mahdi (External Examiner)**

Professor of Highway and Airports Engineering  
Faculty of Engineering, Ain- Shams University

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY  
GIZA, EGYPT

2015

Engineer's Name: Momen Ragab Mousa Mohamed  
Date of Birth: 17/9/1990  
Nationality: Egyptian  
E-mail: Momenragab2012@hotmail.com  
Phone: 01005052473  
Address: New Maadi, Cairo, Egypt  
Registration Date: 1/10/2012  
Awarding Date: ....../....../.....  
Degree: Master of Science  
Department: Civil Engineering-Public Works  
Supervisors:



**Prof. Dr. Ahmed Atef Gadallah**  
**Prof. Dr. Mostafa Amin Abo-Hashema**  
Faculty of Engineering, Fayoum University

Examiners:

**Prof. Dr. Ahmed Atef Gadallah (Thesis Main Advisor)**  
**Prof. Dr. Mostafa Amin Abo-Hashema (Member)**  
Faculty of Engineering, Fayoum University  
**Prof. Dr. Laila Salah Eldin Radwan (Internal Examiner)**  
**Prof. Dr. Hassan Abd El-zaher Hasan (External Examiner)**  
Faculty of Engineering, Ain- Shams University

**Title of Thesis:**

IMPACT OF DIFFERENT PERFORMANCE PREDICTION MODELS ON  
MECHANISTIC-EMPIRICAL FLEXIBLE PAVEMENT DESIGN

**Key Words:**

Pavement Prediction Models; Transfer Functions; M-E; Pavement Design; Environmental Effect; Fatigue Damage

**Summary:**

Over the last several years, there has been a shift of the flexible pavement design from the Empirical to Mechanistic-Empirical (M-E) procedure. Several prediction models have been developed for the M-E procedure to analyze fatigue and rutting failures. Each model has its own parameters, limitations, and magnitude of failure damage. This research presents an assessment of the performance of commonly used fatigue and rutting models under different conditions of traffic loading and climate for new and rehabilitated pavement structures. The study was performed to calculate AC thickness required for two existing pavement cross sections located on major road network in Egypt under wide range of ESALs and two different climatic conditions. Six fatigue models and four rutting models were considered in this study together with six fatigue/rutting failure criteria. A total of 880 computer runs were performed for different combinations of fatigue/rutting models, failure criteria, traffic conditions, and climate using OLFLEX software. This software was developed in a previous study at Cairo University based on Egyptian environmental conditions. For each run, the required AC overlay thickness and fatigue/rutting damage ratios were calculated. The analysis of results indicated that the design is mostly controlled by fatigue failure in old asphalt layer. The analysis also indicated that the Asphalt Institute (AI) and Transport and Road Research Laboratory (TRRL) models are the most appropriate ones to be used in the M-E flexible pavement design.

# Acknowledgments

---

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Ahmed Atef Gadallah and Prof. Dr. Mostafa Amin Abo-Hashema for their supervision and continuous support throughout the execution of this research and preparation of the thesis.

Special thanks also go to my father, Prof. Dr. Ragab Mousa, for his support and help in reviewing and editorial work of this research.

I would also like to thank Mr. Mohamed Metwally for his support and assistance in formatting the text of this thesis.

I wish to express my deepest appreciation to the German University in Cairo and all professors, especially Prof. Ibrahim El Dimeery, for giving me enough time to accomplish this research and thesis.

# Dedication

---

I dedicate this thesis to my mother, Eng. Horyra Mohamed Mokhtar, for her continuous support and encouragement during the work in this master research and for giving me the spirit throughout my life. I wish to express my sincere appreciation for my father and teacher, Prof. Ragab Mousa Mohamed Mousa for his continuous support during the work in this research and for his continuous guidance throughout my academic life as well as my life, and I dedicate this thesis to him.

I would like to thank my fiancée and love Eng. Mahasen Belal for her endless love, support and understanding and encouragement and I am dedicating this thesis for her.

I would also like to thank my sister and brothers, Dr. Rowda Ragab Mousa, Eng. Saleh Ragab Mousa and Youssef Ragab Mousa for their support and encouragement and I dedicate this work to them.

# Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>DEDICATION .....</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES.....</b>	<b>VI</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES.....</b>	<b>VIII</b>
<b>NOMENCLATURE .....</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1 :INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2 :LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. Introduction.....	5
2.2. Pavement Performance Evaluation .....	5
2.2.1. General.....	5
2.2.2. Surface Distress Evaluation .....	6
2.2.3. Roughness Evaluation.....	7
2.2.4. Skid Resistance .....	8
2.2.5. Structural Evaluation .....	8
2.2.5.1. Destructive Structural Evaluation.....	9
2.2.5.2. Non-destructive Structural Evaluation .....	9
2.2.5.3. Back Calculation Programs.....	10
2.3. Review of Flexible Pavement Design Procedures .....	11
2.3.1. Empirical Methods.....	11
2.3.2. Mechanistic-Empirical Methods .....	12
2.4. Mechanistic-Empirical Design Procedure.....	14
2.4.1. Overview on M-E Design Process .....	14
2.4.2. Flexible Pavement Response .....	15
2.4.2.1. Boussinesq's equations .....	15
2.4.2.2. Two-layer Theory.....	17
2.4.2.3. Multi-Layer Theory.....	18
2.4.2.4. The Finite Element Method.....	18
2.4.3. Multi-Layer Computer Programs.....	19
2.4.4. Outline of M-E Overlay Design Procedure.....	20
2.4.4.1. Design Inputs .....	20
2.4.4.2. Material Properties.....	21
2.4.4.3. Traffic and Loading .....	24
2.4.4.4. Environmental Effects.....	24
2.4.4.5. Modeling Pavement Response.....	26
2.5. Performance Prediction Models for AC Pavements .....	26
2.5.1. Fatigue cracking.....	27
2.5.1.1. Overview .....	27
2.5.1.2. Fatigue Cracking Models.....	28

2.5.1.3. <i>Damage Analysis</i> .....	35
2.5.2.    Rutting .....	36
2.5.2.1. <i>Overview</i> .....	36
2.5.2.2. <i>Rutting Models</i> .....	37
2.5.2.3. <i>Damage Analysis</i> .....	39
2.5.3.    Thermal Cracking .....	39
2.5.4.    Closing Remarks .....	39
2.6. Developed M-E Computer Applications .....	41
2.6.1.    Overview .....	41
2.6.2.    EVERPAVE 5.0 Computer Program (Washington, WSDOT) .....	42
2.6.3.    ROADENT 4.0 Computer Program (Minnesota, MN/DOT) .....	43
2.6.4.    WINFLEX 2006 (Idaho, ITD) .....	44
2.6.5.    OLFLEX (Egypt) .....	46
2.6.6.    Mechanistic–Empirical Pavement Design Guide .....	47
2.7. MEPDG Implantation .....	48
2.7.1.    Overview .....	48
2.7.2.    Design Approach .....	49
2.7.3.    Challenges [Dzotepe and Ksaibati, 2010] .....	49
2.7.4.    MEPDG Implantation Efforts .....	51
2.7.5.    Closing Remarks .....	54
2.8. Summary .....	54
<b>CHAPTER 3 :RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>55</b>
3.1. Introduction .....	55
3.2. Research Methodology Overview .....	56
3.3. Data Collection .....	58
3.4. Design of Experiments using OLFLEX .....	58
3.5. Results & Comprehensive Analysis .....	59
<b>CHAPTER 4 :DATA COLLECTION AND COMPILATION .....</b>	<b>60</b>
4.1. Introduction .....	60
4.2. Overview on OLFLEX (2003) .....	60
4.3. Data Collection .....	61
4.3.1.    Models data .....	61
4.3.2.    Other data .....	61
<b>CHAPTER 5 :DESIGN OF EXPERIMENTS .....</b>	<b>67</b>
5.1. Introduction .....	67
5.2. Performance Prediction Models .....	67
5.2.1.    Introduction .....	67
5.2.2.    Models Selection Process .....	68
5.2.3.    Closing Remarks .....	70
5.3. Failure Criteria .....	71
5.4. Traffic Loading .....	73
5.5. Climatic Conditions .....	73
5.6. Closing Remarks .....	73
<b>CHAPTER 6 : DESCRIPTION AND GENERATION OF OLFLEX</b>	
<b>EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS .....</b>	<b>76</b>
6.1. OLFLEX Software .....	76
6.2. Input Data to OLFLEX .....	76
6.2.1.    Pavement and Material Data .....	76
6.2.1.1. <i>Pavement and Overlay Cross Section Data</i> .....	77





## List of Tables

---

	<i><b><u>Page</u></b></i>
Table 2.1: Critical Analysis Locations in a Pavement Structure [WSDOT, 2003].	15
Table 2.2: Multi-Layer Computer Programs [Qin, 2010]	19
Table 2.3: Poisson's ratio of Paving Materials [Yoder and Witczak, 1975].	22
Table 2.4: Poisson's ratio of soils [Das, 1994].	22
Table 2.5: Typical Modulus of Elasticity Values for Various Materials	23
Table 2.6: Published Fatigue and Rutting Models	40
Table 5.1: Selected Fatigue and Rutting Models.	71
Table 5.2: Selected Parameters and Design Experiments	74
Table 5.3: Existing Pavement Cross Section Data for the Case Study	75
Table 7.1: Analysis of 845 runs.	86
Table 7.2: Failure Criteria Analysis	88
Table 7.3: Results of t-test for difference between FNO and FNOR Failure Criteria.	91
Table 7.4: Results of t-test for difference between FNR and R Failure Criteria.	92
Table 7.5: Results of t-test for difference between FN and FNR Failure Criteria	92
Table 7.6: Analysis of Variance for the Impact of Fatigue Model Selection.	94
Table 7.7: Mean and Standard Deviation of Required AC Overlay and Fatigue Ratio for Different Fatigue Models	95
Table 7.8: Results of t-test of Difference between Means of Fatigue Model Results.	99
Table 7.9: Analysis of Variance for the Impact of using Different Rutting Models.	102
Table 7.10: Mean and Standard Deviation of Required AC Overlay and Rutting Damage Ratio for Different Rutting Models.	103
Table 7.11: Results of t-test of Difference between Means of Rutting Model Results	106
Table 7.12: FDR-O & RDR for Fatigue & Rutting Combinations	108
Table 7.13: Relative Strength of Different Pavement Layers in the North and South Regions.	109
Table 7.14: Resilient Modulus Values For Different Pavement Layers in Different Climatic Regions For a Random Computer Run.	110
Table 7.15: Results of T-test For Difference Between North & South	111

Table 7.16: Mean AC Overlay Thickness Grouped by Fatigue Model and Climatic Region .....	111
Table 7.17: Mean AC Thickness For The Different Fatigue Models In The North and South.....	113
Table 7.18: Mean AC Thickness for Combined Fatigue and Rutting Model for North and South Regions.....	114
Table 7.19: Mean Thickness (mm) for each Fatigue Model for Different ESALs .....	116
Table 7.20: Regression Data For Each Fatigue Model.....	117
Table 7.21: Average Additional AC Overlay Thickness (mm) When Doubling ESALs for All Fatigue Models .....	119
Table 7.22: Mean Thickness (mm) For Each Rutting Model For Different ESALs....	120
Table 7.23: Regression Data For Each Rutting Model.....	120
Table 7.24: FDR-N and RDR for Fatigue and Rutting Combinations.....	122
Table 7.25: Required Thickness for different ESALs using AASHTO 1993 .....	126
Table 7.26: Mean AC Thickness for Different Fatigue and Rutting Models and for North and South Regions .....	127
Table 7.27: Relative Strength of Different Pavement Layers In the North and South Regions.....	128
Table 7.28: Mean Thickness (mm) For Each Fatigue Model Combined With AI Rutting Model For Different ESALs.....	129
Table 7.29: Mean Thickness (mm) For Each Fatigue Model Combined With TRRL Rutting Model For Different ESALs.....	130
Table 7.30: Regression Data For Each Fatigue Model Combined With AI Rutting Model.....	130
Table 7.31: Regression Data For Each Fatigue Model Combined With TRRL Rutting Model.....	131
Table 7.32: Average Additional AC Thickness (mm) When Doubling ESALs for All fatigue and rutting Models.....	133
Table A1: Sample Results of 880 Computer Runs.....	150

## List of Figures

---

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Figure 2.1: Main Components of Mechanistic-Empirical Design Procedure .....	15
Figure 2.2: Critical locations in flexible pavement [Muench, et al., 2003].....	16
Figure 2.3: Notation for Boussinesq's equations in polar coordinates [Ullidta,1987]...	16
Figure 2.4: Layered Elastic Inputs [WSDOT, 2003].....	21
Figure 2.5: Schematic of the Modulus-Temperature Adjustment.....	26
Figure 2.6: Fatigue Cracking Mechanism .....	28
Figure 2.7: Subgrade Rutting Failure Mechanism .....	37
Figure 2.8: Everpave 5.0 screen .....	43
Figure 2.9: ROADENT 4.0 screen .....	45
Figure 2.10: WINFLEX 2000 screen .....	46
Figure 2.11: OLFLEX screen.....	48
Figure 2.12: The three-stage scheme of the MEPDG process [ARA, 2004] .....	50
Figure 3.1: Research Methodology .....	57
Figure 4.1: General Map for Aswan Edfo Desert Road (South) .....	63
Figure 4.2: General Map for Zagazig Benha Agricultural Road (North).....	64
Figure 4.3: Collected Data for the North Region .....	65
Figure 4.4: Collected Data for the South Region .....	66
Figure 5.1: Fatigue Life- Tensile Strain Relationship.....	69
Figure 5.2: Rutting Life- Compressive Strain Relationship.....	70
Figure 6.1: Pavement and Material Parameters Data .....	77
Figure 6.2: Types of Fatigue and rutting models and their parameters.....	79
Figure 6.3: Traffic related data.....	80
Figure 6.4 Seasonal Adjustment Factors .....	80
Figure 6.5: Temperature Adjustments for AC Layers.....	81
Figure 6.6: Output Screen in OLFLEX .....	83
Figure 6.7: Strain Report .....	84
Figure 6.8: Seasonal Variation of Layer Moduli for each layer and the overlay .....	84
Figure 7.1: Average AC overlay for different failure criteria .....	89

Figure 7.2: Average damage ratio for different failure criteria .....	89
Figure 7.3: Mean of Required AC Overlay for Different Fatigue Models.....	96
Figure 7.4: Standard Deviation of Required AC Overlay for Different Fatigue Models .....	96
Figure 7.5: Mean of Fatigue Damage Ratios for Different Fatigue Models .....	97
Figure 7.6: Standard Deviation of Fatigue Damage Ratios for Different Fatigue Models .....	97
Figure 7.7: Mean of Required AC Overlay for Different Fatigue Models (without Shell Model) .....	98
Figure 7.8: Mean of Calculated AC Overlay for Different Rutting Models .....	103
Figure 7.9: Standard Deviation of Calculated AC Overlay for Different Rutting Models .....	104
Figure 7.10: Mean of Rutting Damage Ratio for Different Rutting Models.....	104
Figure 7.11: Standard Deviation of Rutting Damage Ratio for Different Rutting Models .....	105
Figure 7.12: Change in AC Thickness (mm) / 1°C For Different Fatigue Models.....	112
Figure 7.13: Change in AC Thickness (mm) / 1°C For Different Rutting Models.....	113
Figure 7.14: Change In AC Thickness (mm) / 1°C For Different Fatigue and Rutting Models .....	115
Figure 7.15: Linear Model for Thickness-EASLs for Different Fatigue Models.....	117
Figure 7.16: Linear Model for Thickness-EASLs for Different Rutting Models.....	120
Figure 7.17: Mean AC Thickness for Different Model Combination .....	123
Figure 7.18: Mean FDR-N for Different Model Combination.....	123
Figure 7.19: Mean RDR For Different Model Combination.....	124
Figure 7.20: Change In AC Thickness(mm)/ 1°C For Different Fatigue and Rutting Models .....	127
Figure 7.21: Linear Model for Thickness- ESALs Relationship for Fatigue Models Combined With AI Rutting Model.....	131
Figure 7.22: Linear Model for Thickness- ESALs Relationship for Fatigue Models Combined With TRRL Rutting Model.....	132

# Nomenclature

---

GARBLT	= General Authority for Roads, Bridges and Land Transport
ME	= Mechanistic-Empirical
AC	= Asphalt concrete
AI	= Asphalt Institute
TRRL	= Transport and Road Research Laboratory
Mn	= Minnesota
ARE	=Austin Research Engineers
AASHTO	= American Association of State Highway and Transportation
SHRP	= Strategic Highway Research Program
NSHRP	= National Cooperative Highway Research Program
ESAL	= Equivalent Single Axle Load

# Abstract

---

Over the last several years, there has been a shift of the flexible pavement design from the Empirical to Mechanistic-Empirical (M-E) procedure. The main design considerations in the M-E procedure are: to limit the horizontal tensile strain induced at the bottom of the Asphalt Concrete (AC) layer to minimize fatigue cracking and; to limit the vertical compressive strain induced on the top of the subgrade to control permanent deformation or rutting. Several fatigue and rutting performance models or transfer functions have been developed by various highway agencies to relate the asphalt modulus and/or the measured strains to the number of load repetitions to fatigue and rutting failures. Each model has its own parameters, limitations, and magnitude of failure damage. The objective of this research is to assess the impact of using different transfer functions on the designed thickness of flexible pavements under different conditions of traffic loading and climate for new and rehabilitated pavement structures.

Two major roads located in North and South of Egypt were selected in the study to represent two different climate conditions. A wide range of traffic loading conditions (ESALs) is considered in the analysis together with six fatigue models and four rutting models. Moreover, six fatigue/rutting failure criteria were taken into consideration. This creates a total of 880 computer runs using OLFLEX software, a Mechanistic-Empirical overlay design system, which was developed in a previous study at Cairo University based on Egyptian environmental conditions. For each run, the required AC overlay thickness and fatigue/rutting damage ratios were recorded.

The analysis of results indicated that the overlay design is mostly controlled by fatigue failure in old asphalt layer. The analysis also indicated that the Asphalt Institute (AI) and Transport and Road Research Laboratory (TRRL) models are the most appropriate ones to be used in the M-E flexible pavement design.