Pavement thickness and stabilised foundation layer assessment using ground-coupled GPR
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ABSTRACT

Experimental results from field and laboratory investigations using a ground-coupled ground penetrating radar (GPR), dielectric measurement, magnetic imaging tomography (MIT) and dynamic cone penetrometer (DCP) tests are presented. Dielectric properties of asphalt pavement and stabilised and unstabilised pavement foundation materials were evaluated in the laboratory in frozen and unfrozen conditions. Laboratory test results showed that dielectric properties of materials back-calculated from GPR in comparison to dielectric gauge measurements are strongly correlated and repeatable. For chemically stabilised materials, curing time affected the dielectric properties of the materials. Field tests were conducted on asphalt pavement test sections with different foundation materials (stabilised and unstabilised layers), drainage conditions and layer thicknesses. GPR and MIT results were used to determine asphalt layer thicknesses and were compared with measured core thicknesses, while GPR and DCP were used to assess foundation layer profiles. Asphalt thicknesses estimated from GPR showed an average error of about 11% using the dielectric gauge values as input. The average error reduced to about 4% when calibrated with cores thicknesses. MIT results showed thicknesses that are about 9% higher than estimated using GPR. Foundation layer thicknesses could not be measured using GPR due to variations in moisture conditions between the test sections, which is partly attributed to variations in gradation and drainage characteristics of the subbase layer.
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1. Introduction

Increasingly, non-destructive testing methods are being applied to assess pavement system conditions. According to the mechanistic empirical pavement design guide,[1] ground penetrating radar (GPR) surveys of existing pavements is a key assessment method for pavement rehabilitation design. Although primarily used for thickness determination, GPR scans are also used to identify defects (e.g. voids, stripping within the asphalt layer, weak bonds between pavement layers) within the pavement layers and beneath the pavement.
Dielectric properties of the pavement and foundation layer materials are key input parameters in determining layer thickness using GPR. The dielectric properties of layers are either assumed based on published typical values, determined from field calibrations or measured directly using independent test devices. Field calibration and direct measurement methods have proved successful for asphalt materials, although some studies have shown that variations in asphalt moisture content can affect the results. For the underlying pavement foundation layer materials, however, the dielectric properties can vary significantly because of moisture and material property variations (e.g. clay content, moisture content, chemical stabiliser content, partially frozen/thawed, etc.). Previous research has demonstrated that GPR data can be used to detect moisture variations within the foundation layers, but very limited data exist for stabilised foundation layers.

This study was undertaken with two objectives. The first objective was to evaluate the use of ground-coupled GPR to determine the asphalt and pavement foundation layer thicknesses, where an independent dielectric property measurement was used as an input. The second objective is to assess if ground-coupled GPR can be used to detect moisture variations and effects of freezing/thawing in the unstabilised and stabilised subbase, and subgrade layers beneath the pavement.

In situ tests were conducted on various asphalt pavement test sections with different foundation layer materials, drainage conditions and thicknesses. The foundation layers included granular subbase layer underlain by stabilised (mechanically and chemically) or unstabilised subbase/subgrade layers. The pavement thicknesses in situ were measured from pavement cores and using a magnetic imaging tomography (MIT) gauge, and foundation layer thicknesses were measured using dynamic cone penetrometer (DCP). A laboratory experimental plan was designed to evaluate dielectric properties of chemically stabilised and unstabilised foundation materials in frozen and unfrozen conditions. To the authors’ knowledge, this is the first paper to document dielectric properties of chemically stabilised materials and dielectric properties of pavement foundation layer materials in frozen and unfrozen conditions.

In the following sections of this paper, background information is presented on the basic principles of GPR and data analysis, field and laboratory data collection methods, followed by results and data analysis and then key findings from this study.

2. Background

2.1. Principles of GPR

GPR uses the principle of transmitting electromagnetic waves to locate changes in subsurface conditions. A detailed overview of GPR basic principles is provided by Daniels [16]. In brief, when an electromagnetic wave is transmitted from the antenna, it travels through the material at a velocity depending on the permittivity or dielectric constant of the material,
until it hits another object or material with different dielectric properties. When the wave hits a new object or a surface, part of the wave is 'reflected' back to the surface and is captured by the receiver, and part of the wave continues to travel downward until it is dissipated (or attenuated). The rate of signal attenuation depends on the dielectric properties and conductivity of the materials. If the materials are highly conductive (e.g. wet clays), the signal is attenuated rapidly.\[17\]

When a series of pulses are sent over a single point, then it is referred to as a scan. The strength or amplitude of the reflection is determined by the contrast in the dielectric constants of the two materials.\[17\] For example, when a pulse moves from dry sand (with a dielectric constant of about 5) to wet sand (with a dielectric constant of about 30), it will produce a strong reflection. On the other hand, when a pulse moves from dry sand to limestone (with a dielectric constant of about 7), it will not produce a strong reflection.

For pavement applications, 900 MHz to 2GHz antennas are typically used to provide information in the top 0.3–1 m. Most highway agencies use horn or air-coupled antennas where the antenna is located 150–500 mm above the surface. These antennas typically have a frequency range of 1–2 GHz. Ground-coupled antennas are in direct contact with the testing surface and typically have a maximum frequency of 1.5 GHz. The air-coupled antennas have advantage over ground-coupled antennas in obtaining data at highway driving speeds. However, as some of the electromagnetic waves sent by an air-coupled antenna are reflected back from the surface, the depth of penetration is generally lower than for a ground-coupled antenna with similar frequency.\[2\] Ground-coupled antennas limit the survey speed to walking speeds, however, to <10 km/h.

In ground-coupled antenna scans, the first positive peak produced in the data is referred to as 'direct coupling',\[17\] which occurs in the beginning of the scan and is used to identify the pavement surface position. The surface zero position is corrected in the data, by identifying this in the line scans.

2.2. Thickness determination using GPR

To determine thickness using GPR, the dielectric constant of the material is needed. The material dielectric constants can be estimated based on GPR signals or directly measured using hand-held test devices. There are two common ways to estimate dielectric constants of materials from GPR signals. One is to use the peak amplitude signals from each layer from a GPR scan in reference to the amplitude signal from a reflective metal surface, and the other is to use the two-way travel time in conjunction with known thickness values. The first method is applicable for air-coupled antennas,\[6,13,18\] which were not used in this study and are therefore not described here. The two-way travel time method, which is applicable for ground-coupled antennas, was used in this study. According to Loken \[18\], the two-way travel time method is not influenced by the errors associated with signal attenuations as with air-coupled methods.

The interval of time that it takes for the wave to travel from the transmitter to the receiver is called the two-way travel time. Using the two-way travel times between the different amplitude peaks observed in a wiggle scan, and known layer thickness values, the dielectric constant values can be determined using Equation (1) \[19\]:

\[
\varepsilon = \left( \frac{ct}{2h_i} \right)^2
\]
where \( c = \) speed of light in air (0.30 m/ns), \( \varepsilon = \) dielectric constant or relative electrical permittivity, \( h_i = \) individual layer thickness and \( t_i = \) time travel in each individual layer.

Irrespective of the two test methods described above, a field calibration is first required wherein dielectric constant of the material is determined using direct thickness measurements. Using air-coupled GPR antennas, some previous studies \([13,20–22]\) have documented average errors of about 6–10% when no core calibration was performed vs. 1–5% when core calibration was performed. Some researchers \([20,23]\) have indicated that calibrating GPR data with at least three cores when compared to one core can substantially reduce the error.

As an alternative to field calibration, dielectric properties of the materials can be determined independent of GPR using hand-held test devices. However, there is no widely accepted method in terms of what test device should be used. Loizos and Plat\([12]\) used a hand-held percometer device in determining dielectric properties of asphalt materials. They found that the location where the dielectric properties were measured (i.e. at the surface or in the middle or at multiple locations on a core) influenced the results. A dielectric probe manufactured by Adek, Ltd. was used by Saarenketo and Scullion \([24]\). In this study, a GS3 sensor manufactured by Decagon Devices, Inc. was used to measure dielectric properties of asphalt and foundation layer materials. Details of GS3 are provided later in this paper.

### 2.3. Moisture content determination in foundation layers

Moisture content influences the dielectric properties of the materials because the water dielectric constant is much higher (81) than that of air (1) or soil materials (4–20). Therefore, high dielectric constants of materials can be attributed to high moisture values \([18]\).

Halabe et al. \([25]\) used the complex refractive model (CRM) to evaluate relationships between dielectric properties of a material mixture, its volumetric ratios and dielectric properties of its components. Using the CRM, the gravimetric moisture contents of granular base materials can be obtained using Equation (2) \([25]\):

\[
w = \left( \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon_b} - 1 - \frac{1-n}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_s} - 1}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_b} - 1 - \frac{1-n}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_s} - 22.2}} \right)
\]

(2)

where \( w = \) moisture content determined as fractional weight of water to total weight; \( \varepsilon_s = \) dry aggregate dielectric constant; \( \varepsilon_b = \) base layer dielectric constant determined using the two-way travel time method (Equation (1)); and \( n = \) porosity = fractional volume of voids (air + water) to total volume.

To determine moisture contents from Equation (2), the porosity of the material has to be either measured or assumed. Maser and Scullion \([26]\) used Equation (2) by measuring the dry unit weight of granular base material at one location for calibration and then used the same constant value to estimate moisture content at other locations. Comparison between the measured and the predicted moisture contents in their study resulted in root-mean-squared error of <2%.

Scullion et al. \([27]\) reported a procedure that involved developing a laboratory relationship between gravimetric moisture content and dielectric constant to estimate moisture contents \textit{in situ} from GPR scans. Results from their study indicated that the relationship
between dielectric content of the mixtures increased with increasing moisture content (as expected), and the relationships were unique for each material type.

Grote et al. [14] used field GPR scans to estimate the dielectric properties of the foundation layers from the two-way travel time method and then estimated material volumetric moisture contents based on laboratory relationships. Site- and material-specific relationships between volumetric moisture content and dielectric properties were used in their study for some materials. For materials where those relationships were not available, a third-order polynomial equation developed by Topp et al. [28] based on tests conducted over a wide range of material types (sandy loam to clay loam to organic soil to glass beads) as shown in Equation (3) was used:

\[
\theta_v = 4.3 \times 10^{-6} \varepsilon^3 - 5.5 \times 10^{-4} \varepsilon^2 + 2.92 \times 10^{-2} \varepsilon - 0.053
\]  

where \( \theta_v \) = volumetric moisture content and \( \varepsilon \) = material dielectric constant.

3. Field test sections and experimental testing methods

3.1. Description of field test sections

The test site located in Boone, Iowa, was specifically constructed in 2012–2013 to incorporate several experimental pavement test sections. The foundation layer construction details are summarised in White et al. [15]. The test site consists of 12 roads labelled from 1st St. to 12th St. A summary of pavement cross section with design thicknesses of each layer in all sections is provided in Table 1. Material properties of all foundation layer materials are summarised in Table 2.

All streets expect 6th St. were surfaced with a nominal 152-mm-thick hot mix asphalt (HMA) or warm mix asphalt (WMA) layer underlain by a nominal 152-mm-thick crushed limestone subbase (CLS) layer. Sixth St. is surfaced with Portland cement (PC) concrete pavement and the results are not included in this paper. The HMA and WMA layers varied between the test sections with the type of aggregate used in the mixture (i.e. low or high absorption aggregate, LAA or HAA) as summarised in Table 2.

Geocells were used within the CLS layer on 3rd St., and geotextiles and geogrids were used at the CLS and subgrade layer interface on 3rd, 4th and 5th St. sections. Natural or compacted subgrade layers were directly beneath the CLS layer on 1st, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 8th and 10th streets. On 2nd, 7th, 9th, 11th and 12th St. sections, either a stabilised or unstabilised reclaimed subbase (RSB) or subgrade layer was used between the CLS and subgrade layers, as summarised in Table 2. Stabilisation of subbase and subgrade layers was performed using mechanical stabilisation (i.e. mixing RSB and existing subgrade), or by adding PC or self-cementing Class C fly ash (FA). On 11th St. N, a geocomposite drainage layer was installed directly beneath the asphalt layer.

An array of temperature sensors (thermistors) were installed in the pavement and the foundation layers down to a depth of about 1.4 m below surface for near-continuous monitoring of temperature variations.

3.2. Field and laboratory testing methods

3.2.1. Field and laboratory GPR surveys

A GPR manufactured by Geophysical Survey Systems, Inc. (GSSI) was used in this study. GPR surveys were conducted on field test sections in March (winter/frozen ground) and
September (fall) of 2014. A ground-coupled 900-MHz antenna setup with SIR-20 data acquisition system was used (Figure 1). Based on the manufacturer recommendations, the following scan settings were used: (a) range = 15 ns; (b) frequency of scans = 64 Hz; and (c) number of samples per scan = 512.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Summary of field tests sections.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st St. N and S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd St. N and S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd St. N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd St. S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th St. N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th St. S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th St. N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th St. S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th St. N and S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th St. N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th St. S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th St. N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th St. S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Low absorption aggregate.
<sup>b</sup>High absorption aggregate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Summary of material index properties.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel content (%) (&gt;4.75 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand content (%) (4.75 – 75 μm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silt + clay content (%) (&lt;75 μm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&lt;sub&gt;10&lt;/sub&gt; (mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&lt;sub&gt;30&lt;/sub&gt; (mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&lt;sub&gt;60&lt;/sub&gt; (mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient of uniformity, C&lt;sub&gt;u&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient of curvature, C&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid limit, LL (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasticity index, PI (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCS group symbol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For *in situ* GPR scanning, a survey encoder was used to connect the GPR device with a calibrated survey wheel to measure the distance. For GPR scanning conducted in the laboratory box study (described in 3.2.6), scans were performed in point-mode setting (i.e. data are collected only over a single point).

### 3.2.2. Pavement coring

Iowa Department of Transportation (Iowa DOT) performed pavement coring at 58 locations in April 2014 in test sections shown in Table 1. The core thicknesses were measured in accordance with ASTM D3549. The core thicknesses are reported in this paper as $h_{\text{core}}$.

### 3.2.3. MIT gauge scanning

The working principle of the MIT gauge is described in detail in Grove et al. [29] and is manufactured by the MIT Measurement and Testing Technology (MIT Mess- und Prüftechnik) in Dresden, Germany. In brief, the MIT gauge generates a variant magnetic field that creates an eddy current in a metal reflector that is placed beneath the pavement. This eddy current will generate an induced magnetic field inside the metal reflector that can be detected by a sensor in the MIT gauge. Based on a calibration between the intensity of the induced magnetic field for a given type of reflector and the distance between the sensor and the

---

**Figure 1.** (a) Test setup using GS3 sensor and GPR antenna in laboratory box study; (b) MIT gauge; (c) GPR setup with a scanning survey wheel setup *in situ*; and (d) DCP testing of the foundation layer through a pavement core.
metal reflector, the pavement thickness is calculated. The calibration is unique to the type of metal reflector used. Grove et al. [29] showed that the differences between the MIT gauge thickness measurements and core thickness measurements were 2 mm or less, based on 106 data points collected over 12 project sites.

A picture of the MIT gauge used in this study is shown in Figure 1. In this study, 0.6-mm-thick galvanized sheet metal circular discs supplied by the manufacturer were used. The metal discs were placed beneath the pavement at 109 selected locations that were marked with global positioning system (GPS).

3.2.4. Field DCP testing
DCP tests were conducted in the foundation layers shortly after the pavement cores were removed and at various test locations prior to paving (Figure 1). Tests were done at a total of 100 locations in accordance with ASTM D6951.[30] Penetration resistance (PR) and cumulative blows vs. depth plots were generated at each test point to determine the base layer thickness as illustrated in Figure 2. The base layer thickness was determined as depth from the bottom of the asphalt layer to the inflection point of the tangent of the lower portion of the cumulative blows with depth curve.

3.2.5. Dielectric constant determination
Dielectric constant of asphalt and foundation layer materials was directly measured using a GS3 sensor manufactured by Decagon Devices, Inc. (Figure 1) and was also estimated using the two-way travel time method as per Equation (1). The dielectric constant measured with the GS3 is reported as \( \varepsilon_{GS3} \), while the dielectric constant estimated from Equation (1) is reported as \( \varepsilon_{GPR} \).

The GS3 device uses capacitance/frequency domain technology to measure soil dielectric constant. The device uses an epoxy body and consists of three stainless steel needles, and has a thermistor to measure temperature. It uses an electromagnetic field to measure the dielectric permittivity of the surrounding medium.[31] The sensor supplies a 70-MHz oscillating wave to the sensor prongs that charge according to the dielectric properties of
the material. According to the manufacturer, the sensor has a measurement influence depth of about 10 cm.[31]

The GS3 sensor was used for the measurement of laboratory-compacted specimens and in field on the asphalt layers. The laboratory-compacted specimens for foundation materials were prepared by compacting materials in accordance with ASTM D698 [32] at various target moisture contents, to assess relationships between gravimetric moisture content \((w)\) and \(\varepsilon_{GS3}\). Laboratory testing was conducted on the following materials: loess, subgrade glacial till, CLS, RSB, and PC- and FA-treated glacial till subgrade. A nominal 10% PC and 20% FA (by dry weight of soil) was used for treatment, to match with field conditions. All compacted specimens, except the FA- and PC-treated subgrade samples, were tested immediately after compaction and after freezing for about 48 h at about −16°C. The PC- and FA-treated subgrade samples were tested at various times after compaction up to about 7 days to assess the influence of curing (i.e. time-dependent formation of cementitious reaction products that hold water) on \(\varepsilon_{GS3}\) measurements.

### 3.2.6. Laboratory box testing

Laboratory box testing was conducted in this study to evaluate the GS3 device by comparing \(\varepsilon_{GPR}\) and \(\varepsilon_{GS3}\) results for various materials compacted at different target moisture contents. A repeatability study on the two-way travel time method to estimate the \(\varepsilon_{GPR}\) was also conducted as part of the box study. The materials included Iowa loess, concrete sand, CLS and cold mix asphalt (CMA). The index properties of these materials are summarised in Table 2.

The materials were compacted in a 762 mm × 304.8 mm × 381 mm wooden box. A metal plate was placed at the bottom of the box as a reflection surface for GPR scans. Tests were conducted on uniform single layer of material with Iowa loess and concrete sand and two- and three-layered structures with loess, CLS and CMA. The layers were compacted in thin layers (<30-mm thick) using a hand tamper.

GPR scan and GS3 sensor measurements were simultaneously obtained on the different materials. The two- and three-layered structures were tested at room temperature and after freezing in a temperature chamber for 48 h (at about −18°C) to assess the influence of frozen vs. unfrozen conditions.

### 3.3. Asphalt layer thickness determination In Situ

Asphalt layer thicknesses were determined from core measurements and using the MIT gauge. GPR scanning data were used to estimate the asphalt layer thicknesses at the core and MIT test locations for comparison with the measured thicknesses, using three procedures.

The first procedure involved the following steps: (1) measure \(\varepsilon_{GS3}\) from one location in each asphalt mixture type and assume the same at all core locations in the test sections with the same mixture type; (2) convert \(\varepsilon_{GS3}\) to \(\varepsilon_{GPR}\) using a relationship developed from the laboratory box study; (3) determine the two-way travel time from the GPR scan at each core location for the asphalt layer; and (4) use the two-way travel time and \(\varepsilon_{GPR}\) in Equation (1) to estimate the asphalt layer thickness \((h_{GPR1})\).

The second procedure involved the following steps: (1) determine two-way travel times at each core location in sections with same asphalt mixture type; (2) use Equation (1) and \(h_{core}\) at each location to calculate \(\varepsilon_{GPR}\); (3) average those values for each asphalt mixture; (3) using the two-way travel time at each location and the average \(\varepsilon_{GPR}\), estimate the asphalt
layer thickness \( (h_{GPR2}) \). This procedure was used herein to assess the advantage of using average data (from multiple samples) over single point data as described below in the third procedure.

The third procedure involved the following steps: (1) determine two-way travel time from the GPR scan at one random core location for each asphalt mixture type; (2) use Equation (1) and the measured \( h_{core} \) at the location to determine \( \varepsilon_{GPR} \) and assume it is the same at all core locations in the test sections with the same mixture type; and (3) determine two-way travel time at the remaining core locations using Equation (1) to estimate the asphalt layer thickness \( (h_{GPR3}) \).

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Laboratory box study results

GPR scanning test results on two- and three-layered systems at room temperature and after freezing are presented in Figure 3. Moisture contents of the CLS and loess layers are noted in Figure 3. Comparison of results at room temperature and after freezing indicated different two-way travel times. For example, the two-way travel time to the metal sheet was about 8 ns at room temperature, while it was about 6 ns after freezing. In the frozen condition, the CLS/loess layer interface is not as well defined as when not frozen.

Results from the box study comparing \( \varepsilon_{GPR} \) and \( \varepsilon_{GS3} \) are shown in Figure 4, which yielded a linear regression relationship with coefficient of determination \( (R^2) = 0.95 \) and standard error (SE) = 1.3. As shown, the \( \varepsilon_{GS3} \) values are lower than \( \varepsilon_{GPR} \) values. The reasons for this difference are attributed to the differences in the measurement influence depths and the measurement errors associated with the two methods. \( \varepsilon_{GPR} \) represents an average value for the full depth of each layer, while \( \varepsilon_{GS3} \) only represents the surrounding medium in the depth of penetration.
The repeatability of the two-way travel time method to determine \( \varepsilon \) GPR was evaluated by obtaining repeated measurements on two-layer and three-layer structures. The results are summarised in Table 3, which indicated that the measurement error of \( \varepsilon \) GPR was \(<0.1\) for all materials and the percentage error relative to the average value was \(<1.5\%\). The CLS and loess layers showed different dielectric constant values in two-layer and three-layer systems. The reason for this is attributed to differences in the material moisture contents.

### Table 3. Summary of repeatability analysis test results in determining \( \varepsilon \) GPR from two-way travel time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical parameters</th>
<th>Two-layer system</th>
<th>Three-layer system in room temperature</th>
<th>Three-layer system in frozen condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of measurements</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average ( \varepsilon ) GPR</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation or measurement error of ( \varepsilon ) GPR</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient of variation or percentage error*</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*calculated as \( 100 \times \text{standard deviation of } \varepsilon \text{ GPR/average } \varepsilon \text{ GPR}.*

The repeatability of the two-way travel time method to determine \( \varepsilon \) GPR was evaluated by obtaining repeated measurements on two-layer and three-layer structures. The results are summarised in Table 3, which indicated that the measurement error of \( \varepsilon \) GPR was \(<0.1\) for all materials and the percentage error relative to the average value was \(<1.5\%\). The CLS and loess layers showed different dielectric constant values in two-layer and three-layer systems. The reason for this is attributed to differences in the material moisture contents.

### 4.2. Laboratory dielectric constant measurements on compacted specimens

Results showing \( \varepsilon \) GS3 vs. gravimetric moisture content (determined on batched materials) immediately after compaction and after freezing are shown in Figure 5. The results indicated that \( \varepsilon \) GS3 values increased with increasing gravimetric moisture content for all materials, as expected, and the relationship between \( \varepsilon \) GS3 and moisture content is unique for each material type. When frozen, the \( \varepsilon \) GS3 values ranged between 4 and 6 for all materials. This is expected because the dielectric constant in the ice phase of frozen water is about 3.2 [33].

Figure 6 shows \( \varepsilon \) GS3 vs. curing time for chemically stabilised specimens compacted at different moisture contents. \( \varepsilon \) GS3 increased with increasing moisture content and decreased with curing time up to about 12 h and then stayed relatively constant. The changes in \( \varepsilon \) GS3 with curing time is attributed to the hydration process where the amount of free water
decreases with curing. This was also observed by others that investigated the concrete hydration and curing process.[34]

The PC- and FA-stabilised subgrade produced lower dielectric constant values compared to unstabilised subgrade. For example, at about 16% gravimetric moisture content, the $\varepsilon_{GS3}$ of the unstabilised subgrade was 16, while $\varepsilon_{GS3}$ of the PC- and FA-stabilised subgrade was about 10.

### 4.3. Field test results

#### 4.3.1. Asphalt layer

Results of GPR scans for a portion of a test section from the two testing times are shown in Figure 7. Ground temperatures are presented in Figure 8, which indicates the foundation layers were frozen in March up to a depth of about 1.3 m below the pavement surface. GPR scans obtained during March did not show a transition between subbase and subgrade layers. This confirmed the laboratory box study results.

The measured ($h_{\text{core}}$) and estimated ($h_{\text{GPR1}}$, $h_{\text{GPR2}}$, $h_{\text{GPR3}}$) asphalt layer thicknesses are compared in Figure 9. A comparison between the average measured and estimated thickness
values for each asphalt mixture type and the average percentage error of the estimates relative to the average measured values is summarised in Table 4. The percentage error is calculated as the ratio of the root mean square error relative to $h_{\text{core}}$ and the average $h_{\text{core}}$.

The $h_{\text{GPR1}}$ values estimated using the $\varepsilon_{\text{GS3}}$ values produced an average error of about 11%. The estimated $h_{\text{GPR2}}$ and $h_{\text{GPR3}}$ values produced values closer to the 1:1 line when compared with the measured values. The error values ranged between 2.7 and 8.6% for $h_{\text{GPR3}}$, depending on the core sample selected in the analysis. The average error reduced to about 3.7% for $h_{\text{GPR3}}$ when average $\varepsilon_{\text{GPR}}$ was used for each material type. This suggests that if calibration is performed with more number of samples, the error in the predicted values can potentially be minimised. The percentage error values reported herein are similar to those reported by others with air-coupled antennas.[13,20–23]

Comparison between asphalt layer thickness measured using the MIT gauge and GPR ($h_{\text{GPR2}}$) is presented in Figure 10. $h_{\text{GPR2}}$ was chosen here for comparison as the data were close to the 1:1 line when compared with $h_{\text{core}}$ (Figure 9). Results indicated that MIT gauge thickness measurements were on average about 9% higher (i.e. about 15 mm) than estimated with GPR. The 15-mm error measured from testing on asphalt cores in this study is higher than reported in Grove et al. [29] study which was 2 mm from testing on concrete cores. A thorough future evaluation with a direct comparison between core thickness and MIT gauge is warranted.

### 4.3.2. Base/subbase layer

GPR scans from September 2014 identified the bottom of the granular base layer (CLS or CLS + RSB layer). On 9th St. test sections where CLS and RSB constitute the subbase layers, a
Figure 7. In situ GPR scans on 10th St. South section (a) on 03/12/14, (b) on 09/16/14.

Figure 8. In situ ground temperatures during the two testing times.
clear transition between the two layers could not be identified in the GPR scans, and is therefore analysed as a single layer. This is attributed to the similar dielectric properties of the two materials as identified in the laboratory testing. The analysis herein is focused only on the CLS and RSB layers, as no transitions were identified in the layers beneath the RSB layers.

Thickness determination of foundation layers from GPR scans was not possible as the laboratory testing showed strong influence of moisture content on dielectric properties of the subbase layer material. The thickness of the base layers \( h_{\text{base}} \) determined from DCP tests (as illustrated in Figure 2) and the two-way travel times were used to determine \( \varepsilon_{\text{GPR}} \) of the subbase material. Volumetric moisture contents were determined using \( \varepsilon_{\text{GPR}} \) and Equation (3) for comparison between the test sections. The purpose of this analysis was to assess variations in the subbase layer moistures between the various test sections. The average \( \varepsilon_{\text{GPR}} \) and volumetric moisture content values determined from DCP test locations are shown in Figure 11.

Results indicated that on average, the volumetric moisture contents in the subbase layer varied from about 6% to 25%. The 8th St. test section showed the lowest values. Field permeability test results documented by White and Vennapusa [35] on 8th St. South section indicated that the CLS layer on this street yielded high saturated hydraulic conductivity and less non-uniformity (Average = 22.7 cm/s and coefficient of variation = 107%), compared to testing performed on 11th St. South section (Average = 1.8 cm/s and coefficient of variation = 172%) and 5th St. South section (Average = 13.2 cm/s and coefficient of variation = 207%). The 8th St. section consisted of more open-graded materials with less segregation and particle degradation compared to 11th St. and 5th St. sections.[35]

5. Key findings and conclusions

Following are key findings and conclusions from this study:

- The dielectric properties obtained from the independent dielectric measurement gauge used in this study correlated strongly with the values back-calculated from GPR and yielded \( R^2 = 0.945 \) with a standard error of 1.3 (Figure 4).
Table 4. Comparison between asphalt thicknesses measured from cores and predicted from GPR scans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Asphalt layer description</th>
<th>No. of measurements</th>
<th>Average $h_{core}$ (mm)</th>
<th>$h_{GPR1}$ (mm)</th>
<th>$h_{GPR2}$ (mm)</th>
<th>$h_{GPR3}$ (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st / 2nd</td>
<td>50-mm HMAa surface with LAAc and 102-mm HMAa base with LAAc</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>163.3</td>
<td>178.8</td>
<td>163.2</td>
<td>156.3–175.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd S. / 4th</td>
<td>50-mm WMAb surface with LAAc and 102-mm WMAb base with LAAc</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>165.5</td>
<td>183.5</td>
<td>165.5</td>
<td>160.9–175.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th / 8th</td>
<td>50-mm HMAa surface with HAAd and 102-mm HMAa base with LAAc</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>165.4</td>
<td>182.2</td>
<td>165.1</td>
<td>155.7–184.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th S. / 10th</td>
<td>50-mm WMAb surface with HAAd and 102-mm HMAa base with LAAc</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>160.1</td>
<td>173.9</td>
<td>159.8</td>
<td>151.0–169.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>50-mm WMAb surface with HAAd and 102-mm WMAb base with LAAc</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>163.8</td>
<td>181.6</td>
<td>163.7</td>
<td>157.2–172.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Hot mix asphalt.

*b* Warm mix asphalt.

*c* Low absorbed aggregate.

*d* High absorbed aggregate.

*e* Error (%) = 100 × (root mean-squared error in reference to $h_{core}$)/average $h_{core}$. 
A new database of dielectric properties of subgrade and base layer materials and chemically stabilised subgrade materials at different moisture contents is provided in this paper (Figures 5 and 6). Results indicated that the dielectric properties are sensitive to moisture content, as expected, and are sensitive to curing times for chemically stabilised soil due to the hydration process. PC- and FA-stabilised subgrade materials produced lower dielectric values than unstabilised subgrade materials.

GPR surveys conducted during frozen condition did not properly differentiate variations in the foundation layers because of similar dielectric properties of those materials in a frozen condition (Figure 7). This was verified by conducting a simple laboratory box study with compacted pavement and foundation layers in frozen and unfrozen conditions (Figure 3). The estimated asphalt thicknesses \( h_{\text{GPR1}} \) using the \( \varepsilon_{\text{GPR3}} \) values produced an average error of about 11% (Table 4). The estimated values \( h_{\text{GPR2}} \) and \( h_{\text{GPR3}} \) were close to the 1:1 line when compared with the measured values, when \( \varepsilon_{\text{GPR}} \) was used (see Figure 9).

![Figure 10. GPR vs. MIT gauge measured asphalt layer thickness.](image)

![Figure 11. Estimated average in situ base layer \( E_{\text{GPR}} \) and volumetric moisture content for each street based on DCP measurements.](image)
The error values ranged between 2.7 and 8.6% $h_{\text{GPR}}$, depending on the core sample selected in the analysis (Table 4). The average error reduced to 3.7% for $h_{\text{GPR}}$, when average $\varepsilon_{\text{GPR}}$ (based on multiple cores for each material type) was used in the analysis (Table 4). These errors are similar to those reported by others in the literature with air-coupled GPR antennas.

- Comparison between asphalt thickness measured using the MIT gauge and GPR ($h_{\text{GPR}}$) indicated that the MIT gauge measurements were on average about 9% higher than estimated with GPR (Figure 10).
- GPR data were used to estimate volumetric moisture content of the granular subbase material. Results indicated that on average, the volumetric moisture contents in the subbase layer varied from about 6 to 25% (Figure 11). The variations are attributed to material segregation and degradation, and variations in aggregate gradations and permeability between the test sections.

**List of Abbreviations and Notations**

- $C$  
  Speed of light in air
- CLS  
  Crushed limestone
- CMA  
  Cold mix asphalt
- CRM  
  Complex refractive model
- DCP  
  Dynamic cone penetrometer
- DOT  
  Department of transportation
- FA  
  Fly ash
- GPR  
  Ground penetrating radar
- GPS  
  Global positioning system
- GSSI  
  Geophysical Survey Systems, Inc.
- $h_{\text{core}}$  
  Thickness of core
- $h_{\text{GPR}}$  
  Back-calculated thickness of asphalt from GPR measurements
- $h_{\text{MIT}}$  
  Thickness of asphalt measured using MIT gauge
- HAA  
  High absorption aggregate
- HMA  
  Hot mix asphalt
- $h_i$  
  Individual layer thickness
- LAA  
  low absorption aggregate
- MIT  
  Magnetic imaging tomography
- N  
  Porosity
PC  Portland cement
PR  Penetration resistance
RSB  Reclaimed subbase
$R^2$  Coefficient of determination
SE  Standard error of the estimate
t$_i$  Time travel in each individual layer
w  moisture content determined as fractional weight of water to total weight
WMA  Warm mix asphalt
$\varepsilon$  Dielectric constant or relative electrical permittivity
$\varepsilon_b$  Base layer dielectric constant
$\varepsilon_s$  Dry aggregate dielectric constant
$\varepsilon_{GS3}$  Dielectric constant measured from GS3 device
$\varepsilon_{GPR}$  Dielectric constant back-calculated from GPR measurements
$\theta_v$  Volumetric moisture content
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