

Permeable Pavement Conference Question Session

Group 8

Funding for research, development, and implementation

- Q66:
 - Funding is available, but need to package proposals to suit priorities
- Q67:
 - Increasing structural capacity, and minimizing maintenance
 - Need funding for pilot studies
- Q68:
 - Storm water utility and pollutant capture credits and rebates
- Q69:
 - Not aware of a University Transportation Center funded to research permeable pavement
 - Should be one for permeable pavement

Construction standards and issues

- Q48:
 - Need to have more certified personnel to check the work
 - Standard test in the spec. that contractors can check their work
 - Longer warranties
- Q49:
 - We need more development on QC/QA test
 - Tests need to relate to design requirement
- Q50 and 51:
 - Move away from low bid
 - Require contractor proven technical expertise/ pre-qualification
- Q52:
 - Project dependent, always room for improvement
 - Best practices are available

Project-level design issues

- Q22:
 - There are locations that permeable is not appropriate
 - Yes, there is adequate information available to design permeable pavement correctly
- Q23:
 - Full-scale testing
- Q24:
 - Yes
- Q25:
 - Yes, the specifications are available. Need to be better enforced.
- Q26:
 - Yes

Project-level design issues

- Q27:
 - Yes to all
- Q28:
 - Safety and durability
 - Structural capacity
 - Lateral infiltration
- Q29:
 - Yes, there is adequate guidance and standards (not USDA soil mapping).
 - For example PICP guide
- Q30:
 - Yes
 - For example PICP guide

Project-level design issues

- Q31:
 - Closer to remove and replace
 - More guidance required for designers and decision makers
- Q32:
 - No, not enough. We have good information for PICP but not for others
- Q33:
 - Yes for load transfer. Specific design for how it achieve
- Q34:
 - Yes, there is guidance (need to keep water out of the adjacent structures)
- Q35:
 - No

Project-level design issues

- Q36:
 - Theoretical but not practical
- Q37:
 - 35 mph (noise and smoothness)
- Q38:
 - FWD is not appropriate (not continuous layer)
 - Benkelman beam ok but needs care with interpreting results

Asset management

- Q61:
 - Yes. Can existing pavement management system accommodate permeable pavement?
 - Depends on the authority
- Q62:
 - Yes. The key is to integrate storm water and pavement management systems (or all asset management systems) together
- Q63:
 - No, case by case. We don't have long term performance data
 - We need dedicated research money to monitor storm water quality from pavements

Asset management

- Q64:
 - No. They can be rebuilt
 - Design life more than environmental than structural
- Q65:
 - There are criteria for functional condition assessment but not environmental performance