



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**PERFORMANCE OF CELLULOSE OIL PALM FIBRE (COPF) IN
STONE MASTIC ASPHALT (SMA) MIX**

JEYAN A/L VASUDEVAN

FK 2001 46



**PERFORMANCE OF CELLULOSE OIL PALM FIBRE (COPF) IN STONE
MASTIC ASPHALT (SMA) MIX**

By

JEYAN A/L VASUDEVAN

**Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirement for the Degree of
Master of Science in the Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia**

April 2001



Dedicated to my beloved family:

Dad, Mum,

Brother, Sisters, Sister-in-law

And Brother-in-laws

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science

PERFORMANCE OF CELLULOSE OIL PALM FIBRE IN STONE MASTIC ASPHALT (SMA) MIX

By

JEYAN VASUDEVAN

April 2001

Chairman : Mr. Ratnasamy Muniandy

Faculty : Engineering

A large amount of money is allocated annually to reduce skid-related accidents due to pavement failures. It seems that the current Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA) could no longer cater for heavy loading vehicles. This indicates that an alternative asphalt technology has to be looked into seriously. As such, Stone Mastic Asphalt (SMA) technology with Cellulose Oil Palm Fibre (COPF) was developed. It is a gap-graded mix with high percentage of coarse aggregate. This mix was found to be performing very well for heavy loading traffic with the use of COPF.

Fibre in SMA plays an important role to stabilise the mix and to minimise the draindown phenomena. This research aims to study the production and processing of the fibre and their performance in the SMA. The fibre production and processing was done using different types of pulping methods such as mechanical and chemical pulping. Each type of pulp products was analysed for its suitability as an anti-draindown agent by using the fibre-oil draindown test. In this study, the standard production and processing methods

would be adjusted or modified if the pulp product failed the oil draindown test or otherwise. When the produced pulp is found to be suitable as an anti-draindown agent, it was then added to the SMA mix to check its performance. Complete mechanical and chemical analyses were also performed on the fibre to check its ability to form micromesh netting.

Material selection of aggregate and asphalt was carried out in accordance with the specified standards. It was found that the selected material complied with SMA mix requirement. Besides that, determination of Optimum Asphalt Content (OAC) was carried out in accordance with the UPM in-house method. From the study OAC of 5.5% was obtained. In addition, a new method of determination of Optimum Fibre Content (OFC) was developed in the study. The OFC of Smartcel obtained through this method was 0.3%.

A detailed comparative performance study of SMA mix was carried out with different types of fibres and without any fibres. The performance was determined by using Density and Void Analysis, Resilient Modulus Test, Marshall Stability Test, Indirect Tensile Test, Moisture Induced Damage Test, Fatigue Test, Static Creep Test, Cantabro and Draindown Test. Results from the analysis revealed that SMA with fibre was performing well.

The entire analysis indicated that the performance of SMA with COPF fibre was far superior as compared to the other SMA with international fibres and SMA without any

fibre. This shows that SMA with COPF fibre can used as a heavy duty, durable and high skid resistance road pavement in Malaysia.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Master Sains.

**PERILAKU SELULOSA SERABUT KELAPA SAWIT DALAM TURAPAN
CAMPURAN ASPHALT MAMAH**

Oleh

JEYAN VASUDEVAN

April 2001

Pengerusi : En. Ratnasamy Muniandy

Fakulti : Kejuruteraan

Kos pemuliharaan jalan terutamanya bagi mengurangkan kemalangan yang disebabkan permukaan jalan, memerlukan perbelanjaan yang tinggi setiap tahun. Ini mungkin disebabkan oleh turapan campuran asphalt tradisional yang digunakan semasa ini tidak lagi mampu menampung beban gandar kenderaan. Oleh itu, satu teknologi turapan alternatif perlu ditinjau. Jesteru itu, turapan campuran asphalt mamah dengan selulosa serabut kelapa sawit (dikenali sebagai COPF dalam kajian ini) telah dihasilkan. Ia merupakan satu campuran gradiasi terbuka dengan peratusan batuan kasar yang tinggi. Campuran dengan COPF ini juga didapati mampu menampung beban gandar yang tinggi.

Serabut dalam campuran asphalt mamah memainkan peranan yang penting dalam menstabil dan mengurangkan pengaliran keluar asphalt dari campuran berkenaan. Fokus kajian ialah menghasilkan dan memproses serabut kelapa sawit, dan juga perilaku selulosa serabut ini dalam campuran asphalt mamah. Penghasilan selulosa serabut kelapa

sawit dijalankan dengan kaedah pulpa mekanikal dan kimia. Setiap produk pulpa berkenaan dikaji peranannya sebagai agen penghalang pengaliran keluar dengan menggunakan ujian pengaliran keluar minyak – serabut. Dalam kajian ini, jika produk yang dihasilkan didapati kurang memuaskan, cara penghasilannya akan diubahsuai. Jika produk yang dihasilkan didapati sesuai, ia seterusnya dimasukkan dalam campuran asphalt mamah bagi mengkaji perilakunya. Satu analisa menyeluruh bagi sifat mekanikal dan kimia serabut juga dijalankan untuk meramal kebolehannya membentuk jaringan mikro dalam turapan.

Pemilihan batuan dan asphalt dilakukan berasaskan spesifikasi yang disyorkan. Dari kajian yang dijalankan ke atas batuan dan asphalt yang dipilih, didapati bahawa ia adalah sesuai digunakan sebagai bahan dalam turapan campuran asphalt mamah. Selain itu, kajian penentuan asphalt optima yang dijalankan berasaskan keadah UPM menunjukkan nilai optima sebanyak 5.5%. Selanjutnya, satu kaedah penentuan serabut optima dibentuk dalam kajian ini. Melalui kaedah baru ini, nilai optima 0.3% diperolehi bagi COPF.

Satu kajian perbandingan mendalam telah dijalankan ke atas campuran asphalt dengan pelbagai jenis serabut dan tanpa sebarang serabut. Kajian perbandingan ini dijalankan dengan Ujian Modulus Keanjalan, Ujian Kekuatan Marshall, Ujian Terikan, Ujian Tusukan Air, Ujian Kelesuan, Ujian Rayapan Static, Ujian Cantabro dan Ujian pengaliran keluar asphalt. Keputusan analisis ini menunjukkan campuran asphalt mamah dengan serabut adalah lebih baik.

Keseluruhan analisis yang dijalankan menunjukkan turapan campuran asphalt mamah dengan COPF mempamerkan keputusan yang lebih baik berbanding dengan campuran asphalt mamah dengan serabut lain dan campuran asphalt mamah tanpa sebarang serabut. Oleh itu, campuran asphalt mamah dengan COPF disyorkan bagi menangani masalah beban gandar berlebihan. Ia juga berkesan untuk mengurangkan gclinciran di jalanraya di Malaysia.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a great pleasure to acknowledge my indebtedness to those who have provided me with great help and assistance upon the completion of this research study. First and foremost, I would like to express my most sincere thanks and appreciation to Mr. Ratnasamy Muniandy for his unflagging and resolute guidance, invaluable advice, constructive suggestions, tutelage, understanding, help and approachability throughout the course of the study. I would like to record my appreciation for the valuable comments and guidance given by Assoc. Prof. Ir. Megat Johari Megat Mohd. Noor (Faculty of Engineering, UPM). I also wish to extend my gratitude to Mr. Hussain Hamid (Faculty of Engineering, UPM) for his support, constructive criticism and valuable comments in making this study a success.

I would like to thank the Ministry of Science, Technology and the Environment, Malaysia for the IRPA research fund. It has enabled me to complete the study without encountering any financial difficulties.

I would like to express my deep appreciation to all the staff member of Chemical laboratory, Forest Research Institute of Malaysia (FRIM) Kepong, who were of great help during the fibre-processing phase. In particular, special thanks go to Dr. Mohd. Noor Mohd. Yusoff (Head of Chemical Laboratory), Dr. Koh Mok Poh, Mrs. Zainab and their colleagues.

I am deeply indebted to Dr. Jalaludin Harun, Faculty of Forestry, UPM for his valuable advice. I also would like to extend my thanks to all the staff member of faculty of engineering, particularly Tn. Hj. Razali Mohd. Amin for his help during the course of the study.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to other postgraduate students in the research centre, who been great friends and helpful in many aspects. I would also like to extend gratitude to all my friends for the discussion, continuous support and encouragement.

Last but not least, may my family be blessed with good health, long life and happiness for all the love and care they have given me all this while. Thanks also for always having faith in me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
DEDICATION		ii
ABSTRACT		iii
ABSTRAK		vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		ix
APPROVAL SHEETS		xi
DECLARATION FORM		xiii
LIST OF TABLES		xviii
LIST OF FIGURES		xxi
LIST OF PLATES		xxv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS		xxvi
CHAPTER		
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background of the study	1
	Background of pavement in Malaysia	3
	Cracking	5
	Rutting	6
	Stripping	7
	Rehabilitation and Maintenance	8
	Background Stone Mastic Asphalt (SMA)	9
	Background of Oil Palm Fibre	10
	Problem Statement	11
	Objective of Study	13
	Importance of Study	13
	Assumptions	14
	Scope of Study	15
	Limitations	16
II	LITERATURE REVIEW	18
	Fibre	18
	Background of Oil Palm Industry in Malaysia	19
	General Description of Oil Palm Empty Fruit Bunch	23
	Availability and Distribution of Empty Fruit Bunch (EFB)	24
	Utilisation of Oil Palm Empty Fruit Bunches (EFB)	27
	Fibre Morphology of Oil Palm Fibre	27
	Chemical Composition of Oil Palm Fibre	28
	Fibre Pulping Process	30
	Kraft Pulping Process	30
	Semi-chemical and Thermo Mechanical Pulping (TMP)	31
	Stone Mastic Asphalt (SMA) Review	32

Advantages of Stone Mastic Asphalt (SMA)	34
Economic Consideration	34
Potential use of Stone Mastic Asphalt (SMA)	35
Issues regarding Stone Mastic Asphalt (SMA)	36
Fibre Additives	36
Draindown	37
Effect of Fibre on the Performance of Asphaltic Mix	42
Density or Unit Weight	42
Marshall Stability	44
Flow	46
Indirect Tensile Strength	48
Resilient Modulus	49
Static Creep	51
Cantabro Test	52
Conclusion	53
III METHODS AND MATERIALS	54
Methodology	54
Fibre Production	58
Fibre Production by modified TMP Method	58
Fibre Production by RMP Method	59
Fibre Production by Kraft Method	60
Fibre Production by Recycle Pulping	61
Oil-Fibre Draindown Test	62
Fibre Mechanical and Chemical Properties Analysis	63
Mesh Screen Analysis	63
Appearance Testing	64
Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM) Analysis	64
Cellulose Content	64
Moisture Content	65
pH value	65
Ash Content	65
Material Selection	65
Aggregate Test	66
Los Angeles Abrasion Test	66
Aggregate Impact Value	66
Aggregate Crushing Value	67
Ten Percent Fines	68
Polished Stone Value (PSV)	69
Soundness Test	70
Determination of Flakiness and Elongation	
Index	71
Determination of Angularity Number	71
Specific Gravity of Aggregate	72
Asphalt Testing	73
Penetration	73
Softening Point	74

	Flash and Fire Point	74
	Thin Film Oven Test	75
	Specific Gravity	76
	Viscosity	77
	Preparation of Specimens For Marshall	77
	Performance Analysis	78
	Density and Void Analysis	78
	Marshall Stability And Flow Of Bituminous	
	Mixtures	81
	Resilient Modulus	85
	Moisture Induced Damage	86
	Static Creep	86
	Fatigue	87
	Cantabro Test	87
	Dr. Schellenberg Mix Draindown	88
	Wire mesh Mix Draindown	89
	Summary of Methodology	90
IV	RESULTS & DISCUSSION	91
	Fibre Production and Suitability Analysis	93
	Modified Thermal-mechanical Pulping	93
	Refinery Mechanical Pulping (RMP) Method	93
	Chemical Pulping (KRAFT) Method	94
	Recycle Pulping Method	95
	Selection of Fibre Pulp	96
	Oil-Fibre Draindown Test	97
	Fibre Mechanical and Chemical Property Analysis	100
	Fibre Sieve Analysis	100
	Appearance Test	101
	Cellulose Content	102
	Moisture Content	103
	Ash Content	103
	pH-value	104
	Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM) analysis	104
	Conclusion of Fibre Analysis	107
	Material Selection	108
	Aggregate Test	108
	Asphalt Test	115
	Summary of Material Selection	119
	Determination of Optimum Asphalt Content	120
	Determination of Optimum Fibre Content	125
	Resilient Modulus	128
	Marshall Stability	130
	Marshall Flow	130
	Moisture Induced Damage Test	132
	Static Creep	134
	Fatigue	136

	Cantabro	138
	Dr. Shellenberg Draindown	139
	COPF Optimum Fibre Content	141
	Performance Analysis	142
	Density and Void Analysis	142
	Resilient Modulus	145
	Marshall Stability	146
	Marshall Flow	148
	Moisture Induced Damage	148
	Static Creep	150
	Fatigue Test	153
	Cantabro Test	155
	SMA Mix Draindown Test	156
	Viscosity Analysis	158
	Performance Ranking	160
	Statistical Analysis	161
V	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	164
	Conclusion	165
	Recommendations	166
	REFERENCES	168
	APPENDIX	175
	VITA	184

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1	Oil Palm EFB Biomass Supply in Malaysia from 1996 to 2020 (t/y dry weight)	25
2.2	Distribution of Oil Palm Areas and Palm Oil Mill for The Respective States in Malaysia	26
2.3	Morphology of Oil Palm Trunk, Frond and Empty Fruit Bunch	28
2.4	Chemical Component of Oil Palm	29
2.5	Summary of Optimum Asphalt Content and Void Result On SMA Mix by the US Pavement Agencies	39
3.1	UPM SMA14 Specification	56
3.2	Stability Correlation Ratio (ASTM D1559)	84
4.1	Modified TMP Draindown	93
4.2	RMP Draindown	94
4.3	Modified RMP Draindown	94
4.4	KRAFT Draindown	95
4.5	Modified KRAFT Draindown	95
4.6	Recycle Pulp Draindown	96
4.7	Pulp Product Oil-Draindown	97
4.8	Oil-Fibre Draindown Test	98
4.9	Average Percent Passing for Fibre Sieve Analysis	100
4.10	Colour and Odour of the Fibres	102
4.11	Summary of Cellulose Content in the Fibre	102
4.12	Summary of Moisture Content in the Fibre	103

4.13	Summary of Ash Content in the Fibre	103
4.14	Summary of pH Value of the Fibres	104
4.15	Los Angeles Abrasion Test	108
4.16	Aggregate Impact Value	108
4.17	Aggregate Crushing Value	109
4.18	Ten Percent Value	110
4.19	Ten Percent Value	111
4.20	Polished Stone Value for Aggregate	111
4.21	The Soundness Test for Aggregate	112
4.22	The Flakiness Index Test for Aggregate	112
4.23	The Elongation Index Test for Aggregate	113
4.24	The Specific Gravity for Aggregate	113
4.25	The Angularity Number Test for Aggregate	114
4.26	Penetration Test for Asphalt	115
4.27	Softening Point Test for Asphalt	116
4.28	Flash & Fire Point Test for Asphalt	116
4.29	Thin Film Test for Asphalt	117
4.30	Specific Gravity Test for Asphalt	118
4.31	Viscosity Test for Asphalt	119
4.32	Summary for Aggregate Test	119
4.33	Summary for Asphalt Test	120
4.34	Density and Void Analysis for Determination of OAC	121
4.35	Resilient Modulus test for Determination of OAC	123
4.36	Marshall Stability tests for Determination of OAC	124

4.37	Density and Void Analysis for Determination of OAC	126
4.38	Resilient Modulus test for Determination of OFC	129
4.39	Marshall Stability Test for Determination of OFC	131
4.40	Moisture Induce Damage Test	133
4.41	Static Creep tests for Determination of OFC	136
4.42	Fatigue Test for Determination of OFC	137
4.43	Cantabro Test for Determination of OFC	138
4.44	Dr. Schellenberg Draindown Test for Determination of OFC	140
4.45	Summary of Determination of OFC	141
4.46	Density and Void Analysis	144
4.47	Resilient Modulus Analysis	146
4.48	Marshall Stability and Flow Analysis	147
4.49	Moisture Induced Damage analysis	150
4.50	Static Creep Analysis	152
4.51	Fatigue Analysis	154
4.52	Cantabro Analysis	156
4.53	Compilation of Critical Compaction Temperature	160
4.54	Ranking of Performance Test	160
4.55	One-way ANOVA Test Comparing SMA with and without Fibre	162

LIST OF FIGURES

Figures	Page
1.1 Accidents due to Road Defect vs. Year	2
1.2 Accidents due to Material Failure vs. Years	3
1.3 Maintenance Allocation - Federal Roads (1992-1998)	11
1.4 Maintenance Allocation-State Roads (1992-1998)	12
2.1 Comparison of SMA and Conventional dense graded mix surface	33
2.2 Pavement Section with SMA Surface Coarse Over a Conventional Paving Mix	33
2.3 Dr. Schellenberg Draindown Method	38
2.4 Wire Basket by NCAT	39
2.5 Percent Draindown of SMA Mix without Cellulose Fibre	40
2.6 Percent Draindown of SMA mix with 0.3% Cellulose Fibre	40
2.7 A Typical Draindown versus Time Plot for Mixture Using Gravel Aggregate, Baghouse Fines, and 20 Percent Passing the No. 4 Sieve and 7% AC.	41
2.8 Comparison between Imported and Malaysian Fibre versus Weight of Oil Passes	41
2.9 Unit Weight Vs. Fibre Content for Granite Aggregate	42
2.10 Unit Weight Vs. Fibre Content for Gravel Aggregate	43
2.11 Bulk Density Vs. Percentage of Oil Palm fibre	43
2.12 Marshall Stability Vs. Fibre Content for Granite Aggregate	45
2.13 Marshall Stability Vs. Fibre Content for Gravel Aggregate	45
2.14 Marshall Stability Vs. Percentage of Oil Palm Fibre	45

2.15	Flow Vs. Fibre Content for Granite Aggregate	46
2.16	Flow Vs. Fibre Content for Gravel Aggregate	47
2.17	Flow Vs. Percentage of Oil Palm Fibre	47
2.18	Indirect Tensile Vs. Fibre Content for Granite Aggregate	48
2.19	Indirect Tensile Vs. Fibre Content for Gravel Aggregate	49
2.20	Resilient Modulus Vs. Fibre Content for Granite Aggregate	49
2.21	Resilient Modulus Vs. Fibre Content for Gravel Aggregate	50
2.22	Resilient Modulus Vs. Percentage of Oil Palm Fibre	50
2.23	Static Creep Permanent Strain Vs. Fibre Content for Granite Aggregate	51
2.24	Static Creep Permanent Strain Vs. Fibre Content for Gravel Aggregate	52
2.25	Comparison of Cantabro data for two type of Cellulose Fibre	53
3.1	UPM SMA 14 Specification and G2 Gradation on 0.45 Power Gradation Chart	57
3.2	Upper and Lower Marshall Testing Head	83
3.3	Flow Chart on the Process and Procedure of Testing	90
4.1	Percent Oil Draindown Vs. Type of Fibre Production	97
4.2	Percent Oil Draindown Vs. Type of Fibre	99
4.3	Cumulative Percent Oil Draindown Vs. Time	99
4.4	Percent Fibre passing Vs. Sieve size	101
4.5	Bulk Density versus Percentage of Asphalt Content	122
4.6	Void in Total Mix (VTM) versus Percentage of Asphalt Content	122
4.7	Resilient Modulus versus Percentage of Asphalt Content	122
4.8	Marshall Stability versus Percentage of Asphalt Content	124

4.9	Bulk Density versus Percentage of Fibre Content	127
4.10	Void in Total Mix (VTM) versus Percentage of Fibre Content	127
4.11	Void Mineral Aggregate (VMA) versus Percentage of Fibre Content	127
4.12	Void Filled Asphalt (VFA) versus Percentage of Fibre Content	127
4.13	Resilient Modulus versus Percentage of Fibre Content	129
4.14	Marshall Stability versus Percentage of Fibre Content	130
4.15	Marshall Flow versus Percentage of Fibre Content	131
4.16	Indirect Tensile versus Percentage of Fibre Content	132
4.17	Tensile Strength Ratio versus Percentage of Fibre Content	134
4.18	Static Creep Loading Strain versus Percentage of Fibre Content	135
4.19	Static Creep Recovery Strain versus Percentage of Fibre Content	135
4.20	Static Creep Recovery Efficiency versus Percentage of Fibre Content	135
4.21	Fatigue Properties versus Percentage of Fibre Content	137
4.22	Cantabro Percentage Loss versus Percentage of Fibre Content	139
4.23	Percentage Draindown versus Percentage of Fibre Content	139
4.24	Bulk Density versus Types of Fibre	143
4.25	VTM versus Types of Fibre	143
4.26	VMA versus Types of Fibre	143
4.27	VFA versus Types of Fibre	143
4.28	Resilient Modulus versus Types of Fibre	145
4.29	Marshall Stability versus Types of Fibre	147
4.30	Marshall Flow versus Types of Fibre	148

4.31	Moisture Induced Damage Load and Tensile Strength Ratio(TSR) versus Type of Fibre	149
4.32	Creep Modulus versus Loading Time for Different Type of Fibre	151
4.33	Initial Strain and Recovery Efficiency versus Type of Fibre	151
4.34	Fatigue Permanent Strain versus Type of Fibre	155
4.35	Percent Loss Çantabro versus Type of Fibre	155
4.36	SMA Mix Draindown versus Type of Fibre	158
4.37	Log Viscosity Vs. Log Temperature	159
4.38	Viscosity versus Temperature	159