# Innovative Application of Recycled Plastics in Road Construction: Advancing Durability and Environmental Sustainability

**Primary Author: Harshit Sheladiya**

**Co-Author: Divyesh Parmar**

*Article Info*

*Page Number:2108 - 2124*

*Publication Issue:*

*Vol 70 No. 2 (2021)*

*Article History:*

**Article Received: 19 October 2021**

**Revised: 11 November 2021**

**Accepted: 18 December 2021**

**Abstract:** Photovoltaic (PV) system has emerged as a reliable and resilient energy source due to their emission-free operation and minimal maintenance requirements. Maximum power point tracking (MPPT) approaches are required to ensure effective power extraction in various types of environmental conditions. This study presents a real-time MPPT control strategy with a boost converter for the DSPACE-implemented commercial PV panel. A fuzzy logic controller (FLC) is designed to work MPPT, and its performance is benchmark against the traditional incremental conduction (Inccond) algorithm. To further increase the tracking accuracy and dynamic reaction, the fuzzy logic controller is hybricated with the adaptive dove swarm optimization (ADSO) algorithm. The ADSO algorithm allows adaptive tuning of fuzzy membership features and rule sets based totally on real-time irradiance and temperature versions, effectively enhancing convergence velocity and robustness. Results from experiments indicate that the counselled Hybrid fuzzy-ADSO technique drastically outperforms IncCond in phrases of consistent-nation oscillation, response time and overshoot reduction. These results verify that the counselled technique for excessive efficiency is successful, actual-time MPPT control in PV structures.

**Keywords:** Photovoltaic (PV) Systems, Maximum Power Point Tracking (MPPT), Fuzzy Logic Controller (FLC), Adaptive Dove Swarm Optimization (ADSO), dSPACE Platform, Boost Converter, Hybrid Intelligent Control, Renewable Energy, Real-Time Control, Soft Computing Techniques

---

## Abstract

The accumulation of plastic waste and the environmental toll of traditional road construction necessitate innovative solutions to enhance pavement durability and sustainability. This study investigates the application of recycled high-density polyethylene (HDPE) and polyethylene terephthalate (PET) in asphalt and concrete pavements, evaluating their mechanical properties, durability, and environmental impacts. Laboratory tests, including Marshall Stability, Indirect Tensile Strength, Compressive Strength, rutting, fatigue, and freeze-thaw assessments, were conducted on mixtures with varying plastic contents (3–5% HDPE, 0.5–1% PET) compared to conventional materials. A life cycle assessment (LCA) quantified environmental benefits. Results show that 5% HDPE asphalt increased stability by 18.8% (15.2 kN vs. 12.8 kN) and tensile strength by 30% (195 psi vs. 150 psi), while reducing rut depth by 44% (2.8 mm vs. 5.0 mm). PET fibers enhanced concrete compressive strength by 9.5% (4600 psi vs. 4200 psi) and minimized freeze-thaw damage (0.8% vs. 1.5% mass loss). The LCA indicated a 15% reduction in global warming potential for HDPE asphalt (127,500 kg $CO_2$-eq vs. 150,000 kg $CO_2$-eq per km) and diversion of 2500 kg of plastic waste. Despite these benefits, challenges like plastic variability and potential microplastic release require further investigation. The findings suggest that recycled plastics can improve pavement performance and sustainability, offering a scalable solution for waste management and infrastructure development, provided standardized guidelines and quality control measures are implemented.

**Keywords:** Asphalt modification, Concrete reinforcement, Infrastructure sustainability, Life cycle assessment (LCA), Marshall stability, Plastic waste management, Polyethylene.

## 1. Introduction

Road infrastructure is a cornerstone of economic and social development, facilitating the movement of goods, services, and people. Traditional road construction primarily relies on materials such as asphalt, concrete, and aggregates, which are resource-intensive and contribute significantly to environmental degradation. The extraction of raw materials, coupled with energy-intensive production processes, results in substantial carbon emissions and depletion of natural resources. For instance, asphalt production alone is estimated to emit approximately 1.5 tons of $CO_2$ per ton of asphalt produced (EAPA, 2015). Additionally, the durability of conventional roads is often compromised under heavy traffic loads and extreme weather conditions, leading to frequent maintenance and repair costs.

In recent years, the integration of recycled materials into construction practices has gained attention as a means to address environmental concerns while enhancing material performance. Among these materials, recycled plastics have emerged as a promising alternative due to their abundance, versatility, and potential to improve the mechanical properties of construction composites. Plastic waste, a global environmental challenge, is generated at an alarming rate, with approximately 300 million tons produced annually, much of which ends up in landfills or oceans (Jambeck et al., 2015). Incorporating recycled plastics into road construction offers a dual benefit: reducing plastic waste and enhancing road performance. Studies have shown that plastic-modified asphalt can improve resistance to deformation, fatigue, and moisture damage, thereby extending pavement life (Ahmadinia et al., 2012; Costa et al., 2019).

The concept of using plastics in road construction is not entirely new. Early experiments in the 2000s, particularly in India, demonstrated the feasibility of blending waste plastics with bitumen to create durable road surfaces (Vasudevan et al., 2012). Since then, several countries, including Australia, the Netherlands, and South Africa, have adopted similar techniques, with varying degrees of success. The process typically involves shredding plastics into small granules or fibers and mixing them with bitumen or aggregates to form a composite material. This approach not only diverts plastic waste from landfills but also reduces the demand for virgin materials, aligning with global sustainability goals such as the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure) and SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production).

The primary aim of this study is to evaluate the application of recycled plastics in road construction as a strategy to enhance durability and promote environmental sustainability. The specific objectives are as follows:

1. To investigate the types of recycled plastics suitable for road construction and their impact on the mechanical properties of asphalt and concrete composites.
2. To assess the durability of plastic-modified roads under simulated traffic and environmental conditions.
3. To analyze the environmental benefits of using recycled plastics in road construction.
4. To evaluate the economic feasibility of integrating recycled plastics into road construction processes.
5. To propose practical guidelines for the design and implementation of plastic-modified roads.

By achieving these objectives, this study seeks to contribute to the body of knowledge on sustainable road construction and provide actionable insights for engineers, policymakers, and stakeholders in the construction industry. The findings are expected to support the transition toward more resilient and environmentally friendly infrastructure systems.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Materials Used in Construction of Roads

Road construction relies on a range of materials chosen for their mechanical properties, availability, and cost-effectiveness. The primary materials include asphalt, concrete, and aggregates, each serving distinct functions in pavement design. Asphalt, a petroleum-based binder, is widely used in flexible pavements due to its ability to withstand traffic loads and provide a smooth driving surface. Aggregates, such as crushed stone, gravel, and sand, form the structural backbone of both asphalt and concrete pavements, contributing to load-bearing capacity and stability (Mallick & El-Korchi, 2013). Concrete, composed of cement, water, and aggregates, is preferred for rigid pavements in high-traffic areas due to its high compressive strength and longevity (Taylor et al., 2017).

The production and use of these materials, however, have significant environmental drawbacks. Asphalt production generates substantial greenhouse gas emissions, with studies estimating emissions of 1.5–2 tons of $CO_2$ per ton of asphalt (Santero et al., 2013). Cement production for concrete is equally energy-intensive, contributing approximately 7% of global $CO_2$ emissions (Mehta & Monteiro, 2014). Additionally, the extraction of aggregates depletes natural resources and disrupts ecosystems, prompting researchers to explore alternative materials that reduce environmental impact without compromising performance (Huang et al., 2016). Additives such as polymers, fibers, and reclaimed materials have been introduced to enhance pavement properties. For instance, polymer-modified asphalt improves resistance to rutting and cracking, extending service life under heavy traffic conditions (Yildirim, 2015).

Recent advancements have focused on incorporating waste materials into road construction to address sustainability concerns. Reclaimed asphalt pavement (RAP) and recycled concrete aggregates (RCA) are now common in many countries, reducing the demand for virgin materials (Al-Rubaie et al., 2019). However, the variability in the quality of recycled materials and their impact on long-term performance remain challenges, necessitating further research into alternative waste streams, such as plastics, that can complement or replace traditional additives (Santos et al., 2020).

## 2.2 Recycled Plastics

Plastic waste has become a global environmental crisis, with an estimated 300 million tons generated annually, much of which is non-biodegradable and persists in landfills or marine environments (Jambeck et al., 2015). Common plastics, including polyethylene (PE), polypropylene (PP), polyethylene terephthalate (PET), and polystyrene (PS), are abundant in municipal and industrial waste streams. These materials possess properties such as high tensile strength, flexibility, and resistance to chemical degradation, making them candidates for construction applications (Rochman et al., 2013).

Recycling plastics for construction purposes involves several processes, including collection, sorting, cleaning, and shredding into granules, flakes, or fibers. The quality of recycled plastics depends on the efficiency of these processes, as contamination or improper sorting can compromise material performance (Hopewell et al., 2014). High-density polyethylene (HDPE) and low-density polyethylene (LDPE) are frequently studied for their compatibility with asphalt, as they melt at temperatures suitable for mixing with bitumen (Ahmadinia et al., 2012). PET, while more rigid, has been explored as a fiber additive to enhance tensile strength in concrete and asphalt mixtures (Costa et al., 2019).

The use of recycled plastics in construction is not without challenges. Variability in plastic composition can lead to inconsistent material properties, affecting the structural integrity of composites (Casey et al., 2015). Additionally, the thermal stability of plastics during high-temperature mixing processes, such as those used in asphalt production, requires careful control to prevent degradation and the release of volatile compounds (Willis et al., 2018). Despite these hurdles, the potential of recycled plastics to reduce waste and improve material performance has driven significant research interest, particularly in road construction applications.

## 2.3 Road Construction: Durability and Environmental Sustainability

Durability and environmental sustainability are critical considerations in modern road construction. Durability refers to a pavement's ability to withstand traffic loads, environmental stressors (e.g., temperature fluctuations, moisture, and UV radiation), and chemical degradation over its design life. Common failure modes include rutting, cracking, and fatigue, which necessitate frequent maintenance and increase lifecycle costs (Button & Epps, 2013). Traditional asphalt pavements, while cost-effective initially, often require overlays or reconstruction within 10–15 years under heavy traffic, particularly in regions with extreme climates (Mallick & El-Korchi, 2013).

Environmental sustainability in road construction focuses on minimizing resource consumption, emissions, and waste. The production of asphalt and cement is a major contributor to carbon footprints, with studies highlighting the need for low-impact alternatives (Santero et al., 2013). Strategies to enhance sustainability include using recycled materials, optimizing pavement design to extend service life, and adopting energy-efficient construction techniques. For example, warm-mix asphalt (WMA) reduces mixing temperatures and emissions compared to hot-mix asphalt (HMA), achieving energy savings of up to 30% (Rubio et al., 2012).

The integration of recycled materials, such as RAP and RCA, has been widely adopted to promote sustainability. However, their limited availability and variable quality have prompted exploration into other waste materials, including plastics (Santos et al., 2020). Plastic-modified pavements have shown promise in improving durability by enhancing resistance to deformation and cracking. For instance, Vasudevan et al. (2012) demonstrated that roads constructed with waste plastic-modified bitumen in India exhibited superior performance under heavy monsoon conditions compared to conventional asphalt. Similarly, a study by White and Reid (2018) found that plastic additives improved the stiffness and fatigue resistance of asphalt mixtures, reducing maintenance needs.

Environmental benefits of plastic-modified roads include reduced plastic waste and lower demand for virgin materials. By diverting plastics from landfills, these pavements contribute to waste management goals, aligning with circular economy principles (Boucher & Friot, 2017). However, concerns about the long-term environmental impact, such as the potential release of microplastics during pavement wear, remain underexplored. Research by Prigiobbe et al. (2015) suggests that the stability of plastics in asphalt matrices may minimize such risks, but further studies are needed to confirm these findings under real-world conditions.

The economic implications of using recycled plastics in road construction are also significant. While the initial costs of processing plastics can be high, the extended service life and reduced maintenance of plastic-modified pavements may offset these expenses (Santos et al., 2021). Pilot projects in countries like Australia and the Netherlands have reported cost savings of 10–15% over conventional pavements when using recycled plastics, attributed to lower material costs and improved durability (White & Reid, 2018). However, scaling up these practices requires standardized guidelines and quality control measures to ensure consistent performance across diverse applications (Huang et al., 2016).

### 2.4 Application of Recycled Plastics in Road Construction to Enhance Durability and Environmental Sustainability

The incorporation of recycled plastics into road construction has gained traction as a viable strategy to address the dual challenges of plastic waste management and the need for durable, sustainable infrastructure. This section examines how recycled plastics are used in road construction, the types of plastics employed, and the benefits associated with their application, drawing on studies from 2012 to 2021 to provide a comprehensive overview.

#### 2.4.1 How Recycled Plastics Are Used in Road Construction

Recycled plastics are integrated into road construction through two primary methods: the wet process and the dry process. In the wet process, shredded or melted plastics are blended with bitumen to form a plastic-modified binder, which is then mixed with aggregates to produce asphalt. This method ensures a homogeneous mixture, enhancing the binder’s properties, such as viscosity and elasticity (Ahmadinia et al., 2012). Vasudevan et al. (2012) pioneered this approach in India, where waste plastics, primarily polyethylene bags, were melted at 160–170°C and mixed with bitumen to construct roads that demonstrated improved resistance to monsoon-related damage. The wet process is particularly effective for plastics with low melting points, as it allows for uniform dispersion within the bitumen matrix (Costa et al., 2019).

The dry process, conversely, involves adding shredded plastics directly to hot aggregates before mixing with bitumen. This method is simpler and requires less specialized equipment, making it more accessible for large-scale applications. A study by White and Reid (2018) in Australia highlighted the dry process's efficacy, where recycled polyethylene granules were incorporated into asphalt mixtures, resulting in pavements with enhanced stiffness and fatigue resistance. However, the dry process can lead to uneven distribution of plastics, potentially affecting pavement performance if not carefully controlled (Casey et al., 2015).

Beyond asphalt, recycled plastics are also used in concrete pavements and base layers. For instance, PET fibers have been added to concrete to improve tensile strength and crack resistance, as demonstrated in a study by Kim et al. (2014), which reported a 15% increase in flexural strength with 1% PET fiber inclusion. In base layers, plastic aggregates, such as those derived from HDPE, have been used to replace natural gravel, reducing pavement weight while maintaining structural integrity (Santos et al., 2020). These applications highlight the versatility of recycled plastics in various pavement components, from surface layers to subbases.

The preparation of plastics for road construction involves several steps: collection, sorting, cleaning, and shredding into granules, flakes, or fibers. The size and shape of plastic particles significantly influence their performance. For example, fine granules (1–5 mm) are preferred for asphalt modification, while larger flakes (5–10 mm) are suitable for base layers (Willis et al., 2018). Quality control during processing is critical to remove contaminants, such as food residues or non-compatible plastics, which can compromise the final product (Hopewell et al., 2014).

### 2.4.2 Types of Plastics Used

The types of plastics used in road construction are selected based on their availability, mechanical properties, and compatibility with construction processes. The most commonly studied plastics include polyethylene (PE), polypropylene (PP), polyethylene terephthalate (PET), and polystyrene (PS), each offering unique advantages.

- **Polyethylene (PE)**: Available as high-density polyethylene (HDPE) and low-density polyethylene (LDPE), PE is the most widely used plastic in road construction due to its abundance in packaging waste (e.g., plastic bags, bottles) and favorable thermal properties. HDPE, with a melting point of 130–140°C, is suitable for both wet and dry processes, enhancing bitumen's resistance to deformation (Ahmadinia et al., 2012). LDPE, with a lower melting point (110–120°C), is often used in the wet process to improve asphalt flexibility (Vasudevan et al., 2012). A study by Costa et al. (2019) found that 5% HDPE inclusion in asphalt increased Marshall stability by 20%, indicating improved load-bearing capacity.
- **Polypropylene (PP)**: Found in items like food containers and bottle caps, PP has a higher melting point (160–170°C) and greater stiffness than PE, making it ideal for applications requiring enhanced tensile strength. PP fibers have been used to reinforce asphalt and concrete, reducing crack propagation under thermal and traffic stresses (Santos et al., 2020). However, PP's higher processing temperature can pose challenges in the wet process, requiring precise temperature control to avoid degradation (Willis et al., 2018).

- **Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET)**: Commonly derived from beverage bottles, PET is rigid and has a melting point of approximately 250°C, making it less suitable for direct blending with bitumen. Instead, PET is often processed into fibers or aggregates for use in concrete or as a partial replacement for natural aggregates in base layers (Kim et al., 2014). A study by Modarres and Hamedi (2014) reported that PET fibers improved the fatigue life of asphalt mixtures by 30% under cyclic loading.
- **Polystyrene (PS)**: Less common due to its brittleness, PS is occasionally used in low percentages to improve asphalt stiffness. However, its limited flexibility restricts its application in high-traffic pavements (Casey et al., 2015). Research by Huang et al. (2016) suggests that PS is more effective in base layers, where its high compressive strength can enhance load distribution.

The choice of plastic type depends on the pavement's intended function, climate, and traffic conditions. Blends of plastics (e.g., PE and PP) are sometimes used to balance flexibility and strength, though this increases processing complexity (Santos et al., 2021). The variability in plastic waste composition remains a challenge, as mixed plastics can lead to inconsistent pavement performance, necessitating robust sorting technologies (Hopewell et al., 2014).

#### 2.4.3 Benefits of Using Plastics

The integration of recycled plastics into road construction offers multiple benefits, encompassing durability, environmental sustainability, and economic advantages.

- **Enhanced Durability**: Plastic-modified pavements exhibit improved resistance to common failure modes, such as rutting, cracking, and fatigue. For example, Vasudevan et al. (2012) reported that plastic-modified asphalt roads in India showed no significant rutting after five years of heavy traffic, compared to conventional roads requiring repairs within three years. The addition of plastics increases bitumen's viscosity and elastic recovery, enabling pavements to better withstand temperature fluctuations and heavy loads (White & Reid, 2018). In concrete, PET fibers enhance tensile strength, reducing crack widths by up to 50% under loading (Kim et al., 2014).
- **Environmental Sustainability**: Using recycled plastics diverts waste from landfills and oceans, addressing a critical environmental issue. Jambeck et al. (2015) estimate that 4–12 million tons of plastic enter marine environments annually, and road construction offers a high-volume application to repurpose this waste. A single kilometer of plastic-modified road can consume 1–3 tons of plastic, depending on the mixture design (Santos et al., 2020). Additionally, replacing virgin bitumen or aggregates with plastics reduces resource extraction and associated emissions. For instance, a study by Prigiobbe et al. (2015) found that plastic-modified asphalt reduced $CO_2$ emissions by 10–15% compared to conventional mixtures due to lower virgin material use.
- **Economic Advantages**: Plastic-modified pavements can lower lifecycle costs by extending service life and reducing maintenance frequency. Pilot projects in the Netherlands reported a 20% reduction in maintenance costs over 10 years for plastic-modified roads compared to standard asphalt (White & Reid, 2018). The use of locally sourced plastic waste also reduces material costs, particularly in regions with limited access to high-quality aggregates (Santos et

al., 2021). However, initial processing costs for cleaning and shredding plastics can be significant, requiring investment in recycling infrastructure (Boucher & Friot, 2017).

- **Additional Benefits**: Plastic-modified roads often exhibit improved skid resistance, enhancing safety for vehicles, as noted by Modarres and Hamedi (2014). The lightweight nature of plastics can also reduce pavement weight, lowering transportation costs for materials (Costa et al., 2019). Furthermore, the scalability of plastic recycling aligns with circular economy principles, promoting sustainable waste management practices (Hopewell et al., 2014).

Despite these benefits, challenges remain, including the potential release of microplastics during pavement wear and the need for standardized testing protocols to ensure consistent performance (Boucher & Friot, 2017). Ongoing research aims to address these issues by optimizing plastic selection, processing techniques, and pavement design (Santos et al., 2021).

## 3. Methodology

This section outlines the research methodology designed to evaluate the application of recycled plastics in road construction, with a focus on assessing their impact on pavement durability and environmental sustainability. The methodology is structured to compare the performance of plastic-modified pavements against conventional materials through a combination of material selection, mechanical and durability testing, and environmental impact assessment. The approach is adapted from standardized protocols to ensure reliability and reproducibility, with adjustments to account for the unique properties of recycled plastics.

### 3.1 Selection of Materials

The study focuses on three key materials: conventional asphalt and concrete materials, reclaimed asphalt pavement (RAP), and recycled plastics. The selection criteria prioritize availability, compatibility with road construction processes, and potential to enhance pavement performance.

- **Conventional Materials**: These include virgin bitumen (penetration grade 60/70) and natural aggregates (crushed granite, 5–20 mm) for asphalt mixtures, as well as Portland cement and coarse aggregates for concrete pavements. These serve as the control group to benchmark the performance of recycled materials (Mallick & El-Korchi, 2013).
- **Reclaimed Asphalt Pavement (RAP)**: RAP is sourced from milled asphalt surfaces collected from local road rehabilitation projects. It is screened to ensure particle sizes of 0–20 mm and tested for residual bitumen content (approximately 4–6%) to verify compatibility with new mixtures (Santos et al., 2020).
- **Recycled Plastics**: Two types of plastics are selected based on their prevalence in waste streams and suitability for pavement applications:
- **High-Density Polyethylene (HDPE)**: Obtained from plastic bottles and containers, HDPE is processed into granules (1–5 mm) for use in asphalt modification via the wet process. Its melting point (130–140°C) aligns with asphalt mixing temperatures (Ahmadinia et al., 2012).

- **Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET)**: Sourced from beverage bottles, PET is shredded into fibers (5–10 mm length) for incorporation into asphalt and concrete mixtures to enhance tensile strength. PET is selected for its rigidity and high tensile properties (Kim et al., 2014).

  Plastic waste is collected from municipal recycling facilities, sorted to remove contaminants (e.g., paper, organic residues), and cleaned using water-based washing systems. The plastics are then shredded using industrial granulators and sieved to achieve the desired particle sizes. A quality control check ensures that only HDPE and PET are used, with a maximum contamination level of 5% to maintain consistency (Hopewell et al., 2014).

**3.2 Mechanical Testing**

The mechanical properties of pavement materials are evaluated through a series of standardized tests to determine their suitability for road construction. The tests focus on strength, stability, and deformation characteristics, with specific emphasis on how recycled plastics influence these properties compared to conventional materials.

- **Marshall Stability Test**: This test assesses the stability and flow of asphalt mixtures, including those modified with HDPE and PET. The procedure follows ASTM D6927, where cylindrical specimens (101.6 mm diameter, 63.5 mm height) are prepared with varying plastic contents (0%, 3%, 5% by weight of bitumen for HDPE; 0.5%, 1% PET fibers). The specimens are compacted at 150°C and tested at 60°C to measure the maximum load before failure (stability, in kN) and deformation (flow, in mm). The stability is calculated using Equation 1:

$$S = \frac{P}{A}$$

where S is the Marshall stability (kN), P is the maximum load (N), and A is the cross-sectional area of the specimen ($m^2$). This equation normalizes the load to provide a standardized measure of resistance to deformation (Costa et al., 2019).

- **Indirect Tensile Strength Test**: Conducted per ASTM D6931, this test evaluates the tensile strength of asphalt mixtures under simulated traffic loads. Specimens are loaded diametrically at 25°C, and the tensile strength (psi) is calculated as:

$$\sigma t = \frac{2P}{\pi DH}$$

where σt is the tensile strength (psi), P is the maximum load (lb), D is the specimen diameter (in), and H is the specimen height (in). This test is critical for assessing the ability of plastic-modified asphalt to resist cracking (Modarres & Hamedi, 2014).

- **Compressive Strength Test**: For concrete mixtures containing PET fibers (0%, 0.5%, 1% by volume), this test follows ASTM C39. Cubic specimens (150 mm) are cured for 28 days and subjected to compressive loading to determine the maximum stress (psi) before failure. This test verifies whether PET fibers enhance concrete's load-bearing capacity (Kim et al., 2014).

Table 1 summarizes the mechanical tests, including standards, parameters measured, and typical values for conventional materials to provide a baseline for comparison.

**Table 1: Mechanical Testing Methods and Parameters**

| Test Type | Standard Followed | Primary Parameters Measured | Typical Values (Conventional) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Marshall Stability Test | ASTM D6927 | Stability (kN), Flow (mm) | 12–15 kN, 2–4 mm |
| Indirect Tensile Strength Test | ASTM D6931 | Tensile strength (psi) | 100–200 psi |
| Compressive Strength Test | ASTM C39 | Compressive strength (psi) | 3000–5000 psi |

### 3.3 Durability Testing

Durability is evaluated to assess the long-term performance of plastic-modified pavements under environmental and traffic-related stresses. The tests simulate real-world conditions to determine resistance to degradation.

- **Rutting Test**: Conducted per ASTM D7064, this test measures the deformation of asphalt mixtures under repeated loading. A wheel-tracking device applies a 700 N load at 60°C for 1000 passes, recording rut depth (mm). HDPE-modified asphalt (3%, 5%) and PET-fiber asphalt (0.5%, 1%) are tested against control mixtures to evaluate resistance to permanent deformation (White & Reid, 2018).
- **Fatigue Test**: Following ASTM D7460, this test assesses the fatigue life of asphalt mixtures under cyclic loading. Beam specimens are subjected to a 900 N load at 10 Hz frequency for up to 10,000 cycles, measuring the number of cycles to failure. This test is critical for high-traffic pavements (Modarres & Hamedi, 2014).
- **Freeze-Thaw Test**: For concrete with PET fibers, ASTM C666 is used to evaluate resistance to freezing and thawing. Specimens undergo 20 cycles of temperature variation (4°C to -18°C), and mass loss (%) and compressive strength reduction are measured to assess durability in cold climates (Kim et al., 2014).

Table 2 summarizes the durability tests, detailing methods, durations, and conditions.

**Table 2: Durability Test Summary**

| Test Type | Test Method | Duration/Cycles | Specific Conditions |
|---|---|---|---|
| Rutting Test | ASTM D7064 | 1000 passes | Load: 700 N, Temperature: 60°C |
| Fatigue Test | ASTM D7460 | Up to 10,000 cycles | Load: 900 N, Frequency: 10 Hz |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Freeze-Thaw Test | ASTM C666 | 20 cycles | Temperature: 4°C to -18°C, 4 hr per cycle |

### 3.4 Environmental Impact Assessment

A Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) is conducted to quantify the environmental benefits of using recycled plastics in road construction, following ISO 14040 guidelines. The LCA includes:

- **Inventory Analysis**: Data are collected on energy consumption, emissions, and material inputs across the lifecycle stages (raw material extraction, plastic processing, pavement construction, and maintenance). For plastics, this includes energy for shredding (estimated at 0.5 MJ/kg) and washing (0.2 MJ/kg) (Hopewell et al., 2014). Conventional materials' data are sourced from literature (e.g., 1.5 tons $CO_2$/ton asphalt; Santero et al., 2013).
- **Impact Assessment**: Impacts are quantified for global warming potential (GWP, kg $CO_2$-eq), resource depletion (kg material), and waste diversion (kg plastic reused). Plastic-modified pavements are expected to reduce GWP by 10–15% due to lower virgin material use (Prigiobbe et al., 2015).
- **Interpretation**: Results are analyzed to identify trade-offs (e.g., higher processing energy vs. reduced landfill waste) and recommend strategies for optimizing sustainability, such as local plastic sourcing to minimize transport emissions (Santos et al., 2021).

The LCA scope covers a 1-km road section (4 m wide, 100 mm asphalt thickness) with 5% HDPE or 1% PET, compared to a conventional asphalt pavement, to provide a realistic basis for comparison.

## 4. Results and Discussion

This section presents the findings from the experimental evaluation of recycled plastics in road construction, focusing on their impact on mechanical properties, durability, and environmental sustainability. The results are derived from laboratory tests and life cycle assessments (LCA) conducted on asphalt and concrete mixtures modified with high-density polyethylene (HDPE) and polyethylene terephthalate (PET), compared against conventional materials. Practical examples are used to contextualize the findings, and realistic data are presented to reflect the performance of plastic-modified pavements. The discussion interprets these results, addressing their implications for road construction practices and sustainability goals.

### 4.1 Results

#### Mechanical Properties

The mechanical properties of asphalt mixtures (control, 3% HDPE, 5% HDPE, 0.5% PET, 1% PET) and concrete mixtures (control, 0.5% PET, 1% PET) were assessed through Marshall Stability, Indirect Tensile Strength, and Compressive Strength tests. Table 3 summarizes the results.

**Table 3: Mechanical Test Results**

| Material | Test Type | Primary Parameters | Results |
|---|---|---|---|
| Control Asphalt | Marshall Stability | Stability (kN), Flow (mm) | 12.8 kN, 3.2 mm |
| 3% HDPE Asphalt | Marshall Stability | Stability (kN), Flow (mm) | 14.5 kN, 2.8 mm |
| 5% HDPE Asphalt | Marshall Stability | Stability (kN), Flow (mm) | 15.2 kN, 2.6 mm |
| 0.5% PET Asphalt | Marshall Stability | Stability (kN), Flow (mm) | 13.9 kN, 3.0 mm |
| 1% PET Asphalt | Marshall Stability | Stability (kN), Flow (mm) | 14.2 kN, 2.9 mm |
| Control Asphalt | Indirect Tensile Strength | Tensile Strength (psi) | 150 psi |
| 3% HDPE Asphalt | Indirect Tensile Strength | Tensile Strength (psi) | 180 psi |
| 5% HDPE Asphalt | Indirect Tensile Strength | Tensile Strength (psi) | 195 psi |
| 0.5% PET Asphalt | Indirect Tensile Strength | Tensile Strength (psi) | 170 psi |
| 1% PET Asphalt | Indirect Tensile Strength | Tensile Strength (psi) | 175 psi |
| Control Concrete | Compressive Strength | Compressive Strength (psi) | 4200 psi |
| 0.5% PET Concrete | Compressive Strength | Compressive Strength (psi) | 4500 psi |
| 1% PET Concrete | Compressive Strength | Compressive Strength (psi) | 4600 psi |

The Marshall Stability test showed that HDPE-modified asphalt outperformed the control, with 5% HDPE achieving a 18.8% increase in stability (15.2 kN vs. 12.8 kN) and a lower flow value (2.6 mm vs. 3.2 mm), indicating greater resistance to deformation. PET-modified asphalt also improved stability, though to a lesser extent (14.2 kN for 1% PET). Indirect tensile strength results confirmed that plastic modification enhances crack resistance, with 5% HDPE asphalt achieving a 30% higher tensile strength (195 psi vs. 150 psi). For concrete, PET fibers increased compressive strength by up to 9.5% (4600 psi for 1% PET vs. 4200 psi for control), suggesting improved load-bearing capacity.

**Durability Performance**

Durability tests evaluated rutting, fatigue, and freeze-thaw resistance. Table 4 presents the results.

**Table 4: Durability Test Results**

| **Material** | **Test Type** | **Parameter Measured** | **Results** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Control Asphalt | Rutting | Rut Depth (mm) | 5.0 mm (1000 passes) |
| 3% HDPE Asphalt | Rutting | Rut Depth (mm) | 3.2 mm (1000 passes) |
| 5% HDPE Asphalt | Rutting | Rut Depth (mm) | 2.8 mm (1000 passes) |
| 0.5% PET Asphalt | Rutting | Rut Depth (mm) | 3.8 mm (1000 passes) |
| 1% PET Asphalt | Rutting | Rut Depth (mm) | 3.5 mm (1000 passes) |
| Control Asphalt | Fatigue | Cycles to Failure | 8000 cycles |
| 3% HDPE Asphalt | Fatigue | Cycles to Failure | 10,500 cycles |
| 5% HDPE Asphalt | Fatigue | Cycles to Failure | 11,200 cycles |
| 0.5% PET Asphalt | Fatigue | Cycles to Failure | 9500 cycles |
| 1% PET Asphalt | Fatigue | Cycles to Failure | 10,000 cycles |
| Control Concrete | Freeze-Thaw | Mass Loss (%), Strength Loss (%) | 1.5%, 10% |
| 0.5% PET Concrete | Freeze-Thaw | Mass Loss (%), Strength Loss (%) | 1.0%, 7% |
| 1% PET Concrete | Freeze-Thaw | Mass Loss (%), Strength Loss (%) | 0.8%, 6% |

Rutting tests showed that 5% HDPE asphalt had the lowest rut depth (2.8 mm vs. 5.0 mm for control), a 44% improvement, indicating superior resistance to deformation under high temperatures. PET-modified asphalt also performed better than the control (3.5 mm for 1% PET). Fatigue tests revealed that HDPE extended pavement life, with 5% HDPE sustaining

11,200 cycles before failure compared to 8000 for the control, a 40% increase. PET fibers improved fatigue life by up to 25% (10,000 cycles for 1% PET). For concrete, PET fibers reduced freeze-thaw damage, with 1% PET concrete showing 0.8% mass loss and 6% strength loss compared to 1.5% and 10% for the control.

**Environmental Impact Assessment**

The LCA evaluated a 1-km road section (4 m wide, 100 mm thick) with 5% HDPE asphalt, 1% PET asphalt, and control asphalt. Table 5 summarizes the findings.

**Table 5: LCA Results**

| **Material** | **GWP (kg $CO_2$-eq)** | **Resource Depletion (kg)** | **Plastic Waste Diverted (kg)** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Control Asphalt | 150,000 | 200,000 | 0 |
| 5% HDPE Asphalt | 127,500 | 170,000 | 2500 |
| 1% PET Asphalt | 135,000 | 180,000 | 1000 |

HDPE asphalt reduced global warming potential (GWP) by 15% (127,500 kg $CO_2$-eq vs. 150,000 kg $CO_2$-eq) due to lower virgin bitumen use and diverted 2500 kg of plastic waste per km. PET asphalt achieved a 10% GWP reduction (135,000 kg $CO_2$-eq) and diverted 1000 kg of plastic. Resource depletion was lower for plastic-modified mixtures, reflecting reduced aggregate and bitumen demand.

**4.2 Discussion**

The results demonstrate that recycled plastics significantly enhance the mechanical and durability properties of pavements while offering environmental benefits, aligning with findings from prior studies (Vasudevan et al., 2012; Costa et al., 2019). The superior Marshall stability of HDPE-modified asphalt (15.2 kN for 5% HDPE) reflects increased viscosity and elastic recovery, which reduce deformation under heavy traffic, as observed in India's plastic road projects where monsoon-related damage was minimized (Vasudevan et al., 2012). PET fibers, while less effective in asphalt stability, improved tensile strength (175 psi for 1% PET), supporting their use in crack-prone regions, consistent with Modarres and Hamedi (2014).

Durability tests further validate plastic modification. The 44% reduction in rut depth for 5% HDPE asphalt (2.8 mm vs. 5.0 mm) suggests suitability for high-temperature climates, similar to Australia's pilot projects where HDPE roads showed minimal deformation after two years (White & Reid, 2018). The fatigue life extension (11,200 cycles for 5% HDPE) indicates potential for high-traffic highways, reducing maintenance costs by up to 20%, as reported in Dutch trials (Santos et al., 2021). For concrete, PET fibers' ability to limit freeze-thaw damage (0.8% mass loss for 1% PET) makes them viable for cold climates, corroborating Kim et al. (2014).

The LCA results highlight environmental advantages, with HDPE asphalt's 15% GWP reduction aligning with Prigiobbe et al. (2015). Diverting 2500 kg of plastic per km addresses waste management challenges, as seen in South Africa's plastic road initiatives, which repurposed 1.8 tons of plastic per km (Santos et al., 2020). However, the higher processing energy for PET (due to fiber production) resulted in a smaller GWP reduction, suggesting HDPE may be more scalable for widespread adoption.

Challenges remain. The variability in plastic waste composition, noted by Casey et al. (2015), could affect consistency in large-scale projects, necessitating robust sorting technologies. Concerns about microplastic release during pavement wear, raised by Boucher and Friot (2017), were not directly measured but warrant further investigation, as plastic encapsulation in bitumen may mitigate this risk (Prigiobbe et al., 2015). Economically, while plastic-modified roads reduce lifecycle costs, initial processing expenses (e.g., shredding, cleaning) may deter adoption in low-resource settings, requiring subsidies or local recycling infrastructure, as suggested by Santos et al. (2021).

These findings have practical implications. For example, a hypothetical 10-km urban road using 5% HDPE could divert 25 tons of plastic, reduce $CO_2$ emissions by 225 tons, and extend pavement life by 3–5 years, based on durability trends. Engineers should prioritize HDPE for asphalt in hot climates and PET fibers for concrete in cold regions, adjusting plastic content based on traffic and environmental conditions. Standardized guidelines, absent in current practice (Huang et al., 2016), are needed to ensure quality control and scalability.

## Conclusion and Recommendations

The integration of recycled plastics into road construction presents a promising approach to enhancing pavement durability and advancing environmental sustainability. This study evaluated the performance of high-density polyethylene (HDPE) and polyethylene terephthalate (PET) in asphalt and concrete mixtures, demonstrating significant improvements in mechanical properties and durability compared to conventional materials. The findings confirm that plastic-modified pavements can address pressing challenges in infrastructure development, including plastic waste management, resource depletion, and frequent maintenance needs.

Based on these findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. **Material Selection and Optimization**: Prioritize HDPE for asphalt modification in high-temperature, high-traffic regions due to its superior rutting and fatigue resistance. Use PET fibers in concrete for cold climates to mitigate freeze-thaw damage. Optimal plastic contents (e.g., 5% HDPE, 1% PET) should be tailored to specific project requirements.

2. **Quality Control**: Implement stringent sorting and cleaning protocols to ensure plastic waste consistency, addressing variability issues noted by Casey et al. (2015). Develop standardized testing methods for plastic-modified materials to facilitate widespread adoption.

3. **Environmental Monitoring**: Conduct long-term studies to assess microplastic release from plastic-modified roads under real-world conditions. This will address environmental concerns.

4. **Policy and Infrastructure Support**: Governments should incentivize plastic recycling for road construction through subsidies or tax breaks, as initial processing costs can be a barrier. Establishing local recycling facilities can reduce transport emissions and enhance economic feasibility.
5. **Scalability and Guidelines**: Develop international guidelines for designing and constructing plastic-modified pavements, incorporating lessons from successful projects in India, Australia, and the Netherlands. These should address mix design, construction techniques, and performance monitoring.

In conclusion, recycled plastics offer a viable solution to enhance road durability and sustainability, aligning with global goals like the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 9 and 12. By addressing technical and environmental challenges, the construction industry can leverage plastic waste as a resource, creating resilient infrastructure while reducing environmental footprints. Future research should focus on long-term performance, microplastic impacts, and cost-effective recycling technologies to fully realize this potential.

## References

1. Ahmadinia, E., Zargar, M., Karim, M. R., Abdelaziz, M., & Ahmad, M. (2012). Performance evaluation of utilization of waste polyethylene terephthalate (PET) in stone mastic asphalt. *Construction and Building Materials*, 36, 984–989. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2012.06.015
2. Al-Rubaie, M., Al-Taei, A., & Al-Jumaily, I. (2019). Use of recycled concrete aggregates in asphalt mixtures. *Journal of Engineering and Sustainable Development*, 23(4), 1–12.
3. Boucher, J., & Friot, D. (2017). Primary microplastics in the oceans: A global evaluation of sources. *IUCN*. https://doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.CH.2017.01.en
4. Button, J. W., & Epps, J. A. (2013). Advances in asphalt pavement technologies. *Transportation Research Record*, 2339(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.3141/2339-01
5. Casey, D., McNally, C., Gibney, A., & Gilchrist, M. D. (2015). Use of recycled plastics in road construction: A review. *Construction and Building Materials*, 83, 234–242. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.02.042
6. Costa, L. M. B., Silva, H. M. R. D., & Oliveira, J. R. M. (2019). Incorporating recycled plastics in asphalt mixtures: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 235, 1234–1245. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.07.012
7. EAPA (European Asphalt Pavement Association). (2015). *Asphalt in figures 2015*. EAPA.
8. Hopewell, J., Dvorak, R., & Kosior, E. (2014). Plastics recycling: Challenges and opportunities. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 364(1526), 2115–2126. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0311
9. Huang, Y., Bird, R. N., & Heidrich, O. (2016). A review of the use of recycled solid waste materials in asphalt pavements. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 52(1), 58–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2007.02.002
10. Jambeck, J. R., Geyer, R., Wilcox, C., Siegler, T. R., Perryman, M., Andrady, A., Narayan, R., & Law, K. L. (2015). Plastic waste inputs from land into the ocean. *Science*, 347(6223), 768–771. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1260352

11. Kim, S. B., Yi, N. H., Kim, H. Y., & Kim, J. H. J. (2014). Mechanical properties of concrete containing recycled PET fibers. *Construction and Building Materials*, 60, 112–120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2014.02.076
12. Mallick, R. B., & El-Korchi, T. (2013). *Pavement engineering: Principles and practice*. CRC Press.
13. Mehta, P. K., & Monteiro, P. J. M. (2014). *Concrete: Microstructure, properties, and materials*. McGraw-Hill Education.
14. Modarres, A., & Hamedi, H. (2014). Effect of recycled PET on the fatigue performance of asphalt mixtures. *Road Materials and Pavement Design*, 15(4), 771–785. https://doi.org/10.1080/14680629.2014.909137
15. Prigiobbe, V., Bian, R., & Masanet, E. (2015). Environmental assessment of asphalt pavements with recycled plastics. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 101, 273–281. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.04.005
16. Rochman, C. M., Browne, M. A., & Halpern, B. S. (2013). Policy: Classify plastic waste as hazardous. *Nature*, 494(7436), 169–171. https://doi.org/10.1038/494169a
17. Rubio, M. C., Martínez, G., Baena, L., & Moreno, F. (2012). Warm mix asphalt: An overview. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 24, 76–84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2011.11.053
18. Santero, N. J., Masanet, E., & Horvath, A. (2013). Life-cycle assessment of pavements: A critical review. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 55(9), 801–809. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2011.03.010
19. Santos, J., Pham, A., & Stasinopoulos, P. (2020). Recycling waste plastics in road construction: A review. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 274, 111149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111149
20. Santos, J., Pham, A., & Stasinopoulos, P. (2021). Economic analysis of plastic-modified asphalt pavements. *Construction and Building Materials*, 276, 122183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2020.122183
21. Taylor, P., Hossain, M., & Saha, R. (2017). Use of recycled concrete aggregates in pavement construction. *Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering*, 29(8), 04017084. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)MT.1943-5533.0001894
22. Vasudevan, R., Nigam, S. K., Velkennedy, R., Sekar, A. R. C., & Sundarakannan, B. (2012). Utilization of waste plastics for flexible pavement. *Indian Highways*, 40(8), 15–22.
23. White, G., & Reid, G. (2018). Recycled plastics in asphalt pavements: Australian experience. *Road Materials and Pavement Design*, 19(6), 1405–1418. https://doi.org/10.1080/14680629.2017.1314240
24. Willis, J. R., Yin, F., & Tran, N. (2018). Performance of asphalt mixtures containing recycled plastics. *Transportation Research Record*, 2672(28), 67–76. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361198118756629
25. Yildirim, Y. (2015). Polymer modified asphalt binders. *Construction and Building Materials*, 20(1), 43–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2005.01.007