# MEASUREMENTS OF EXPOSURE SOUND LEVEL $L_{AE}$ GENERATED BY PASSING VEHICLES FOR DIFFERENT ROAD SURFACE TYPES

## Barbara RUDNO-RUDZIŃSKA

Wrocław University of Technology Institute of Telecommunication, Teleinformatics and Acoustics Wybrzeże Wyspiańskiego 27, 50-370 Wrocław, Poland e-mail: barbara.rudno-rudzinska@pwr.wroc.pl

(received March 30, 2007; accepted April 24, 2007)

The influence of the road surface types on the noise emission level is a significant source of uncertainty of road noise maps drawn up using computational methods. In such methods the influence of the road surface type is taken into account through a correction to the noise emission level determined for the so-called reference surface. Depending on the kind of carriageway surface and its condition the road noise emission level may vary by several dB, which significantly affects the determined road noise propagation range. The paper presents the results of pass-by noise measurements for vehicles moving in the real city traffic. The investigations were carried out for 11 road with different pavements typical for city streets in Poland, including asphalt, asphalt concrete, stone mastic asphalt and cobblestones pavements. Also the results of comparative analyses of measurements and NMPB calculations for the investigated are be presented.

Keywords: road noise, pass-by measurements, road surface.

## 1. Introduction

The level of noise emitted by vehicles moving in a traffic stream is the resultant of engine and exhaust system noise, aerodynamic noise and tyre/road surface interaction noise. The engine and exhaust system noise depends on the type of vehicle and the engine speed. The tyre/road noise is determined by the type of tyres, the type of road surface as well as by the type of vehicle and its travelling speed. As travelling speed increases so does the share of tyre/road noise in the resultant noise emission level and at high travelling speeds it may become dominant [8, 10].

In methods of calculating road noise for noise mapping or environmental impact assessments the type of road surface is one of the noise source model input parameters which affect the noise emission level. In the French calculation method NMPB recommended by the European Noise Directive (END) for constructing strategic noise maps one can choose from 6 types of road surface: from "quiet" porous surfaces to "loud" stone-paved surfaces [5]. The Good Practice Guide developed by the EC Working Group for the Assessment of Environmental Noise in order to provide help to the Member States in the first round of noise mapping in accordance with END proposes road surface type corrections from -3.5 dB to +4.8 dB [4]. In Poland because of the lack of relevant data, the type of road surface and its condition are usually determined through visual inspection. If this is so, the effect of road surface can be a major source of uncertainty of road noise maps constructed using calculation methods. For this reason investigations of the level of noise emitted by cars moving in real urban traffic on roadways with different surfaces were undertaken.



Fig. 1. A diagram of the measuring system.

### 2. Measuring method

Several measuring methods are used to evaluate the acoustic properties of road surfaces. The most popular among them are the Statistical Pass-By (SPB) method [6]. In this method the measurements are taken at specific location and driving conditions, a microphone is placed at 7.5 m from the center of the lane, at a height of 1.2 m. In view of the aim of the investigations, a method consisting in measuring the noise emitted by passing single vehicles moving in a real traffic stream in urban conditions was adopted in this research. The measuring microphone was located in accordance with the guide-lines for locating the reference point for measurements of road noise emission, i.e. at distance  $d_o = 10$  m from the roadway's edge at height  $h_o = 4$  m (Fig. 1) [8]. The passage of a car is considered as an acoustic event for which exposure sound level  $L_{AE}$  and maximum sound level  $L_{A \max}$  are measured. Acoustic events were classified according to the type of vehicles, the traffic lane and the speed. A two-class division into types of vehicles: a light vehicles class and a heavy vehicles class was assumed [8, 9]. A major problem, besides noise level measurement, is vehicle identification which would allow the explicit classification of the measured acoustic events.

The sound level  $L_A$  was recorded at every 100 ms, stored in the memory of the digital sound level meter and subsequently analyzed in order to determine the values of  $L_{AEi}$  and  $L_{A \max i}$  for the particular acoustic events. A digital camera was used to

identify vehicles and determine their travelling speed. The camera set up at a right angle to the roadway records the passage of a vehicle along road section S visible in the camera frame, being a function of the distance of the camera from the traffic line and the camera's shooting angle  $\alpha$ . The distance of the camera from the roadway was determined from an analysis of the speed (V) estimation error, which took into account the variable distance of the traffic line of vehicles moving on the same traffic lane and the error in reading the time of vehicle passage across the camera frame. For urban conditions, the camera distance was set at d = 30...40 m at which the error in reading speed V is  $\pm 4$  km/h for thr speed about 70 km/h and the camera illumination at night is sufficient [10].

#### 3. Selection of road surface and measuring points

The main types of road surface which occur on urban roads in Poland, i.e. standard asphalt road surfaces in good and bad condition, an asphalt concrete, stone mastic asphalt and stone-paved surfaces with different types of paver, were selected for the investigations. Measurements were carried out mainly at exit roads where the traffic can be regarded as approximately continuous. The location of the measuring points was such that the influence of the surrounding could be regarded as negligibly small. Because of the low traffic volume required to measure single acoustic events, the measurements were performed mainly in the evening and at night. The measurements were carried out for 11 streets with different roadway surfaces. The investigated situations are described in Table 1.

| Point No | Type or road surfaces                 | Road surface condition | Symbol |
|----------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|--------|
| P1       | Smooth asphalt                        | Good                   | SA-1   |
| P2       | Smooth asphalt                        | Good                   | SA-2   |
| P3       | Asphalt concrete                      | Good                   | AC-1   |
| P4       | Asphalt concrete                      | Good                   | AC-2   |
| P5       | Stone mastic asphalt                  | Good                   | SMA    |
| P6       | Asphalt                               | Rather bad             | AP-1   |
| P7       | Asphalt                               | Bad, ruts              | AP-2   |
| P8       | Asphalt                               | Bad, patch             | AP-3   |
| Р9       | Even large cobblestones               | Rather good            | LCS    |
| P10      | Convex small cobblestones             | Rather good            | SCS    |
| P11      | Mixed: large cobblestones and Asphalt | Bad                    | MIX    |

Table 1. Measured type of road surfaces.

### 4. Measurement and analysis results

In total 1040 single vehicle passage, including 456 heavy-class vehicles, measurements were carried out [3, 10]. Sample results of direct measurements for smooth asphalt road surface are illustrated in Fig. 2. At first step the analysis covered:

• The normalization of measurement results of sound exposere level,  $L_{AE}$ , obtained for vehicles moving on traffic lanes situated at a larger distance  $(d_m)$  than the reference one  $(d_r - \text{first lane})$ , according to relation (Fig. 1):

$$L_{\text{AE}r} = L_{\text{AE}m} - 10\log(d_m/d_r) \quad \text{dB},\tag{1}$$

where:  $L_{AEm}$  – measured pass-by sound exposure level,  $d_m$  – distance between traffic lane and observation point,  $d_r$  – distance between 1-st traffic lane and observation point.



Fig. 2. Results of  $L_{AEi}$  measurement for smooth ashalt road surface – point P2; a) light vehicles (N = 62), b) heavy vehicles (N = 41) ( $L_{AEi}$  – normalised to 1-st lane).

• The determination of the sound power level,  $L_{\rm WA}$ , for each pass-by vehicle according to:

$$L_{\rm WA} = L_{\rm A \, max} + 10 \log \left(2\pi + 20 \log(d_m/d_o)\right) \quad {\rm dB},\tag{2}$$

where  $L_{A \max}$  – maximum A-weighted pass-by sound level,  $d_m$  – distance between traffic lane and observation point (for 1-st lane  $d_m = d_r$ ),  $d_o = 1$  m.

**Table 2.** Results of regression analysis:  $L_{AE} = a + b \log(V)$ , N – number of measured pass-by,  $\Delta a$  and  $\Delta b$  – errors, R – correlation coeffcient.

| Point No                   | Symbol | Ν  | a<br>[dB] | $\Delta a$<br>[dB] | b<br>[dB] | $\Delta b$<br>[dB] | $R^2$ | Speed range v [km/h] |  |
|----------------------------|--------|----|-----------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|-------|----------------------|--|
| a) light class of vehicles |        |    |           |                    |           |                    |       |                      |  |
| P1                         | SA-1   | 56 | 35.6      | 3.0                | 22.0      | 3                  | 0.50  | 50-120               |  |
| P2                         | SA-2   | 62 | 29.9      | 4.1                | 25.3      | 2.1                | 0.70  | 40–160               |  |
| Р3                         | AC-1   | 45 | 28.1      | 5.8                | 25.6      | 3                  | 0.62  | 50-130               |  |
| P4                         | AC-2   | 47 | 53.2      | 7.1                | 13.1      | 3.6                | 0.23  | 60–130               |  |
| P5                         | SMA    | 49 | 35.8      | 3.6                | 21.8      | 2.1                | 0.74  | 40–140               |  |
| P6                         | AP-1   | 54 | 45.2      | 6.2                | 17.3      | 3.5                | 0.32  | 30–110               |  |
| P7                         | AP-2   | 47 | 31.1      | 5.6                | 24.2      | 3.2                | 0.57  | 40–100               |  |
| P8                         | AP-3   | 46 | 30.2      | 5.3                | 25.7      | 2.7                | 0.67  | 50-150               |  |
| P9                         | LCS    | 70 | 40.1      | 4.6                | 20.9      | 2.5                | 0.57  | 30-120               |  |
| P10                        | SCS    | 52 | 39.1      | 5.8                | 22.7      | 3.2                | 0.50  | 30–130               |  |
| P11                        | MIX    | 55 | 52.7      | 6.8                | 14.5      | 3.8                | 0.20  | 30–130               |  |
|                            |        |    | b) hear   | vy class of        | vehicles  |                    |       |                      |  |
| P1                         | SA-1   | 46 | 46.2      | 9.0                | 20.3      | 5.1                | 0.27  | 40–90                |  |
| P2                         | SA-2   | 41 | 54.4      | 7.5                | 15.7      | 4.1                | 0.27  | 40–100               |  |
| P3                         | AC-1   | 36 | 76.1      | 10.5               | 3.5       | 5.8                | 0.01  | 40–100               |  |
| P4                         | AC-2   | 39 | 63.7      | 9.9                | 10.4      | 5.3                | 0.95  | 50-100               |  |
| P5                         | SMA    | 38 | 71.8      | 7.9                | 5.3       | 4.4                | 0.38  | 40–90                |  |
| P6                         | AP-1   | 39 | 80.2      | 8.8                | 0.9       | 5.2                | 0.00  | 30-80                |  |
| P7                         | AP-2   | 50 | 69.3      | 5.5                | 7.4       | 3.3                | 0.07  | 20–70                |  |
| P8                         | AP-3   | 49 | 39.4      | 10.8               | 23.5      | 5.8                | 0.33  | 40-100               |  |
| Р9                         | LCS    | 35 | 54.2      | 11                 | 15.9      | 6.5                | 0.15  | 30-80                |  |
| P10                        | SCS    | 43 | 73.1      | 9.1                | 6.3       | 5.3                | 0.06  | 30-80                |  |
| P11                        | MIX    | 39 | 65.8      | 7.2                | 10.8      | 4.5                | 0.14  | 20-80                |  |



Fig. 3. Results of regression analysis:  $L_{AE} = a + b \log(V)$  for investigated road situations; legends – as in Table 2.

The data collected for each measuring situations and each vehicles class is used as input to linear regression analysis. The tyre/road and power unit noise have a strong relationship with vehicle speed. The tyre/road noise level increases approximately logarithmically with speed. So, for each measuring point (i) and each vehicle class (j) the best fitting linear function was determined according to:

$$L_{AEij} = a_{ij} + b_{ij} \log(V) \quad dB,$$
  

$$L_{WAij} = a_{wij} + b_{wij} \log(V) \quad dB.$$
(3)

The correlation coefficient between sound exposure level  $L_{AE}$  and velocity V as well between sound power level  $L_{WA}$  and velocity V were estimated. The errors of determined values of  $a_{ij}$  and  $b_{ij}$  were calculated too. The obtained result are given in Tables 2, 3 and showed in Fig. 3.

|          |        | I          | Light class |                    | Heavy class |            |         |  |
|----------|--------|------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|---------|--|
| Point No | Symbol | $a_w$ [dB] | $b_w$ [dB]  | $b_w$ [dB] $R_w^2$ |             | $b_w$ [dB] | $R_w^2$ |  |
| P1       | SA-1   | 51.2       | 28.3        | 0.6                | 60.2        | 27.6       | 0.34    |  |
| P2       | SA-2   | 37.6       | 35.7        | 0.79               | 73          | 20.8       | 0.33    |  |
| P3       | AC-1   | 43.9       | 31.7        | 0.77               | 92.1        | 9.7        | 0.07    |  |
| P4       | AC-2   | 66.9       | 20.2        | 0.42               | 83.8        | 14.4       | 0.14    |  |
| P5       | SMA    | 50.1       | 28.5        | 0.84               | 85.7        | 12.7       | 0.16    |  |
| P6       | AP-1   | 59.5       | 24.4        | 0.45               | 90.6        | 10.5       | 0.08    |  |
| P7       | AP-2   | 46         | 30.4        | 0.66               | 84          | 13.3       | 0.18    |  |
| P8       | AP-3   | 47.8       | 31.2        | 0.75               | 54.1        | 30.4       | 0.34    |  |
| P9       | LCS    | 52.1       | 29.2        | 0.61               | 67.9        | 23.3       | 0.28    |  |
| P10      | SCS    | 52.7       | 30.6        | 0.61               | 83.4        | 16.1       | 0.20    |  |
| P11      | MIX    | 65.3       | 22.8        | 0.38               | 80.4        | 18.3       | 0.25    |  |

**Table 3.** Results of regression analysis:  $L_{WA} = a_w + b_w \log(V)$ .

## 5. Corrections for surface type

For the investigated situations the surface type correction  $\Delta L_{A \text{ surf}}$  was determined by comparing the measured and calculated equivalent sound level  $L_{AeqT}$  at the reference point for the same traffic conditions. It was assumed that the NMPB method correctly estimates the engine and exhaust system noise emission level and any differences between measurements and calculations are mainly due to the influence of the road surface. The measured noise level  $L_{AeqTm}$  was calculated from relations (4) and (5).

The equivalent sound level  $L_{\text{Aeq}Tij}$  for given vehicles class (i) and given trafffic lane (j) is:

$$L_{\text{Aeq}Tij} = L_{\text{AE}ir}(V) + 10\log(Q_i) + 10\log(1/T) + 10\log(d_r/d_{m_i}) \quad \text{dB}, \qquad (4)$$

where  $L_{AEir}$  – sound exposure level calculated acc. to (3) for coefficients a and b given in Table 2,  $Q_i$  – traffic volume,  $d_r$  and  $d_{mj}$  – distances acc. to Fig. 1.

The total equivalent sound level  $L_{\text{Aeq}T}$  is:

$$L_{\text{Aeq}T} = \sum_{ij} 10^{0.1 L_{\text{Aeq}Tij}} \text{ dB},$$
(5)

where  $L_{\text{Aeq}Tij}$  – acc. to. (4).

The calculations were done using the NMPB method and software Cadna A. Noise level  $L_{\text{Aeq}Tc}$  was calculated for open space conditions assuming:

- the roadway cross section based on the inventory of the existing state,
- road srface type smooth asphalt (the reference road surface, the correction for the road surface type – 0 dB),
- total traffic volume Q = 1000 veh./h.

The influence of the traffic speed and the vehicle stream composition on the value of correction  $\Delta L_{A \text{ surf}}$  was analyzed. Levels  $L_{A eqTm}$  and  $L_{A eqTc}$  were determined for traffic speeds in a range of V = 50...120 km/h for different traffic stream compositions. A typical and extreme percentage of heavy-class vehicles:  $p_c = 0$ ; 0.15 and 100% were assumed. Table 4 shows road estimated surface type corrections  $\Delta L_{A \text{ surf}}$  in comparison to corrections assumed according to [4] on the basis of the visual inspection.

|                                      |          | $\Delta L_{\mathrm{A}\mathrm{surf}} = L_{\mathrm{A}\mathrm{eq}Tm} - L_{\mathrm{A}\mathrm{eq}Tc}, \mathrm{dB}.$ |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |         |           |           |
|--------------------------------------|----------|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| Point                                |          | P1   | P2   | P3   | P4   | P5   | P6   | P7   | P8   | Р9      | P10       | P11       |
| $p_{c}  [\%]$                        | V [km/h] | SA-1   | SA-2 | AC-1 | AC-2 | SMA  | AP-1 | AP-2 | AP-3 | LCS     | SCS       | MIX       |
|                                      | 50       | 1.9  | 1.8  | 0.1  | 3.6  | 1.8  | 3.6  | 1.2  | 2.8  | 4.4     | 6.5       | 5.6       |
| 0                                    | 70       | 2.0  | 2.4  | 0.7  | 2.4  | 1.9  | 3.0  | 1.6  | 3.5  | 4.4     | 6.7       | 4.6       |
|                                      | 90       | 2.1  | 2.8  | 1.2  | 1.5  | 2.0  | 2.6  | 1.9  | 4.0  | 4.3     | 6.9       | 3.9       |
| 15                                   | 50       | 0.2  | 0.3  | 0.0  | 1.1  | 0.2  | 1.6  | -0.2 | 0.1  | 1.8     | 6.7       | 3.4       |
|                                      | 70       | 1.2  | 1.2  | -0.2 | 0.7  | 0.2  | 1.0  | 0.1  | 1.6  | 2.4     | 6.6       | 3.2       |
|                                      | 90       | 1.3  | 1.3  | -0.6 | -0.2 | -0.2 | 0.2  | -0.1 | 2.1  | 2.3     | 6.1       | 2.4       |
| 100                                  | 50       | -2.6   | -2.2 | -1.6 | -2.7 | -2.4 | -2.6 | -2.2 | -1.6 | -2.7    | -2.4      | 0.1       |
|                                      | 70       | 0.4  | 0.1  | -1.1 | -1.2 | -1.6 | 0.4  | 0.1  | -1.1 | -1.2    | -1.6      | 1.7       |
|                                      | 90       | 0.6  | -0.2 | -2.7 | -2.0 | -3.1 | 0.6  | -0.2 | -2.7 | -2.0    | -3.1      | 0.8       |
| Surface type [4]                     |          | Ref.   | Ref. | Ref. | Ref. | Ref. | Ror. | Ror. | Ror. | PS even | PS uneven | PS uneven |
| $\Delta L_{A \text{ surf}}$ acc. [4] |          | 0.0  | 0.0  | 0.0  | 0.0  | 0.0  | 1.1  | 1.1  | 1.1  | 3.1     | 4.8       | 4.8       |

**Table 4.** Road surface correction  $\Delta L_{A \text{ surf}}$ .

Ref. - smooth asphalt (reference), Ror - rough asphalt,

PS even - even pavement stones,

PS uneven – uneven pavement stones [].

## 6. Conclusion

The measurement results show a trend consistent with the data reported in the literature [2, 4]. Stone-paved road surfaces have been found to be the loudest – causing an increase in noise emission for mixed traffic stream by 2...7 dB. For light vehicles the differences in the measured noise emission levels for the asphalt, asphalt concrete and stone mastic asphalt road surfaces are so small (compare to estimated errors) that all the investigated surfaces of this type can be considered as reference surfaces.

A regards the average acoustic properties, the new asphalt road surfaces in Poland are similar to the ones in other EU countries. For the investigated road surfaces the differences in average corrections for the road surface type, experimentally determined for a typical traffic stream composition ( $p_c = 15\%$ ) amount to -0.6-1.3 dB.

The experimentally estimated corrections for the asphalt road surface depend on the traffic speed and the traffic vehicle composition. For light-class vehicles  $(p_c = 0) L_{\text{Aeq}T}$  determined from measurements is higher than the one calculated using the NMPB method whereas for heavy-class vehicles  $(p_c = 100\%)$  the measured noise level is lower than the calculated one. This indicates that the influence of the road surface type is not the only source of the differences between calculation and measurement results.

The disadvantages of assumed measuring method is the influence of the variability of noise emission from different vehicles within each type and class.

#### References

- BRAGADO B., et al., Methods for evaluation of road noise, 1st European Road Congress, Lisbon 2004 (paper ERC 2004 36).
- [2] GARDZIEJCZYK W., Wpływ technologii wykonania warstwy ścieralnej na poziom hałasu od przejeżdżających pojazdów, Materiały I Polskiego Kongresu Drogowego, str. 333–241, Warszawa, 04-06.10.2006.
- [3] GNIAZDOWSKA A., Badania emisji hałasu przejeżdżających samochodów w zależności od rodzaju nawierzchni jezdni. Cz. 1. Nawierzchnie bitumiczne standardowe i brukowane, Praca dyplomowa magisterska, ITTA Politechnika Wrocławska, 2006.
- [4] Good Practice Guide for Strategic Noise Mapping and the Production of Associated Data on Noise Exposure, Version 2, 13 January 2006.
- [5] Instrukcja do programu Cadna A. Datakustic.
- [6] ISO 11819-1. Method for measuring the influence of road surface on traffic noise Part 1. Statistical Pass-By method.
- [7] RAITANEN N., *Measuring of noise and wearing of quite surfaces*, Doctoral dissertation, Helsinki University of Technology, 2005.

- [8] Rozporządzenie Ministra Środowiska z dnia 23 stycznia 2003 r., w sprawie wymagań w zakresie prowadzenia pomiarów poziomów w środowisku substancji lub energii przez zarządzającego drogą, linią kolejową, linią tramwajową, portem (D.U. nr 35, 2003, poz. 308).
- [9] SANDBERG U., Vehicle categories for description of noise source, Technical Report HAR11TR-030108-VTI04, 2003.
- [10] SOBESTO K., Badania emisji hałasu przejeżdzających samochodów w zależności od rodzaju nawierzchni jezdni. Cz. 2. Nowe nawierzchnie bitumiczne i nawierzchnie "ciche", Praca dyplomowa magisterska, ITTA Politechnika Wrocławska, 2006.