

ANALYSIS TYPE OF ROAD DAMAGE IN THE NATIONAL ROAD TEUKU UMAR TUBAN

Richo Ardidarmawan Mintiya^{a*}, Herry Widhiarto^b, Aditya Riskiardi^c.

^a Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, Indonesia

^c Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, Indonesia

^b Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, Indonesia

Corresponding Author:

Email: potensi@live.undip.ac.id

Keywords:

Road Damage, Bina Marga, Tuban

Abstract: The road is an object that can help humans in their lives. One example is that roads can be a link between one place and another, no wonder there are often road damages due to excessive vehicle loads. To overcome it all, it is necessary to have an accurate maintenance to make the road can be used according to the age of the plan. One of the roads that suffered damage was Teuku Umar Road Tuban, where on this road there were several damages at several points so that the driver had to be more careful to cross this road.

Copyright © 2022 POTENSI-UNDIP

1. INTRODUCTION

Asphalt roads are roads that are often used on Indonesian roads, asphalt roads have the advantage of fast work so that they do not cause disruption of road operations for a long time. However, it is necessary to have several important aspects so that the road can last until the life of the predetermined plan, these aspects include the selection of good materials, good drainage, and also good compaction of the basic soil. Road damage can be divided into 2 types, namely structural damage and functional damage [1]. As for the cause of road damage is 1. Traffic, increased vehicle load. 2. Water, can come from rainwater, groundwater, or poor drainage systems. 3. Road construction materials, where road damage can occur due to natural factors in the material that makes up the road or due to improper material selection. 4. Climate. 5. Unstable bottom soil [2].

2. DATA AND METHOD

2.1 Object of Research

The object of this study is the Teuku Umar Tuban National road, which has a road width of 11 meters and will be analyzed the type of road damage based on the Bina Marga method.

2.2 COLLECTING DATA

Data collection in this study is carried out by means of a survey directly at the research location. The data needed for this study include the types of damage that occur, the extent and category of damage that occurs, and also LHR data which is used as a calculation for determining the level of damage that occurs.

2.3 Data Processing

The data processing used in this study is by processing data using the Bina Marga method, where the management of survey results can be divided into several steps, including:

- The first step is to prepare the tools and survey forms that will be used in the research.
- The second stage is to divide the area of the road into several segments that are useful to facilitate the process of analyzing the level of damage that occurs.
- The Third step is to determine the type of damage by referring to the Bina Marga method.
- The fourth step is to record the results of the research on the form that has been provided.
- The fifth Performs the average LHR calculation.

3. RESULT AND DISSCUSSION

3.1 Type of Damage

From the results of research conducted to determine the type of damage that occurs on the Teuku Umar Tuban National road section, several types of damage with different severities and extents are also obtained. The following is a table of each damage that occurred on the Teuku Umar Tuban National road section.

Table 1 Type of Road Damage Segment 1(Richo, 2022)

| No. | Type of Damage | Area m ² | Area of Segment | Percentage |
|-----|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 1 | Patholes | 0.009 | 1100 | 0.0008 |
| 2 | Patching | 86.99 | 1100 | 7.90 |
| 3 | Cracking | 179.92 | 1100 | 16.35 |
| | Total | 266.919 | 1100 | 24.26 |

Table 2 Type of Road Damage Segment 2 (Richo, 2022)

| No. | Type of Damage | Area m ² | Area of Segment | Percentage |
|-----|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 1 | Patholes | 0.0093 | 1100 | 0.0008 |
| 2 | Patching | 194.082 | 1100 | 17.64 |
| 3 | Cracking | 95.33 | 1100 | 8.66 |
| 4 | Bleeding | 0.7 | 1100 | 0.06 |
| | Total | 290.121 | 1100 | 26.37 |

Table 3 Type of Road Damage Segment 3 (Richo, 2022)

| No. | Type of Damage | Area m ² | Area of Segment | Percentage |
|-----|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 1 | Patching | 162.85 | 1100 | 14.80 |
| 2 | Cracking | 348.41 | 1100 | 31.67 |
| 3 | Bleeding | 7.44 | 1100 | 0.67 |
| 4 | Revelling | 0.0003 | 1100 | 0.00003 |
| 5. | Depression | 9.6 | 1100 | 0.87 |
| | Total | 528.30 | 1100 | 48.02 |

Table 4 Type of Road Damage Segment 4 (Richo, 2022)

| No. | Type of Damage | Area m ² | Area of Segment | Percentage |
|-----|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 1 | Potholes | 0.0034 | 1100 | 0.0003 |
| 2 | Patching | 193.96 | 1100 | 17.63 |
| 3 | Cracking | 137.38 | 1100 | 12.5 |
| 4 | Revelling | 0.0045 | 1100 | 0.0004 |
| 5. | Bump and Sugs | 0.138 | 1100 | 0.01 |
| | Total | 331.486 | 1100 | 30.13 |

Table 5 Type of Road Damage Segment 5 (Richo, 2022)

| No. | Type of Damage | Area m ² | Area of Segment | Percentage |
|-----|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 1 | Potholes | 0.0056 | 1100 | 0.0005 |
| 2 | Patching | 40.62 | 1100 | 3.69 |
| 3 | Cracking | 109.5 | 1100 | 9.95 |
| 4 | Revelling | 0.0507 | 1100 | 0.0046 |
| | Total | 150.176 | 1100 | 13.65 |

Table 6 Type of Road Damage Segment 6 (Richo, 2022)

| No. | Type of Damage | Area m ² | Area of Segment | Percentage |
|-----|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 1 | Potholes | 0.0228 | 1100 | 0.0021 |
| 2 | Patching | 10.74 | 1100 | 0.97 |
| 3 | Cracking | 96.65 | 1100 | 8.78 |
| 4 | Revelling | 20.79 | 1100 | 1.89 |
| | Total | 107.82 | 1100 | 9.80 |

Table 7 Type of Road Damage Segment 7 (Richo, 2022)

| No. | Type of Damage | Area m ² | Area of Segment | Percentage |
|-----|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 1 | Potholes | 0.0035 | 1100 | 0.0003 |
| 2 | Patching | 43.98 | 1100 | 3.99 |
| 3 | Cracking | 186.22 | 1100 | 16.9 |
| 4 | Revelling | 0.58 | 1100 | 0.05 |
| 5 | Bleeding | 17.49 | 1100 | 1.59 |
| 6 | Depression | 0.004 | 1100 | 0.0004 |
| | Total | 248.28 | 1100 | 22.57 |

Table 8 Type of Road Damage Segment 8 (Richo, 2022)

| No. | Type of Damage | Area m ² | Area of Segment | Percentage |
|-----|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 1 | Patching | 32.7 | 1100 | 2.97 |
| 2 | Cracking | 207.56 | 1100 | 18.87 |
| 3 | Revelling | 0.426 | 1100 | 0.039 |
| 4 | Depression | 0.003 | 1100 | 0.0003 |
| | Total | 240.689 | 1100 | 21.88 |

Table 9 Type of Road Damage Segment 9 (Richo, 2022)

| No. | Type of Damage | Area m ² | Area of Segment | Percentage |
|-----|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 1 | Patching | 23.4 | 1100 | 2.13 |
| 2 | Cracking | 296.21 | 1100 | 26.93 |
| 3 | Revelling | 0.01 | 1100 | 0.0009 |
| 4 | Bump and Sugs | 1.24 | 1100 | 0.11 |
| 5 | Depression | 0.075 | 1100 | 0.0068 |
| | Total | 320.935 | 1100 | 29.17 |

Table 10 Type of Road Damage Segment 10 (Richo, 2022)

| No. | Type of Damage | Area m ² | Area of Segment | Percentage |
|-----|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 1 | Patholes | 0.013 | 1100 | 0.0012 |
| 2 | Patching | 0.0039 | 1100 | 0.0004 |
| 3 | Cracking | 170.15 | 1100 | 15.47 |
| 4 | Depression | 0.0039 | 1100 | 0.0004 |
| | Total | 320.935 | 1100 | 15.47 |

Table 11 Type of Road Damage Segment 11 (Richo, 2022)

| No. | Type of Damage | Area m ² | Area of Segment | Percentage |
|-----|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 1 | Patholes | 0.0554 | 1100 | 0.005 |
| 2 | Patching | 42.29 | 1100 | 3.844 |
| 3 | Cracking | 119.847 | 1100 | 10.89 |
| 4 | Ravelling | 0.117 | 1100 | 0.010 |
| | Total | 162.31 | 1100 | 14.75 |

Table 12 Type of Road Damage Segment 12 (Richo, 2022)

| No. | Type of Damage | Area m ² | Area of Segment | Percentage |
|-----|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 1 | Patching | 46.024 | 1100 | 4.18 |
| 2 | Cracking | 124.08 | 1100 | 11.28 |
| 3 | Ruts | 6.56 | 1100 | 0.596 |
| 4 | Ravelling | 0.038 | 1100 | 0.0035 |
| 5 | Bleeding | 2.53 | 1100 | 0.23 |
| 6 | Depression | 5.5 | 1100 | 0.5 |
| | Total | 184.74 | 1100 | 16.79 |

From the table above, the segment that suffered the highest damage was segment 3, which was 48.03% and the segment with the smallest damage rate was segment 6, which was 9.8%..

3.2 LHR Survei Data

Table 13 Determination of LHR Level

| Class of LHR | LHR |
|--------------|---------------|
| 0 | <20 |
| 1 | 20 – 50 |
| 2 | 50 – 200 |
| 3 | 200 – 500 |
| 4 | 500 – 2000 |
| 5 | 2000 – 5000 |
| 6 | 5000 - 20000 |
| 7 | 20000 - 50000 |
| 8 | >50000 |

(Source: *Tata Cara Penyusunan Program Pemeliharaan Jalan Kota*, 1990)

The following are the results of LHR calculations carried out over several days to find the peak value of road density.

Tabel 13 The Highest of LHR Data (Richo, 2022)

| No. | Vehicle Type | EKR | Road Vehicle/Hour | Volume Data SMP/Hour |
|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | Light Vehicle | 1.0 | 315 | 315 |
| 2 | Medium Heavy Vehicle | 1.3 | 143 | 185.9 |
| 3 | Bug Bus | 1.5 | 16 | 24 |
| 4 | Big Truck | 2.5 | 188 | 470 |
| 5 | Motorcycle | 0.6 | 1188 | 712.8 |
| | Total | | 1850 | 1707.7 |

Referring to the LHR table above, it can be seen that the Teuku Umar Tuban National Road is 4.

4, CONCLUSSION

Based on research and analysis of data obtained several conclusions including :

1. The type of damage that occurs and the percentage of damage that occurs on the Teuku Umar Tuban National Road is:
 - a. Cracking 55.3 %
 - b. Patholes 0.013 %
 - c. Patching 37.19%
 - d. Raveling 6.36%
 - e. Grade Depression 1 %
 - f. And ruts 0.10%
2. Teuku Umar Tuban National Road is included in category 4 in determining the level of road density based on procedures for the preparation of the city road maintenance program.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In the success of this research, many parties play a role, for that here the author will thank the :

1. My Parents who have given moral and material encouragement and support and prayers offered to Allah SWT for the author.
2. Mrs. Faradlillah Saves, ST., MT. As Head of Civil Engineering Study Program of The Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya.
3. Ir. Herry Widhiarto, M.Sc as lecturer of Guidance I and Aditya Riskiardi, ST., MT as Lecturer of Guidance II who has deigned to provide knowledge and guidance in every problem faced in fulfilling this Final Task Report.
4. Dr. Mulyanto Nugroho, MM, CMA., CPAI, as Rector of the Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya.
5. All Lecturers of the University 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya who have provided knowledge and knowledge during the process of teaching and learning activities in the lecture.
7. Riskiya Nurul Jannah, who has helped and encouraged the author in completing this Final Task Report.

REFERENCES

[1]

Hardiyatmo, H. C. (2015). Teknik Fondasi 2. *Gramedia Pustaka Utama*, 275.
[https://www.academia.edu/download/57492139/Hardiyatmo - 1996 -
 Teknik Pondasi 1.pdf](https://www.academia.edu/download/57492139/Hardiyatmo_-_1996_-_Teknik_Pondasi_1.pdf)

[2]

Sukirman, S. (1999). Tl I / ,1. *Perkerasan Jalan Lentur*, 1–129.

Tata Cara Penyusunan Program Pemeliharaan Jalan Kota. (1990). 018.

[3]

Hardiyatmo, H. C. (2015). Teknik Fondasi 2. *Gramedia Pustaka Utama*, 275.
https://www.academia.edu/download/57492139/Hardiyatmo_1996_Teknik_Pondasi_1.pdf

[4]

Direktorat Jendral Bina Marga, K. U. (1997). *Tata Cara Perencanaan Geometrik Jalan Antar Kota No. 038/TBM/1997 Direktorat Jenderal Bina Marga. 038*, 1-54.