
“CLIMATE-RESILIENT DESIGN STRATEGIES FOR SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE”

LEKHA JITENDRA BHOYAR

Lecturer

Civil Engineering Department

SOMAYYA DIPLOMA IN ENGINEERING

lekhabhojar07@gmail.com

SILKESHA GANESH KURREWAR

Lecturer

Civil Engineering Department

SOMAYYA DIPLOMA IN ENGINEERING

silksha.kurrewar@gmail.com

TANISH SUBRATO GHOSH

Student

Civil Engineering Department

SOMAYYA DIPLOMA IN ENGINEERING

tanishghosh939@gmail.com

APEKSHA SAPAN DUTTA

Student

Civil Engineering Department

SOMAYYA DIPLOMA IN ENGINEERING

duttaapeksha9@gmail.com

To Cite this Article

LEKHA JITENDRA BHOYAR, SILKESHA GANESH KURREWAR, TANISH SUBRATO GHOSH, APEKSHA SAPAN DUTTA, “CLIMATE-RESILIENT DESIGN STRATEGIES FOR SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE”, *Journal of Science Engineering Technology and Management Science*, Vol. 03, Issue 02, February 2026, pp: 155-165, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.64771/jsetms.2026.v03.i02.pp155-165>

Submitted: 16-01-2026

Accepted: 21-02-2026

Published: 28-02-2026

Abstract: Transportation infrastructure plays an essential role in economic development, urban mobility, trade, emergency response, and access to public services. However, roads, bridges, railway systems, drainage structures, and associated transport facilities are increasingly exposed to climatic stresses such as extreme rainfall, flooding, high temperatures, landslides, coastal inundation, and severe storms. Conventional transportation infrastructure is generally designed using historical climatic conditions, which may not adequately represent future environmental stresses. This study examines climate-resilient design strategies that can improve the long-term sustainability, safety, and operational reliability of transportation infrastructure. A scenario-based civil engineering assessment method is adopted to compare conventional design, engineering-based resilient design, and hybrid resilient design integrating structural and nature-based solutions. Major parameters considered include flood resistance, thermal resistance, slope and erosion stability, service continuity, drainage performance, environmental sustainability, and ease of recovery after extreme events. The study indicates that improved drainage capacity, climate-responsive pavement materials, bridge hydraulic protection, slope bioengineering, permeable surfaces,

vegetation-based stabilization, redundancy in transportation networks, and continuous condition monitoring can substantially improve infrastructure resilience. The analysis further shows that climate adaptation should be incorporated during planning and design rather than being treated only as a post-disaster rehabilitation measure. A combination of conventional engineering and nature-based solutions provides the most balanced approach because it improves structural reliability while supporting environmental sustainability. Climate-resilient design can therefore reduce infrastructure vulnerability, improve service continuity, and support the development of safer and more sustainable transportation networks under changing climatic conditions.

Keywords: Climate resilience; Transportation infrastructure; Sustainable design; Flood protection; Pavement; Adaptation

This is an open access article under the creative commons license
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>



Introduction:

Transportation infrastructure forms the physical backbone of modern settlements and economies. Roadways, bridges, railways, tunnels, drainage systems, ports, and transit facilities allow the movement of people and goods and connect communities with employment, education, healthcare, and emergency services. Damage or interruption to these systems can therefore produce consequences that extend far beyond the damaged asset itself. Climate change is creating new challenges for transportation engineers because many infrastructure systems were originally designed using climatic records and design assumptions based primarily on past conditions. Increasing temperatures can affect asphalt stiffness, pavement rutting, concrete behavior, rail alignment, and the deterioration of construction materials. At the same time, intense rainfall and flooding can weaken pavement foundations, wash away embankments, damage culverts, scour bridge foundations, and interrupt traffic movement. Recent research has emphasized that temperature, precipitation, sea-level rise, and compound climatic stresses are increasingly capable of pushing road infrastructure beyond traditional engineering limits.

Flooding is particularly significant for transportation systems because even when a roadway is not structurally destroyed, water accumulation can substantially reduce vehicle speed, road capacity, and accessibility. Pregolato et al. demonstrated that road disruption changes progressively with flood depth rather than simply changing from an operational to a completely closed condition.

The scale of exposure is also considerable. Koks et al. estimated that approximately 27% of global road and railway infrastructure is exposed to at least one major natural hazard, while about 7.5% is exposed to a 1-in-100-year flood event. Their analysis further indicated that surface and river flooding account for a major proportion of expected direct damage to transport assets.

Climate-resilient transportation design therefore requires more than simply increasing the strength of individual structural components. It requires a system-level approach that combines climate-risk assessment, adaptable engineering standards, improved drainage, durable materials, nature-based protection, asset monitoring, lifecycle maintenance, and emergency recovery planning. The IPCC has similarly emphasized that infrastructure

adaptation should address interconnected climate risks rather than treating individual hazards independently.

The present study evaluates practical climate-resilient design strategies from a civil engineering perspective and develops a comparative framework for identifying design approaches capable of improving structural reliability, sustainability, and long-term transport service continuity.

Related Works:

Bles et al. (2016) examined climate-related risks to road infrastructure through the ROADAPT project and proposed a systematic approach for identifying vulnerabilities and selecting suitable adaptation measures. Their study emphasized that road networks are increasingly affected by extreme weather conditions and that infrastructure managers need to consider not only the physical damage caused by climatic events but also the wider consequences of road disruption. The ROADAPT framework applies a risk-based methodology in which the causes, effects, and consequences of weather-related events are evaluated before adaptation measures are selected. The work established an important foundation for incorporating climate risk assessment into road planning, maintenance, and infrastructure management.

The Federal Highway Administration (2022) investigated the resilience of transportation infrastructure under extreme weather and changing climatic conditions using case studies from four National Parks in the United States. Particular attention was given to variations in precipitation and streamflow and their influence on roadside drainage systems, storm drains, culverts, bridges, and other hydraulic components of transportation infrastructure. The study showed that transportation structures located near watercourses are particularly sensitive to changes in rainfall intensity and flood discharge. It therefore highlighted the importance of hydraulic assessment, improved drainage design, and consideration of future extreme events when designing or rehabilitating transportation facilities.

Filosa et al. (2017) presented the third edition of the Federal Highway Administration's Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Framework. The framework was developed to assist transportation agencies in identifying infrastructure that may be vulnerable to extreme weather and climate change. It provides a structured procedure for assessing exposure, sensitivity, and potential consequences before selecting appropriate adaptation strategies. The framework is particularly useful because it links climate vulnerability assessment with practical transportation decision-making. It encourages transportation departments and planning organizations to incorporate climate adaptation into infrastructure planning, construction, operation, and maintenance instead of treating it as a separate environmental issue.

Gudipudi et al. (2017) investigated the potential influence of climate change on pavement structural performance in the United States. The authors incorporated climate projections from multiple climate models into pavement performance analysis and compared predicted pavement deterioration under future and historical climatic conditions. Their findings indicated that projected climate changes are likely to increase pavement distress and, in some cases, contribute to earlier pavement failure. The study demonstrated that temperature and environmental conditions directly influence pavement serviceability and therefore need to be

considered during pavement material selection and structural design. This research is particularly important for climate-resilient transportation engineering because it demonstrates that conventional pavement designs based solely on historical climate records may become inadequate under future conditions.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2022) provided a broader assessment of climate risks affecting cities, settlements, and critical infrastructure. Transportation systems are identified as essential components of urban infrastructure because they enable the movement of people, goods, services, and economic resources. The report emphasizes that climate risks to infrastructure are interconnected and can create cascading consequences across urban systems. Flooding, increasing temperatures, sea-level rise, extreme precipitation, and other hazards may affect infrastructure functionality and increase disruption. The report therefore supports integrated and forward-looking adaptation strategies that consider long-term climatic changes when planning major infrastructure systems.

Islam and Kabir (2024) conducted a systematic review of the relationship between climate variability and transportation infrastructure sustainability. Their study identified extreme weather, temperature variations, flooding, sea-level rise, and related climatic stresses as important factors affecting transportation infrastructure performance. The authors observed that these conditions can influence structural integrity, operational efficiency, maintenance requirements, and overall system reliability. Their review further highlighted the need for sustainable construction materials, climate-responsive design, improved maintenance strategies, risk assessment, and adaptive infrastructure management. The study reinforces the idea that sustainability and climate resilience should be considered together rather than as separate objectives in transportation infrastructure development.

Knott et al. (2019) focused specifically on integrating climate adaptation into pavement management systems. Their work recognized that increasing temperatures, sea-level rise, and associated groundwater changes can accelerate pavement deterioration and contribute to premature failure. The authors proposed a framework through which transportation agencies could introduce climate considerations into pavement management and investment decisions. Rather than waiting for climate-related deterioration to occur, the proposed approach encourages agencies to identify vulnerable pavement sections and incorporate adaptation measures within maintenance and rehabilitation programs. This approach is valuable because it connects long-term climate resilience with routine infrastructure asset management.

Koks et al. (2019) presented a global multi-hazard analysis of road and railway infrastructure. Their study demonstrated the considerable exposure of transportation assets to natural hazards and estimated that approximately 27% of global road and railway infrastructure is exposed to at least one hazard. They also found that about 7.5% of these assets are exposed to a 1-in-100-year flood event. Surface and river flooding represented a substantial share of estimated infrastructure damage, indicating the importance of flood resilience in transport planning. The authors further demonstrated that improved flood protection could provide positive economic returns for many exposed roads. The study provides strong evidence that resilience investment can reduce both physical infrastructure damage and long-term economic losses.

Pregnoletto et al. (2017) examined the effect of flooding on road transportation and developed a depth-disruption relationship linking standing floodwater depth with vehicle speed. Their

study challenged the conventional assumption that flooded roads should be represented simply as completely open or completely closed. Instead, the results showed that transport performance gradually decreases as floodwater depth increases. The proposed relationship can be incorporated into transportation and flood-risk models to estimate delays and network disruption more realistically. This research demonstrates that climate resilience should not be evaluated only in terms of physical damage to infrastructure; the ability of transportation systems to maintain safe and reliable operation during extreme weather is equally important. Sias et al. (2025) provided a recent comprehensive review of climate change impacts on roadway infrastructure. The study brought together evidence concerning the influence of changing temperature, precipitation, moisture conditions, flooding, and other environmental stresses on roadway materials and structural performance. The authors considered pavement deterioration as well as broader roadway adaptation issues, emphasizing the need for design and maintenance approaches that can accommodate future environmental conditions. Their work reflects a shift in transportation engineering from responding to climate-related damage after it occurs toward anticipating future climatic stresses during design, material selection, asset management, and rehabilitation planning.

Collectively, the reviewed studies demonstrate that climate change presents a multidimensional challenge to transportation infrastructure. Earlier research concentrated strongly on vulnerability assessment and risk-management frameworks, whereas later studies increasingly addressed pavement deterioration, flooding, infrastructure service disruption, multi-hazard exposure, and long-term sustainability. The literature consistently indicates that historical climatic conditions alone are no longer sufficient for designing infrastructure expected to remain operational for several decades. However, much of the available research evaluates individual hazards or infrastructure components separately. There remains a need for integrated approaches that combine climate-responsive materials, enhanced drainage, hydraulic protection, slope stabilization, nature-based solutions, preventive maintenance, and network-level resilience. The present study addresses this requirement by comparatively examining conventional, engineered climate-resilient, and hybrid sustainable transportation design strategies within a common resilience assessment framework.

Objectives of the Study:

1. To identify the major climate-related hazards affecting roads, bridges, pavements, drainage systems, slopes, and other transportation infrastructure.
2. To evaluate engineering and nature-based design strategies that can improve the resilience and sustainability of transportation systems.
3. To compare conventional, climate-resilient, and hybrid infrastructure designs using a multi-criteria resilience assessment framework.

Material and Methods:

The study adopts a **Climate Stress Resilience Performance Assessment (CSRPA)** approach developed specifically for the present analysis. It is a scenario-based engineering method rather than a field experiment. Published research, engineering guidance, climate-risk studies, and documented infrastructure adaptation practices were used to identify important climate hazards and suitable design responses.

The methodology consisted of five stages.

Stage 1: Identification of climatic stresses

Five major groups of climatic stresses were considered:

- Extreme rainfall and flooding
- Increasing temperature and heatwaves
- Landslides and erosion
- Coastal flooding and storm effects
- Repeated wetting, drying, and other long-term environmental deterioration

Stage 2: Identification of vulnerable infrastructure

The transportation components assessed included flexible pavements, rigid pavements, bridges, culverts, embankments, slopes, roadside drainage, railway infrastructure, and urban road networks.

Stage 3: Selection of resilient design measures

Potential measures were classified as structural, material-based, hydraulic, nature-based, technological, and management-based interventions.

Table 1. Climate Hazards and Proposed Engineering Responses

Climate Hazard	Possible Infrastructure Impact	Climate-Resilient Design Strategy
Extreme rainfall	Road flooding and pavement saturation	Larger drains, improved culverts, permeable surfaces
River flooding	Bridge and embankment damage	Raised approaches, flood barriers, hydraulic redesign
Extreme heat	Asphalt softening and rutting	High-temperature resistant binders and improved mixtures
Coastal flooding	Pavement saturation and erosion	Elevated structures, coastal protection and improved drainage
Landslides	Road blockage and slope failure	Retaining structures, soil reinforcement and vegetation
Erosion	Loss of shoulder and embankment material	Geotextiles, vegetation and erosion-control systems
Bridge scour	Foundation instability	Scour protection and improved hydraulic openings
Intense storm events	Network disruption	Alternative routes, redundancy and emergency management

Climate risks affecting transportation infrastructure are strongly influenced by flooding, temperature, precipitation, and other interacting hazards.

Stage 4: Development of design alternatives

Three representative transportation infrastructure design alternatives were considered:

Alternative A – Conventional Design:

Traditional materials, standard drainage capacity, conventional slope protection, and maintenance based largely on observed deterioration.

Alternative B – Engineered Climate-Resilient Design:

Enhanced pavement materials, larger drainage structures, increased erosion protection, structural strengthening, raised infrastructure, and climate-based maintenance.

Alternative C – Hybrid Sustainable Resilient Design:

Engineered resilience measures combined with permeable drainage, vegetated slopes,

bioengineering, green infrastructure, condition monitoring, lifecycle planning, and network redundancy.

Stage 5: Resilience performance assessment

Five criteria were evaluated using a five-point scale:

1 = Very poor

2 = Poor

3 = Moderate

4 = Good

5 = Very good

The weighted Climate Resilience Performance Index was calculated as:

$$CRPI = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{W_i}{100} \times S_i \right)$$

Where:

CRPI = Climate Resilience Performance Index

W_i = Weight assigned to the i^{th} criterion (%)

S_i = Performance score of the i^{th} criterion

n = Total number of assessment criteria

Table 2. Evaluation Criteria and Weighting

Criterion	Weight (%)
Flood and drainage resilience	30
Thermal and material resistance	20
Slope and erosion resilience	20
Service continuity and recovery	15
Environmental sustainability	15
Total	100

The weighting gives greater importance to flood and drainage performance because flooding is repeatedly identified as one of the principal hazards affecting transportation infrastructure.

Analysis of the Study:

The three design alternatives were assessed using the proposed CSRPA framework.

Table 3. Comparative Resilience Assessment

Evaluation Parameter	Conventional Design	Engineered Resilient Design	Hybrid Sustainable Design
Flood and drainage resilience	1.8	4.2	4.6
Thermal and material resistance	2.0	4.4	4.2
Slope and erosion resilience	2.3	4.0	4.6
Service continuity and	2.2	4.2	4.5

recovery			
Environmental sustainability	2.0	3.2	4.8
Weighted CRPI	2.03	4.05	4.54

Note: The scores are scenario-based comparative values developed for this study and should not be interpreted as measured field-performance data.

The assessment indicates that conventional transportation design provides satisfactory operation under normal environmental conditions but has limited capacity to accommodate increasing climatic extremes. Its overall CRPI value of 2.03 reflects weaknesses particularly in flood management, thermal adaptation, and recovery capacity.

The engineered resilient alternative achieves a CRPI of 4.05. Improvement results mainly from stronger drainage systems, climate-compatible pavement materials, hydraulic protection, structural strengthening, and enhanced maintenance planning.

The hybrid sustainable alternative records the highest comparative CRPI of 4.54. Its advantage arises from combining engineering measures with environmental approaches such as vegetation, permeable systems, bioengineering, runoff management, and continuous asset management.

Table 4. Conventional and Climate-Resilient Design Comparison

Design Aspect	Conventional Practice	Climate-Resilient Practice	Expected Engineering Benefit
Pavement	Historical climate-based material selection	Climate-adjusted binder and pavement structure	Reduced heat and moisture deterioration
Drainage	Standard design storm assumptions	Future rainfall allowances and additional drainage capacity	Lower flood exposure
Bridges	Conventional hydraulic opening	Improved scour and flood-flow consideration	Increased foundation and hydraulic safety
Embankments	Conventional compacted soil	Reinforced soil and erosion protection	Improved stability
Slopes	Retaining structures alone	Structural protection with vegetation/bioengineering	Reduced erosion and landslide susceptibility
Maintenance	Reactive maintenance	Risk-based and predictive maintenance	Earlier identification of deterioration
Road network	Limited alternative routing	Network redundancy and emergency routes	Better service continuity
Stormwater	Rapid discharge	Infiltration, retention and controlled drainage	Reduced runoff pressure

The analysis suggests that climate resilience cannot be achieved through one design modification. Instead, several complementary interventions are necessary. Pavement material

changes primarily address temperature and moisture deterioration, while drainage improvements address rainfall and flooding. Bridge modifications respond to increased hydraulic loads, whereas slope reinforcement and nature-based stabilization address erosion and landslide risks.

Climate resilience should therefore be understood as a systems-engineering problem in which structural design, materials engineering, geotechnical engineering, hydrology, environmental engineering, transportation planning, and infrastructure management work together.

Results and Discussion:

The study demonstrates that integrating climate considerations into transportation design can considerably improve the ability of infrastructure to remain functional during extreme environmental conditions.

The first important finding concerns **drainage and flood protection**. Increasing the hydraulic capacity of drains and culverts, maintaining clear drainage paths, improving roadside grading, introducing permeable surfaces, and providing temporary water-storage systems can reduce pavement saturation and surface flooding. This is especially significant because flooding is one of the most widespread hazards affecting transport networks. Koks et al. reported substantial global exposure of roads and railways to flood hazards, emphasizing the importance of targeted flood-protection measures.

The second finding relates to **climate-responsive pavement design**. Pavement materials selected only according to historical temperature ranges may become less reliable when temperatures regularly exceed their original design assumptions. High temperatures can soften asphalt and increase rutting, while excessive moisture may weaken pavement foundations. Current reviews consequently recommend climate-informed material selection and pavement design procedures.

A third important area is **bridge and culvert resilience**. Greater rainfall intensity and flood discharge may increase scour around bridge foundations and hydraulic pressure on crossings. Appropriate hydraulic opening, erosion protection, scour-resistant foundation design, and adequate freeboard can therefore reduce the probability of severe structural damage.

The study also identifies **slope stability and erosion control** as critical considerations, especially in mountainous terrain. Conventional retaining structures can be strengthened through geosynthetics, drainage, vegetation, and soil bioengineering. Examples from road projects in India show that drainage improvement and bioengineering can be incorporated into road upgrades in areas exposed to landslide and erosion hazards.

Nature-based solutions also provide sustainability advantages. Vegetation can stabilize slopes, reduce erosion, support infiltration, and moderate runoff while creating environmental benefits that conventional concrete structures alone cannot provide. However, these solutions should not automatically replace engineering structures. In high-risk locations, hybrid combinations of conventional structural protection and nature-based systems are more appropriate. World Bank guidance similarly recommends considering nature-based interventions within a wider portfolio of engineered risk-reduction measures.

Another important requirement is **resilience during operation and maintenance**. Infrastructure resilience depends not only on initial construction but also on inspections, preventive maintenance, monitoring, and rapid response after hazardous events. Sensors, geographic information systems, pavement condition monitoring, weather information, and

predictive maintenance can enable agencies to identify vulnerable assets before major failures occur. Climate-informed road maintenance systems have already been introduced in some resilience programs.

The comparison presented in Table 3 shows that the hybrid design performs better than the other alternatives because it addresses both engineering reliability and environmental sustainability. Nevertheless, the most appropriate strategy for an actual project should be selected using site-specific rainfall, temperature, geology, traffic loading, hydrology, lifecycle cost, environmental constraints, and projected climate conditions.

Conclusion:

Climate change presents a significant long-term challenge to the safety, durability, and sustainability of transportation infrastructure. Increasing temperature, extreme rainfall, flooding, landslides, erosion, coastal effects, and other climatic hazards can accelerate pavement deterioration, damage bridges and drainage systems, destabilize slopes, and interrupt transportation services.

The study demonstrates that climate-resilient transportation design requires an integrated civil engineering approach rather than reliance on a single protective measure. Enhanced drainage systems, climate-compatible pavement materials, bridge scour protection, reinforced embankments, slope stabilization, permeable surfaces, green infrastructure, network redundancy, monitoring systems, and preventive maintenance all contribute to increased resilience.

The proposed comparative assessment indicates that conventional infrastructure provides the lowest resilience under changing climatic conditions, while engineered climate-resilient design provides substantial improvement. The highest overall performance is obtained through a hybrid approach that combines conventional structural engineering with nature-based solutions and sustainable infrastructure management.

Future transportation projects should therefore incorporate climate-risk assessment during planning, design, construction, operation, and maintenance. Designing infrastructure for future climate conditions can reduce repeated damage, maintain essential mobility, improve public safety, and support the long-term sustainability of transportation systems.

References:

1. Bles, T., Ennesser, Y., Fadeuilhe, J. J., Falemo, S., Lind, B., Mens, M., Ray, M., & Sandersen, F. (2016). Climate change risk assessments and adaptation for roads—Results of the ROADAPT project. *Transportation Research Procedia*, 14, 58–67.
2. Federal Highway Administration. (2022). *Infrastructure resilience to extreme events and climate change: Federal lands sensitivity case studies*. U.S. Department of Transportation, FHWA-HIF-22-043.
3. Filosa, G., Plovnick, A., Stahl, L., Miller, R., & Pickrell, D. (2017). *Vulnerability assessment and adaptation framework* (3rd ed.). Federal Highway Administration, FHWA-HEP-18-020.
4. Gudipudi, P. P., Underwood, B. S., & Zalghout, A. (2017). Impact of climate change on pavement structural performance in the United States. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 57, 172–184.

5. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2022). Cities, settlements and key infrastructure. In *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Islam, M., & Kabir, G. (2024). Navigating climate variability for the pursuit of transportation infrastructure sustainability: A systematic review. *Infrastructures*, 9(10), 182. <https://doi.org/10.3390/infrastructures9100182>
7. Knott, J. F., Jacobs, J. M., Sias, J. E., Kirshen, P., & Dave, E. V. (2019). A framework for introducing climate-change adaptation in pavement management. *Sustainability*, 11, 4382.
8. Koks, E. E., Rozenberg, J., Zorn, C., Tariverdi, M., Vousdoukas, M., Fraser, S. A., Hall, J. W., & Hallegatte, S. (2019). A global multi-hazard risk analysis of road and railway infrastructure assets. *Nature Communications*, 10, 2677. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-10442-3>
9. Pregolato, M., Ford, A., Wilkinson, S. M., & Dawson, R. J. (2017). The impact of flooding on road transport: A depth-disruption function. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 55, 67–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2017.06.020>
10. Sias, J. E., Dave, E. V., Underwood, B. S., et al. (2025). Climate change impacts on roadways. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, 6, 555–573. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-025-00711-9>