



The Cost Implications of Using Various Flexible Pavement Design Methodologies for Canadian Municipalities

Alain Duclos, P.Eng. Senior Pavement Engineer, LVM, M.Sc. Candidate
Susan L. Tighe, PhD, P.Eng., Professor and Canada Research Chair

Centre for Pavement and Transportation Technology, University of Waterloo, ON, Canada



Introduction

- Pavement design methodologies have evolved quite rapidly over the past 30 years
- Adoption of these new techniques has varied significantly by Canadian municipalities
- Current pavement design methodologies used vary from experiential/empirical based design methodologies to more modern mechanistic-empirical based designs



Example Empirical Design MTO SDO-90 Example Empirical Design MTO MI-183/AASHTO 93 Example Mechanistic-Empirical Design AASHTO ME-MEPDG

Summary of Flexible Pavement Design Methods Used in Canada [1]

AGENCY	GENERAL DESIGN METHODS	DESIGN LIFE (years)
BC	AASHTO 93	20-20
AB	AASHTO 93	20-10-20
SK	Shell Method Asphalt Institute	15-15
MB	AASHTO 93/MEPDG CUR/M-EPDG	20-20
ON	AASHTO 93 SPM Routine (Empirical) Method	Major Highways: 18-22/12-15 Other Projects: 12-15/10-12
QC	AASHTO 93 Chemin 2	Major Highways: 30/15/30 Other Projects: 25/15-25
NB	AASHTO 93 Rubroad Values	20-15
PEI	Asphalt Institute	20-12
NS	AASHTO 93 Condition Charts	20-15
NL	Standard Sections Used	20-15
Yukon	State of Alaska Design Method	20-12
PWOSC	AASHTO 93	20-12

Study Design

- As pavement design technology has evolved, it has allowed the design of thinner, longer lasting and more reliable pavements
- The objective of the study is to try and quantify the cost benefits of using new design methodologies
- The result will enable municipal engineers to select the most appropriate design method for their district

Design Inputs Required for Each Method

DESIGN INPUT	MTO SDO-90	AASHTO 93 (MTO MI-183)	MEPDG (if available for Ontario)
Pavement Performance	Free Choice (based on Engineering or Experience) or Standardized Highway Design Grades or Service Classes	Standardized and Tested Serviceability	Standard Test Method (ST)
Traffic Characteristics	AADT, Truck Percentage	AADT % Trucks, Lane Distribution Factor, Daily Traffic, Vehicle Classification Factor, Serviceability, Performance Grade	AADT, Lane Distribution Factor, Daily Traffic, Vehicle Classification Factor, Serviceability, Standard Deviation, Wheel Load, Standard Deviation, Performance Grade
Subgrade Characteristics	Laboratory Strength Tests (Shrink Swell Analysis, Resilient Modulus)	Laboratory Strength Tests (Shrink Swell, Bulk Unit Weight, CBR, PVD Testing)	Laboratory Strength Tests (Shrink Swell, Bulk Unit Weight, CBR, PVD Testing)
Pavement Structural Characteristics	Observed Base Strength	Standard Layer Coefficients	Laboratory Strength Tests (Shrink Swell, Bulk Unit Weight, CBR, PVD Testing)
Reliability	-	Design Reliability, Standard Deviation	Design Reliability Levels
Drainage	Engineering Judgment	Drainage Coefficient	Automatically incorporated into design procedure
Environment	-	-	AASHTO Free Choice/Local Weather Data
Design Prediction Method	-	-	Design Value or adjustment based on reference values

Case Examples

- To compare design methods, three different pavement design types were considered
 - low volume local/collector road
 - medium volume arterial road
 - high volume major arterial road
- Common design inputs were used to show how the pavement structural design differ
- The design types represent typical municipal road classes and show the sensitivity of the design methods to different traffic volumes and compositions

Design Notes

- SDO-90 is limited to 130 mm of HMA for traffic > 400 AADT. A rule of thumb of 30 mm HMA for each x 2 of traffic was used to estimate equivalent HMA thickness
- For MI-183 and MEPDG designs, the required SSM depth was based on engineering judgement depending on the class of roadway and operating speed
- To simulate the strength gained by adding the SSM in MI-183 designs, the effective subgrade modulus was increased by 1.20 which reduced design SN

Inputs Used For Each Design

DESIGN INPUT	SDO-90	MTO MI-183	MEPDG
Pavement Performance	Free Choice (based on Engineering or Experience) or Standardized Highway Design Grades or Service Classes	Standardized and Tested Serviceability	Standard Test Method (ST)
Traffic Characteristics	AADT, Truck Percentage	AADT % Trucks, Lane Distribution Factor, Daily Traffic, Vehicle Classification Factor, Serviceability, Performance Grade	AADT, Lane Distribution Factor, Daily Traffic, Vehicle Classification Factor, Serviceability, Standard Deviation, Wheel Load, Standard Deviation, Performance Grade
Subgrade Characteristics	Laboratory Strength Tests (Shrink Swell Analysis, Resilient Modulus)	Laboratory Strength Tests (Shrink Swell, Bulk Unit Weight, CBR, PVD Testing)	Laboratory Strength Tests (Shrink Swell, Bulk Unit Weight, CBR, PVD Testing)
Pavement Structural Characteristics	Observed Base Strength	Standard Layer Coefficients	Laboratory Strength Tests (Shrink Swell, Bulk Unit Weight, CBR, PVD Testing)
Reliability	-	Design Reliability, Standard Deviation	Design Reliability Levels
Drainage	Engineering Judgment	Drainage Coefficient	Automatically incorporated into design procedure
Environment	-	-	AASHTO Free Choice/Local Weather Data
Design Prediction Method	-	-	Design Value or adjustment based on reference values

Calculated Pavement Structural Thicknesses for a Local Road

	SDO-90	MTO MI-183	MEPDG
Hot mix Asphalt	50	70	50
Granular Base	150	150	150
Granular Subbase	450	175	200
Design Value	552 (GBC)	57 (SN)	-

Calculated Pavement Structural Thicknesses for a Major Arterial Road

	SDO-90	MTO MI-183	MEPDG
Hot mix Asphalt	250	250	250
Granular Base	150	150	150
Granular Subbase	800	420	150
Select Subgrade Material	-	600	600
Design Value	1186 (GBC)	114 (SN)	-

Calculated Pavement Structural Thicknesses for a Minor Arterial Road

	SDO-90	MTO MI-183	MEPDG
Hot mix Asphalt	100	150	100
Granular Base	150	150	150
Granular Subbase	800	100	150
Select Subgrade Material	-	450	450
Design Value	1006 (GBC)	89 (SN)	-

Analysis Results

- Initial cost of construction calculated using 2012 cost data
- The mixes specified in the MEPDG designs were also used in the SDO-90 and MI-183 designs to make initial costs comparable
- The costs are based on one lane kilometre of roadway, 3.75 m wide

Difference in Initial Cost of Construction

	SDO-90	MTO MI-183	MEPDG
Local Road	20.2%	3.2%	-
Minor Arterial	16.7%	-	1.3%
Major Arterial	19.5%	-	2.8%

The lowest cost in each group is shown with a dash while the other costs are shown as a percentage increase compared to the lowest cost

- Both the MI-183 and MEPDG methods provide considerable cost savings over the SDO-90 method
- Greatest savings observed on lower volume roads
- Design HMA thicknesses similar between all methods
- Greatest savings provided by the use of optimized granular materials to mitigate frost heaving while providing required ride quality and service life
- Rule of thumb provided design HMA thickness remarkably similar to those calculated using the MEPDG
- SDO-90 does not model different HMA mixes and a designer may potentially specify mixes that will not perform as those in MEPDG designs and as a result, only very experienced designers are capable of using SDO-90 and MI-183 to produce comparable designs to those created using the MEPDG

CONCLUSIONS

- Design HMA thicknesses are very similar for all three design methods
- Optimized material selection results in significant cost savings
- MEPDG designs are more costly to complete and this additional cost must be accounted for when considering using this method
- Experiential and Empirical designs are equivalent to MEPDG designs when completed by very experienced designers
- MEPDG design more readily take into account and can be calibrated for local materials which may result in better designs