Performance Management Framework for Pavement Assets

Dr Kieran Feighan, Chartered Engineer, PMS Pavement Management Services Ltd.

24/09/15





Transportation Asset Management

Different Way of Doing Business

□ Increase service life

□ Improve performance

Preserve asset value

Reduce annualized costs

Tell Your Story More Effectively Change The Way Assets Are Managed

Document needs
Improve accountability in decisions
Assess and manage risk
Make better use of technology
Better respond to changes in standards

Principles of Asset Management



Factors influencing decisions are known

Key Performance Measures (or Indicators)



Physical Condition



Congestion



Safety



Environment

SMART Method of Evaluating Measures

- Specific
- Measurable
- Achievable
- Results Oriented
- Timely

Performance Targets

• A specific measure of performance that the agency hopes to achieve



Framework of TAM Pavement Parameters

Framework Strategic Objectives – Atkins Report

	Strategic Objectives	Description			
1	Carriageway Safety	Safety characteristics of carriageway surface			
2	Pavement Health	Pavement performance			
3	Value for Money	Use of investment to provide the best return for carriageway surface and structural maintenance			
4	Investment in Maintenance	Investment need in carriageway surface and structural maintenance made to achieve long term benefits			
5	Sustainability	Delivering an environmentally sustainable road network			
6	Road user satisfaction	Meeting road user expectations			

Pavement Health KPI



Carriageway Safety (Subnetwork 0)

	Strategic Objective: Carriagew	ay Safety				
Objective Category	Performance measure / description					
	Skidding Resistance	% of network above SCRIM Investigatory Level				
Carriageway Safety	Rut Depth	% of network with rutting depth < 10 mm (*)				
	Texture Depth	% of network with texture depth > 0.6 mm				

(*) values to be confirmed

Carriageway Safety (Subnetworks 1-4)

	Strategic Objective: Carriagew	ay Safety	
Objective Category	Performance measure / descri	ption	
	Skidding Resistance	% of network above SCRIM Investigatory Level	
Carriageway Safety	Rut Depth	% of network with rutting depth < 20 mm (*)	
	Texture Depth	% of network with texture depth > 0.6 mm (*)	

(*) values to be confirmed by NRA

Pavement Health

Strategic Objective: Pavement Health						
Objective Category	Performance measure / descri	ption				
	Rut Depth	% of network with rut depth in condition category > 2				
Structural Health	Structural cracking	% of network with structural cracking in condition category > 2				
	LPV3	% of network with LPV3 in condition category > 2				
	Other cracking	% of network with other cracking in condition category > 2				
Surface Health	Ravelling	% of network with ravelling in condition category > 2				
Surface nearth	Macro-texture	% of network with macro-texture in condition category > 2				
	International Roughness Index (IRI)	% of network with IRI in condition category > 2				

2014

Objective: Carriageway Safety

									Overa	II Tactica	l Index		
Performance Measure SF1.1.2: Maximum Mean Rut Depth of 20mm							90.53%						
Road Hierarchy		LC	OS Banding	9		Performance measure (Operational)	Performance Measure (Tactical)	re Performance / Hierarchy				Weighting Factors	
Pavement Performance	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	% of roads above the maximum MRD	% of roads in condition better than Poor	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	
Subnet 0	> 9.00	≤ <mark>9.00</mark>	≤ 6.00	≤ 5.00	≤ 3.00								
(Motorways/Dual Carriageways)		> 6.00	> 5.00	> 3.00		0.1%	97.55%	0.13%	2.32%	4.45%	29.34%	63.76%	20%
Subnet 1	> 9.00	≤ 9.00	≤ 6.00	≤ 5.00	≤ 3.00								
(Engineered Pavements)		> 6.00	> 5.00	> 3.00		2.4%		2.43%	4.59%	4.10%	23.29%	65.59%	20%
Subnet 2	> 15.00	≤ 15.00	≤ 9.00	≤ 6.00	≤ 4.00								
Legacy Pavements > 3500 AADT		> 9.00	> 6.00	> 4.00		1.7%	00 770/	1.69%	6.22%	10.64%	17.32%	64.13%	20%
Subnet 3	> 15.00	≤ 15.00	≤ 9.00	≤ 6.00	≤ 4.00		00.//%						
Legacy Pavements 2000 to 3500 AADT		> 9.00	> 6.00	> 4.00		5.6%		5.64%	11.77%	12.74%	16.71%	53.13%	20%
Subnet 4	> 20.00	≤ 20.00	≤ 15.00	≤ 9.00	≤ 6.00								
Legacy Pavements < 2000 AADT		> 15.00	> 9.00	> 6.00		4.7%		4.67%	7.90%	19.19%	15.53%	52.70%	20%

Trending and Visualisation

RUT DEPTH

Weighting Factors

Sum of %s	Subnet 0	Subnet 1	Subnet 2	Subnet 3	Subnet 4
100.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0

% Better than Poor	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Subnet 0	97.7%	98.5%	98.4%	98.6%	97.6%
Subnets 1-4	78.8%	83.2%	86.2%	86.8%	88.8%

% Very Poor	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Subnet 0	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%
Subnet 1	4.4%	2.1%	2.6%	1.9%	2.4%
Subnet 2	5.3%	5.2%	2.5%	2.3%	1.7%
Subnet 3	12.5%	10.3%	7.6%	8.5%	5.6%
Subnet 4	9.9%	9.6%	5.5%	6.1%	4.7%

Rut Depth Trends 2010-2014 by Subnetwork



IRI

Weig	hting	Factors
------	-------	---------

Sum of %s	Subnet 0	Subnet 1	Subnet 2	Subnet 3	Subnet 4
100.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0

% Better than Poor	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Subnet 0	96.2%	97.1%	96.9%	97.0%	96.7%
Subnets 1-4	75.5%	79.5%	83.4%	84.4%	85.5%

% Very Poor	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Subnet 0	<mark>2.1%</mark>	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%	1.7%
Subnet 1	7.8%	5.8%	4.5%	3.7%	3.9%
Subnet 2	11.6%	9.6%	7.4%	6.8%	6.2%
Subnet 3	18.8%	15.9%	12.2%	12.1%	9.8%
Subnet 4	17.7%	14.5%	10.9%	10.2%	9.3%

IRI Trends 2010-2014 by Subnetwork



MPD

Weighting Factors

Sum of %s	Subnet 0 Subnet 1 Subne		Subnet 2	Subnet 3 Subnet		
100.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	

% Better than Poor	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Subnet 0	99.3%	99.4%	99.3%	99.3%	99.0%
Subnets 1-4	86.8%	85.9%	86.5%	87.9%	87.2%

% Very Poor	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Subnet 0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Subnet 1	0.5%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.6%
Subnet 2	1.3%	1.9%	2.2%	1.6%	1.9%
Subnet 3	1.3%	1.8%	1.6%	1.9%	2.2%
Subnet 4	1.2%	2.6%	2.0%	2.2%	2.7%

MPD Trends 2010-2014 by Subnetwork







International Comparisons

Austroads – Target: 97% (IRI) 99% (Rut Depth)





New Zealand: Target 97% - Subnetworks 0 and 1



Austroads: Target 97% - subnets 2 to 4



Virginia DOT – Target 85% overall (veh-km weighted)



New Zealand TA: Target 99%



Performance Brackets – Visualisation

Descriptive Brackets

	LIRI												
	Subnet 0		Subnet 0		Sub	net 1	Sub	net 2	Subnet 3		Sub	net 4	
	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max			
V. Good	1.5		2		2.7		2.7		3		1		
Good	2	1.5	2.5	2	3.2	2.7	3.2	2.7	4	3	2		
Fair	2.5	2	3	2.5	4	3.2	4	3.2	5	4	3		
Poor	3	2.5	3.5	3	5	4	5	4	7	5	4		
V Poor		3		3.5		5		5		7	5		
	LRUT												
	Sub	net 0	Sub	net 1	Sub	net 2 Subnet 3		Subnet 4					
	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max			
V. Good	3		3		4		4		6		1		
Good	5	3	5	3	6	4	6	4	9	6	2		
Fair	6	5	6	5	9	6	9	6	15	9	3		
Poor	9	6	9	6	15	9	15	9	20	15	4		
V Poor		9		9		15		15		20	5		

M01 – 100 metre Data – Colour Charting

N01D1ML001	11	11.1	0.1	1	0	2	1	1	1
N01D1ML001	11.1	11.2	0.1	1	0	3	1	2	1
N01D1ML001	11.2	11.3	0.1	1	0	1	. 1	2	1
N01D1ML001	11.3	11.4	0.1	1	0	1	1	1	1
N01D1ML001	11.4	11.5	0.1	1	0	1	1	2	1
N01D1ML001	11.5	11.6	0.1	1	0	2	1	1	1
N01D1ML001	11.6	11.7	0.1	1	0	2	1	2	1
N01D1ML001	11.7	11.8	0.1	1	0	1	1	1	1
N01D1ML001	11.8	11.9	0.1	1	0	2	1	1	1
N01D1ML001	11.9	12	0.1	1	0	2	1	1	1
N01D1ML001	12	12.1	0.1	1	0	2	1	1	1
N01D1ML001	12.1	12.2	0.1	1	0	1	. 1	1	1
N01D1ML001	12.2	12.3	0.1	1	0	1	1	1	1
N01D1ML001	12.3	12.4	0.1	1	0	2	1	1	1
N01D1ML001	12.4	12.5	0.1	1	0	2	1	1	1
N01D1ML001	12.5	12.6	0.1	1	0	2	1	1	1
N01D1ML001	12.6	12.7	0.1	1	0	2	1	1	1
N01D1ML001	12.7	12.8	0.1	1	0	1	1	1	1
N01D1ML001	12.8	12.9	0.1	1	0	2	1	1	1
N01D1ML001	12.9	13	0.1	1	0	2	1	1	1

N70 and N71 – 100m data – Colour Charting

N70D1ML006	22.2	22.3	0.1	1	3	3	4	3	2
N70D1ML006	22.3	22.4	0.1	1	3	5	5	4	5
N70D1ML006	22.4	22.5	0.1	1	3	4		2	1
N70D1ML006	22.5	22.6	0.1	1	3	3	3	1	1
N70D1ML006	22.6	22.7	0.1	1	3	5	3	3	3
N70D1ML006	22.7	22.8	0.1	1	3	3	4	3	2
N70D1ML006	22.8	22.9	0.1	1	3	1	. 1	3	1
N70D1ML006	22.9	23	0.1	1	3	3	2		1
N70D1ML006	23	23.1	0.1	1	3	5	3		5
N70D1ML006	23.1	23.2	0.1	1	3	2	. 3		1
N70D1ML006	23.2	23.3	0.1	1	3	3	3		1
N70D1ML006	23.3	23.4	0.1	1	3	4	3		1
N70D1ML006	23.4	23.5	0.1	1	3	5	3		1
N70D1ML006	23.5	23.6	0.1	1	3	5	3		2
N70D1ML006	23.6	23.7	0.1	1	3	2	2		2
N70D1ML006	23.7	23.8	0.1	1	3	5	2	3	2
N70D1ML006	23.8	23.9	0.1	1	3	3	1	3	2
N70D1ML006	23.9	24	0.1	1	3	1	. 1	4	1
N71D2ML001	0	0.1	0.1	2	2	3	2	2	2
N71D2ML001	0.1	0.2	0.1	2	2	5	3	1	5
N71D2ML001	0.2	0.3	0.1	2	2	1	. 2	1	1
N71D2ML001	0.3	0.4	0.1	2	2	1	. 3	1	1
N71D2ML001	0.4	0.5	0.1	2	2	1	. 3	1	1
N71D2ML001	0.5	0.6	0.1	2	2	1	. 2	1	1
N71D2ML001	0.6	0.7	0.1	2	2	1	. 2	1	1
N71D2ML001	0.7	0.8	0.1	2	2	1	. 2	1	1
N71D2ML001	0.8	0.9	0.1	2	2	1	. 3	1	1

Whole Network

Sum %s							
Sum Totals		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	
	4	20.5%	20.0%	21.7%	22.7%	21.6%	
	5	19.8%	21.8%	23.0%	23.9%	23.5%	
	6	12.5%	14.0%	15.5%	16.1%	17.1%	
	7	8.8%	9.2%	9.6%	9.3%	10.2%	
	8	6.7%	6.8%	6.5%	6.2%	6.5%	
	9	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%	4.5%	4.6%	
	10	4.4%	4.4%	3.9%	3.6%	3.6%	
	11	4.2%	3.7%	3.1%	2.9%	2.9%	
	12	3.5%	3.1%	2.6%	2.4%	2.2%	
	13	3.2%	2.9%	2.2%	2.0%	2.0%	
	14	3.0%	2.5%	2.0%	1.9%	1.8%	
	15	2.7%	2.1%	1.7%	1.5%	1.4%	
	16	2.6%	1.9%	1.4%	1.3%	1.2%	
	17	1.5%	1.2%	1.0%	0.9%	0.7%	
	18	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	
	19	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	
	20	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	

4 Parameter: Sum of Values



4 Parameter: Sum of Values



4 Parameter: Sum of Values





4 Parameter: Count of 4 or 5 Values









4 Parameter: Worst Single Value

Summary

SMART Method of Evaluating Measures

- Specific
- Measurable
- Achievable
- Results Oriented
- Timely

Framework's Strategic Objectives

	Strategic Objectives	Description
1	Carriageway Safety	Safety characteristics of carriageway surface
2	Pavement Health	Pavement performance
3	Value for Money	Use of investment to provide the best return for carriageway surface and structural maintenance
4	Investment in Maintenance	Investment need in carriageway surface and structural maintenance made to achieve long term benefits
5	Sustainability	Delivering an environmentally sustainable road network
6	Road user satisfaction	Meeting road user expectations