# The First and Last Kilometre

How do Road Construction Activities Impact Local Government Assets?

**Daniel Orriss** 

**BE** (Civil)





### Asset Management

### Pavement Design

## **Traffic Loading**

**Construction Traffic** 

**Financial Impacts** 



## Asset Life - Basics of Pavement Design

### **Design Principals**

Pavement design is primarily a function of traffic loading and underlying subgrade strength

# Traffic Loading Calculation – DESA's

- Existing traffic data
- Vehicle classification
- Functionality
- Predicted growth



# 

#### **GUIDE TO PAVEMENT TECHNOLOGY**

#### Part 2: Pavement Structural Design



### DESA's and Relativity to Local Roads

"It has been well established that light vehicles contribute very little to structural deterioration, only heavy vehicles are considered in pavement design" – AGPT Part s7.2

- Cars
- Garbage trucks
- Buses
- Delivery vehicles

### **DESA's and Relativity to Local Roads**

Street type	AADT two-way	Heavy vehicles (%)	Design AADHV (single lane)	Design period (years)	Annual growth rate (%)	Cumulative growth factor (Table 7.4)	Axle groups per heavy vehicle	Cumulative HVAG over design period	ESA/HVAG	Indicative design traffic (ESA)
Minor with single	30	3	0.9	20	0	20	2.0	13 140	0.2	3 x 10 <sup>3</sup>
lane traffic				40	0	40	2.0	26 280	0.2	5 x 10 <sup>3</sup>
Minor with two	90	3	1.35	20	0	20	2.0	19710	0.2	4 x 10 <sup>3</sup>
lane traffic				40	0	40	2.0	39 420	0.2	8 x 10 <sup>3</sup>
Local access with	400	4	8	20	1	22.0	2.1	128 480	0.3	4 x 10 <sup>4</sup>
no buses				40	1	48.9	2.1	285 576	0.3	9 x 10 <sup>4</sup>
Local access with buses	500	6	15	20	1	22.0	2.1	240 900	0.3	8 x 10 <sup>4</sup>
				40	1	48.9	2.1	535 455	0.3	1.5 x 10 <sup>5</sup>
Local access in	400	8	16	20	1	22.0	2.3	256 960	0.4	1.5 x 10 <sup>5</sup>
industrial area				40	1	48.9	2.3	571 152	0.4	3 x 10 <sup>5</sup>
Collector with no buses	1200	6	36	20	1.5	23.1	2.2	607 068	0.6	4 x 10 <sup>5</sup>
				40	1.5	54.3	2.2	1 427 004	0.6	106
Collector with buses	2000	7	70	20	1.5	23.1	2.2	1 180 410	0.6	8 x 10 <sup>5</sup>
				40	1.5	54.3	2.2	2 774 730	0.6	2 x 10 <sup>6</sup>

Table 12.2: Indicative heavy vehicle axle group volumes for lightly-trafficked urban streets

Note: Direction factor is 0.5, except for Minor Street with single lane traffic where DF= 1.0.

### **Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Options**

### Local Example - Kingsway



### Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Options



- Reconstruction options designed for 25 year performance life span and traffic loading of 1x10<sup>6</sup> ESA
- 1x10<sup>6</sup> ESA is a conservative figure as 6x10<sup>5</sup> ESA was indicated by pavement investigations conducted by Council prior to reconstruction works in November 2013
- Four reconstruction options are compared in this case study:
  - Granular replacement
  - Deep lift asphalt replacement
  - Cement stabilisation
  - Foamed bitumen stabilisation

#### Granular Replacement

#### Deep Lift Asphalt Replacement

#### Cement Stabilisation

#### Foamed Bitumen Stabilisation









50mm Asphalt Wearing Course Bitumen Single Coat Spray Seal 400mm Granular Replacement Clay Subgrade with CBR 5% 50mm Asphalt Wearing Course Bitumen Single Coat Spray Seal 150mm Asphalt Base Course Clay Subgrade with CBR 5% 50mm Asphalt Wearing Course Bitumen Single Coat Spray Seal 325mm Cement Stabilisation Clay Subgrade with CBR 5% 50mm Asphalt Wearing Course Bitumen Single Coat Spray Seal 250mm Foamed Bitumen Stabilisation Clay Subgrade with CBR 5%











### **Exported and Imported Material**

**Material Efficiency** 



### **Truck Movements**

#### **Truck Distance Travelled**



#### Total Truck Distance Travelled (km)

- Foamed Bitumen Stabilisation
- Deep Lift Asphalt Replacement
- Cement Stabilisation
- Granular Replacement

### **Truck Movements**



### **Construction Traffic**





12t Load

30t Load

### DESA's - 2

DESA's - 4

### **DESA's and Relativity to Local Roads**

Street type	AADT two-way	Heavy vehicles (%)	Design AADHV (single lane)	Design period (years)	Annual growth rate (%)	Cumulative growth factor (Table 7.4)	Axle groups per heavy vehicle	Cumulative HVAG over design period	ESA/HVAG	Indicative design traffic (ESA)
Minor with single lane traffic	30	3	0.9	20	0	20	2.0	13 140	0.2	3 x 10 <sup>3</sup>
				40	0	40	2.0	26 280	0.2	5 x 10 <sup>3</sup>
Minor with two lane traffic	90	3	1.35	20	0	20	2.0	19710	0.2	4 x 10 <sup>3</sup>
				40	0	40	2.0	39 420	0.2	8 x 10 <sup>3</sup>
Local access with no buses	400	4	8	20	1	22.0	2.1	128 480	0.3	4 x 10 <sup>4</sup>
				40	1	48.9	2.1	285 576	0.3	9 x 10 <sup>4</sup>
Local access with buses	500	6	15	20	1	22.0	2.1	240 900	0.3	8 x 10 <sup>4</sup>
				40	1	48.9	2.1	535 455	0.3	1.5 x 10 <sup>5</sup>
Local access in	400	8	16	20	1	22.0	2.3	256 960	0.4	1.5 x 10 <sup>5</sup>
industrial area				40	1	48.9	2.3	571 152	0.4	3 x 10 <sup>5</sup>
Collector with no buses	1200	6	36	20	1.5	23.1	2.2	607 068	0.6	4 x 10 <sup>5</sup>
				40	1.5	54.3	2.2	1 427 004	0.6	106
Collector with buses	2000	7	70	20	1.5	23.1	2.2	1 180 410	0.6	8 x 10 <sup>5</sup>
				40	1.5	54.3	2.2	2 774 730	0.6	2 x 10 <sup>6</sup>

Table 12.2: Indicative heavy vehicle axle group volumes for lightly-trafficked urban streets

Note: Direction factor is 0.5, except for Minor Street with single lane traffic where DF= 1.0.

### **Construction Traffic Impacts and Pavement Life**

Street Type	DESA's	Treatment	Truck Movements	ESA's	% of DESA's
Minor with 2 Lane	2x10 <sup>4</sup>	Insitu Foamed Bitumen	112	224	1.12%
Traffic		Deeplift Asphalt	352	704	3.52%
		Granular Reconstruction	766	1532	7.66%
Local Access no	4x10 <sup>4</sup>	Insitu Foamed Bitumen	112	224	0.56%
Buses		Deeplift Asphalt	352	704	1.76%
		Granular Reconstruction	766	1532	3.80%
Collector with	8x10 <sup>5</sup>	Insitu Foamed Bitumen	112	224	0.03%
Buses		Deeplift Asphalt	352	704	0.09%
		Granular Reconstruction	766	1532	0.19%

### Calculating the Financial Impact of Construction Traffic



### **Example Calculation**



## How Can we Manage the Impact?

- Understand our construction options at treatment evaluation phase, give some thought to the associated impact
- For larger projects or programs, consider a formal evaluation
- Provide input into the construction VMP
- Material efficiency look to reuse existing pavement, in place





### Final Thought...

### What cumulative effect would these impacts have on your budget if considered throughout your overall works program?



