Evaluating the Effectiveness of Full Depth Pavement Reclamation



Delaware County, Ohio Chris Bauserman, PE, PS December 8, 2014

Background

- Population has increased from 55,000 in 1989 to approximately 200,000
- Explosive growth in residential, commuter, construction and commercial traffic
- County Highway system inadequate to meet demands of growth

1990's Road Conditions

Narrow Roads – 18 feet or less with poor crown
Predominantly Chip Seal surfaces
Cross sections vary in thickness

Poor subgrade
Shallow aggregate base sections

HMA projects were not performing well

Reflective cracking early in maintenance cycle
Loss of cross slope early in the maintenance cycle





- •Pulverized flexible pavement section creating a uniform stabilized base
- •Further Stabilization obtained through:
 - Addition of aggregate
 - Addition of stabilizers
 - •Liquid Asphalt
 - Portland Cement

Mechanical Stabilization – Aggregate



- Chemical Stabilization
 - Liquid Asphalt



Chemical Stabilization

Portland Cement



FDR - Slope Adjustments



FDR - Slope Adjustments



FDR – Pavement Widening



FDR- Resists Reflective Cracking



1997 FDR Test Section

Norton Road

- 4.7 mile section widening & overlay (3" depth)
- 1.0 mile section FDR with 3 treatment variations
- Performed "Before and After" falling weight deflectometer tests at multiple locations on each section



Test Section

CONTROL SECTION (widening & 3" overlay)

R-1 (aggregate)

R-2 (aggregate & emulsion)

R-3 (aggregate & portland cement)

Test Section

CONTROL SECTION (widening & 3" overlay) Deflection reduced by 17.6% R-1 (aggregate) Deflection reduced by 41.7% R-2 (aggregate & emulsion) Deflection reduced by 48.3% R-3 (aggregate & portland cement) Deflection reduced by 51.0%

DELAWARE COUNTY ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT **RECLAMATION SUMMARY**

12/7/2014

YEAR		ROAD DATA											
	#	NAME	MILEAGE	ADDITIVES									
1997	202	Norton (test sections)	1.00	AGGREGATE/EMULSION/PORTLAND CEMENT									
1998	25	Center Village	4.63	AGGREGATE & EMULSION									
1	65	County Home	2.41	AGGREGATE									
	129	Concord	3.58	AGGREGATE									
	131	Harriott	1.80	AGGREGATE									
1.10	163	Ostrander	4.35	AGGREGATE & EMULSION									
	172	Warrensburg	3.30	AGGREGATE									
	198	Radnor	6.37	AGGREGATE									
1999	9	Liberty (Powell CL - Home)	2.96	COLD IN-PLACE RECYCLE									
· · · · ·	17	Harlem	5.40	AGGREGATE									
	18	Miller-Paul	5.97	AGGREGATE									
	72	Cheshire	9.71	AGGREGATE & EMULSION									
	246	Ashley	1.91	AGGREGATE									
2000	10	Lackey Old State	2.65	AGGREGATE									
1.000	34	N. Galena	7.75	AGGREGATE									
	34	S. Galena	2.04	AGGREGATE									
	153	Ostrander South	1.31	AGGREGATE									
1. 1. 1	65	Kilbourne	6.16	AGGREGATE & EMULSION									
-	123	Hyatts	5.27	AGGREGATE & EMULSION									
2001	7	Troy	7.19	AGGREGATE									
2002	164	Fontanelle	1.70	AGGREGATE & EMULSION									
	165	Burnt Pond	3.74	AGGREGATE & EMULSION									
	170	Brindle	2.45	AGGREGATE									
2003	14	East Powell	0.54	AGGREGATE & EMULSION									
	39	Rome Corners	3.35	AGGREGATE & PORTLAND CEMENT									
-	109	Big Walnut	0.97	AGGREGATE & PORTLAND CEMENT									
2005	224	Steamtown	5.93	CEMENT									
2008	22	Trenton	2.45	AGGREGATE									
2010	35	3B's & K	4.49	CEMENT									
	96	Gregory	1.08	CEMENT									
2014	136	Moore	1.21	CEMENT									

97-14 TOTAL MILES 113.67 **APPROXIMATE RECLAMATION \$**

5.8 MILLION

Pavement Preservation

Funding

- Commitment
 - Staff
 - Political
- Collect and maintain data on the condition of your system

Pavement Preservation

2014 Pavement	Condition F	Record		HOME-2 (124)							_	
HOME-2	124	LIMIT	S NOME ROAD BRIL 19	US 23	<u> </u>							
BASE COMP	AIA	2004	CRACKING (50%) 10 "WH	BLOK * STAGE THRML LNGTOL								
SURFACE	A	2013	SURFACE (30%) 9 (RA	BLEED PATCH DEBND CRACK	1							
TREATMENT	n/a		*RUTTING (30%) 10	INTERSECTION LANE						_		
LENGTH (LF / MI)	31,892	6.040	*DRAINAGE (10%) 10 POT	THOLE HIBERM DERMISION								
WIDTH (ft.)	22.0	1000	WEIGHTED AVG 9.7 97	PAVEMENT CONDITION RATING								
STRAIGHT LINE (SF)	701.524	_	CRACKING / 50% / 50 0.0					-				
EXTRA LANE (LF)	16375		AURPACE (30%) 30 -3.0			HOME BOAD PRIT		to	116 22			
EXTRA LANE (SF)	196,500		-CUTTING (1000-) 10 0.0			HOME ROAD BRIL		10	03 23			
TOTAL (SF)	898,124		DR AINAGE (1995) 10 0.0				-	-		_	-	
TOTAL (SY)	99,792		WEIGHTED DEDUCTS -3			CRACKING (50%)	10	*WHI	BLOK	* EDGE	THR	ML LNGTD
INSPECTION DATE	24-Nov-14		BERM 3 2013				1	10000		0.58 66		100 Jan 10 100
INSPECTED BY	HCM		ROAD MARKINGS 3 2013	1		SURFACE (30%)	9	*RA	VEL BLE	ED PATC	H DE	BND CRACI
					23				C-R -LLR	NO NOUV		a com
PRE	VIOUS YEAR		CURRE	ENT YEAR		*RUTTING (10%)	10		INTER	SECTIO	N I	LANE
							-			A.1. 374-57		and a state of the
						*DRAINAGE (10%)	10	PO'	THOLE	HIBER	M D	FRMTION
												00.0013108
						WEIGHTED AVG	9.7	97	PAVE	MENT CO	NDITIC	ON RATING
						CRACKING (50%)	50	0.0				
		_				SURFACE (30%)	30	-3.0				
ADDITIONAL PHOTOS							10		1			
SUMMARY OF IMPROVE	MENTS					*ROTTING (10%)	10	0.0				
1995-2001	FULL DEPT	H REPAIR	AY (1.5"/1.25")	\$276,700.00	1.6	a second s						
2002	INTERSEC	TION IMPRO	OVEMENT - MILL/FILL @ SE	\$8,700.00	81	* DRAINAGE (10%)	10	0.0				
2002	INTERSEC	TION IMPRO	OVEMENT - MILL/FILL @ SP	\$5,200.00	14	WEIGHTED DEDUG						
2004	FULL DEPT	TH REPAIR		\$31,400.00		WEIGHTED DEDUC	.15	-3				
2004	MILL SAM	ERLAY (1.5" II-F. SCRATC	/1.25") CH/OVERLAY (1.25"/1.25")	\$242,300.00		- A21.8	1.2		-			
	- SR257	TO SCIOTO	RESERVE (EAST JOINT)	1		BERM	3	2013				
2009	FULL DEPT	RFACE (SR2	57 TO SCIOTO RESERVE)	\$70,800.00			1.00	-				
2013	chip seal/		ROAD MARKINGS	3	2013	-						
2014	CHIP LEVE	L OVERLAY	.75 & 1.25 FROM SAWMILL	\$300,000.00								

Pavement Preservation



Prepared by The Delaware County Engineer's Office

Pavement Preservation Program

- How much surface treatment work?
 - Every year each system ages by 1 year
 - In order to maintain your system at the current level, preventative maintenance treatments and/or structural improvements are required that extend the remaining useful life by a number equal to your system mileage

Pavement Preservation Program

DELAWARE COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE ROAD IMPROVEMENT SUMMARY

1997	- 2014	
------	--------	--

YEAR	TOTAL MILES IMPROVED	TOTAL RECONSTRUCTION (HMA)	CONCRETE	FDR / HMA (LEVEL/OVERLAY)	FDR / HMA / CHIP SEAL	WIDENING / HMA	HMA (LEVEL/OVERLAY)	CHIP SEAL / HMA / MICRO	CHIP SEAL / HMA	HMA / MICRO	HMA / CHIP SEAL	HMA / CHIP SEAL / FOG	HMA (SURFACE ONLY)	COLD MIX / CHIP SEAL	CHIP SEAL / MICRO	MICRO ONLY	CHIP SEAL / FOG	CHIP SEAL (ONLY)	CRACK SEAL	TOTAL \$
EXPECTE	D LIFE EXT	25	16	15	12	10	10	9	9	8	8	8	8	7	7	6	5	4	3	· · · · · ·
1997	28.10	0.09	T	0.90	_	1.000	27.11						111							\$1,827,200
1998	49.52			24.70		8.72	16.10						1					1		\$4,196,802
1999	25.98			24.32		1.00	1.66	1	11					TT T						\$2,426,161
2000	47.60	4		25,62		1	0.13			7.98	13.87	1		1						\$3,548,900
2001	59.47			7.19		1 - 1	18.55				33.73		1.114							\$2,924,333
2002	27.97			7.89			19.32			1	D.76								-	\$1,992,005
2003	21.91			4.86			0.98		111	8.16	2,59		3.70	111	11	1.62	1.11			\$1,743,128
2004	47.96	-	0,19	-	-		13,14			4,35	7,31								22.97	\$2,010,124
2005	54.65			5.93	1					5.32	10.30		0.01	5.24		1.00	+	1.22	26.63	\$2,049,151
2006	64.93						1.88	9.03	1.26	1.43			1.48		6.08	30.89		7.35	5.53	\$2,224,692
2007	100.15		-		1	k = 0	2.73	i	0,45	0.61		1	2,72	=	23.80	4.25	h	7.55	58.04	\$2,579,236
2008	77.17				2,45		10.10		3.89		1.50		1.77	1.26	2.67				53,53	\$2,980,922
2009	56.84			0.65	1.1.1	11.1		9.13	11 a 1	6,79	TI		0,87				3.32		36.08	\$1,978,268
2010	49.76			1.08	4.49			Contraction of the	0.09	1 mil				1	18.98		10.12		15.00	\$2,605,394
2011	60.90			121	111	11	1		5,05						11.59		15.29	3.77	25.20	\$2,183,562
2012	37.84		I	1		1 Q			12.04				0.61				17.56		7.63	\$2,580,013
2013	33.29								8.26			13.99					6.94		4.10	\$2,680,678
2014	35.61		1	1.21			1.31		5.55	1		3.76		1			9.81	-	13.97	\$2,296,541

879.65 0.09 0.19 104.35 6.94 8.72 113.01 18.16 36.59 34.64 70.06 17.75 11.16 6.50 63.12 36.76 63.04 19.89 268.68 \$44,827,109

TOTAL MILES IMPROVED	879.65
TOTAL FUNDS	\$44,827,109.21
\$ / MILE	\$51,000
\$ / YEAR	\$2,490,400



2014 Pavement Condition Record LIBERTY-3 (009) LIBERTY-3 009 OLD LIBERTY (LI DEL CTY LIMIT ina 12 2004 CRACKING (50%) BASE COMP 10. NUM BLOK STORE THRML INGTO URFACE SURFACE (30% RAVEL BLEED PATCH DEEND LRACK 4 2002 TREATMENT INTERSECTION nia-TRUTTING (1984) 1,650 LENGTH (LF / ML) 23,209 4.097 RAINAGE (10%) 10 POTHOLE HIBERM DERMITOR 23.0 WEIGHTED AVG 92 92 PAVEMENT CONSISTION RATING WIDTH (fL) STRAIGHT LINE (SF) STEROT WALLSTON OF STR -5.0 EXTRA LANE (LF) SMORPACE FIRM 9.E- 0E 1965 EXTRA LANE (SET 21580 LOCAL PROPERTY AND A DESCRIPTION OF A DE 30 0.0 TOTAL (SF) 557,307 THE ENANCES 0.0 01 WEIGHTED DEDUCTS -8 TOTAL (SY) 61.932 INSPECTION DATE 24-lánv-14 BERM 3 2012 INSPECTED BY NOM ROAD MARKINGS 3 2012 PREVIOUS YEAR CURRENT YEAR ADDITIONAL PHOTOS SUMMARY OF IMPROVEMENTS 1996 WIDENING, LEVEL/OVERLAY (1.25"/1.25") \$306,700.00 2002 INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT-MILL/FILL @ BU \$14,800.00 2004 FULL DEPTH REPAIR \$27,800.00 2004 LEVEL/OVERLAY (1.5"/1.25") \$260,500.00 2012 CHIP SEAL/LEVEL/OVERLAY(.75"/1.5") \$548,700.00 TOTAL COST OF IMPROVEMENTS TO DATE \$1,158,500.00

Pressured by The Delayare Coustly Engineer's Office

Phenoment by Tim Delaware County Engineer's Office

- Analyzed amount of money spent on each FDR roadway and each structural overlay
 - Expressed in \$ per square yard per year
 - Excludes initial cost
 - Evaluates amount of subsequent expenditures by roadway segment



Average for all applicable Delaware County roads:

Conventional Structural Overlay Segments

FDR w/ Structural Overlay Segments

Average Expenditure \$.28 / sy / year

- Initially, FDR with overlay has cost about twice as much as the structural overlay
- Long term, FDR has saved about two thirds of subsequent surface treatment and repair costs
- This doesn't account for the additional benefits of crown correction and profile grade adjustments

Disadvantages of FDR

□ Higher initial cost

- □ Traffic control is more difficult than conventional paving operation
- □ Initial Public reaction
- □ Length of disturbance is greater
- Destroys survey monuments in pavement

Advantages of FDR

- □ Lower long term cost
- Increased Pavement Strength
- Re-establishment and retention of crossslope
- □ Reduction in reflective cracking
- □ Extended Maintenance Cycle
- □ Cost Effective alternative to reconstruction
- Flexibility in stabilizers (stone, asphalt, cement)
- □ Public perception

Questions?

Chris Bauserman, PE, PS

Delaware County Engineer

cbauserman@co.delaware.oh.us

740-833-2400

