



# 9th International Conference on **MANAGING PAVEMENT ASSETS (ICMPA9)**

# Measures of Pavement Performance Must Consider the Road User

Eric Perrone  
AgileAssets, Inc.

W. Ronald Hudson, Ph.D.,  
Professor Emeritus,  
University of Texas

Ralph Haas, Ph.D.  
Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering  
University of Waterloo



# Outline

- Introduction
- History
- Serviceability Ratings, Indexes, and Pavement Performance
- HPMS, PSR and IRI
- IRI Measures and Statistics
- Roughness Related to Panel Ratings
- Performance in Network Level Systems
- Considering the Road User in PMS
- Conclusions

# Introduction

- Performance is of interest to everyone
  - Measured in schools
  - Measured at work
  - Increasing emphasis on performance in governing
  - Pavement performance is the foundation of pavement design since the 1960's
- We contend that pavement performance must encompass the road user's perception of serviceability

# History

- Early road tests and design methods did not have consistent definitions for condition or failure of pavements
- Mr. Bill Carey and Dr. Paul Irick developed the means to measure pavement condition and performance
- The Serviceability-Performance concept
  - Supported the AASHO Road Test definition of failure
  - Key component of design used since 1962
  - Supported pavement load equivalency concepts
  - Defines pavement performance


# Serviceability

- Five Assumptions by Carey and Irick
  - Highways are built for the comfort, convenience and safety of the travelling public
  - User's opinions highway service are subjective
  - Objective measurements are directly related to the users subjective opinions
  - The “serviceability” may be expressed as the mean rating (evaluation) given by all highway users.
  - Performance is then defined as the serviceability history of a pavement.

# Serviceability Ratings and Index

- The Present Serviceability Rating (PSR) is an estimate of the mean rating obtained by a user survey
- The Present Serviceability Index (PSI) is an estimate of the PSR obtained by measuring critical characteristics of the road and correlating those measurements to the PSR
- AASHO Road test initial equations found that PSR could be estimated by measurements of
  - Roughness
  - Cracking and Patching
- Since that time PSI is generally computed only from measures of roughness

# Serviceability-Performance



# PSR, HPMS and IRI


- Original HPMS reporting required estimates of PSR for pavements
  - PSR estimates widely acknowledged to be poor
  - No original requirement for an objective PSI measure
- The International Roughness Index (IRI) was adopted as the HPMS reporting standard
- PSR/PSI has since faded as network condition rating and performance monitoring tool
- Relating roughness, however measured, to mean panel rating is no longer a common practice

# IRI as a Condition Indicator

- IRI is derived from a simulated quarter car passing over a measured profile
- IRI is an open ended scale with condition categories that vary across agencies
- 5 categories often used to describe IRI



IRI Category	WSDOT	FHWA
Very Good	$\leq 95$	$\leq 60$
Good	96 - 170	61 - 95
Fair	171 - 220	96 - 120
Poor	221 - 320	121 - 170
Very Poor	$> 320$	$> 170$
	Shaded areas deemed unacceptable	

# RANGES OF IRI



# Mean Panel Ratings Related to Roughness Statistics


- Other efforts to relate roughness to MPR have occurred
- Janoff et.al. performed basic research into a Ride Number (RN)
  - Computed from measured profiles
  - Purpose was to estimate Mean Panel Ratings
  - Provided better estimates than IRI for MPR
  - Difficulty in computing RN for different lengths



# Modern Network Level PMS Systems

- At a network level pavement management systems frequently separate “performance” from distress
- Distress deterioration controls engineering decision making
- Distresses impact the pavement leading to changes in performance over time
- Many practitioners have foregone utilizing PSI or Roughness to drive network level decision making
  - lack of connection between distress deterioration models and PSI for network level use
  - Roughness/PSI is seen as a lagging indicator and not suitable to be an analysis objective

# PMS Concept



# Considering the Road User in PMS Systems

- Key Concepts must be considered
  - The purpose of the road as stated by Carey/Irick
  - Estimated user perceptions provide key to understanding highway performance
  - Analysis should utilize projections of performance as captured by the area or trend in PSI
  - Models needed, especially at the network level, that relate deterioration to projected pavement performance through roughness
  - Then 'performance' becomes a suitable analysis driver
  - Distress remains primary decision criteria

# Conclusions

- The 'serviceability' and thus over time the 'performance' of pavements are a subjective quantity
- Objective measures relate to the user estimated serviceability and performance
- Further develop relationships between panel ratings and roughness measures
- Need to develop usable network level frameworks that relate deterioration/distress to pavement performance
- Meaningful ratings on a 5 point scale are a good communications tool to all, including legislators and the public
- PSI is a simple scale understood by all stake holders and over time a good measure of performance

# Questions