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## INTRODUCTION

## Roads Condition in Oklahoma

- $40 \%$ of Oklahoma's major roads are rated in poor or mediocre condition (ASCE 2009).
- Costs Oklahoma motorists $\$ 1$ billion a year in extra vehicle repairs and operating costs (OTC 2009).
- Total projected revenues from FY2009 to FY2028 amount to 39 percent of needs, resulting in a shortfall of $\$ 16.9$ billion (ODOT 2009).
- Urgent need to improve management strategies; minimize the costs and optimize rehabilitation activities.


## OBJECTIVES

- Study the feasibility of using CA4PRS for PCC pavement rehabilitation projects in Oklahoma.


## CA4PRS Workshop

## CA4PRS One day Workshop

- Date: April 13, 2010
- Instructor: Dr. E.B. Lee
- Participants: ODOT Engineers
- Survey Topics:
- General knowledge of the program
- Applicability to ODOT operations
- Potential for improvement of process
- Availability of information
- Usability of the program


## CA4PRS ONE DAY WORKSHOP

Questionnaire »

Oklahoma State University Georgia Institute of Technology
Evaluation of Construction Strategies for PCC pavements CA4PRS Knowledge Inventory and Opinion Survey April 13 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2009$ (pre-demonstration)

The purpose of this short questionnaire is to assess your understanding of the concepts presented in the CA4PRS demonstration and to obtain your opinion on the implementation of CA4PRS at the Oklahoma Department of Transportation.

| Indicate your level of agreement with the <br> following statements. | Strongly <br> Agree | Agree | Not <br> sure | Disagree | Strongly <br> Disagree |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| CA4PRS is a scheduling and traffic analyisis tool. | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| CA4PRS is used to select the most economical <br> strategies for highway rehabilitation given variuos <br> project constraints. | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| CA4PRS will allow ODOT to comply with FHWA Rule <br> 23 CFR Part 630 Subpart J. | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| The use of CA4PRS will allow ODOT to improve safety <br> in work zones. | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| The use of CA4PRS will improve constructability of <br> ODOT's new roadway projects. | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| The use of CA4PRS will improve constructability of <br> ODOT's roadway rehabilitation projects. | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| CA4PRS is applicable for asphalt pavement <br> construction and/or rehabilitation in Oklahoma | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| CA4PRS is applicable for Jointed Plane Concrete <br> Pavement (JPCP) construction and/or rehabilitation in <br> Oklahoma. | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| CA4PRS is applicable for Continuously Reinforced <br> Concrete Pavement (CRCP) construction and/or <br> rehabilitation in Oklahoma. | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| CA4PRS is applicable to the way lane closures are <br> implemented in Oklahoma. | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| ODOT has readily available information regarding <br> mobilization and demobilization durations. | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| ODOT has readily available schedule logic relationship <br> information (for example, finish-to-start) for paving <br> activities. | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| ODOT has readily available contractor resource <br> information (number of trucks, capacity of batch plants, <br> speed and number of paving machines, etc.). | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| CA4PRS is a useful tool for analysis of staging <br> alternatives in Oklahoma. | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| ODOT has the necessary data to make use of <br> CA4PRS without substantial changes to current <br> practices. | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| I feel that I can learn to use CA4PRS on my own. | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| I feel that I will be more productive in my job by using <br> CA4PRS. | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| CA4PRS can improve communication between the <br> various project participants at ODOT. | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| CA4PRS can easily be integrated into the current <br> ODOT project development process. | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |

## Survey Results



## Interpretation of Results

- A general increase (approximately 20\%) in the level of agreement with the potential applicability of the program for analysis of procedures used in Oklahoma.
- A general increase in the level of agreement of participants with the idea that CA4PRS could improve ODOT current practices.
- Participants have been consistent with their perception that ODOT does not have the readily available input information to run CA4PRS (Q13, Q15).


## Case Studies

## Case Projects

- Two PCC pavement rehabilitation projects studied (I-35 \& I-40)
- I-35 is finished / I-40 is ongoing

I-35 Project


## I-35 Scheduling \& Traffic Analysis

## Project Overview

- North-South Interstate highway
- Two lanes in each direction
- Project starts from the mile post of 197 and ends in the mile post of 204



## Rehabilitation Profile



## Contractual Features

- A+B Contract; $\mathrm{A}=\$ 13.1 \mathrm{M} \& \mathrm{~B}=275$ c-days
- Incentive/Disincentive $\rightarrow \$ 7,500 / \mathrm{c}$-day
- Incentive Cap $\rightarrow 90$ c-days
- Started on August 2009
- Finished on May 2010
- Actual Duration $\rightarrow 275$ c-days


## Problems faced during analysis

- The project had to be divided into different phases in order to be modeled by CA4PRS.
- Resource profile information had to be collected by performing regular site visits.
- Neither ODOT nor contractors had information regarding Mobilization, Demobilization, and lead lag times.


## PHASING PLANS

- Phase 1: 6' concrete temporary shoulder
- Phase 2: Construct X-overs

- Phase 3: 2x12'+1x14' Overlay \& Full Depth
- Phase 4: $2 \times 12$ ' $+1 \times 14$ ' Overlay \& Full Depth
- Phase 5: Open lanes
- Phase 6: 2x12' inside lanes mill \& overlay Prase 6
- Phase 7: $2 \times 12$ outside lanes mill \& overlay



## ANALYSIS \& RESULTS

| Phase | Description | Duration <br> (working days) | User cost (\$) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | NB temporary shoulder | 15 | 51,108 |
| 2 | Pave crossovers | 5 | 14,720 |
| $3 \& 4$, Section 1 | SB \& NB Concrete overlays | 47 | 176,736 |
| $3 \& 4$, Section 2 | SB \& NB full depth reconstruction | 85 | 498,027 |
| $6 \& 7$ | Mill and overlay | 4 | 23,552 |
| 8 | Other activities | 38 | 322,869 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 8 7 , 0 1 2}$ |

-Considering $15 \%$ expansion; the final suggested duration for this project would be 230 working days or 316 c-days.
-Has been scheduled and finished by the contractor in 200 working days or 275 c-days.

- Actual productivity rate of the project was higher than CA4PRS calculations.
- User cost per c-day $=\$ 4,000<$ Actual Incentive $=\$ 7,500 /$ c-day


## I-40 Scheduling \& Traffic Analysis

## Project Overview

- West-East Interstate highway
- Two lanes in each direction
- Project starts from the mile marker 125 to mile marker 136.
- Still on going



## Contractual Features

- A+B Contract; A=\$59 M \& B=800 c-days
- Incentive/Disincentive $\rightarrow \$ 15,000 / \mathrm{c}$-day
- Incentive Cap $\rightarrow 150$ c-days
- Liquidated damage $\rightarrow \$ 2,000 / \mathrm{c}-$ day
- Lane Rental Fee $\rightarrow \$ 30,000 /$ hour

| Time | Monday thru <br> Friday | Saturday | Sunday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 2} \mathbf{~ a m}-\mathbf{6}$ am | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $\mathbf{6} \mathbf{~ a m}-\mathbf{- 9} \mathbf{~ a m}$ | $\$ 30,000$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $\mathbf{9} \mathbf{~ a m}-\mathbf{1 2} \mathbf{~ p m}$ | $\$ 30,000$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2} \mathbf{~ p m} \mathbf{- 6} \mathbf{~ p m}$ | $\$ 30,000$ | $\$ 30,000$ | $\$ 30,000$ |
| $\mathbf{6} \mathbf{~ p m}-\mathbf{9} \mathbf{~ p m}$ | $\$ 30,000$ | $\$ 30,000$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $\mathbf{9} \mathbf{~ p m}-\mathbf{1 2} \mathbf{~ a m}$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |

## Unique Features

- Phase 1: 10 ' concrete $^{\text {Prase }}$ temporary shoulder
- Phase 2: $28^{\prime}$ EB widening
- Phase 3:

Reconstruction and
Phase 2
Widening


Eastbound - All Night Work
 WB widening

- Phase 4: EB

Reconstruction

Phase 3


Eastbound

## Problems faced during analysis

- Most of the activities could not be modeled by CA4PRS.
- The project was a combination of widening and rehabilitation which is not supported by CA4PRS.
- Project was divided into four phases for traffic analysis.


## Results and Analysis

|  | Duration | User Cost | Queue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase 1 | 50 | $\$ 528,958.00$ | Saturdays 6 am -12 pm |
| Phase 2 | 200 | $\$ 1,589,221.00$ | - |
| Phase 3 | 200 | $\$ 3,178,443.00$ | - |
| Phase 4 | 100 | $\$ 1,589,221.00$ | - |
| Total |  | $\$ 6,885,843.00$ |  |

-User cost per c-day $=\$ 8,700<$ Actual Incentive $=\$ 15,000 /$ c-day
-Traffic demand is more than capacity from 6 am to 12 pm during Saturdays
-User cost for closing one lane $=\$ 27,000 / \mathrm{hr} \sim$ Lane Rental Fee $=$ $\$ 30,000 / \mathrm{hr}$


Weekdays


Saturdays

# Resource Profile Information 

## Scheduling Process of CA4PRS



- The results are highly dependent on resource profile information.


## Observed Resource Information

| Resource Description | Suggested Input Data | Minimum Observed | Maximum Observed | Mean | CA4PRS <br> Manual |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demolition Hauling Truck | Truck Capacity: 23 ton <br> Trucks per Hour per Team: <br> 4-6 <br> Efficiency: 0.45 <br> Number of Teams: 1 <br> Team Efficiency: 0.94 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 8 to 13 |
| Base Delivery Truck | Truck Capacity: 8 cu. yd <br> Trucks per Hour: 6-8 <br> Efficiency: 0.90 | 2 | 20 | 7 | - |
| Batch Plant | Capacity: 200 cu. yd/hour <br> Number of Plants: 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Concrete Delivery Truck | Truck Capacity: 9 cu. yd <br> Trucks per Hour: 14-16 <br> Efficiency: 1.0 | 5 | 22 | 14 | 9 to 16 |
| Paver | Speed: $5.5 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min}$ <br> Number of Pavers: 1 |  |  |  |  |

(Productivity Rate Required in Oklahoma) < (Productivity Rate Required in California)

## Assessment of Resource Analysis

Output of CA4PRS Scheduling Analysis

| Resource | Allocated | Utilized |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Demolition Hauling Truck (per Hour per Team) | 10 | 10 |
| Base Delivery Truck (per Hour) | 5 | 5 |
| Batch Plant (cu-yd/hour) | 120 | 120 |
| Concrete Delivery Truck (per Hour) | 20 | 16.7 |
| Paver Speed (ft/min) | 6.6 | 4.6 |

How many trucks need to be added to or released from the operation to reach the optimum point?
Can the productivity rate be increased by adding to the number of allocated trucks?

The user may increase the number of trucks allocated to the operation with the hope of increasing the number of trucks per hour and accelerating the project while it only increases the operation costs of the project without adding to the productivity rate.

# Development of a Model for Resource Profile Information 

## Cyclone Simulation Model



| Tasks | Duration (min) | Resources | Numbers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Load at Plant | 5 | Batch Plant | 1 |
| Travel to Job Site | 15 | Trucks | 10 |
| Dump | 10 | Spot Available | 1 |
| Return | 15 |  |  |

## CA4PRS InPuT Analysis

$\sim$ Productivity Rate $\quad$ Optimum Number of Trucks


- Productivity does not increase necessarily by increasing CA4PRS input variable or by increasing the total number of trucks.
- There is a maximum productivity rate which is achieved by the CA4PRS input of 12 Trucks per Hour.
- Optimum number of trucks (which is required by contractors) is different from CA4PRS input.


## Distance from Batch-Plant



- The further the distance from the Batch Plant the less the productivity rate is.
- The further the distance from the Batch Plant the more trucks are needed, but even by allocating more trucks the maximum productivity rate decreases.


## Limited Number of Activities

## CPM Analysis

Project Finish Dates:


September 7, 2010

September 14, 2010

September 9, 2010

September 7, 2010

- The relationship between the main activities in CA4PRS and other rehabilitation activities not available in CA4PRS is critical.


## Conclusions

## Results

- Contractor finished the project 30 working days sooner than CA4PRS schedule.
- User cost calculated by CA4PRS (\$4,000/day) is smaller than actual incentive amount ( $\$ 7,500 /$ day). (the incentive amount has been set higher to encourage the contractor to accelerate the project)
- Scheduling module cannot be used properly for large size rehabilitation projects (I-40).
- Lane rental fee calculated by CA4PRS in I-40 project is almost the same as ODOT calculations.
- The ODOT user cost calculation process is not considering the difference between traffic patterns during weekdays and weekends. CA4PRS provide the required platform for a more comprehensive work zone traffic analysis.
- The Agency Cost module was not utilized in case projects.


## RECOMMENDATIONS

- ODOT; based on experience.
- Innovative; compare What-If scenarios, the optimized scenario is selected.



## RECOMMENDATIONS

- The Construction Windows and Working Methods are limited in Oklahoma therefore there is a limited number of what-if scenarios.
- Currently, there is no any reliable resource profile database in ODOT.
- The daily traffic distribution data is required for Work-Zone traffic analysis.
- ODOT is encouraged to start collecting resource profile information for scheduling analysis.
- ODOT may start scheduling the projects with CA4PRS in the inception phase but they are not encouraged to use CA4PRS scheduling module extensively until the necessary data base is available.
- ODOT is encouraged to start using the Work-Zone Analysis module of CA4PRS and replace it with the existing spreadsheet program.


## Thank You

