MODOT Alternate Pavement Approach

Dave Ahlvers

NCAUPG Conference Overland Park, Kansas February 3, 2010

Cost Control in Missouri

implementation - the road to success

• Past Decade – Letting schedules optimized

- Spring 2002 Performance Spec.s written
 - Fall 2003 Alternate bidding pavements required
 - **December 2004** Practical Design concept pitched to Commission
 - Spring 2005 Districts challenged to cut STIP 10%
 Fall 2005 – First Practical Design Policy written
 - 2006 First Design/Build
 Projects
 - Fall 2007 First ATC Project

Alternate Pavement Bidding Responsibility

5,000 miles of Major Roads 27,000 miles of Minor Roads 10,000 Bridges

Annual Pavement Quantities

Year	Asphalt		Concrete				
	Tons	\$\$	YD ³	\$\$			
1992	4,950,706	106,542,443	599,575	30,760,634			
1995	2,110,902	50,445,371	744,506	63,910,232			
2000	5,115,218	200,192,172	1,141,790	108,794,341			
2005	8,035,462	397,618,849	604,216	78,585,445			
2006	2,467,655	134,679,642	573,052	77,422,513			
2007	3,745,808	178,237,592	867,917	103,433,907			
2008	2,087,204	122,035,246	667,354	90,891,896			

First Alternate Bidding Experiment

Missouri let five pilot projects in 1996 under the auspices of FHWA SEP-14 Project conditions included Design costs within 15% of each other At least one mile of paving Primary work was paving Minimal grade change impact Area unit prices An LCCA adjustment factor was used

Alternate Bidding Restart

Pavement Team; composed of MoDOT, PCC and HMA paving industry, and FHWA representatives; recommended in 2003 to restart alternate pavement design bidding

Open, Transparent Process

LCCA assumptions difficult to reach consensus on

Alternate Bidding Pavement Design

From 1993 – 2004 a simple catalogue design, derived from the 1986 AASHTO Guide for the Design of Pavement Structures, was used for new Jointed Plain Concrete pavements.

The Pavement Team recommended adopting a mechanistic-empirical (M-E) design approach for pavements in Missouri.

Alternate Pavement Design Bidding

maximizing competition



Structurally Equivalent' PCC and HMA bid competitively by using life cycle cost analysis correction factors.

Alternate Pavements - Policy

Alternate pavement design with a LCCA factor for projects with 7500 sq yd in a continuous area
 Optional pavement designs without a LCCA factor for smaller paving quantities
 New full depth and major rehabilitation

M-E Design Implementation

- Started using nationally-calibrated MEPDG program at the beginning of 2005 for JPCP and HMA designs.
- Average JPCP thicknesses reduced by
 - ~ 2" for high truck volume routes
 - ~ 1" for low to medium truck volume routes
- Average HMA thicknesses reduced by
 - ~ 3-4" for high truck volume routes
 - ~ 1-2" for low to medium truck volume routes

Reasons for Selecting NCHRP M-E Pavement Design Guide

Common traffic and climatic module platforms are provided for both PCC and HMA analysis Distress models were calibrated and validated with largest pavement database ever New materials in designs could be evaluated Probably will become most defensible method because of AASHTO adoption

Alternate Pavement Designs

New construction (based on M-E Design Guide) JPCP Conventional HMA Rehabilitation (default thickness derived partly) from M-E and empirical data) 8" Unbonded PCC overlay (UBOL) Rubblization w/ 12" HMA overlay

Method of Measurement

New JPCP and HMA measured in square yards

Unbonded overlays measured in <u>cubic</u> <u>yards</u> for furnishing and <u>square yards</u> for placing

HMA overlay (on rubblized PCC) measured in wet tons

Alternate Pavement Bidding seeking innovation

Performance specifications Eliminate method specifications where possible Alternate Design Life Cycle Costs

LCCA used solely to determine adjustment factor for 45-year design life Life cycle costs considered Initial construction Maintenance Rehabilitation Salvage value User costs

Rehabilitation Assumptions

 \diamond HMA Mill and fill wearing course <u>at 20 years</u> in driving lanes Mill and fill wearing course at 33 years across whole surface ♦ PCC Diamond grind whole surface and perform full-depth repairs on 1 1/2 % of surface area at 25 years

Adjustment Factor

<u>Adjustment factor</u> = PW (future HMA rehab) – PW (future PCC rehab)

Adjustment factor calculated by Estimating Section using current market unit prices

Present worth (PW) values of future rehabilitation determined using OMB discount rates.

Life-Cycle Cost Adjustment Worksheet

YOD NUMBER	
County	
Route	
Call	
Letting Date	
-	



SP125 Weight Factor

Estimated Unit Price for SP125 Estimated Unit Price for Cold Milling Estimated Unit Price for Diamond Grinding Estimated Unit Price for Pavement Repair**





1.97 Tons/CY



\$1,469,204

This Documentation should be filed with all other Final Engineer's Estimate Documentation. Also include a copy along with the pavement estimation worksheet in the Alternate Pavements Notebook

Spreadsheets use OMB Real Interest Rates March 2004 5-Year 10-Year 20-Year* 25-Year* 2.100% 2.800% 3.150% 3.325% *Straight Line Interpolation From Published Rates

"Includes all related Pavement Repair Items

USE # 1,469,200

Total LCCA Adjustment Factor For Job Special Provision

MoDOT AC Projection							2003
_	% or				Unit		Present
	Thick. (in.)	Year	Quantity	Unit	Price	Cost	Worth
20 Year Maintenance							
Discount Rate:	3.150%						
Mill Surface Lift Traveled Way	. 1	20	256,781	SY	\$1.47	\$377 468	\$203.000
AC Resurfacing Traveled Way	1.75	20	24,590	TON	\$38.78	\$953,614	\$512.847
Miscellaneous	20%	20	1	Price	\$266,216,35	\$266,216	\$143 169
Mobilization	5%	20	. 1	Price	\$79,864,90	\$79,865	\$42,951
Construction added costs	12.9%	20	1	Price	\$216,354.02	\$216,354	\$116,354
33 Year Maintenance	L school						
Eventual trans.	2000/98						
Mill Surface Lift - all	1	33	415 518	sv	\$1.47	\$610.011	\$100.000
AC Resurfacing (100%) - all	1.75	33	39,792	TON	\$38.78	\$1 543 110	\$190,200
Miscellaneous	20%	33	1	Price	\$430 786 09	\$430 796	\$139,670
Mobilization	5%	33	- 1	Price	\$129 235 83	\$120,236	\$130,430
Construction added costs	12.9%	33	1	Price	\$350,099.86	\$350,100	\$112,502
Years in analysis:	Total Cost:					\$4,957,569	\$2,002,932
Discount Rate: 3	3.500%						12,008,008
Equivalent Uniform Annual Cost:							\$89,037

MoDOT PCC Projection							2002
•	% or Thick. (in.)	Year	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Cost	Present Worth
25 Year Maintenance							
Discount Rate: 3.325%							1
Traveled Way Slab Replacements Diamond Grinding of Traveled Way	1.5%	25 25	3,852	SY	\$100.00	\$385,172	\$170,027
Miscellaneous	20%	25	1	Price	\$169,989.02	\$169,989	\$200,100
Mobilization	5%	25	1	Price	\$50,996.71	\$50,997	\$22,512
Construction added costs	12.9%	25	1	Price	\$138,150.08	\$138,150	\$60,984
Years in analysis:	Total Cost: \$1,209,081				\$533,728		
Discount Rate: 3.500%							
	Equivalent Uniform Annual Cost:					\$23,726	

Alternate Bid Selection

Low bidder = lower of (PCC bid price) vs. (HMA bid price + adjustment factor)

Alt. Pavement Update for Jobs Thru July 2009 with LCCA Factor

124 Alternate Projects to Date (\$1.645 bil) 118 Full Depth (\$1.562 bil) 6 Rehabilitation (\$82.6 mil) Full Depth 40 Asphalt Awards (\$451.7 mil) 78 Concrete Awards (\$1.111 bil) Rehabilitation 1 Asphalt Award (\$2.6 mil) 5 Concrete Awards (\$80 mil)

Results – Difference in Low Bids

Low PC Bids vs. Low AC Bids w/o LCCA Factor PC Total – \$645,054,399 AC Total - \$666,875,468 Difference - \$21,821,069 (3.4%) Low PC Bids vs. Low AC Bids w/ LCCA Factor PC Total – \$645,054,399 AC Total - \$691,278,469 Difference - \$46,224,069 (7.2%)

LCCA Factor has Determined Low Bid 3 Times since October 2003.

Number of **Bidders**



Price Summaries

3-year average asphalt price/ton for alternate paving projects is 5.1% below that for non-alternate projects and 4.8% below the 3-year average for all projects

3-year average concrete price/CY for alternate paving projects is 8.6% below that for non-alternate projects and 2.8% below the 3-year average for all projects

Other Optional Bidding

Intermediate overlays ■ 5 ³⁄₄" HMA vs. 5" 'big block' PCC Thinner overlays ■ <u>3 ³/4</u>" HMA vs. 4" ultrathin PCC or 5" 'big block' PCC



Other Optional Bidding

Thin overlays ■ 1 ³⁄₄" HMA vs. 1" HIR plus surface treatment and ■ 3 ³⁄₄" HMA vs. 4" CIR plus surface treatment





Optional Shoulder Designs

♦ A2 design ■ 5 ³⁄₄" HMA ■ 5 ³⁄₄" PCC A3 design ■ 3 ³⁄₄" HMA



 4" PCC (also roller compacted concrete pavement option) An independent third party peer review was performed in late 2005 by a respected national consultant on MoDOT's alternate pavement bidding process.

"It appears that MoDOT has developed a balanced, innovative program that could serve as a national model for other highway agencies throughout the nation and beyond."

Thank You! Questions?

For more information including example plans and specifications go to: http://epg.modot.mo.gov

david.ahlvers@modot.mo.gov (573) 751-7455