



City of Los Angeles Department of General Services Bureau of Street Services Shahin and Associates May 2017



SDRF Update



Study Objective

To Update the 1996 Street Damage Restoration Fees



Presentation Organization

- 1. Random Selection of Pavement sections (Test Sites)
- 2. Functional (Condition) Testing and Analysis
- 3. Structural Testing and Analysis
- 4. Determination of Annual Damage due to Utility Cut Patching
- 5. Determination of Street Damage Restoration Fees (SDRF)
- 6. Conclusions and Recommendations

1. Section Selection

Google Earth, along with BOE utility database were used extensively to validate candidate sections as follows :

- > A referenced patch in the BOE database has to be seen in Google Earth.
- > There is enough pavement without utility cut patching adjacent to the PAT area to allow for the establishment of the CTL.
- > The PAT and CTL areas can't be located in intersections or turning lanes to ensure they are subjected to the same traffic.

PAT and CTL Pavement Areas



Section Selection (Stratified Random Criterion)

Pavement Sections were randomly selected from stratified groups to insure:

- Sections are from different pavement age groups to allow for the development of the deterioration curve.
- Utility cut patch has been in the pavement long enough to allow for the patch to have its effect on pavement performance.
- > Different utility companies are adequately represented.



Map of Selected Sections

2. Functional (Condition) Inspection PCI 100 Distress type Good 70 Fair Sample Distress 55 quantity PCI Poor Distress severity 0



Local Sites









CTL PAT

LOCAL - ALLIGATOR CRACKING - % AREA BY SEVERITY LEVEL









Unit Cost of Preventive Maintenance vs. PCI



PCI Family Model for Select – CTL Sites



Functional (Condition) Pavement Life at PCI = 60 CTL PAT Loss in Functional Life

6.48 Yrs.

64%

Select Roads	15.44 Yrs.	5.29 Yrs.	66%

18.25 Yrs.

Local Roads

3. Structural Testing Program



- Eight deflections adjacent to patch joint -
- > One deflection in patch center-
- > Eight deflections in the Control area

Cores were taken:

- > In the trench
- Outside the trench
- > In the Control area

Piezocone Penetration Testing:

- > In the trench
- > Outside the trench
- In the Control area











Comparison of Relative Soil Strength









	Mean Life Ratio	Loss in Structural Life
local Streets	0.45	55%
Select Streets	0.47	53%



4. Calculation of Annual Damage due to Utility Cuts

Used same approach as 1996 study;

- Fotal Cost = Overlay + Manhole Alignment + Milling + Profiling
- > Average Yearly Cost = Total Cost/ Pavement Life



The following unit costs are Direct Costs Provided by BOE based on Actual Bidding Costs:

- > Asphalt Concrete Cost/ ton, = 100.00
- Manhole Alignment/ Each, \$ = 1000.00
- > Average Manholes/ mile = 5.00
- > Cold Plane/ SF/ in, = 0.35
- > 6 Ft Profile near gutter/ SF, = 1.00

Annual Damage due to Utility Cuts

Structural Effect Only	\$18.71M	\$29.12M	\$47.83M
Functional Effect Only	\$40.59M	\$74.22M	\$114.81M
Functional and Structural Effects	\$82.74M	\$154.89M	\$237.63M
	Local	Select	Total

5. Calculation of Utility Cut Fees

Determine Average UtilityCut Width of Influence





- Determine Annual SF of Utility Cuts Last 5 Year Average from BoE Database:
 - > Local = 799,594 SF
 - > Select = 760,443 SF

Utility Cut Patching Width of Influence





Width of Influence Testing Results

- The deflection ratio around the edge of the patch compared to away from the patch ranges from 1.25 to 2.74 with an average of 1.59.
- The Utility Cut Patch Width of influence ranges from
 2.5 ft. to 10.0 ft. with an average of about 5 ft.





Street Damage Restoration Fees (SDRF)

Functional ad Structural Effects

	0 ft. Width of	2 ft. Width of	5 ft. Width of
	Influence	Influence	Influence
Local	\$103.48	\$37.77	\$16.80
Select	\$203.69	\$82.80	\$40.58

Functional Only

	0 ft. Width of	2 ft. Width of	5 ft. Width of
	Influence	Influence	Influence
Local	\$50.76	\$18.53	\$8.24
Select	\$97.60	\$39.68	\$19.44

Structural Only

	0 ft. Width of	2 ft. Width of	5 ft. Width of
	Influence	Influence	Influence
Local	\$23.40	\$8.54	\$3.80
Select	\$38.30	\$15.57	\$7.63

6. Conclusions – Functional (Condition)Testing

- The PCI of the CTL areas is significantly higher than the PAT areas:
 - Local sites 15 points.
 - Select Sites 11 points.
- > The pavement life to a PCI of 60 of the CTL areas is significantly higher than the PAT areas:
 - Local sites 11.8 years.
 - Select Sites 10.2 years.
- The percent loss in pavement life of the PAT vs the CTL areas was calculated as:
 - Local sites 64%
 - Select Sites 66%
- There is a higher percent of load related distresses (Alligator cracking and Rutting) in PAT vs CTL areas. Most of the differences are at the medium and high severity levels of the distresses.

Conclusions – Structural Testing

- The loss in structural life was estimated at 55% for Local sites and 53% for Select sites.
- > The average overlay design thickness for the PAT areas is about twice as much as that needed for the CTL areas.
- The deflection ratio around the edge of the patch compared to away from the patch ranges from 1.25 to 2.74 with an average of 1.59.
- The weakened width around the patch (measured perpendicular to patch joint) varies from 2.5ft to 10ft. with an average of 5.2 ft.
- > The average pavement thickness at the center of the patch is lower than around the patch.

Minimum Annual Damage and Patching Fees						
	Local Streets	Select Streets				
Min. Annual Damage	\$40.59M	\$74.22M				
Minimum Patching Fees (5 ft. width of influence)	\$8.24 per SF	\$19.44 per SF				

Comparison of CTL and PAT Test Results Local Streets

	Difference in Pavement Life, years	% Loss in Pavement life	Pavement Deflection Ratio: Trench Edge/CTL	Annual Damage, \$
1996	6	18	1.2	3.5 M (6.5 M with 3% inflation)
2017	11.77	64	1.41	82.7 M

Comparison	of	CTL	and	PAT	Test	Results
	S	elect	: Stro	eets		
		and and an an an an				

	Difference in Pavement Life years	% Loss in ' Pavement life	Pavement Deflection Ratio: Trench Edge/CTL	Annual Damage, \$
1996	8.5	34	1.22	12.9 M (24 M with 3% inflation)
2017	10.15	66	1.51	154.9 M