FY 2022 -----

Maintenance Conditions of Kentucky Highways

Division of Maintenance Operations & Pavement Management Branch



TABLE OF CONTENTS	Р
Executive Summary	1
Goals and Requirements	8
Methodology	10
Analysis	12
Appendices	13

APPENDICES Appendix I Statewide Scores Appendix II Statewide Scores by Element Type Appendix III District Scores by Element Type Appendix IV Total Scores by Road Type Appendix V Activity Spending Appendix VI Inspection Features

2022 MAINTENANCE RATING PROGRAM REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) has surveyed the state's roadside conditions in order to estimate the needs for routine maintenance. The 2022 Maintenance Rating Program (MRP) inspections were completed statewide during summer 2021. The purpose of this report is to provide the results of the inspections and assess the current condition of the highway infrastructure maintenance activities. The report is broken into two parts – a statewide report used for higher level analysis; and individual district reports used on a local level for management decisions.

Background

The KYTC Maintenance Rating Program (MRP) is a systematic measurement process that uses annual performance measurements of highway infrastructure data to support planning and management decisions regarding maintenance activities and resources. Data collected from the MRP is used in conjunction with the cabinet's Operations Management System (OMS) to calculate the maintenance budget for each of the twelve highway districts.

Target for Sustained Performance

The **target performance level** score was set at **80** (service level B-good) for each highway district and for the statewide score for all highways.

The target serves as a benchmark for districts to help identify best practices among high performers and opportunities for improvement. The statewide target may be increased in the future as the districts reach higher levels of performance.

It is generally recognized that the level of service provided on the four road types for all features will not be the same. Interstate highways with higher traffic volumes and higher speed limits need to be maintained at a higher level of service than Rural Secondary roads. It is the responsibility of each district to set target values for every feature for each of the four road types to achieve the target score of 80.

Results

FY 2020 KYTC MAINT	ENANCE ST	ATEWIDE SCOR	ES
CLASSIFICATION	SCORE	GRADE	COMMENTS
Interstates	92.8	А	Slight Increase
National Highway System	91.9	А	Slight Increase
State Primary and Secondary	84.3	В	Slight Increase
Rural Secondary	81.4	В	Slight Increase
All Roads	84.0	В	Slight Increase

Table 1: Statewide Maintenance Levels of Service





Figure 2: District Maintenance Levels of Service



Figure 3 shows in recent years the categories that have seen the most significant drops in level of service over a five (5) year period. Fencing scores have remained above the recommended level of 70 and are showing an upward trend the last two years. A 6% increase in Level of Service from the 2018 MRP Scores. Rutting has shown the most consistent rise in Level of Service for the last five years. Showing a 14% increase in Level of Service from the 2018 MRP Scores. Drains has shown a decrease in the Level of Service from five years ago. There was a 13% decrease to Drains Level of Service form the 2018 MRP Scores. Ditches had shown a dip in Level of Service but has had slight increase year-to-year for the last two years. Ending with only a 4% decrease in Level of Service from the 2018 MRP Scores. Guide Signs Level of Service has shown the most volatility over the last five years. Overall, it has had a 17% decrease from the 2018 MRP Scores. As of the 2022 MRP Scores; none of these Road Scores Categories have score of less than 70; some are showing improvement but many of these Categories of Interest show Level of Service lower than their scores five years prior.



Figure 4: District Maintenance Levels of Service for Featured Categories of Interest (FY2022)





The Figure 5a and 5b charts show the yearly statewide expenditures for the last five (5) fiscal years broken out for spending classifications related to the featured categories of interest.

Fencing ("5b") expenses pertain to the construction and maintenance of roadside fencing for maintaining limited access to the right-of-way. Rutting ("5b") expenses include surface maintenance from pothole and abnormality repair to surface milling to maintain level. Drains ("5a") contains expense for clearing and repairing drainage pipes and culverts. Ditches ("5a") contains expenses to remove vegetation and debris from ditches as well as vegetation maintenance and mowing to maintain ditch flow. Guide Signs ("5b") expenses are for placement and repair of roadside Guide Signs.

Many of the expenses associated with these categories of interest have shown either consistent increase or relative plateau in spending. While there has been a decrease in Level of Service for these Categories of Interest; the spending is still maintaining, in some cases well above, the recommended minimum Level of Service of 70.

TABLE 2 - DISTRICT MAINTENANCE FEATURE SCORES All State Roads - Fiscal Year 2022

District:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Rideability Index	77.5	75.2	79.9	78.6	65.7	70.4	66.5	75.1	79.5	68.4	77.5	75.7
Appearance	94.3	100.0	93.7	85.6	95.0	83.0	91.1	77.6	86.1	86.9	90.1	92.7
Vertical Clearance	92.0	99.6	88.8	53.1	88.9	74.1	83.6	83.5	99.2	60.8	63.9	51.2
Visual Obstructions	99.0	100.0	88.7	95.4	83.4	88.3	94.4	88.5	99.6	57.4	90.7	90.3
Fencing	59.2	100.0	100.0	99.6	99.1	98.9	77.8	90.0	98.4	N/A	100.0	99.0
Guardrail Out of Specifications	51.6	100.0	99.0	52.4	85.4	60.9	79.1	69.5	82.4	55.2	76.9	66.5
Guardrail Damaged	100.0	98.4	87.2	52.4	66.0	80.8	79.9	92.3	64.6	97.5	85.4	89.7
Attenuators/Rail Ends Damaged	99.0	98.7	99.8	99.5	68.9	97.1	82.5	100.0	85.1	96.3	98.9	85.6
Pavement Potholes	98.0	96.0	90.6	62.0	76.3	77.7	77.7	61.7	73.6	90.1	87.3	57.2
Rutting	87.6	99.4	86.4	56.8	83.4	80.7	92.7	91.0	96.6	75.6	99.6	61.9
Pavement Dropoff	87.9	100.0	84.4	58.0	74.7	81.2	94.1	92.4	97.1	81.2	98.0	70.0
Shoulder Dropoff	95.3	98.8	73.1	59.1	54.0	62.6	72.7	85.5	95.7	77.7	57.2	53.0
High Shoulder	100.0	100.0	97.7	92.2	92.2	86.7	95.6	94.8	98.2	96.8	29.8	78.7
Shoulder Potholes	97.4	99.7	93.4	80.9	81.6	84.8	82.2	89.9	78.2	82.3	88.8	76.9
Drains	85.9	100.0	89.1	77.5	92.5	75.7	91.9	95.1	55.3	77.4	81.9	58.5
Ditches	98.0	97.8	89.9	91.7	81.9	77.7	93.3	88.3	86.0	52.0	45.3	51.3
Curbs and Gutters	100.0	100.0	99.9	98.2	77.3	95.6	94.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	99.3
White Striping	97.6	99.5	89.6	88.9	93.8	N/A	79.4	75.5	71.5	73.5	N/A	74.5
Yellow Striping	85.1	100.0	96.1	93.6	95.9	N/A	86.2	81.6	55.4	63.4	N/A	41.9
Guide Sign Faces	100.0	93.7	93.9	99.3	85.0	86.3	41.9	89.4	96.6	35.7	52.5	88.8
Guide Sign Assemblies	100.0	75.5	89.2	99.6	82.4	86.0	78.2	85.4	79.6	82.1	91.8	88.5
Warning/Reg Sign Faces	89.0	97.8	85.8	91.3	82.7	80.0	71.9	86.7	89.6	51.8	40.1	89.4
W/R Sign Assemblies	99.9	91.8	98.2	100.0	85.8	83.1	80.4	85.6	68.8	84.4	63.2	82.4

Strength - A feature scored at 90 or higher across the district.

Within Acceptable Limits - A feature scored between 70 and 90 points across the district.

Failing - A feature scored below 70 across the district.

Features did not have a sample size large enough to produce statistically valid data

*Some values may appear to be shaded incorrectly due to rounding

A. GOALS AND REQUIREMENTS

Assess the maintenance activities of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet.

The MRP allows the cabinet to assess the effectiveness of infrastructure maintenance activities and compare the outcomes to customer expectations.

Make informed policy and management decisions.

The results of the MRP provide guidance for investment decisions and resource allocation. In addition, the MRP findings also offer a means to assess effectiveness of prior decisions and resource allocations. MRP findings also reveal where additional resources are needed to bring performance to targeted levels.

The MRP supports the cabinet goal of delivering a consistent level of customer service across the state by providing the necessary data to identify differences in performance across districts, road types, and roadway features. The results of the MRP demonstrate how each district is performing in comparison to targeted levels in specific categories. The MRP can thereby help district management determine how district resources should be allocated to achieve a consistent level of service. The MRP can also help district and cabinet management formulate the budget request necessary to achieve targeted levels of performance.

Similarly, the MRP communicates targeted performance levels, along with the policy and budget decisions that drive them, to policy makers as well as citizens. The MRP thus aids the Commonwealth's Executive and Legislative branches in determining acceptable levels of performance for their constituents.

The MRP is designed to support "management by fact" at all levels and provides a means to identify best practices among the districts by identifying districts exceeding target levels. These practices can then be shared with districts that may be falling short of their goals.

Promote alignment with the Transportation Cabinet's Strategic Plan.

The Maintenance Rating Program is vital to two of the cabinet's four strategic goals. These goals are as follows:

Strategic Goal Number 1: "Ensure Mobility & Access" to preserve the transportation system infrastructure.

Strategic Goal Number 3: "Continually Improve Organizational Performance" of Operational and Support Processes.

The MRP is a direct assessment tool for maintenance activities related to infrastructure preservation, as defined in *Strategic Goal Number 1*. The MRP is also the principal

performance measure for assessing maintenance process improvement, thereby facilitating *Strategic Goal Number 3*.

Provide Data for GASB-34.

MRP data can be used to satisfy the Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement 34 (GASB-34) condition of highway assets requirement. This requirement obligates state governments to report all capital assets, including infrastructure, in a *statement of net assets* and to report depreciation expense associated with these assets. Infrastructure assets are not required to be depreciated if (1) the government manages the assets using an asset management system that has certain defined characteristics and (2) the government can document that the assets are being preserved approximately at (or above) a condition level established and disclosed by the government.

KYTC's Operations Management System (OMS) satisfies the first requirement listed above. The MRP fulfills the second requirement.

B. METHODOLOGY

Sampling and Data Collection

Data is collected during one wave each year, June through October.

For this wave, between 300 and 400 roadway segments are randomly selected in each district among the following four road types:

Interstates - Those routes designated as part of the Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. These include three north-south interstates (I-65, I-71, I-75); two east-west interstates (I-24 and I-64); and smaller loop routes in Louisville Metro and Northern Kentucky.

Other NHS - Non-interstate routes that are part of the National Highway System. This category includes most of the state's parkways and major US routes. Some state routes (roads designated with a "KY" prefix) are also components of this system.

Other SP/Sec - State Primary and Secondary roads include all "KY" routes which do not carry an NHS or Rural Secondary designation.

Rural Secondary – The system of roads in Kentucky that are usually considered "farm to market" roads.

Each roadway segment is 500 feet in length and includes all adjacent right-of-way. Twoperson teams from each district inspect the selected roadway segments and complete the MRP inspection for each segment. The KYTC GIS department and ESRI developed a mobile ArcGIS application for field use in 2015. This application allowed inspections to be completed with an Apple iOS unit with the ESRI Collector App installed. The mobile application gave Central Office access to a SDE layer that was updated daily with inspection results. All districts have utilized the new devices and software since the 2017 data collection.

The MRP collection splits performance measures into five main categories: roadway general, pavement, shoulders, drainage, and traffic. The following are some of the inspected features: general aesthetics, visual obstructions, potholes, rutting, drop off, ditches, and guide sign faces. These measures are then used in the calculation of statewide and district MRP scores.

Quality Assurance

The Field Data Collection Manual was revised in May 2006 to reflect the recording changes for some features. The training manual contains an introduction of the Maintenance Rating Program and its purposes, as well as definitions and guidelines for recording measurements and observations on the inspection form. Additionally, the manual establishes safety procedures for both the inspection team and the public. This manual along with a training power point presentation is available on the website: http://transportation.ky.gov/maintenance/

Statewide training was available prior to the summer 2009 data collection to ensure new employees are properly trained and to address any additional questions regarding the program. All districts requested and received training with the exception of districts three and eight during this time. District three requested and received training prior to the summer 2010 data collection. All districts were trained for mobile device collection in 2011 and additional training was offered in 2012. In 2016 the new iOS Application and devices were provided to All Districts. All districts were provided Training with the new iOS devices in 2016.

A quality assurance procedure was established to assess the accuracy of MRP data collection, and indirectly, the consistency of training. Two teams from the central office in Frankfort re-inspected approximately 10% of the segments surveyed in each district. The results of the quality assurance inspections will be compared to that of the original inspections and will be used to determine additional needs for training of the field data collection teams.

A committee of stakeholders, including Maintenance and Traffic Engineers in the MRP will periodically meet to review the data collection procedures, features and weight factors to make further improvements to align the MRP with the Strategic Goals of the cabinet.

C. ANALYSIS

The inspection results for each of the sample sets were analyzed using the Operations Management System MRP module. Most of the information reported is statistical summaries of the data. Rideability indices were provided by the Pavement Management Branch within the Division of Maintenance. Each road type score was weighted according to the proportion of centerline miles for each of the four road types to produce district and statewide road type totals and a state total score. Spending data was taken from OMS and EMARS according to fiscal year. Spending data from the previous fiscal year is paired with MRP data collected during the current fiscal year.

Each of the roadway features measured was evaluated and given an "importance weight" with respect to the other features so that the sum of all weights is 100. These importance weights were determined through a consensus of approximately 100 key KYTC managers and staff. They are based on the customer requirements identified and prioritized in the 1998 Voice of the Customer research conducted by the cabinet. These requirements include safety, protection of the infrastructure, comfort and convenience, and aesthetics. Importance weights were revised in 2011 to reflect results of the 2010 Maintenance Customer Survey performed by KTC.

The targeted confidence levels and intervals are based on the size of the samples. The target confidence interval for the smallest sample, road type by district, is set as 90% +/-10%. District totals and road type totals have a confidence interval of 90% +/- 5%, while the statewide total target confidence interval is set as 99% +/- 3%. For a feature where the number of occurrences is less than nineteen in the sample segments, no data is reported, as the data may lack statistical validity.

If no data was present for a particular feature in a district, the scores were adjusted for missing values so that the potential value remained 100. This allows for calculation of overall district and road type scores in the absence of specific feature data.

APPENDIX I

Statewide Scores

Appendix I charts show the MRP score by road type for each feature measured. Boxes are color coded according to scores:

Green – a strength, score at 90 or higher Yellow – within acceptable limits, score between 70 and 90 Red – failing, score below 70

In some cases, a score of "N/A" is listed. In these instances, there were not enough occurrences in order to achieve the desired confidence level. This may be due to the absence of a particular feature in the sample segments (such as guardrail, curb, etc.). It also may indicate that inspection crews were unable to measure certain items due to safety concerns (as with striping on interstates). Rideability scores for Rural Secondary are "Blank" as IRI data is not currently collected for Rural Secondary routes.

10
Ð
Ľ
~
0
C
10
U)
1
_
σ
5
~
-
œ
ŭ
_
()
÷
1

ALL ROADS	73.7	89.9	79.0	90.8	87.3	76.2	82.5	94.9	79.5	84.4	85.0	75.0	89.6	87.2	77.0	81.8	96.5	90.1	84.4	79.4	88.4	81.2	89.8	84.0
RURAL SECONDARY		85.8	73.7	88.2	87.8	75.8	81.6	95.4	71.3	83.0	82.0	71.0	87.8	84.8	71.4	78.9		91.0	84.4	78.1	88.2	77.6	89.7	81.4
STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY	74.6	93.3	80.5	92.0	76.0	76.9	88.4	86.8	86.9	86.1	84.9	74.7	89.9	89.6	86.4	81.9	78.6	86.9	81.4	88.7	89.0	83.4	90.1	84.3
NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM	84.4	95.2	93.9	97.1	92.9	83.3	94.5	94.8	88.5	85.9	96.5	91.2	95.4	88.5	93.3	91.6	92.4	93.1	96.3	94.8	94.6	90.3	94.2	91.9
INTERSTATE	88.1	95.7	8'26	97.8	98.1	90.2	91.9	92.7	88.4	81.0	2.86	93.2	6'96	92.0	94.2	94.8	73.7	100.0	100.0	93.3	0'26	87.7	98.4	92.8
FEATURE DESCRIPTION	Rideability	Appearance	Vertical Clearance	Visual Obstructions	Fencing	Guardrail Specifications	Guardrail Damage	Attenuators	Potholes	Rutting	Pavement Drop Off	Shoulder Drop Off	High Shoulder	Shoulder Potholes	Drains	Ditches	Curb and Gutter	White Stripe	Yellow Stripe	Guide Signs	Guide Sign Assemblies	Warning and Reg. Signs	Warning and Reg. Sign	Total Score

Scores
Score
Score
Scol
Sco
Š
ဟ
Ψ
$\mathbf{\cap}$
U
÷
C
t
Str
listr

ALL ROADS	77.5	94.3	92.0	0.66	59.2	51.6	100.0	0.06	98.0	87.6	87.9	95.3	100.0	97.4	85.9	98.0	100.0	97.6	85.1	100.0	100.0	89.0	99.9	94.4
RURAL SECONDARY		92.7	92.7	98.2	48.2				97.7	89.1	84.6	95.4	100.0	95.4	80.0	98.0			86.6			91.1		95.7
STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY	75.2	97.2	2.06	100.0	70.8				2.79	94.4	2.06	93.5	100.0	100.0	92.4	0.86		83.3	79.2	100.0	100.0	82.6		0'06
NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM	81.8	90.5	87.8	100.0	74.4	60.0	100.0		100.0	76.8	95.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.7		90.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		92.6
INTERSTATE		100.0	100.0	100.0					100.0	21.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										91.2
FEATURE DESCRIPTION	Rideability	Appearance	Vertical Clearance	Visual Obstructions	Fencing	Guardrail Specifications	Guardrail Damage	Attenuators	Potholes	Rutting	Pavement Drop Off	Shoulder Drop Off	High Shoulder	Shoulder Potholes	Drains	Ditches	Curb and Gutter	White Stripe	Yellow Stripe	Guide Signs	Guide Sign Assemblies	Warning and Reg. Signs	Warning and Reg. Sign	Total Score

S
ð
Ľ
0
Ŭ
Ň
0
ž
2
÷
C
5
÷
S
5

ALL ROADS	75.2	100.0	9.66	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.4	98.7	96.0	99.4	100.0	98.8	100.0	99.7	100.0	97.8	100.0	99.5	100.0	83.7	75.5	97.8	91.8	94.6
RURAL SECONDARY		100.0	99.1	100.0					97.7	99.1	100.0	98.2	100.0	100.0		98.0			100.0			97.5	91.7	94.2
STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY	74.7	100.0	100.0	100.0		100.0	89.5		93.2	100.0	100.0	1.99.1	100.0	100.0		6.96		96.4	100.0			97.6	90.1	94.5
NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM	84.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.9	100.0	100.0	99.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		100.0		100.0	100.0			100.0	100.0	97.9
INTERSTATE	86.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	93.3	95.8	98.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	91.7		100.0		100.0	100.0					97.3
FEATURE DESCRIPTION	Rideability	Appearance	Vertical Clearance	Visual Obstructions	Fencing	Guardrail Specifications	Guardrail Damage	Attenuators	Potholes	Rutting	Pavement Drop Off	Shoulder Drop Off	High Shoulder	Shoulder Potholes	Drains	Ditches	Curb and Gutter	White Stripe	Yellow Stripe	Guide Signs	Guide Sign Assemblies	Warning and Reg. Signs	Warning and Reg. Sign	Total Score

ŝ
ŏ
Ξ.
0
ŏ
ň
••
Ð
ð
Ľ
2
•
オ
. <u> </u>
5
7

ALL ROADS	79.9	93.7	88.8	88.7	100.0	0.66	87.2	99.8	90.6	86.4	84.4	73.1	97.7	93.4	89.1	89.9	99.9	89.6	96.1	93.9	89.2	85.8	98.2	91.0
RURAL SECONDARY		92.4	81.8	84.6					86.4	90.0	77.3	66.4	98.2	88.6	84.3	86.9		86.3	97.1			77.8	96.9	90.5
STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY	78.0	96.3	96.4	93.6		0.06	100.0		95.4	85.4	6.06	77.3	97.3	100.0	94.1	92.1		93.8	95.4	88.9	91.7	95.0	100.0	91.7
NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM	87.1	8.06	99.1	91.8	100.0	93.9	100.0	100.0	93.2	69.1	100.0	99.1	97.3	2.79	100.0	98.0		93.8	91.2	9.96	100.0	100.0	100.0	94.4
INTERSTATE	90.9	90.4	100.0	9.96	100.0				100.0	69.0	100.0	87.9	96.6	87.1		100.0								92.7
FEATURE DESCRIPTION	Rideability	Appearance	Vertical Clearance	Visual Obstructions	Fencing	Guardrail Specifications	Guardrail Damage	Attenuators	Potholes	Rutting	Pavement Drop Off	Shoulder Drop Off	High Shoulder	Shoulder Potholes	Drains	Ditches	Curb and Gutter	White Stripe	Yellow Stripe	Guide Signs	Guide Sign Assemblies	Warning and Reg. Signs	Warning and Reg. Sign	Total Score

-
2
Ľ
ō
ŏ
Ň
ゴ
Ň
オ
. <u> </u>
t
Ś
Ξ

78.6 81.3 85.6 50.9 53.1 96.4 95.4	81.3 85.6 50.9 53.1 96.4 95.4	50.9 53.1 96.4 95.4	96.4 95.4		99.6	52.4	52.4	99.5	38.6 62.0	52.7 56.8	52.7 58.0	55.4 59.1	93.6 92.2	77.3 80.9	77.1 77.5	89.7 91.7	98.2	88.2 88.9	93.7 93.6	99.3	99.6	89.5 91.3	100.0	87.4 86.5
	0.77	89.9	52.3	94.5					86.2	59.6	61.5	61.5	89.0	83.9	74.0	92.7		90.0	93.5	94.1	96.4	92.2	100.0	82.7
	85.2	90.3	62.7	92.7	98.6	85.1	89.4	94.7	90.9	60.9	67.3	65.4	98.2	86.4	97.2	100.0		87.8	94.4	94.9	100.0	100.0	94.1	2.78
	91.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	84.8		100.0	100.0	100.0	91.7	100.0	100.0	97.2	100.0				94.1	100.0			97.2
	Rideability	Appearance	Vertical Clearance	Visual Obstructions	Fencing	Guardrail Specifications	Guardrail Damage	Attenuators	Potholes	Rutting	Pavement Drop Off	Shoulder Drop Off	High Shoulder	Shoulder Potholes	Drains	Ditches	Curb and Gutter	White Stripe	Yellow Stripe	Guide Signs	Guide Sign Assemblies	Warning and Reg. Signs	Warning and Reg. Sign	Total Score

S
ö
Ľ
0
Ŭ
()
-
Ð
>
iT.
ž
<u> </u>
5
3

JRE DESCRIPTION	INTERSTATE	NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM	STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY	RURAL SECONDARY	ALL ROADS
	84.2	74.4	71.9		65.7
	91.1	96.2	97.2	93.6	95.0
arance	100.0	96.4	92.7	80.9	88.9
uctions	96.7	95.4	85.4	75.4	83.4
	98.2	100.0			99.1
ecifications	86.2	81.0			85.4
amage	82.8	100.0			66.0
	100.0				68.9
	83.3	95.4	93.2	54.6	76.3
	71.7	89.1	92.7	76.4	83.4
rop Off	96.7	99.1	73.6	64.6	74.7
op Off	85.0	90.9	57.3	34.6	54.0
er	98.3	90.0	95.4	88.2	92.2
tholes	91.7	90.9	88.6	70.4	81.6
	96.9	94.8	93.4	90.0	92.5
	97.8	89.8	79.8	78.1	81.9
utter		81.2	63.6		77.3
			92.9	94.7	93.8
0			96.7	95.1	95.9
	86.4	83.2	84.9	85.1	85.0
Assemblies	94.9	87.5	80.7	79.6	82.4
Reg. Signs		78.6	86.9	79.8	82.7
I Reg. Sign		94.1	86.5	82.7	85.8
re	90.3	89.6	84.3	73.9	79.3

S
- Ő
~
-
0
()
40
0)
×
ŝ
••
÷
Ö
<u> </u>
÷
S
\mathbf{n}

82.4	82.9	80.0	88.5	86.2	Total Score
83.1	83.0		100.0		Warning and Reg. Sign
80.0	87.6	73.3	94.6		Warning and Reg. Signs
86.0			87.4	100.0	Guide Sign Assemblies
86.3		91.3	86.7	96.7	Guide Signs
					Yellow Stripe
					White Stripe
95.6			90.9	68.4	Curb and Gutter
77.7	72.4	80.2	75.9	89.2	Ditches
75.7	63.2	83.3	79.0	85.4	Drains
84.8	81.8	86.1	72.0	100.0	Shoulder Potholes
86.7	83.6	88.9	91.6	83.3	High Shoulder
62.6	53.6	64.8	78.5	88.3	Shoulder Drop Off
81.2	84.6	75.9	97.2	96.7	Pavement Drop Off
80.7	75.4	83.3	99.1	80.0	Rutting
L'LL	68.2	86.1	95.3	54.2	Potholes
1.79		84.0	94.6	68.4	Attenuators
80.8		84.6	96.7	90.6	Guardrail Damage
6'09		65.4	57.4	78.1	Guardrail Specifications
6.86				94.7	Fencing
88.3	89.1	86.1	97.2	96.7	Visual Obstructions
74.1	65.4	76.8	97.2	90.0	Vertical Clearance
83.0	72.7	88.0	98.1	95.0	Appearance
70.4		70.6	76.2	87.0	Rideability
ALL ROADS	RURAL SECONDARY	STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY	NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM	INTERSTATE	FEATURE DESCRIPTION

Scores
seven s
istrict S
Ō

66.5		91.1	83.6	94.4	77.8	79.1	79.9	82.5	77.7	92.7	94.1	72.7	95.6	82.2	91.9	93.3	94.3	79.4	86.2	41.9	78.2	71.9	80.4	79.3
KURA SECOND,		88.6	76.4	91.8	72.0				75.0	88.2	90.9	56.4	93.6	79.6	85.7	88.0		61.9	77.1			58.1		72.0
STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY	72.7	91.7	86.4	95.4	77.8				79.6	95.4	95.4	79.1	96.4	88.6	97.6	97.5		93.6	91.7	96.9		83.0	86.2	88.1
HIGHWAY SYSTEM	82.5	97.2	94.6	100.0	88.0	87.8	92.7	100.0	70.4	96.4	98.2	96.4	98.2	72.7	94.3	98.7		93.2	100.0	96.3	100.0	82.0		91.9
INTERSTATE	89.7	93.3	95.0	95.0	100.0	96.0	92.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	75.0		92.3				100.0				95.4
FEATURE DESCRIPTION	Rideability	Appearance	Vertical Clearance	Visual Obstructions	Fencing	Guardrail Specifications	Guardrail Damage	Attenuators	Potholes	Rutting	Pavement Drop Off	Shoulder Drop Off	High Shoulder	Shoulder Potholes	Drains	Ditches	Curb and Gutter	White Stripe	Yellow Stripe	Guide Signs	Guide Sign Assemblies	Warning and Reg. Signs	Warning and Reg. Sign	Total Score

S
ă
Ľ
0
ŏ
ň
0)
÷
2
σ
ш
ىد
$\overline{\mathbf{O}}$
. <u> </u>
E.
5

77.6	0.4 77.6		7.3 83.5	5.4 88.5	90.0	69.5	92.3	100.0	0.0 61.7	91.0	.8 92.4	7 85.5	2.7 94.8	.9 89.9	3.3 95.1	5.3 88.3		1.3 75.5	1.1 81.6	0.2 89.4	85.4	5.5 86.7	3.7 85.6	.3 86.1
		22	12	85					50	06	91	82	62	96	99	85		64	74	96		85	86	38
	78.0	87.4	90.9	90.0		67.9	89.3	100.0	79.6	90.9	89.1	86.4	98.2	84.1	100.0	92.0		96.2	94.4	82.4	70.4	89.3	82.6	87.4
SYSTEM	86.6	95.2	100.0	100.0	88.9	87.7	98.2	100.0	86.4	90.9	100.0	96.4	99.1	93.2		95.9		96.3	97.2	96.4	92.3	88.0		93.8
	90.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		98.3				93.1				98.2
	Rideability	Appearance	Vertical Clearance	Visual Obstructions	Fencing	Guardrail Specifications	Guardrail Damage	Attenuators	Potholes	Rutting	Pavement Drop Off	Shoulder Drop Off	High Shoulder	Shoulder Potholes	Drains	Ditches	Curb and Gutter	White Stripe	Yellow Stripe	Guide Signs	Guide Sign Assemblies	Warning and Reg. Signs	Warning and Reg. Sign	Total Score

S
ä
Ľ
0
Ŭ
Ś
Φ
Ž
Ζ
÷
ΰ
-
ũ
Δ

S
ö
Ľ
0
C
S
_
Š
-Φ
÷
<u>U</u>
Ξ
ž
<u></u>

RURAL ECONDARY ALL ROADS	68.4	76.7 86.9	43.1 60.8	40.4 57.4		55.2	97.5	96.3	81.6 90.1	62.4 75.6	75.2 81.2	74.3 77.7	96.3 96.8	65.6 82.3	74.2 77.4	41.9 52.0		57.9 73.5		42.9 63.4	42.9 63.4 35.7 35.7	42.9 63.4 35.7 35.7 82.1	42.9 63.4 35.7 35.7 82.1 82.1 40.0 51.8	42.9 63.4 42.9 63.4 7 35.7 82.1 82.1 40.0 51.8 85.0 84.4
STATE PRIMARY ND SECONDARY SI	74.2	96.2	73.2	70.4		73.7	86.8	84.6	97.7	86.1	84.3	77.8	97.2	97.7	77.0	61.5		86.2	79.4		62.1	62.1	62.1 56.1	62.1 56.1 81.4
NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM AI	86.7	98.9	100.0	90.2		81.3	93.3	92.4	100.0	98.9	100.0	96.7	96.7	100.0	98.1	62.2		98.7	100.0		100.0	100.0 95.6	100.0 95.6 97.4	100.0 95.6 97.4 96.3
FEATURE DESCRIPTION	kideability	\ppearance	/ertical Clearance	/isual Obstructions	encing	Buardrail Specifications	buardrail Damage	Attenuators	otholes	Rutting	avement Drop Off	shoulder Drop Off	ligh Shoulder	Shoulder Potholes	Drains	Ditches	Curb and Gutter	Vhite Stripe	cellow Stripe		Buide Signs	Buide Signs Buide Sign Assemblies	Juide Signs Juide Sign Assemblies Varning and Reg. Signs	Juide Signs Buide Sign Assemblies Varning and Reg. Signs Varning and Reg. Sign

FEATURE DESCRIPTION	INTERSTATE	NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM	STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY	RURAL SECONDARY	ALL ROADS
Rideability	88.6	88.8	74.3		77.5
Appearance	100.0	100.0	91.4	86.8	90.1
Vertical Clearance	97.1	95.4	65.4	55.4	63.9
Visual Obstructions	97.1	95.4	93.5	87.3	90.7
Fencing	100.0	100.0			100.0
Guardrail Specifications	81.5	66.7	48.9		76.9
Guardrail Damage	88.9	90.7	77.8		85.4
Attenuators		81.1	87.5		98.9
Potholes	85.3	95.4	95.3	79.6	87.3
Rutting	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.1	9.66
Pavement Drop Off	97.1	97.3	99.1	97.3	98.0
Shoulder Drop Off	85.3	69.1	61.7	50.0	57.2
High Shoulder	97.1	72.7	37.4	12.7	29.8
Shoulder Potholes	85.3	79.6	88.3	90.9	88.8
Drains	89.3	91.2	82.6	79.4	81.9
Ditches	68.2	79.4	41.9	40.8	45.3
Curb and Gutter					
White Stripe					
Yellow Stripe					
Guide Signs		85.5	74.0		52.5
Guide Sign Assemblies		80.8	88.7		91.8
Warning and Reg. Signs		60.5	59.1	21.3	40.1
Warning and Reg. Sign		84.4	88.8	38.8	63.2
Total Score	89.8	86.5	77.6	77.7	78.2

District Eleven Scores

ALL ROADS	75.7	92.7	51.2	90.3	0.66	66.5	89.7	85.6	57.2	61.9	70.0	53.0	78.7	76.9	58.5	51.3	99.3	74.5	41.9	88.8	88.5	89.4	82.4	78.2
RURAL SECONDARY		92.7	37.3	90.9		69.2	92.3	83.3	59.1	69.1	65.4	53.6	72.7	81.8	42.5	35.6		77.4	40.6			89.8		80.9
STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY	71.8	91.8	50.0	88.2		61.0	86.4	86.0	52.3	56.4	64.6	41.8	1.97	70.4	66.7	53.0		66.3	26.8			87.6	89.0	68.4
NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM	88.1	95.4	92.7	95.4		7.97	93.2	90.0	68.2	60.0	100.0	87.3	93.6	84.1	75.5	88.2	96.6	92.7	93.5	100.0	91.3	93.8	89.2	88.3
FEATURE DESCRIPTION	Rideability	Appearance	Vertical Clearance	Visual Obstructions	Fencing	Guardrail Specifications	Guardrail Damage	Attenuators	Potholes	Rutting	Pavement Drop Off	Shoulder Drop Off	High Shoulder	Shoulder Potholes	Drains	Ditches	Curb and Gutter	White Stripe	Yellow Stripe	Guide Signs	Guide Sign Assemblies	Warning and Reg. Signs	Warning and Reg. Sign	Total Score

District Twelve Scores

APPENDIX II

Statewide Scores by Element Type

Appendix II is a graphical representation of historical scores on a statewide basis. Scores for the current and previous four years are represented in the graphs for each of the four road types. The gray shaded area represents the weighted average of all roads for the given feature. This weighting is based on the number of miles present for each road type. For this reason, the shaded area may not appear to be a true average of the individual lines. In general, the weighted average will tend to gravitate toward the RS and Other SP/SS scores as these have the majority of centerline miles.

In some instances, there may be insufficient data available to analyze a specific road type. In these cases, individual lines may be broken or may not appear at all. Where possible, the overall average score is still displayed.









Statewide









Appendix II.2

Statewide









Statewide



FY2018

50

. 80

06

100

- 02

09



70

60

Appendix II.4

→ STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY → RURAL SECONDARY → ALL ROADS

FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019

FY2018

50

Yellow Stripe

100

06

80

Statewide









Statewide

Appendix II.5






Statewide

APPENDIX III

District Scores by Element Type

Similar to Appendix II, the District Scores by Element Type have scores for the current and previous four years represented in the graphs for each of the four road types. The gray shaded area represents the weighted average of all roads for the given feature.

Due to the much smaller sample size in district evaluations, there are many more instances where there was insufficient data for analysis. These graphs are still shown, but will be marked accordingly. In some cases, the line representing a specific road type may be missing or broken due to insufficient data for a specific year or road type, but the district-wide average for all road types is still shown where possible.









Appendix III.2

District One

















FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019

District One

→ STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY → RURAL SECONDARY → ALL ROADS FY2018 50 ▲ STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY BURAL SECONDARY STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY FY2022 FY2021 INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM FY2020 FY2019 FY2018 50









District One

Appendix III.5





→ STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY TURAL SECONDARY STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY STATE PRIMARY STAT

District One

INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM







District One











Appendix III.1









District Two

Appendix III.2









Appendix III.3

District Two









District Two

Appendix III.4





FY2018

50

FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019

FY2018

50

09

60



INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM



















Appendix III.1









Appendix III.2

District Three



- ALL ROADS

Fencing

100

06

80

FY2022

FY2021

FY2020



70

60



→ STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY → RURAL SECONDARY → ALL ROADS

FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019

FY2018

50

District Three









District Three

Appendix III.4









- ALL ROADS

→ STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY → RURAL SECONDARY

INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM

FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019

FY2018

50

Guide Sign Assemblies

100

90

80

70

60

District Three







District Three









District Four

Appendix III.1









Appendix III.2

District Four







Appendix III.3

District Four









Appendix III.4

District Four











Appendix III.5







District Four









District Five

















Appendix III.3

District Five









Appendix III.4

District Five



Guide Sign Assemblies







- ALL ROADS

FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019

FY2018

District Five



















District Six









District Six









Appendix III.3

District Six









District Six


Appendix III.5

FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019

FY2018

District Six

60 50 FY2022 FY2021 INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM FY2020 FY2019 FY2018 60 50







District Six









Appendix III.1

District Seven



















Appendix III.3

District Seven









District Seven

Appendix III.4



★ STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY HURAL SECONDAR

INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Appendix III.5

→ STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY → RURAL SECONDARY → ALL ROADS

District Seven

















Appendix III.1

District Eight









Appendix III.2

District Eight









Appendix III.3

District Eight









District Eight

Appendix III.4







Appendix III.5



- ALL ROADS

→ STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY → RURAL SECONDARY

FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019

FY2018

50

Guide Sign Assemblies

100

90

80

70

60







District Eight









Appendix III.1

District Nine





→ STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY → RURAL SECONDARY → ALL ROADS

FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019

FY2018

FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019

FY2018

District Nine

INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM









District Nine





→ STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY TURAL SECONDARY STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY STATE PRIMARY STAT

FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019

FY2018

FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019

FY2018

District Nine

INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM





FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019

FY2018

District Nine

→ STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY → RURAL SECONDARY → ALL ROADS 50 FY2022 FY2021 INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM FY2020 FY2019 FY2018 50







District Nine



FY2020

FY2019

FY2018

50

. 80

06

100

- 02

.09

Appearance









Shoulder Drop Off

FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019







District Ten









District Ten







FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019

FY2018

50

60

70

Yellow Stripe

100

06

80

District Ten





FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019

FY2018

50

FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019

FY2018

50

. 09 NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM - STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY

60

District Ten







District Ten



















District Eleven

Appendix III.2







Guardrail Damage

100



District Eleven











Appendix III.4





FY2022

FY2021

FY2020

FY2019

FY2018

50

District Eleven

80 70 60 50 FY2018 FY2019 FY2020 FY2021 FY2022 FY2018 FY2019 FY2020 FY2021 FY2022







District Eleven









Appendix III.1

District Twelve









Shoulder Drop Off









Guardrail Damage



District Twelve









Appendix III.4

District Twelve






Appendix III.5











FY2022

Appendix III.6

APPENDIX IV

Total Scores by Road Type

The graphs in Appendix IV illustrate the total MRP scores for each district and statewide. These are the combined scores for all roadway features. Included are the most recent MRP data and historical data for all previous four years.

As in previous graphs, the four road types are represented by colored lines, while the overall weighted average is shown as a gray shaded area.





















Appendix IV.3









Appendix IV.4

APPENDIX V

Activity Spending

Appendix V tables and graphs are a summary of previous fiscal year district spending impacting current MRP scores. Spending is pulled from a combination of OMS and EMARS reports in order to include state force and contract spending.

Appendix V also contains a complete list of activities that impact features inspected by the MRP.



Statewide



District One



District Two



District Three



District Four



District Five



District Six



District Seven



District Eight



District Nine



District Ten



District Eleven



District Twelve

Rutting			×	×					×	×				Γ																		Π	Π	
Potholes		×	×	×	×		×	×																										
Pavement																																		
Attenuators/Rail Ends																																×		
Guardrail Damage																																		×
Guardrail Out of Specifications																																		×
Fencing																																	×	
Visual Obstructions																																		
Vertical Clearance																																		
Appearance		х	х	×	×	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	×	×				х	х						х	х	х	×	х	х	х			
Rideability		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×																×								
General Roadway																																		
	ACTIVITY	A010 SUR-POT HOLE PATCH (tons)	A020 MACHINE PATCH (tons)	A030 SURF-ABNORM REP (tons)	A040 SURF-REPAIR PCC (sq. ft.)	A050 SURFACE-SPOT SEAL COAT (tons)	A140 TOTAL CONTRA PATCH (tons)	A150 VENDOR AIDED PATCH (tons)	A710 MILLING-STATE MACH (sq. yds.)	A720 MILLING-VENDOR (sq. yds.)	B010 SHR-POT HOLE HOT (tons)	B040 SHOULDER-SEAL COAT (tons)	B020 SHR-MACH PATCH HOT (tons)	B050 SHR - ABNORM REP (tons)	B110 WEDG PAVE SHR HOT (tons)	B120 BIT EDGE SHDL (tons)	B130 GRADE SHRS-GRASS (Ln. Mile)	B140 SHR TBM MAINT (tons)	B150 CONTRA SHLD MAINT (tons)	B210 GRADE SHOULDERS (miles)	B220 GRADE SHR ADD MAT (tons)	B230 GRADE SHLD UNDR GR (linear foot)	B540 EDGE UNPAVED SHDLS (tons)	B990 MISC SHR MAINT (hours)	C010 ROCK FALLS AND DEBRIS (hours)	C020 SLIDES/SINKHOLES & DEBRIS (hours)	C100 LITTER CLNUP EX (hours)	C110 LITTER CLEANUP (hours)	C130 DEAD ANIMAL (hours)	C140 SWEEP (hours)	C150 CONT-MECH SWEEP (miles)	C190 CRASH CUSHIONS (each)	C200 REPAIR FENCES (linear foot)	C300 REP ST BM GRL (linear foot)

Butting																																					
Potholes																																					
fnement																																					
Attenuators/Rail Ends		×	×	×																																	
Guardrail Damage			×	×																																	
Guardrail Out of Specifications			×	×																																	
Fencing																																					
Visual Obstructions					×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×																					
Vertical Clearance					×	×	×	×				×																									
Appearance					×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×											×	х	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Rideability																																					
Roadway General																																					
	ACTIVITY	C330 REP GR END TR (each)	C390 CNTRCT GRAIL (hours)	C400 CNTRCT GRAIL EN (hours)	E010 TREE&BRUSH RMVL (hours)	E020 GRADER	E030 CONTR TREE-BRSH (hours)	E110 TREE&SHRUB MNT (hours)	E290 HERB GRAIL (miles)	E300 SPOT SPRAY HERB (acres)	E310 MECH SPRAY OF H (acres)	F050 SLOPE MOWING (hours)	F080 MOWER SUPPORT (hours)	F090 HAND TRIM/LAWN MOW (hours)	F310 MOW-STATE FORCE (acres)	F320 MOW-CONTRACT (hours)	J010 HAND CLN CULVRT (each)	J020 MACH CLN CULVRT (each)	J030 RPR CULV/PIPE (each)	J070 PVT ENT MAINT (each)	J110 SLOPE PROTECT (tons)	J150 CONTRACT DRNGE (hours)	J210 DITCH W/ GRADE (miles)	J230 SPT DCH BOOM EQ (miles)	J310 PAV/ ROCK DTCH (linear foot)	J320 CLN DRAIN CHNL (hours)	T010 CONTRACT 4" YELLOW STRIP (linear foot)	T020 S.F. 4" YELLOW STRIPING (linear foot)	T030 S.F. 4" WHITE STRIPING (linear foot)	T040 HAND PVMT MARK (hours)	T050 HAND PVMT PAINT (hours)	T060 RAISED PVMT MRK (each)	T110 PNT LNE&EDG LNE (miles)	T200 PLCMNT SHT SIG (each)	T210 RPLC SIGN & DEL (each)	T240 SIGN MNT (each)	T250 MNT PANEL SIGNS (each)

səildməssA																																		Π
Narning Sign																																		
Warning Signs																																		1
SaildməssA																																		
SngiS sbiuD			_		-		-									-		-											-					
renow surpe Reflectivity																																		
Reflectivity			_		-		_									-		_											-					
White Stripe																																		
Traffic		_																					_									\vdash	\vdash	
Curb and Gutter																																		
Ditches																							×		×	×								
Drainage Structures																																		
Drainage																																		
Potholes Shoulder											×		×	×					×					×										
High Shoulder																	х		×	×	×	×		×										
Shoulder Drop- Off to Ground													×	×				×	×	×	×			×		×								
Pavement Drop- Off to Shoulder													×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×										
Shoulders																																		
	ACTIVITY	A010 SUR-POT HOLE PATCH (tons)	A020 MACHINE PATCH (tons)	A030 SURF-ABNORM REP (tons)	A040 SURF-REPAIR PCC (sq. ft.)	A050 SURFACE-SPOT SEAL COAT (tons)	A140 TOTAL CONTRA PATCH (tons)	A150 VENDOR AIDED PATCH (tons)	A710 MILLING-STATE MACH (sq. yds.)	A720 MILLING-VENDOR (sq. yds.)	B010 SHR-POT HOLE HOT (tons)	B040 SHOULDER-SEAL COAT (tons)	B020 SHR-MACH PATCH HOT (tons)	B050 SHR - ABNORM REP (tons)	B110 WEDG PAVE SHR HOT (tons)	B120 BIT EDGE SHDL (tons)	B130 GRADE SHRS-GRASS (Ln. Mile)	B140 SHR TBM MAINT (tons)	B150 CONTRA SHLD MAINT (tons)	B210 GRADE SHOULDERS (miles)	B220 GRADE SHR ADD MAT (tons)	B230 GRADE SHLD UNDR GR (linear foot)	B540 EDGE UNPAVED SHDLS (tons)	B990 MISC SHR MAINT (hours)	C010 ROCK FALLS AND DEBRIS (hours)	C020 SLIDES/SINKHOLES & DEBRIS (hours)	C100 LITTER CLNUP EX (hours)	C110 LITTER CLEANUP (hours)	C130 DEAD ANIMAL (hours)	C140 SWEEP (hours)	C150 CONT-MECH SWEEP (miles)	C190 CRASH CUSHIONS (each)	C200 REPAIR FENCES (linear foot)	C300 REP ST BM GRL (linear foot)

Narning Sign Asemblies																																		×	×	×	
sngiS gnimsW																																		×	×	×	
ngiS əbin£ səildməssA																																		×	×	×	×
sngiS ebiuE)																																	×	×	×	×
Yellow Stripe Zeflectivity																											х	х		х	х	х	х				
Ahite Stripe Reflectivity																													×	×	×	×	×				
าลที่ได																																					
Curb and Gutter																						×															
sədətiC																	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×											
Orainage Structures																	×	×	×	×		×		×		×											
əganianO																																					
Shoulder Shoulder																																					1
-ligh Shoulder																																					
Shoulder Drop- Shoulder Drop-																																					
-Rond Drop סזי גיס Shoulder																																					
Shoulders																																					
	ACTIVITY	C330 REP GR END TR (each)	C390 CNTRCT GRAIL (hours)	C400 CNTRCT GRAIL EN (hours)	E010 TREE&BRUSH RMVL (hours)	E020 GRADER	E030 CONTR TREE-BRSH (hours)	E110 TREE&SHRUB MNT (hours)	E290 HERB GRAIL (miles)	E300 SPOT SPRAY HERB (acres)	E310 MECH SPRAY OF H (acres)	F050 SLOPE MOWING (hours)	F080 MOWER SUPPORT (hours)	F090 HAND TRIM/LAWN MOW (hours)	F310 MOW-STATE FORCE (acres)	F320 MOW-CONTRACT (hours)	J010 HAND CLN CULVRT (each)	J020 MACH CLN CULVRT (each)	J030 RPR CULV/PIPE (each)	J070 PVT ENT MAINT (each)	J110 SLOPE PROTECT (tons)	J150 CONTRACT DRNGE (hours)	J210 DITCH W/ GRADE (miles)	J230 SPT DCH BOOM EQ (miles)	J310 PAV/ ROCK DTCH (linear foot)	J320 CLN DRAIN CHNL (hours)	T010 CONTRACT 4" YELLOW STRIP (linear foot)	T020 S.F. 4" YELLOW STRIPING (linear foot)	T030 S.F. 4" WHITE STRIPING (linear foot)	T040 HAND PVMT MARK (hours)	T050 HAND PVMT PAINT (hours)	T060 RAISED PVMT MRK (each)	T110 PNT LNE&EDG LNE (miles)	T200 PLCMNT SHT SIG (each)	T210 RPLC SIGN & DEL (each)	T240 SIGN MNT (each)	T250 MNT PANEL SIGNS (each)

APPENDIX VI

Inspection Features

Appendix VI includes an example of the current inspection form used in data collection.

The table in Appendix VI explains the data collection of each inspection feature of the Maintenance Rating Program and how that data is converted into scoring for the report.

Inspection Date: _____

01-0001

Maintenance Rating Program Inspection Form

Evaluation Team: _____

Wave 19 Summer 2009

District 01 County: LIVING	STON	Route: I -24	Mil 03	e Point: 0.563		Dir: E			
Number of Lanes: 4	Surface: AC	AADT: 28500	Median:	Earth		Shoulder:	AC		
Lane Width: 12	Category: Interstates/Exp	pressways	Median V	Vidth: 48		Shoulder	Width: 10	r.	
r1 - General Aesthetics (G	rass, Vegetation, Litter & Si	urface) 1=Excelle	nt 2=Good	3=Acceptable	4=Poor	5=Unacceptable			
r2 – Is there roadway or sh	oulder with less than 15' ve	rtical clearance?					(2)	Y	Ν
r3 – Are there visual obstru	ctions of intersections, curv	es or signs, etc.?					(3)	Y	Ν
r4 - Is there right-of-way fe	ncing?						(4)	Y	Ν
r5 – Is there fence not prov	iding a positive barrier?						(5)	Y	Ν
r6 – Is there guardrail?							(6)	Y	Ν
r7 – Is there guardrail outsi	de height specifications (25	" to 29")?					(7)	Y	Ν
r8 – Is there guardrail with	post or accident damage?						(8)	Y	Ν
r9 - Number of guardrail at	enuators/rail ends						(9)		
r10 - Number of attenuators	s/rail ends damaged						(10)		
p1 - Number of pavement p	ootholes 6" long, 6" wide an	d 1" deep or larger (n	naximum = 20))			(11)		
p2 - Rutting - Outside whee	el path at 0 feet (circle one)	Gre	ater than ¼"		Less t	han or equal to ¼"			
p3 - Rutting - Outside whee	el path at 100 feet (circle or	ne) Gre	ater than ¼"		Less t	han or equal to ¼"			
s1 - Is there pavement dro	poff to shoulder greater tha	n or equal to 1.5"?					(14)	Y	Ν
s2 – Is there shoulder drop	off to ground greater than o	r equal to 3.0"?					(15)	Y	Ν
s3 – Is there high shoulder	?						(16)	Y	Ν
s4 - Number of shoulder po	tholes 6" x 6" x 1" or larger	(maximum = 20)					(17)		
d1 - Number of drainage st	ructures (do not include en	trance pipes)					(18)		
d2 – Number of drainage s	tructures with 25% or greate	er flow inhibited					(19)		
d3 – Are there ditches?							(20)	Y	Ν
d4 – Are there ditches with	flow inhibited? (include any	/ blocked entrance pip	es here)				(21)	Y	Ν
d5 – Are there curbs and g	utters?						(22)	Y	Ν
d6 – Are there curbs and g	utters with flow inhibited?						(23)	Y	Ν
Striping reflectivity measure	ements taken 10 paces apa	rt (Priorities: 1=Edge	Line, 2=Cente	er Line, 3=Skip L	ine)				
t1 - White reading #1	(24) t	2- White reading #2	(25)	ta	8- White re	eading #3	(26)		
t4 - Yellow reading #1	(27) t	5- Yellow reading #3	(28)	t6	3- Yellow r	eading #3	(29)		
t7 - Number of guide signs							(30)		
t8 - Number of guide signs	not conforming with sign fa	ce specifications (dan	naged sign fa	ce, faded, vanda	lized, etc)		(31)		
t9 - Number of guide sign a	ssemblies						(32)		
t10 - Number of guide sign	assemblies not conforming	with specifications					(33)		
t11 - Number of warning ar	d regulatory signs						(34)		
t12 - Number of warning ar	id regulatory signs not conf	orming with sign face	specifications	(damaged sign	face, fade	d, vandalized, etc.)	(35)		
t13 - Number of warning an	id regulatory sign assemblie	es					(36)		
t14 - Number of warning an	d regulatory sign assemblie	es not conforming with	specification	S			(37)		

Comments:

Inspection Features	Explanation	Score	MRP Score
International Roughness Index	A measure that indicates	51 or less	90 +
	smoothness and ride quality for		
	the highway user.	52 - 90	80 - 89.9
	Note: Weighting used in sampling	01 120	70 70 0
	scheme may create variances	91-129	/0 - /9.9
	indices and those reported for the	130 - 167	60 - 69 9
	entire population.	150 107	00 07.5
		168+	59.9 and below
Appearance	The general visual character	100% acceptable	100
	(height of grass, litter, unsightly		
	patching, etc.) of the roadway and	80%	80
	roadside as it would be seen by		
	the public.	60%	60
Vertical Clearance	Roadways and shoulders are free	0% obstructed	100
	of any canopy (trees or other	200/	80
	for a minimum height of 15 feet	20%	80
	for a minimum neight of 15 feet.	40%	60
Visual Obstructions	Vegetation structures signage	0% obstructed	100
	etc. cause horizontal or vertical	0,0000000000	100
	visual obstructions of	20%	80
	intersections, curves, signs,		
	oncoming lanes, etc.	40%	60
Fencing Providing	Fencing provides an effective	100% effective	100
Effective Barriers	barrier on limited access	200/	80
	or other highways)	80%	80
	to deny access to people or	60%	60
	animals. Segments with no	0070	
	fencing are not included in the		
	sample.		
Guardrail Within	The height is at least 25 inches	100% in spec	100
Height Specifications	and not more than 29 inches.	0.00/	
		80%	80
		600/	60
		00%	00
Guardrail Fully	Guardrails have not been	100% in spec	100
Functional	damaged due to vehicular hits or		
	other factors.	80%	80
		60%	60

Explanation and Score Equivalence of Inspection Features

Inspection Features	Explanation	Score	MRP Score
Attenuators/End Treatments	Attenuators / End Treatments	100% undamaged	100
Undamaged	have not been damaged due to vehicular hits or other factors.	80%	80
		60%	60
Pavement Potholes	A bowl shaped hole of various	0 failed sections	100
	sizes in the pavement surface. The surface may have broken into small pieces due to cracking or	10%	75
	localized disintegration and the material removed by traffic. A	20%	50
	pothole has a minimum size of 6"x6"x1".	40%	0
Rutting	A surface depression of pavement	0% have ruts larger	100
	in the wheel paths. Ruts may be more noticeable after a rainfall when wheel paths are full with	20%	80
	water.	40%	60
Pavement Drop-off to	Occurs whenever there is a	0% have drop-off larger	100
Shoulder	decrease in elevation between the	than 1.5"	80
	may be due to consolidation.	2070	80
	displacement or settlement of underlying material.	40%	60
Shoulder Drop-off to Ground	An elevation difference between	0% have drop-off larger	100
	the improved shoulder and adjacent ground at the outside	20%	80
	edge of the shoulder. It could be	2070	00
	due to consolidation of material, erosion, run off or other factors.	40%	60
High Shoulder	The opposite of pavement drop-	0% unacceptable	100
	swelling soils or other factors can	20%	80
	ponding of water on pavement.	40%	60
Shoulder Potholes	A bowl shaped hole or depression in the shoulder surface. The	0% failed sections	100
	surface may have broken into small pieces due to the cracking	10%	75
	or localized disintegration and the material removed by traffic. A	20%	50
	shoulder pothole has a minimum size of 6"x6"x1".	40%	0

Inspection Features	Explanation	Score	MRP Score
Drainage Structures	Drainage structures like pipes and	100% acceptable	100
	culverts that are free of any degree of obstruction and are in good working order. Drainage	80%	80
	structures obstructed more than 25% fail.	60%	60
Ditches	Ditches on the side of the road	0% blockage	100
	dirt, rock, debris, or other items or	20%	80
		40%	60
Curbs and Gutters	Curbs and gutters with water flow	0% blockage	100
	damage.	20%	80
		40%	60
White Striping Reflectivity	Measures night reflectivity of striping that provides positive	100% acceptable	100
	guidance to motorists.	80%	80
	exceeding 125 from retro- reflectometer pass.	60%	60
Yellow Striping Reflectivity	Measures night reflectivity of striping that provides positive	100% acceptable	100
	guidance to motorists.	80%	80
	exceeding 80 from retro- reflectometer pass.	60%	60
Guide Sign Faces	Includes route markers (cardinal directions, route numbers,	100% in spec	100
	arrows), distance/destination	90%	80
	(Green, brown or blue backgrounds). The standard is no	80%	60
	visible defects that detract from		
	effectiveness under nighttime conditions.		
Guide Sign Assemblies	Guide signs mounted according to specifications including: not	100% in spec	100
	leaning more than 22.5 degrees in either direction, no holts or rivets	90%	80
	missing, not turned more than 45 degrees from the line of sight, etc.	80%	60

Inspection Features	Explanation	Score	MRP Score
Warning and Regulatory Sign	No visible defects that detract	100% in spec	100
Faces Meeting Specifications	from sign face effectiveness under		
	nighttime conditions. Includes	90%	80
	red and white backgrounds		
	(STOP, WRONG WAY, DO	80%	60
	NOT ENTER, speed limit, etc.)		
	and yellow backgrounds (STOP		
	AHEAD, curve warning signs,		
	chevrons, etc).		
Warning and Regulatory Sign	Warning and regulatory signs	100% in spec	100
Assemblies	mounted according to	-	
	specifications, including: not	90%	80
	leaning more than 22.5 degrees in		
	any direction, no bolts or rivets	80%	60
	missing, not turned more than 45		
	degrees from the line of sight, etc.		

Note: Scores for features were calculated only in segments where features were present at least nineteen times to give statistically valid results. If the feature occurred less than nineteen times, "N/A" was entered. However, it was still used for calculating weighted totals such as District Totals (including all road types), Road Type Totals (including all districts), and State Totals (including all road types and all districts).