

**FY 2022**

**Maintenance Conditions of Kentucky Highways**

Division of Maintenance

Operations & Pavement Management Branch

**DISTRICT 12**







TABLE OF CONTENTS	P
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
Appendix VII Discrepancies



## **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**

**Table 1: Statewide Maintenance Levels of Service**


FY 2020 KYTC MAINTENANCE STATEWIDE SCORES			
CLASSIFICATION	SCORE	GRADE	COMMENTS
Interstates	92.8	A	Slight Increase
National Highway System	91.9	A	Slight Increase
State Primary and Secondary	84.3	B	Slight Increase
Rural Secondary	81.4	B	Slight Increase
<b>All Roads</b>	<b>84.0</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>Slight Increase</b>

**Figure 1: Statewide**







ALL ROADS




INTERSTATES



NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM



STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY



RURAL SECONDARY




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 from 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.

2022 Maintenance Rating Program Report

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

## ***2022 Maintenance Rating Program Report***

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. Two-person 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.

## Statewide Scores

FEATURE DESCRIPTION	INTERSTATE	NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM	STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY	RURAL SECONDARY	ALL ROADS
Rideability	88.1	84.4	74.6		73.7
Appearance	95.7	95.2	93.3	85.8	89.9
Vertical Clearance	97.8	93.9	80.5	73.7	79.0
Visual Obstructions	97.8	97.1	92.0	88.2	90.8
Fencing	98.1	92.9	76.0	87.8	87.3
Guardrail Specifications	90.2	83.3	76.9	75.8	76.2
Guardrail Damage	91.9	94.5	88.4	81.6	82.5
Attenuators	92.7	94.8	86.8	95.4	94.9
Potholes	88.4	88.5	86.9	71.3	79.5
Rutting	81.0	85.9	86.1	83.0	84.4
Pavement Drop Off	98.7	96.5	84.9	82.0	85.0
Shoulder Drop Off	93.2	91.2	74.7	71.0	75.0
High Shoulder	96.9	95.4	89.9	87.8	89.6
Shoulder Potholes	92.0	88.5	89.6	84.8	87.2
Drains	94.2	93.3	86.4	71.4	77.0
Ditches	94.8	91.6	81.9	78.9	81.8
Curb and Gutter	73.7	92.4	78.6		96.5
White Stripe	100.0	93.1	86.9	91.0	90.1
Yellow Stripe	100.0	96.3	81.4	84.4	84.4
Guide Signs	93.3	94.8	88.7	78.1	79.4
Guide Sign Assemblies	97.0	94.6	89.0	88.2	88.4
Warning and Reg. Signs	87.7	90.3	83.4	77.6	81.2
Warning and Reg. Sign	98.4	94.2	90.1	89.7	89.8
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>92.8</b>	<b>91.9</b>	<b>84.3</b>	<b>81.4</b>	<b>84.0</b>



## District Twelve Scores





FEATURE DESCRIPTION	NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM	STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY	RURAL SECONDARY	ALL ROADS
Rideability	88.1	71.8		75.7
Appearance	95.4	91.8	92.7	92.7
Vertical Clearance	92.7	50.0	37.3	51.2
Visual Obstructions	95.4	88.2	90.9	90.3
Fencing				99.0
Guardrail Specifications	76.7	61.0	69.2	66.5
Guardrail Damage	93.2	86.4	92.3	89.7
Attenuators	90.0	86.0	83.3	85.6
Potholes	68.2	52.3	59.1	57.2
Rutting	60.0	56.4	69.1	61.9
Pavement Drop Off	100.0	64.6	65.4	70.0
Shoulder Drop Off	87.3	41.8	53.6	53.0
High Shoulder	93.6	79.1	72.7	78.7
Shoulder Potholes	84.1	70.4	81.8	76.9
Drains	75.5	66.7	42.5	58.5
Ditches	88.2	53.0	35.6	51.3
Curb and Gutter	96.6			99.3
White Stripe	92.7	66.3	77.4	74.5
Yellow Stripe	93.5	26.8	40.6	41.9
Guide Signs	100.0			88.8
Guide Sign Assemblies	91.3			88.5
Warning and Reg. Signs	93.8	87.6	89.8	89.4
Warning and Reg. Sign	89.2	89.0		82.4
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>88.3</b>	<b>68.4</b>	<b>80.9</b>	<b>78.2</b>





## **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.6





## **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.






















District Twelve

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.

# Statewide MRP Scores









## **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 Maintenance Spending FY2021



TOTAL = \$ 185,191,401


- A - Surface
- B - Shoulder
- C - Roadside
- E - Tree and Brush
- F - Mowing
- J - Drainage
- T - Signs and Marking



#### Statewide Scores Comparison


Classification	FY2020	FY2022
ALL ROADS	80.9	84.0
INTERSTATE	92.0	92.8
NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM	89.5	91.9
STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY	81.9	84.3
RURAL SECONDARY	78.4	81.4

### District Twelve Maintenance Spending FY2021



**TOTAL = \$ 10,238,958**

- A - Surface
- B - Shoulder
- C - Roadside
- E - Tree and Brush
- F - Mowing
- J - Drainage
- T - Signs and Marking



#### District Twelve Scores Comparison

Classification	FY2020	FY2022
ALL ROADS	84.6	78.2
NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM	85.0	88.3
STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY	76.3	68.4
RURAL SECONDARY	88.6	80.9

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

ACTIVITY	Roadway										Rutting	
	General	Rideability	Appearance	Vertical Clearance	Visual Obstructions	Fencing	Guardrail Out of Specifications	Guardrail Damage	Attenuators/Rail Ends	Pavement		Potholes
C330 REP GR END TR (each)									X			
C390 CNTRCT GRAIL (hours)							X	X	X			
C400 CNTRCT GRAIL EN (hours)							X	X	X			
E010 TREE&BRUSH RMVL (hours)			X	X	X							
E020 GRADER			X	X	X							
E030 CONTR TREE-BRSH (hours)			X	X	X							
E110 TREE&SHRUB MNT (hours)			X	X	X							
E290 HERB GRAIL (miles)			X		X							
E300 SPOT SPRAY HERB (acres)			X		X							
E310 MECH SPRAY OF H (acres)			X		X							
F050 SLOPE MOWING (hours)			X	X	X							
F080 MOWER SUPPORT (hours)												
F090 HAND TRIM/LAWN MOW (hours)			X		X							
F310 MOW-STATE FORCE (acres)			X		X							
F320 MOW-CONTRACT (hours)			X		X							
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)			X									
T020 S.F. 4" YELLOW STRIPING (linear foot)			X									
T030 S.F. 4" WHITE STRIPING (linear foot)			X									
T040 HAND PVMT MARK (hours)			X									
T050 HAND PVMT PAINT (hours)			X									
T060 RAISED PVMT MRK (each)			X									
T110 PNT LNE&EDG LNE (miles)			X									
T200 PLCMNT SHT SIG (each)			X									
T210 RPLC SIGN & DEL (each)			X									
T240 SIGN MNT (each)			X									
T250 MNT PANEL SIGNS (each)			X									

ACTIVITY	Shoulders			Traffic			Drainage			Shoulders			Warning Signs		
	Pavement Drop-Off to Shoulder	Shoulder Drop-Off to Ground	High Shoulder	Shoulder Potholes	Ditches	Curb and Gutter	Traffic	White Stripe Reflectivity	Yellow Stripe Reflectivity	Guide Signs	Guide Sign Assemblies	Warning Signs	Warning Sign Assemblies		
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)															

ACTIVITY	Shoulders			Shoulder Drop-Off to Shoulder			Shoulder Drop-Off to Ground			High Shoulder			Shoulder Potholes			Drainage			Traffic			Warning Signs Assemblies		
	Pavement Drop-Off to Shoulder	Shoulder Drop-Off to Ground	High Shoulder	Shoulder Potholes	Drainage Structures	Ditches	Curb and Gutter	Traffic	White Stripe Reflectivity	Yellow Stripe Reflectivity	Guide Signs	Guide Signs Assemblies	Warning Signs	Warning Signs Assemblies										
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)					X	X																		
J020 MACH CLN CULVRT (each)					X	X																		
J030 RPR CULV/PIPE (each)					X	X																		
J070 PVT ENT MAINT (each)					X	X																		
J110 SLOPE PROTECT (tons)					X	X																		
J150 CONTRACT DRNGE (hours)					X	X	X																	
J210 DITCH W/ GRADE (miles)					X	X																		
J230 SPT DCH BOOM EQ (miles)					X	X																		
J310 PAV/ ROCK DTCH (linear foot)					X	X																		
J320 CLN DRAIN CHNL (hours)					X	X																		
T010 CONTRACT 4" YELLOW STRIP (linear foot)									X															
T020 S.F. 4" YELLOW STRIPING (linear foot)									X															
T030 S.F. 4" WHITE STRIPING (linear foot)									X															
T040 HAND PVMT MARK (hours)									X															
T050 HAND PVMT PAINT (hours)									X															
T060 RAISED PVMT MRK (each)									X															
T110 PNT LINE&EDG LNE (miles)									X															
T200 PLCMNT SHT SIG (each)									X															
T210 RPLC SIGN & DEL (each)									X															
T240 SIGN MNT (each)									X															
T250 MNT PANEL SIGNS (each)									X															

## **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.

**Maintenance  
Rating Program  
Inspection Form**

Inspection Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation Team: \_\_\_\_\_

**01-0001**

Wave 19 Summer 2009

<b>District 01</b>	County: <b>LIVINGSTON</b>	Route: <b>I-24</b>	Mile Point: <b>030.563</b>	Dir: <b>E</b>
Number of Lanes: <b>4</b>	Surface: <b>AC</b>	AADT: <b>28500</b>	Median: <b>Earth</b>	Shoulder: <b>AC</b>
Lane Width: <b>12</b>	Category: <b>Interstates/Expressways</b>		Median Width: <b>48</b>	Shoulder Width: <b>10</b>

r1 - General Aesthetics (Grass, Vegetation, Litter & Surface) <b>1=Excellent 2=Good 3=Acceptable 4=Poor 5=Unacceptable</b>				
r2 - Is there roadway or shoulder with less than 15' vertical clearance?	(2)	Y	N	
r3 - Are there visual obstructions of intersections, curves or signs, etc.?	(3)	Y	N	
r4 - Is there right-of-way fencing?	(4)	Y	N	
r5 - Is there fence not providing a positive barrier?	(5)	Y	N	
r6 - Is there guardrail?	(6)	Y	N	
r7 - Is there guardrail outside height specifications (25" to 29")?	(7)	Y	N	
r8 - Is there guardrail with post or accident damage?	(8)	Y	N	
r9 - Number of guardrail attenuators/rail ends	(9)			_____
r10 - Number of attenuators/rail ends damaged	(10)			_____
p1 - Number of pavement potholes 6" long, 6" wide and 1" deep or larger ( <i>maximum = 20</i> )	(11)			_____
p2 - Rutting - Outside wheel path at 0 feet ( <b>circle one</b> )	Greater than ¼"		Less than or equal to ¼"	
p3 - Rutting - Outside wheel path at 100 feet ( <b>circle one</b> )	Greater than ¼"		Less than or equal to ¼"	
s1 - Is there pavement dropoff to shoulder greater than or equal to 1.5"?	(14)	Y	N	
s2 - Is there shoulder dropoff to ground greater than or equal to 3.0"?	(15)	Y	N	
s3 - Is there high shoulder?	(16)	Y	N	
s4 - Number of shoulder potholes 6" x 6" x 1" or larger ( <i>maximum = 20</i> )	(17)			_____
d1 - Number of drainage structures ( <i>do not include entrance pipes</i> )	(18)			_____
d2 - Number of drainage structures with 25% or greater flow inhibited	(19)			_____
d3 - Are there ditches?	(20)	Y	N	
d4 - Are there ditches with flow inhibited? ( <i>include any blocked entrance pipes here</i> )	(21)	Y	N	
d5 - Are there curbs and gutters?	(22)	Y	N	
d6 - Are there curbs and gutters with flow inhibited?	(23)	Y	N	
Striping reflectivity measurements taken 10 paces apart (Priorities: 1=Edge Line, 2=Center Line, 3=Skip Line)				
t1 - White reading #1	(24)	_____	t2 - White reading #2	(25)
t4 - Yellow reading #1	(27)	_____	t5 - Yellow reading #3	(28)
			t6 - Yellow reading #3	(29)
t7 - Number of guide signs	(30)			_____
t8 - Number of guide signs not conforming with sign face specifications ( <i>damaged sign face, faded, vandalized, etc</i> )	(31)			_____
t9 - Number of guide sign assemblies	(32)			_____
t10 - Number of guide sign assemblies not conforming with specifications	(33)			_____
t11 - Number of warning and regulatory signs	(34)			_____
t12 - Number of warning and regulatory signs not conforming with sign face specifications ( <i>damaged sign face, faded, vandalized, etc.</i> )	(35)			_____
t13 - Number of warning and regulatory sign assemblies	(36)			_____
t14 - Number of warning and regulatory sign assemblies not conforming with specifications	(37)			_____

Comments:

---



---



---



### Explanation and Score Equivalence of Inspection Features

Inspection Features	Explanation	Score	MRP Score
International Roughness Index	A measure that indicates smoothness and ride quality for the highway user. Note: Weighting used in sampling scheme may create variances between the MRP rideability indices and those reported for the entire population.	51 or less	90 +
		52 - 90	80 – 89.9
		91-129	70 – 79.9
		130 – 167	60 – 69.9
		168+	59.9 and below
Appearance	The general visual character (height of grass, litter, unsightly patching, etc.) of the roadway and roadside as it would be seen by the public.	100% acceptable	100
		80%	80
		60%	60
Vertical Clearance	Roadways and shoulders are free of any canopy (trees or other vegetation) or other obstructions for a minimum height of 15 feet.	0% obstructed	100
		20%	80
		40%	60
Visual Obstructions	Vegetation, structures, signage etc. cause horizontal or vertical visual obstructions of intersections, curves, signs, oncoming lanes, etc.	0% obstructed	100
		20%	80
		40%	60
Fencing Providing Effective Barriers	Fencing provides an effective barrier on limited access highways (Interstate, Parkways, or other highways) to deny access to people or animals. Segments with no fencing are not included in the sample.	100% effective	100
		80%	80
		60%	60
Guardrail Within Height Specifications	The height is at least 25 inches and not more than 29 inches.	100% in spec	100
		80%	80
		60%	60
Guardrail Fully Functional	Guardrails have not been damaged due to vehicular hits or other factors.	100% in spec	100
		80%	80
		60%	60

<b>Inspection Features</b>	<b>Explanation</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>MRP Score</b>
Attenuators/End Treatments Undamaged	Attenuators / End Treatments have not been damaged due to vehicular hits or other factors.	100% undamaged	100
		80%	80
		60%	60
Pavement Potholes	A bowl shaped hole of various sizes in the pavement surface. The surface may have broken into small pieces due to cracking or localized disintegration and the material removed by traffic. A pothole has a minimum size of 6"x6"x1".	0 failed sections	100
		10%	75
		20%	50
		40%	0
Rutting	A surface depression of pavement in the wheel paths. Ruts may be more noticeable after a rainfall when wheel paths are full with water.	0% have ruts larger than ¼"	100
		20%	80
		40%	60
Pavement Drop-off to Shoulder	Occurs whenever there is a decrease in elevation between the traffic lane and the shoulder. It may be due to consolidation, displacement or settlement of underlying material.	0% have drop-off larger than 1.5"	100
		20%	80
		40%	60
Shoulder Drop-off to Ground	An elevation difference between the improved shoulder and adjacent ground at the outside edge of the shoulder. It could be due to consolidation of material, erosion, run off or other factors.	0% have drop-off larger than 3"	100
		20%	80
		40%	60
High Shoulder	The opposite of pavement drop-off to shoulder. Frost heave, swelling soils or other factors can cause it. High shoulder creates ponding of water on pavement.	0% unacceptable	100
		20%	80
		40%	60
Shoulder Potholes	A bowl shaped hole or depression in the shoulder surface. The surface may have broken into small pieces due to the cracking or localized disintegration and the material removed by traffic. A shoulder pothole has a minimum size of 6"x6"x1".	0% failed sections	100
		10%	75
		20%	50
		40%	0

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

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

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).


## **APPENDIX VII**

### **Discrepancies**


The graphs in Appendix VII illustrate the data collection discrepancies between central office and the districts. Approximately 10% of all MRP sections are re-inspected by central office. The discrepancy tolerances are based on the MRP scoring system and are as follows:

r1	both sections must either pass or fail
r2	both sections must be either Yes or No
r3	both sections must be either Yes or No
r4	both sections must be either Yes or No
r5	both sections must be either Yes or No
r6	both sections must be either Yes or No
r7	both sections must be either Yes or No
r8	both sections must be either Yes or No
r9	exact match required
r10	exact match required
p1	the difference between the sections must not exceed 2
p3	both sections must either pass or fail
p4	both sections must either pass or fail
s1	both sections must be either Yes or No
s2	both sections must be either Yes or No
s3	both sections must be either Yes or No
s4	the difference between the sections must not exceed 2
d1	the difference between the sections must not exceed 1
d2	the difference between the sections must not exceed 1
d3	both sections must be either Yes or No
d4	both sections must be either Yes or No
d5	both sections must be either Yes or No
d6	both sections must be either Yes or No
t7	the difference between the sections must not exceed 2
t8	the difference between the sections must not exceed 2
t9	the difference between the sections must not exceed 2
t10	the difference between the sections must not exceed 2
t11	the difference between the sections must not exceed 2
t12	the difference between the sections must not exceed 2
t13	the difference between the sections must not exceed 2
t14	the difference between the sections must not exceed 2

# STATEWIDE AVERAGE MRP DATA DISCREPANCIES



### DISTRICT TWELVE/CO MRP DATA COLLECTION DISCREPANCIES



### DISTRICT TWELVE/CO MRP DATA COLLECTION DISCREPANCIES

