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## 2019 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 2019 Maintenance Rating Program (MRP) inspections were completed statewide during summer 2018. 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 $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ KYTC MAINTENANCE STATEWIDE SCORES |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| CLASSIFICATION | SCORE | GRADE | COMMENTS |
| Interstates | 92.4 | A | Slight Decrease |
| National Highway <br> System | 89.2 | B | Slight Decrease |
| State Primary and <br> Secondary | 81.7 | B | Slight Decrease |
| Rural Secondary | 78.2 | C | Decrease |
| All Roads | $\mathbf{8 1 . 0}$ | B | Decrease |
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Figure 2: District Maintenance Levels of Service


Figure 3 shows in recent years the categories that have remained consistent in their scoring, those that had started to show improvement, and those that are starting to show decreasing trends. Guardrail Specification had showing greatest improvement year-toyear with scores last year peaking at 82.2 and then significant drops in service level with a score of 65.6 this year. There was a change to the Guardrail Height Specification in 2018. This change in Guardrail height was used with the Maintenance Rating Program Inspection with the summer of 2018 and it is likely the cause in the reduced Guardrail service level scores decline and the first time it has dropped below the target service score of 70 in four years. Shoulder Drop Off had some consistent service levels with improvement over previous three years and then some drops in level of service these last two years. Shoulder Potholes had been making similar improvements and also saw some reduction in levels of service this year. Warning and Regulatory Signs has remained constant for the last four years and showed a significant drop this last year. Warning and Regulatory Sign Assemblies are categories that has shown the most consistent decrease in weighted scoring for All Roads; with continued decrease in level of service for four of the last five years.
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Figure 4: District Maintenance Levels of Service for Featured Categories of Interest

Figure 5: Statewide Maintenance Spending
Spending trends for Featured Categories of Interest


The Figure 5 chart show the expenditures for the last five (5) fiscal years broken out for spending classifications related to the featured categories of interest.

Shoulder expenditures ("B") contain expenses to fixing Shoulder Drop Off. Roadside expenditures ("C") contain expenses to both Guardrail Specifications and Guardrail Attenuators. Drainage ("J") contain expenses to ditch maintenance, drainage structures, and curbs and gutters. Signs and Markings ("T") contain expenses to replace and maintain

Shoulder spending has stayed pretty consistent through the last five years and would correlate with the plateau trending level of service for "Shoulder Drop Off". Roadside spending covers such a variety of expenditures; from litter cleanup, guardrail maintenance, to slide repair. Therefore it is difficult to follow the spending trends along with the level of service trends for "Guardrail Specifications" to see a direct comparison.

| District: | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rideability Index | 75.1 | 73.6 | 77.8 | 76.1 | 71.9 | 70.0 | 74.4 | 79.4 | 75.1 | 71.0 | 74.9 | 75.4 |
| Appearance | 95.2 | 94.2 | 91.6 | 89.0 | 99.7 | 71.2 | 94.9 | 93.7 | 79.4 | 85.5 | 87.5 | 94.4 |
| Vertical Clearance | 81.7 | 95.6 | 84.4 | 51.9 | 73.0 | 78.9 | 84.7 | 77.8 | 72.5 | 45.1 | 71.4 | 46.6 |
| Visual Obstructions | 93.5 | 93.8 | 84.0 | 89.0 | 75.9 | 90.5 | 96.5 | 92.3 | 95.2 | 75.4 | 87.6 | 86.2 |
| Fencing | 81.9 | 96.7 | 100.0 | 99.2 | 97.3 | 96.9 | 89.2 | 88.1 | 100.0 | 84.6 | 93.6 | 92.0 |
| Guardrail Out of Specifications | 81.4 | 64.8 | 57.6 | 82.1 | 69.4 | 57.4 | 84.8 | 55.7 | 77.6 | 55.7 | 67.3 | 65.0 |
| Guardrail Damaged | 95.1 | 90.2 | 77.0 | 86.8 | 72.8 | 75.1 | 91.0 | 84.9 | 84.7 | 90.0 | 93.1 | 87.2 |
| Attenuators/Rail Ends Damaged | 87.6 | 97.0 | 58.0 | 87.6 | 80.8 | 99.5 | 94.6 | 99.0 | 93.3 | 85.7 | 86.0 | 95.4 |
| Pavement Potholes | 75.2 | 44.8 | 90.0 | 67.8 | 67.8 | 91.4 | 81.8 | 90.3 | 47.7 | 79.5 | 49.5 | 68.3 |
| Rutting | 61.6 | 82.2 | 87.9 | 49.8 | 91.1 | 75.1 | 85.0 | 93.2 | 85.7 | 72.4 | 66.5 | 80.8 |
| Pavement Dropoff | 78.3 | 76.1 | 86.6 | 50.6 | 91.4 | 86.4 | 83.4 | 98.0 | 75.8 | 67.8 | 92.6 | 59.9 |
| Shoulder Dropoff | 93.4 | 81.6 | 58.7 | 44.6 | 55.7 | 72.8 | 84.6 | 71.4 | 84.3 | 64.2 | 64.3 | 52.1 |
| High Shoulder | 96.4 | 89.0 | 80.3 | 87.4 | 83.7 | 92.5 | 95.0 | 87.0 | 77.0 | 92.3 | 68.2 | 87.1 |
| Shoulder Potholes | 88.0 | 74.2 | 79.1 | 82.7 | 60.8 | 87.0 | 90.4 | 91.5 | 69.8 | 76.6 | 64.4 | 87.1 |
| Drains | 96.9 | 93.1 | 74.4 | 77.5 | 73.9 | 79.7 | 91.0 | 72.6 | 84.1 | 70.5 | 62.3 | 60.8 |
| Ditches | 93.5 | 96.9 | 68.0 | 81.4 | 82.7 | 82.6 | 93.2 | 78.5 | 85.0 | 78.2 | 63.5 | 65.7 |
| Curbs and Gutters | 99.2 | 93.5 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 100.0 | 94.9 | 87.9 | 90.4 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 78.1 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 93.2 |
| White Striping | 87.6 | 90.0 | 85.5 | 81.1 | 83.8 | 95.3 | 80.9 | 66.5 | 91.6 | 73.0 | 90.6 | 81.2 |
| Yellow Striping | 95.9 | 86.0 | 97.1 | 92.9 | 81.9 | 90.6 | 89.0 | 80.6 | 87.4 | 66.6 | 97.9 | 75.5 |
| Guide Sign Faces | 96.9 | 93.1 | 62.6 | 85.4 | 96.3 | 74.3 | 97.0 | 80.2 | 88.0 | 63.7 | 68.3 | 80.9 |
| Guide Sign Assemblies | 92.3 | 92.1 | 65.6 | 87.5 | 93.8 | 95.9 | 98.2 | 89.8 | 96.0 | 84.8 | 85.5 | 80.2 |
| Warning/Reg Sign Faces | 78.5 | 91.9 | 76.5 | 68.5 | 71.2 | 73.4 | 72.2 | 67.0 | 94.3 | 68.3 | 62.6 | 95.5 |
| W/R Sign Assemblies | 80.2 | 96.4 | 74.7 | 99.6 | 68.1 | 82.4 | 85.4 | 81.8 | 90.9 | 89.7 | 64.4 | 86.3 |



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.

Statewide Scores

| FEATURE DESCRIPTION | INTERSTATE | NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY | RURAL SECONDARY | ALL ROADS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rideability | 88.7 | 84.5 | 71.9 |  | 74.5 |
| Appearance | 95.0 | 96.2 | 90.3 | 88.6 | 90.1 |
| Vertical Clearance | 97.9 | 93.3 | 74.9 | 67.4 | 73.5 |
| Visual Obstructions | 99.3 | 98.1 | 89.6 | 86.4 | 89.1 |
| Fencing | 99.4 | 91.6 | 92.6 | 87.6 | 90.4 |
| Guardrail Specifications | 81.0 | 79.4 | 64.1 | 63.8 | 65.6 |
| Guardrail Damage | 85.7 | 92.4 | 86.0 | 76.4 | 82.1 |
| Attenuators | 95.7 | 92.0 | 91.5 | 86.5 | 89.3 |
| Potholes | 74.3 | 69.4 | 69.2 | 67.0 | 68.3 |
| Rutting | 92.6 | 82.8 | 76.0 | 75.7 | 76.8 |
| Pavement Drop Off | 97.6 | 94.0 | 79.4 | 73.7 | 78.4 |
| Shoulder Drop Off | 94.7 | 87.5 | 70.9 | 64.3 | 69.8 |
| High Shoulder | 97.6 | 95.1 | 88.1 | 83.4 | 86.7 |
| Shoulder Potholes | 76.9 | 78.9 | 79.4 | 80.4 | 79.8 |
| Drains | 83.3 | 90.5 | 81.7 | 75.3 | 79.4 |
| Ditches | 94.6 | 90.9 | 82.9 | 78.6 | 81.9 |
| Curb and Gutter | 94.5 | 93.6 | 90.9 |  | 91.4 |
| White Stripe | 98.0 | 89.6 | 86.4 | 79.1 | 83.6 |
| Yellow Stripe | 100.0 | 95.1 | 89.2 | 84.7 | 87.9 |
| Guide Signs | 95.7 | 86.2 | 82.3 | 83.3 | 83.4 |
| Guide Sign Assemblies | 92.5 | 90.6 | 86.7 | 87.8 | 87.7 |
| Warning and Reg. Signs | 98.3 | 90.9 | 79.8 | 72.3 | 77.7 |
| Warning and Reg. Sign | 90.9 | 91.7 | 87.0 | 81.2 | 84.8 |
| Total Score | 92.4 | 89.2 | 81.7 | 78.2 | 81.0 |

District One Scores

| FEATURE DESCRIPTION | INTERSTATE | NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY | RURAL SECONDARY | ALL ROADS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rideability | 89.3 | 83.5 | 73.1 |  | 75.1 |
| Appearance | 100.0 | 100.0 | 95.2 | 94.4 | 95.2 |
| Vertical Clearance | 100.0 | 98.0 | 87.6 | 74.1 | 81.7 |
| Visual Obstructions | 100.0 | 98.0 | 98.1 | 88.9 | 93.5 |
| Fencing | 93.2 | 93.6 |  |  | 81.9 |
| Guardrail Specifications | 95.2 | 94.9 | 80.0 |  | 81.4 |
| Guardrail Damage | 90.5 | 97.4 | 95.0 |  | 95.1 |
| Attenuators |  | 84.6 |  |  | 87.6 |
| Potholes | 95.7 | 100.0 | 88.1 | 60.7 | 75.2 |
| Rutting | 93.1 | 64.7 | 67.6 | 54.6 | 61.6 |
| Pavement Drop Off | 100.0 | 91.2 | 84.8 | 70.4 | 78.3 |
| Shoulder Drop Off | 100.0 | 100.0 | 95.2 | 90.7 | 93.4 |
| High Shoulder | 100.0 | 100.0 | 98.1 | 94.4 | 96.4 |
| Shoulder Potholes | 95.7 | 95.1 | 83.3 | 90.7 | 88.0 |
| Drains |  | 100.0 | 97.3 | 96.3 | 96.9 |
| Ditches | 100.0 | 97.9 | 97.0 | 89.7 | 93.5 |
| Curb and Gutter |  |  |  |  | 99.2 |
| White Stripe | 94.9 | 87.1 | 87.0 |  | 87.6 |
| Yellow Stripe | 100.0 | 90.0 | 97.3 | 95.2 | 95.9 |
| Guide Signs | 100.0 | 88.0 | 100.0 | 95.2 | 96.9 |
| Guide Sign Assemblies | 93.1 | 90.0 | 100.0 | 86.2 | 92.3 |
| Warning and Reg. Signs |  | 96.3 | 82.7 | 73.1 | 78.5 |
| Warning and Reg. Sign |  |  |  |  | 80.2 |
| Total Score | 96.2 | 92.1 | 88.5 | 82.7 | 86.0 |

## District Two Scores

| FEATURE DESCRIPTION | INTERSTATE | NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY | RURAL SECONDARY | ALL ROADS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rideability | 87.2 | 84.9 | 71.1 |  | 73.6 |
| Appearance | 100.0 | 95.9 | 92.1 | 96.2 | 94.2 |
| Vertical Clearance | 98.3 | 99.0 | 96.0 | 94.3 | 95.6 |
| Visual Obstructions | 100.0 | 99.0 | 93.1 | 93.3 | 93.8 |
| Fencing | 100.0 | 92.4 |  |  | 96.7 |
| Guardrail Specifications | 87.5 | 80.8 |  |  | 64.8 |
| Guardrail Damage | 95.8 | 88.5 |  |  | 90.2 |
| Attenuators |  | 92.3 |  |  | 97.0 |
| Potholes | 0.0 | 46.4 | 35.6 | 57.1 | 44.8 |
| Rutting | 86.7 | 83.7 | 81.2 | 82.9 | 82.2 |
| Pavement Drop Off | 71.7 | 92.9 | 81.2 | 66.7 | 76.1 |
| Shoulder Drop Off | 96.7 | 96.9 | 82.2 | 77.1 | 81.6 |
| High Shoulder | 100.0 | 98.0 | 88.1 | 87.6 | 89.0 |
| Shoulder Potholes | 16.7 | 64.3 | 80.2 | 71.4 | 74.2 |
| Drains |  | 100.0 | 88.9 | 96.8 | 93.1 |
| Ditches | 100.0 | 96.2 | 96.2 | 97.9 | 96.9 |
| Curb and Gutter |  |  |  |  | 93.5 |
| White Stripe | 100.0 | 98.6 | 88.0 |  | 90.0 |
| Yellow Stripe | 100.0 | 100.0 | 80.7 | 88.7 | 86.0 |
| Guide Signs | 100.0 | 95.2 | 90.8 | 95.2 | 93.1 |
| Guide Sign Assemblies | 92.6 | 94.1 | 85.2 | 100.0 | 92.1 |
| Warning and Reg. Signs |  | 95.2 | 89.0 | 94.7 | 91.9 |
| Warning and Reg. Sign |  | 89.7 | 100.0 | 93.6 | 96.4 |
| Total Score | 85.0 | 89.9 | 83.1 | 86.6 | 85.1 |

District Three Scores

| FEATURE DESCRIPTION | INTERSTATE | NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY | RURAL SECONDARY | ALL ROADS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rideability | 91.3 | 88.1 | 75.6 |  | 77.8 |
| Appearance | 100.0 | 100.0 | 94.4 | 88.1 | 91.6 |
| Vertical Clearance | 98.3 | 100.0 | 90.7 | 77.1 | 84.4 |
| Visual Obstructions | 98.3 | 99.1 | 88.9 | 78.0 | 84.0 |
| Fencing | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |  | 100.0 |
| Guardrail Specifications | 57.1 | 65.2 |  |  | 57.6 |
| Guardrail Damage | 90.5 | 87.0 |  |  | 77.0 |
| Attenuators |  | 75.0 |  |  | 58.0 |
| Potholes | 66.7 | 86.4 | 90.7 | 90.8 | 90.0 |
| Rutting | 98.3 | 92.7 | 80.6 | 92.7 | 87.9 |
| Pavement Drop Off | 100.0 | 100.0 | 88.0 | 83.5 | 86.6 |
| Shoulder Drop Off | 100.0 | 84.6 | 65.7 | 48.6 | 58.7 |
| High Shoulder | 98.3 | 93.6 | 85.2 | 74.3 | 80.3 |
| Shoulder Potholes | 100.0 | 86.4 | 88.4 | 70.2 | 79.1 |
| Drains | 95.8 | 86.5 | 86.4 | 63.0 | 74.4 |
| Ditches | 86.4 | 90.7 | 74.0 | 60.0 | 68.0 |
| Curb and Gutter |  |  |  |  |  |
| White Stripe |  | 92.8 | 83.5 | 86.2 | 85.5 |
| Yellow Stripe |  | 100.0 | 99.0 | 96.4 | 97.7 |
| Guide Signs | 100.0 | 66.3 | 72.4 | 52.9 | 62.6 |
| Guide Sign Assemblies | 100.0 | 70.8 | 72.1 | 58.6 | 65.6 |
| Warning and Reg. Signs |  | 93.1 | 68.2 | 81.1 | 76.5 |
| Warning and Reg. Sign |  | 89.1 | 68.1 | 78.1 | 74.7 |
| Total Score | 92.9 | 89.7 | 81.7 | 77.2 | 80.0 |


| FEATURE DESCRIPTION | INTERSTATE | NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY | RURAL SECONDARY | ALL ROADS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rideability | 92.0 | 86.2 | 74.4 |  | 76.1 |
| Appearance | 100.0 | 95.1 | 84.0 | 92.7 | 89.0 |
| Vertical Clearance | 100.0 | 62.8 | 47.2 | 53.6 | 51.9 |
| Visual Obstructions | 100.0 | 98.0 | 91.5 | 85.5 | 89.0 |
| Fencing | 100.0 | 98.8 |  |  | 99.2 |
| Guardrail Specifications | 90.9 | 96.9 |  |  | 82.1 |
| Guardrail Damage | 77.3 | 90.8 |  |  | 86.8 |
| Attenuators |  | 91.7 |  |  | 87.6 |
| Potholes | 93.9 | 82.8 | 59.9 | 72.7 | 67.8 |
| Rutting | 100.0 | 65.7 | 48.1 | 48.2 | 49.8 |
| Pavement Drop Off | 100.0 | 62.8 | 49.1 | 49.1 | 50.6 |
| Shoulder Drop Off | 100.0 | 65.7 | 42.5 | 42.7 | 44.6 |
| High Shoulder | 100.0 | 100.0 | 88.7 | 84.6 | 87.4 |
| Shoulder Potholes | 87.8 | 77.9 | 74.1 | 90.9 | 82.7 |
| Drains | 100.0 | 100.0 | 79.3 | 72.9 | 77.5 |
| Ditches | 100.0 | 100.0 | 80.0 | 80.3 | 81.4 |
| Curb and Gutter |  |  |  |  | 100.0 |
| White Stripe |  | 77.8 | 89.1 | 74.2 | 81.1 |
| Yellow Stripe |  | 90.1 | 92.1 | 94.0 | 92.9 |
| Guide Signs | 96.3 | 100.0 | 85.7 | 83.3 | 85.4 |
| Guide Sign Assemblies | 100.0 | 100.0 |  | 85.7 | 87.5 |
| Warning and Reg. Signs |  | 93.1 | 88.7 | 47.5 | 68.5 |
| Warning and Reg. Sign |  | 92.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.6 |
| Total Score | 96.2 | 87.1 | 75.5 | 73.7 | 75.5 |

District Five Scores

| FEATURE DESCRIPTION | INTERSTATE | NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY | RURAL SECONDARY | ALL ROADS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rideability | 84.3 | 70.0 | 69.3 |  | 71.9 |
| Appearance | 100.0 | 92.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.7 |
| Vertical Clearance | 95.0 | 80.0 | 78.4 | 60.9 | 73.0 |
| Visual Obstructions | 98.3 | 93.6 | 80.4 | 63.6 | 75.9 |
| Fencing | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |  | 97.3 |
| Guardrail Specifications | 69.6 | 51.6 | 71.4 |  | 69.4 |
| Guardrail Damage | 87.0 | 74.2 | 71.4 |  | 72.8 |
| Attenuators |  | 100.0 |  |  | 80.8 |
| Potholes | 79.2 | 75.0 | 84.5 | 45.5 | 67.8 |
| Rutting | 96.7 | 98.2 | 95.9 | 83.6 | 91.1 |
| Pavement Drop Off | 100.0 | 99.1 | 94.9 | 84.6 | 91.4 |
| Shoulder Drop Off | 91.7 | 88.2 | 63.9 | 34.6 | 55.7 |
| High Shoulder | 100.0 | 96.4 | 89.7 | 71.8 | 83.7 |
| Shoulder Potholes | 66.7 | 77.3 | 71.7 | 45.5 | 60.8 |
| Drains | 52.8 | 81.7 | 79.2 | 72.5 | 73.9 |
| Ditches | 100.0 | 94.9 | 81.2 | 79.1 | 82.7 |
| Curb and Gutter |  | 94.0 |  |  | 94.9 |
| White Stripe |  |  | 86.5 | 80.8 | 83.8 |
| Yellow Stripe |  |  | 85.0 | 78.3 | 81.9 |
| Guide Signs | 85.4 | 80.8 | 96.8 | 100.0 | 96.3 |
| Guide Sign Assemblies | 82.4 | 77.4 | 100.0 | 91.3 | 93.8 |
| Warning and Reg. Signs |  | 78.3 | 71.2 | 70.3 | 71.2 |
| Warning and Reg. Sign |  | 78.3 | 62.1 | 73.5 | 68.1 |
| Total Score | 88.2 | 84.4 | 81.0 | 73.0 | 78.6 |

District Six Scores

| FEATURE DESCRIPTION | INTERSTATE | NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY | RURAL SECONDARY | ALL ROADS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rideability | 87.7 | 76.4 | 67.9 |  | 70.0 |
| Appearance | 88.1 | 86.9 | 73.8 | 63.3 | 71.2 |
| Vertical Clearance | 96.6 | 98.1 | 81.6 | 70.6 | 78.9 |
| Visual Obstructions | 100.0 | 98.1 | 91.3 | 87.2 | 90.5 |
| Fencing | 100.0 | 98.9 |  |  | 96.9 |
| Guardrail Specifications | 71.4 | 83.6 | 54.6 |  | 57.4 |
| Guardrail Damage | 80.0 | 89.6 | 72.7 |  | 75.1 |
| Attenuators | 100.0 | 95.7 |  |  | 99.5 |
| Potholes | 44.9 | 72.0 | 53.9 | 74.8 | 61.4 |
| Rutting | 76.3 | 87.9 | 68.9 | 83.5 | 75.1 |
| Pavement Drop Off | 98.3 | 100.0 | 89.3 | 78.9 | 86.4 |
| Shoulder Drop Off | 86.4 | 88.8 | 70.9 | 72.5 | 72.8 |
| High Shoulder | 100.0 | 99.1 | 91.3 | 92.7 | 92.5 |
| Shoulder Potholes | 74.6 | 83.6 | 83.0 | 95.4 | 87.0 |
| Drains | 93.2 | 98.2 | 79.4 | 76.8 | 79.7 |
| Ditches | 95.7 | 85.6 | 83.9 | 78.2 | 82.6 |
| Curb and Gutter |  | 77.4 |  |  | 87.9 |
| White Stripe |  |  | 100.0 | 88.0 | 95.3 |
| Yellow Stripe |  |  | 90.9 | 90.0 | 90.6 |
| Guide Signs | 100.0 | 84.6 | 70.0 |  | 74.3 |
| Guide Sign Assemblies | 100.0 | 94.6 | 95.4 |  | 95.9 |
| Warning and Reg. Signs | 100.0 | 74.1 | 71.6 | 71.9 | 73.4 |
| Warning and Reg. Sign | 89.5 | 96.8 | 85.6 | 75.3 | 82.4 |
| Total Score | 88.5 | 87.9 | 78.4 | 79.8 | 79.7 |

## District Seven Scores

| FEATURE DESCRIPTION | INTERSTATE | NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY | RURAL SECONDARY | ALL ROADS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rideability | 91.6 | 83.2 | 70.4 |  | 74.4 |
| Appearance | 98.3 | 99.1 | 97.9 | 90.3 | 94.9 |
| Vertical Clearance | 100.0 | 96.3 | 87.1 | 77.4 | 84.7 |
| Visual Obstructions | 100.0 | 97.2 | 96.8 | 95.7 | 96.5 |
| Fencing | 100.0 | 86.8 | 89.2 | 88.4 | 89.2 |
| Guardrail Specifications | 96.4 | 83.8 |  |  | 84.8 |
| Guardrail Damage | 85.7 | 100.0 |  |  | 91.0 |
| Attenuators | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |  | 94.6 |
| Potholes | 95.6 | 90.7 | 83.9 | 75.8 | 81.8 |
| Rutting | 98.3 | 96.3 | 87.1 | 78.5 | 85.0 |
| Pavement Drop Off | 100.0 | 92.5 | 83.9 | 78.5 | 83.4 |
| Shoulder Drop Off | 96.5 | 91.6 | 89.3 | 76.3 | 84.6 |
| High Shoulder | 100.0 | 99.1 | 97.9 | 90.3 | 95.0 |
| Shoulder Potholes | 86.8 | 90.7 | 89.3 | 91.9 | 90.4 |
| Drains | 100.0 | 93.8 | 91.3 | 88.9 | 91.0 |
| Ditches | 100.0 | 98.8 | 90.7 | 93.8 | 93.2 |
| Curb and Gutter |  |  |  |  | 90.4 |
| White Stripe |  | 85.7 | 90.0 | 70.0 | 80.9 |
| Yellow Stripe |  | 88.4 | 90.2 | 87.9 | 89.0 |
| Guide Signs | 100.0 | 89.5 | 100.0 |  | 97.0 |
| Guide Sign Assemblies | 100.0 | 95.4 |  |  | 98.2 |
| Warning and Reg. Signs |  | 91.9 | 82.1 | 56.5 | 72.2 |
| Warning and Reg. Sign |  | 91.7 | 100.0 | 68.0 | 85.4 |
| Total Score | 96.8 | 92.3 | 88.4 | 81.1 | 86.2 |

District Eight Scores
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \text { FEATURE DESCRIPTION } & \text { INTERSTATE } & \begin{array}{c}\text { NATIONAL } \\
\text { HIGHWAY } \\
\text { SYSTEM }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { STATE PRIMARY } \\
\text { AND SECONDARY }\end{array}
$$ \& \begin{array}{c}RURAL <br>

SECONDARY\end{array} \& ALL ROADS\end{array}\right]\)|  |
| :--- |
| Rideability |
| Appearance |
| Vertical Clearance |
| Visual Obstructions |
| Fencing |
| Guardrail Specifications |
| Guardrail Damage |
| Attenuators |
| Potholes |
| Rutting |


| FEATURE DESCRIPTION | INTERSTATE | NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY | RURAL SECONDARY | ALL ROADS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rideability | 91.9 | 83.6 | 71.7 |  | 75.1 |
| Appearance | 83.3 | 86.0 | 83.5 | 74.6 | 79.4 |
| Vertical Clearance | 100.0 | 100.0 | 72.5 | 65.5 | 72.5 |
| Visual Obstructions | 100.0 | 100.0 | 94.5 | 94.6 | 95.2 |
| Fencing | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |  | 100.0 |
| Guardrail Specifications | 77.5 | 71.7 | 79.1 |  | 77.6 |
| Guardrail Damage | 75.0 | 92.5 | 83.7 |  | 84.7 |
| Attenuators | 84.0 | 89.7 | 94.4 |  | 93.3 |
| Potholes | 91.7 | 22.5 | 65.6 | 34.1 | 47.7 |
| Rutting | 100.0 | 79.0 | 87.2 | 84.6 | 85.7 |
| Pavement Drop Off | 100.0 | 100.0 | 79.8 | 66.4 | 75.8 |
| Shoulder Drop Off | 98.3 | 94.0 | 87.2 | 79.1 | 84.3 |
| High Shoulder | 91.7 | 90.0 | 78.0 | 72.7 | 77.0 |
| Shoulder Potholes | 91.7 | 42.5 | 70.2 | 72.7 | 69.8 |
| Drains | 93.6 | 96.2 | 88.6 | 77.6 | 84.1 |
| Ditches | 73.5 | 85.7 | 90.6 | 81.2 | 85.0 |
| Curb and Gutter |  |  |  |  |  |
| White Stripe | 100.0 | 93.9 | 89.9 | 91.9 | 91.6 |
| Yellow Stripe | 100.0 | 98.0 | 95.7 | 77.8 | 87.4 |
| Guide Signs |  | 95.9 | 79.3 | 93.8 | 88.0 |
| Guide Sign Assemblies | 100.0 | 95.4 | 90.9 | 100.0 | 96.0 |
| Warning and Reg. Signs |  | 100.0 | 94.6 | 92.9 | 94.3 |
| Warning and Reg. Sign |  |  | 94.7 | 87.5 | 90.9 |
| Total Score | 92.6 | 86.3 | 84.0 | 78.9 | 82.1 |

## Appendix I. 11

District Ten Scores

| FEATURE DESCRIPTION | NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY | RURAL SECONDARY | ALL ROADS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rideability | 86.6 | 68.3 |  | 71.0 |
| Appearance | 96.9 | 88.7 | 80.0 | 85.5 |
| Vertical Clearance | 91.8 | 43.4 | 38.2 | 45.1 |
| Visual Obstructions | 95.9 | 70.8 | 76.4 | 75.4 |
| Fencing | 82.5 |  |  | 84.6 |
| Guardrail Specifications | 79.8 | 50.0 |  | 55.7 |
| Guardrail Damage | 92.9 | 88.5 |  | 90.0 |
| Attenuators | 95.7 | 81.8 |  | 85.7 |
| Potholes | 79.6 | 88.2 | 70.5 | 79.5 |
| Rutting | 78.6 | 74.5 | 69.1 | 72.4 |
| Pavement Drop Off | 95.9 | 64.2 | 66.4 | 67.8 |
| Shoulder Drop Off | 77.6 | 62.3 | 63.6 | 64.2 |
| High Shoulder | 96.9 | 96.2 | 87.3 | 92.3 |
| Shoulder Potholes | 84.7 | 81.1 | 70.5 | 76.6 |
| Drains | 76.5 | 67.1 | 72.9 | 70.5 |
| Ditches | 90.0 | 76.5 | 77.8 | 78.2 |
| Curb and Gutter |  |  |  | 78.1 |
| White Stripe | 84.4 | 74.4 | 69.6 | 73.0 |
| Yellow Stripe | 96.9 | 64.8 | 62.9 | 66.6 |
| Guide Signs | 96.0 | 54.1 | 67.7 | 63.7 |
| Guide Sign Assemblies | 100.0 | 81.8 |  | 84.8 |
| Warning and Reg. Signs | 58.7 | 71.4 |  | 68.3 |
| Warning and Reg. Sign | 96.3 | 91.8 |  | 89.7 |
| Total Score | 87.6 | 73.8 | 70.2 | 73.3 |

District Eleven Scores

| FEATURE DESCRIPTION | INTERSTATE | NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY | RURAL SECONDARY | ALL ROADS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rideability | 90.2 | 85.1 | 72.3 |  | 74.9 |
| Appearance | 79.7 | 99.0 | 84.6 | 88.9 | 87.5 |
| Vertical Clearance | 96.6 | 92.8 | 68.2 | 69.4 | 71.4 |
| Visual Obstructions | 96.6 | 100.0 | 82.7 | 89.8 | 87.6 |
| Fencing | 100.0 | 90.6 |  |  | 93.6 |
| Guardrail Specifications | 100.0 | 79.7 | 63.9 |  | 67.3 |
| Guardrail Damage | 95.4 | 98.4 | 91.7 |  | 93.1 |
| Attenuators | 91.7 | 95.5 | 83.3 |  | 86.0 |
| Potholes | 91.5 | 89.7 | 50.0 | 39.8 | 49.5 |
| Rutting | 84.8 | 76.3 | 63.6 | 66.7 | 66.5 |
| Pavement Drop Off | 100.0 | 100.0 | 91.8 | 91.7 | 92.6 |
| Shoulder Drop Off | 94.9 | 93.8 | 64.6 | 57.4 | 64.3 |
| High Shoulder | 78.0 | 88.7 | 62.7 | 69.4 | 68.2 |
| Shoulder Potholes | 78.8 | 71.7 | 59.1 | 67.6 | 64.4 |
| Drains |  | 81.8 | 63.5 | 57.7 | 62.3 |
| Ditches | 81.5 | 77.5 | 63.0 | 60.6 | 63.5 |
| Curb and Gutter |  |  |  |  |  |
| White Stripe | 100.0 | 100.0 | 89.1 |  | 90.6 |
| Yellow Stripe | 100.0 | 100.0 | 98.6 | 96.7 | 97.9 |
| Guide Signs |  | 64.0 | 68.6 |  | 68.3 |
| Guide Sign Assemblies | 66.7 | 86.4 | 87.0 |  | 85.5 |
| Warning and Reg. Signs |  | 96.4 | 63.9 | 55.6 | 62.6 |
| Warning and Reg. Sign |  | 95.2 | 71.9 | 51.7 | 64.4 |
| Total Score | 90.7 | 90.0 | 73.9 | 69.3 | 73.5 |

District Twelve Scores

| FEATURE DESCRIPTION | NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY | RURAL SECONDARY | ALL ROADS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rideability | 87.0 | 72.2 |  | 75.4 |
| Appearance | 95.3 | 96.3 | 91.6 | 94.4 |
| Vertical Clearance | 88.8 | 46.7 | 30.8 | 46.6 |
| Visual Obstructions | 96.3 | 85.1 | 84.1 | 86.2 |
| Fencing |  |  |  | 92.0 |
| Guardrail Specifications | 84.1 | 59.2 | 65.6 | 65.0 |
| Guardrail Damage | 88.9 | 95.9 | 75.0 | 87.2 |
| Attenuators | 89.5 | 100.0 | 91.7 | 95.4 |
| Potholes | 34.6 | 69.6 | 79.0 | 68.3 |
| Rutting | 82.2 | 82.2 | 78.5 | 80.8 |
| Pavement Drop Off | 95.3 | 60.8 | 45.8 | 59.9 |
| Shoulder Drop Off | 77.6 | 44.9 | 52.3 | 52.1 |
| High Shoulder | 93.5 | 86.9 | 85.1 | 87.1 |
| Shoulder Potholes | 79.0 | 81.3 | 97.7 | 87.1 |
| Drains | 81.8 | 64.6 | 48.2 | 60.8 |
| Ditches | 87.7 | 65.0 | 58.4 | 65.7 |
| Curb and Gutter | 97.4 |  |  | 93.2 |
| White Stripe | 88.7 | 87.1 | 70.7 | 81.2 |
| Yellow Stripe | 87.7 | 82.1 | 62.3 | 75.5 |
| Guide Signs | 94.0 | 75.6 |  | 80.9 |
| Guide Sign Assemblies | 94.4 | 69.2 | 89.5 | 80.2 |
| Warning and Reg. Signs | 100.0 | 90.9 | 100.0 | 95.5 |
| Warning and Reg. Sign | 100.0 | 77.5 | 92.9 | 86.3 |
| Total Score | 87.3 | 76.4 | 74.1 | 77.0 |

## 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.


Appendix II. 1

Statewide
Shoulder Drop Off
Shoulder Potholes

[^0]



[^1]


Appendix II. 4


| Guide Sign Assemblies |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| -- INTERSTATE -- NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |

Warning and Reg. Sign Assemblies

[^2]
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.

Rutting
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District One



[^4]
District One

| 100 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 90 |  |  |  |


| 100 |  | Fencing |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 90 |  |  |  |

[^5]

District One

| Visual Obstructions |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $100$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| -- INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |



[^6]
District One

| Guide Sign Assemblies |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 | - | - | $\square$ | - | $\cdots$ |
| 90 |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |
| 80 |  |  |  | - |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| -- INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |
| - - STA | PRIMARY | SECONDA | $\checkmark-$ RURA | ECONDARY | - ALL RO |



## Appendix III. 6


District One


Franting
Appendix III. 1

District Two

Shoulder Potholes

[^7]
District Two

| 100 |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
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District Two
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District Two

| Guide Sign Assemblies |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| - INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |

Warning and Reg. Sign Assemblies

[^10]

District Two



District Two


Appendix III. 1

District Three


| Shoulder Potholes |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  | -------- | - |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| -- INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |
| - STA | PRIMARY | SECONDAR | $\checkmark$ RURAL | ECONDARY | - ALL RO |

[^11]
District Three

| Guardrail Damage |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $90$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| -- InTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |
| - STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY $\rightarrow$ RURAL SECONDARY - - ALL ROADS |  |  |  |  |  |


| 100 |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 90 |  |  |  |

[^12]

District Three


Appendix III. 4

District Three
Guide Sign Assemblies
Warning and Reg. Sign Assemblies

## Appendix III. 5

District Three




|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix III. 1

District Four
Shoulder Drop Off
Shoulder Potholes
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District Four



[^14]

District Four

| Visual Obstructions |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $100$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| -- INTERSTATE -- NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |


Appendix III. 4

District Four
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District Four

Rideability
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District Five
Shoulder Drop Off
Shoulder Potholes

[^17]
District Five



[^18]
District Five
Visual Obstructions

| Yellow Stripe |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $100$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| -- INTERSTATE -- NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |
| - STA | PRIMARY | SECONDAR | $\checkmark$ RURAL | CONDARY | - ALL ROA |

[^19]
District Five
Guide Sign Assemblies
Warning and Reg. Sign Assemblies
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District Five


Rutting
Appendix III. 1

District Six
Shoulder Drop Off
Shoulder Potholes
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District Six



[^22]

District Six

| Visual Obstructions |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $100$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| -- INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |


Appendix III. 4

District Six

| Guide Sign Assemblies |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Warning and Reg. Sign Assemblies
Appendix III. 5


District Six



Appendix III. 1

District Seven
Shoulder Drop Off


[^23]
District Seven


Appendix III. 3

District Seven


| Yellow Stripe |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 | $\cdots$ | - | - | $=$ |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| -- INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |
| - - ST | PRIMARY | SECONDA | $\bigcirc$ RURA | CONDARY | - ALL RO |

Appendix III. 4

District Seven

| Guide Sign Assemblies |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| -- INTERSTATE -- NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |



## Appendix III. 5


District Seven



Appendix III. 1

District Eight
Shoulder Drop Off

| Shoulder Potholes |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $100$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| -- INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |

[^24]
District Eight

| 100 | Guardrail Damage |  |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 100 |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

[^25]
District Eight


| Yellow Stripe |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $100$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  | 兂 |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| -- INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |

[^26]
District Eight

| 100 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 100 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Appendix III. 5

District Eight



Appendix III. 1

District Nine

Shoulder Potholes

[^27]
District Nine

| 100 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


Appendix III. 3

District Nine

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Yellow Stripe |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10090 |  |  | - |  |  |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ | , | $\xrightarrow{+}$ |  |
| 80 | $\stackrel{H}{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| -- INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |
| - STA | PRIMARY | SECONDA | $\bigcirc-$ RURAL | CONDARY | - ALL RO |

Appendix III. 4

District Nine

| 100 | Guide Sign Assemblies |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 90 |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |


Appendix III. 5

District Nine



| Rutting |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| -- NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM -- STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY <br> - RURAL SECONDARY - ALL ROADS |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix III. 1

District Ten

Shoulder Potholes
Appendix III. 2

District Ten

| 100 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



District Ten

| Visual Obstructions |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $100$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $90$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| ```-- NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM -- STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY``` |  |  |  |  |  |


| Yellow Stripe |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $80$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| $\begin{aligned} & - \text { NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM }- \text { - STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY } \\ & - \text { RURAL SECONDARY }- \text { ALL ROADS } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix III. 4

District Ten

| $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 90 \\ 80 \\ 70 \\ 60 \\ 50 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM - - STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY- RURAL SECONDARY - ALL ROADS |  |  |  |  |  |

Warning and Reg. Sign Assemblies
Appendix III. 5

District Ten


Appendix III. 6


District Ten

Rutting
Appendix III. 1

District Eleven
Shoulder Drop Off
Shoulder Potholes

[^28]
District Eleven


| 100 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



[^29]
District Eleven

| Visual Obstructions |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 90 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| -- INTERSTATE - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |



[^30]
District Eleven



## Appendix III. 5


District Eleven


| Rideability |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | - |  |
| 70 | - | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


Appendix III. 1

District Twelve




District Twelve

| 100 | Guardrail Damage |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 90 |  |  |  |


Appendix III. 3

District Twelve

Yellow Stripe
Appendix III. 4

District Twelve

| Guide Sign Assemblies |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
| ```-- NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM -- STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY -- RURAL SECONDARY -- ALL ROADS``` |  |  |  |  |  |

Warning and Reg. Sign Assemblies
Appendix III. 5

District Twelve


## 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
District Three MRP Scores


## Appendix IV. 2





Appendix IV. 3


|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 100 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

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 Scores Comparison |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Classification FY2017 | FY2019 |  |
| ALL ROADS | 99.6 | 85.1 |
| INTERSTATE | 94.5 | 96.2 |
| NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | 93.3 | 92.1 |
| STATE PRIMARY AND <br> SECONDARY | 86.7 | 83.1 |
| RURAL SECONDARY | 77.6 | 86.6 |




| District One Scores Comparison |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  FY2017 | FY2019 |  |
| Classification | 79.6 | 85.1 |
| ALL ROADS | 94.5 | 96.2 |
| INTERSTATE | 93.3 | 92.1 |
| NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | 86.7 | 83.1 |
| STATE PRIMARY AND <br> SECONDARY | 77.6 | 86.6 |
| RURAL SECONDARY |  |  |



| District Two Scores Comparison |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Classification FY2017 | FY2019 |  |
| ALL ROADS | 79.6 | 85.1 |
| INTERSTATE | 94.5 | 96.2 |
| NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | 93.3 | 92.1 |
| STATE PRIMARY AND <br> SECONDARY | 86.7 | 83.1 |
| RURAL SECONDARY | 77.6 | 86.6 |




| District Three Scores Comparison |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Classification | FY2017 | FY2019 |
| ALL ROADS | 79.6 | 85.1 |
| INTERSTATE | 94.5 | 96.2 |
| NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | 93.3 | 92.1 |
| STATE PRIMARY AND <br> SECONDARY | 86.7 | 83.1 |
| RURAL SECONDARY | 77.6 | 86.6 |




| District Four Scores Comparison <br>  <br> Classification |  | FY2017 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | FY2019 $\quad$| ALL ROADS | 79.6 |
| :--- | :---: |
| 85.1 |  |
| INTERSTATE | 94.5 |
| NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | 93.3 |
| STATE PRIMARY AND <br> SECONDARY | 86.7 |
| RURAL SECONDARY | 77.6 |




| District Five Scores Comparison |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Classification | FY2017 | FY2019 |
| ALL ROADS | 79.6 | 85.1 |
| INTERSTATE | 94.5 | 96.2 |
| NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | 93.3 | 92.1 |
| STATE PRIMARY AND <br> SECONDARY | 86.7 | 83.1 |
| RURAL SECONDARY | 77.6 | 86.6 |




| District Six Scores Comparison |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Classification | FY2017 | FY2019 |
| ALL ROADS | 79.6 | 85.1 |
| INTERSTATE | 94.5 | 96.2 |
| NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | 93.3 | 92.1 |
| STATE PRIMARY AND <br> SECONDARY | 86.7 | 83.1 |
| RURAL SECONDARY | 77.6 | 86.6 |



| District Seven Scores Comparison |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Classification | FY2017 | FY2019 |
| ALL ROADS | 79.6 | 85.1 |
| INTERSTATE | 94.5 | 96.2 |
| NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | 93.3 | 92.1 |
| STATE PRIMARY AND <br> SECONDARY | 86.7 | 83.1 |
| RURAL SECONDARY | 77.6 | 86.6 |



| District Eight Scores Comparison |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Classification | FY2017 | FY2019 |
| ALL ROADS | 79.6 | 85.1 |
| INTERSTATE | 94.5 | 96.2 |
| NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | 93.3 | 92.1 |
| STATE PRIMARY AND <br> SECONDARY | 86.7 | 83.1 |
| RURAL SECONDARY | 77.6 | 86.6 |




| District Nine Scores Comparison |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Classification | FY2017 | FY2019 |
| ALL ROADS | 79.6 | 85.1 |
| INTERSTATE | 94.5 | 96.2 |
| NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | 93.3 | 92.1 |
| STATE PRIMARY AND <br> SECONDARY | 86.7 | 83.1 |
| RURAL SECONDARY | 77.6 | 86.6 |




| District Ten Scores Comparison |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Classification | FY2017 | FY2019 |
| ALL ROADS | 79.6 | 85.1 |
| INTERSTATE | 94.5 | 96.2 |
| NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | 93.3 | 92.1 |
| STATE PRIMARY AND <br> SECONDARY | 86.7 | 83.1 |
| RURAL SECONDARY | 77.6 | 86.6 |



| District Eleven Scores Comparison <br>  <br> Classification |  | FY2017 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | FY2019 $\quad$| ALL ROADS | 79.6 | 85.1 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| INTERSTATE | 94.5 | 96.2 |
| NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | 93.3 | 92.1 |
| STATE PRIMARY AND <br> SECONDARY | 86.7 | 83.1 |
| RURAL SECONDARY | 77.6 | 86.6 |




| District Twelve Scores Comparison |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|   <br> Classification  | 79.6 | 85.1 |
| ALL ROADS | 94.5 | 96.2 |
| INTERSTATE | 93.3 | 92.1 |
| NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM | 86.7 | 83.1 |
| STATE PRIMARY AND <br> SECONDARY | 77.6 | 86.6 |
| RURAL SECONDARY |  |  |






## 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.
$\qquad$
Maintenance
Rating Program
Evaluation Team: $\qquad$
Inspection Form


## 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. <br> Note: Weighting used in sampling scheme may create variances between the MRP rideability indices and those reported for the entire population. | $\begin{gathered} 51 \text { or less } \\ 52-90 \\ 91-129 \\ 130-167 \\ 168+ \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 90+ \\ 80-89.9 \\ 70-79.9 \\ 60-69.9 \end{gathered}$ <br> 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 <br> 80\% <br> 60\% | 100 <br> 80 <br> 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 $\begin{array}{r} 20 \% \\ 40 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 100 <br> 80 <br> 60 |
| Visual Obstructions | Vegetation, structures, signage etc. cause horizontal or vertical visual obstructions of intersections, curves, signs, oncoming lanes, etc. | $0 \%$ obstructed $\begin{aligned} & 20 \% \\ & 40 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & 80 \\ & 60 \end{aligned}$ |
| 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 <br> $80 \%$ <br> 60\% | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & 80 \\ & 60 \end{aligned}$ |
| Guardrail Within Height Specifications | The height is at least 25 inches and not more than 29 inches. | $100 \%$ in spec <br> 80\% <br> 60\% | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & 80 \\ & 60 \end{aligned}$ |
| Guardrail Fully Functional | Guardrails have not been damaged due to vehicular hits or other factors. | $100 \%$ in spec <br> $80 \%$ <br> 60\% | 100 <br> 80 <br> 60 |


| Inspection Features | Explanation | Score | MRP Score |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Attenuators/End Treatments <br> Undamaged | Attenuators / End Treatments <br> have not been damaged due to <br> vehicular hits or other factors. | $100 \%$ undamaged | 100 |
| Pavement Potholes | A bowl shaped hole of various <br> sizes in the pavement surface. <br> The surface may have broken into <br> small pieces due to cracking or <br> localized disintegration and the <br> material removed by traffic. A <br> pothole has a minimum size of <br> 6"x6"x1". | $00 \%$ | 80 |
|  | A surface depression of pavement <br> in the wheel paths. Ruts may be <br> more noticeable after a rainfall <br> when wheel paths are full with <br> water. | $0 \%$ have ruts larger |  |
| than $1 / 4 "$ |  |  |  |
| Rutting | $20 \%$ | 60 | 100 |


| Inspection Features | Explanation | Score | MRP Score |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Drainage Structures | Drainage structures like pipes and <br> culverts that are free of any <br> degree of obstruction and are in <br> good working order. Drainage <br> structures obstructed more than <br> 25\% fail. | $100 \%$ acceptable | $80 \%$ |
| Ditches | Ditches on the side of the road <br> with water flow not obstructed by <br> dirt, rock, debris, or other items or <br> by structural damage. | $00 \%$ | 80 |
| Curbs and Gutters | $20 \%$ | 60 |  |
|  | Curbs and gutters with water flow <br> not obstructed by blockage or <br> damage. | $0 \%$ blockage | 100 |
|  | $20 \%$ <br> White Striping Reflectivity | Measures night reflectivity of <br> striping that provides positive <br> guidance to motorists. <br> Measurements equal to or <br> exceeding 125 from retro- <br> reflectometer pass. | $100 \%$ acceptable |


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