Pavement Management
Paving & Rehabilitation Program
Overall Pavement Condition (OPC) Summary

- All Segments Rated on Scale of 0-100 (or 0-5)
  - 60-100 Good
  - 50-60 Fair
  - 0-50 Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005 (FY07)</th>
<th>2004 (FY06)</th>
<th>2003 (FY05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3102.49</td>
<td>3307.37</td>
<td>3459.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>932.1</td>
<td>781.31</td>
<td>641.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>375.27</td>
<td>363.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4457.9</td>
<td>4463.95</td>
<td>4464.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>$44.5M</td>
<td>$40.5M</td>
<td>$45.1M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candidate Selection for the Pave & Rehab List

Statewide Candidate List

- Expressways
  OPC <= 70

- Arterials & Collectors
  OPC <= 60

- Locals
  OPC <= 50
Candidate Selection for the Pave & Rehab List

- All Candidate Locations are Field Reviewed by Pavement Management
- Each Location is Scored based on Five Factors
Scoring Calculation

Total Score
(Higher Score = Higher Priority)

Condition
30%

OPC at 2.5 threshold
Extensive alligator cracking
Ride quality not affected
Points = 1

Wheel path deformation
Blow ups
Ride quality is affected
Points = 2

Extensive & continuous fatigue
Pot holes developing
Inferior ride
Points = 3

Local = 1

Local < 250
Collector < 1000
Arterial < 4000
Points = 1

Local 250-600
Collector 1000-4000
Arterial 4000-15000
Points = 2

Local > 600
Collector > 4000
Arterial > 15000
Points = 3

Collector = 2

Arterial & Interstate = 3

Collector 250-600
Collector 1000-4000
Arterial 4000-15000
Points = 2

Collector > 4000
Arterial > 15000
Points = 3

ADT
25%

Educational facilities
Community centers
Major government facility
Points = 3

Small employments centers
Small businesses
Points = 2

Limited or no facilities
other than occasional residents or farms
Points = 1

Projects should be weighed only by the four previous factors
Points = 1

Special Conditions
20%

Location nominated 2 or more yrs
Project linkage
Legislative interest
Points = 2

Location to operate as detour
Catastrophic failure imminent
Safety concerns
Points = 3

PMT Modifier
10%

Total Score
(Higher Score = Higher Priority)

Functional Classification
15%

Arterial & Interstate = 3

Collector > 4000
Arterial > 15000
Points = 3

Collector 1000-4000
Arterial 4000-15000
Points = 2

Collector < 1000
Arterial < 4000
Points = 1

ADT
25%

Educational facilities
Community centers
Major government facility
Points = 3

Small employments centers
Small businesses
Points = 2

Limited or no facilities
other than occasional residents or farms
Points = 1

Projects should be weighed only by the four previous factors
Points = 1

Special Conditions
20%

Location nominated 2 or more yrs
Project linkage
Legislative interest
Points = 2

Location to operate as detour
Catastrophic failure imminent
Safety concerns
Points = 3

PMT Modifier
10%

Total Score
(Higher Score = Higher Priority)

Functional Classification
15%

Arterial & Interstate = 3

Collector > 4000
Arterial > 15000
Points = 3

Collector 1000-4000
Arterial 4000-15000
Points = 2

Collector < 1000
Arterial < 4000
Points = 1

ADT
25%

Educational facilities
Community centers
Major government facility
Points = 3

Small employments centers
Small businesses
Points = 2

Limited or no facilities
other than occasional residents or farms
Points = 1

Projects should be weighed only by the four previous factors
Points = 1

Special Conditions
20%

Location nominated 2 or more yrs
Project linkage
Legislative interest
Points = 2

Location to operate as detour
Catastrophic failure imminent
Safety concerns
Points = 3

PMT Modifier
10%

Total Score
(Higher Score = Higher Priority)
Why Do We Use a Priority Formula?

- Remove the Pave & Rehab Program from a Worst First Approach as used in the Past
  - Allows us to do Less Severe Remedies
  - More Cost Effective
Bond Bill Creation Process

- Historically Locations Scoring 80 and above have a High Probability of Making the Bond Bill
- Locations with a Score of 75 and Higher are Scoped
Scoping

- Van tour of all high scoring candidates
- Tour consists of representatives from:
  - Pavement Management, Materials & Research, Construction, Pave & Rehab Contract Group, Maintenance, Traffic, Bike/Ped Group
- Remedies for each Location are Decided
- Need for Additional Information is Assessed before a Decision is made
  - Pavement Data (Cores)
  - Related Projects and timelines
Pave/Rehab List Creation Process

• Draft List and Rough Estimates are Circulated throughout Department for Comments
• Detailed Estimates are Calculated by Pave & Rehab Group and North Construction
• List Presented to the Secretary and once Finalized to the Bond Bill Committee
Contract Formation

• Contracts are formed based on Locations Geography and Remedy
• Consideration is given to Locations that could be added to Open Contracts
• Contracts are Prepared and Circulated by Pave & Rehab Group