






The **Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency** (NOACA) is a public organization serving the counties of and municipalities and townships within Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain and Medina (covering an area with 2.1 million people). NOACA is the agency designated or recognized to perform the following functions:

- Serve as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), with responsibility for comprehensive, cooperative and continuous planning for highways, public transit, and bikeways, as defined in the current transportation law.
- Perform continuous water quality, transportation-related air quality and other environmental planning functions.
- Administer the area clearinghouse function, which includes providing local government with the opportunity to review a wide variety of local or state applications for federal funds.
- Conduct transportation and environmental planning and related demographic, economic and land use research.
- Serve as an information center for transportation and environmental and related planning.
- As directed by the Board, provide transportation and environmental planning assistance to the 172 units of local, general purpose government.

The NOACA Board of Directors is composed of 45 local public officials. The Board convenes quarterly to provide a forum for members to present, discuss and develop solutions to local and areawide issues and make recommendations regarding implementation strategies. As the area clearinghouse for the region, the Board makes comments and recommendations on applications for state and federal grants, with the purpose of enhancing the region's social, physical, environmental and land use/transportation fabric. NOACA invites you to take part in its planning process. Feel free to participate, to ask questions and to learn more about areawide planning.

For more information, call (216) 241-2414 or log on at <http://www.noaca.org>



# 2018 NOACA BOARD OF DIRECTORS

## BOARD OFFICERS

**President:** Armond Budish,  
County Executive, Cuyahoga County

**First Vice President:** Valarie J. McCall,  
Chief of Government & International Affairs, City of  
Cleveland

**Second Vice President:** Timothy C. Lennon,  
Commissioner, Geauga County

**Secretary:** Ted Kalo,  
Commissioner, Lorain County

**Assistant Secretary:** Holly C. Brinda,  
Mayor, City of Elyria

**Assistant Secretary:** Michael P. Summers,  
Mayor, City of Lakewood

**Treasurer:** Daniel P. Troy,  
Commissioner, Lake County

**Assistant Treasurer:** James R. Gills, P.E., P.S.,  
Lake County Engineer

**Assistant Treasurer:** Kirsten Holzheimer Gail,  
Mayor, City of Euclid

**Immediate Past President:** Adam Friedrich,  
Commissioner, Medina County

## BOARD MEMBERS

### CUYAHOGA COUNTY

Samuel J. Alai,  
Mayor, City of Broadview Heights

Annette M. Blackwell,  
Mayor, City of Maple Heights

Pamela Bobst,  
Mayor, City of Rocky River

Michael Dylan Brennan,  
Mayor, City of University Heights

Tanisha R. Briley,  
City Manager, Cleveland Heights

Armond Budish,  
County Executive

Glenn Coyne,  
Executive Director, Planning  
Commission

Timothy J. DeGeeter,  
Mayor, City of Parma

Michael W. Dever, MPA  
Public Works Director

Kirsten Holzheimer Gail,  
Mayor, City of Euclid

Michael D. Gammella,  
Mayor, City of Brook Park

Dale Miller,  
County Councilman

David H. Roche,  
Mayor, City of Richmond Heights

Robert A. Stefanik,  
Mayor, City of North Royalton

Michael P. Summers,  
Mayor, City of Lakewood

### CITY OF CLEVELAND

Anthony Brancatelli,  
City Councilman

Freddy L. Collier, Jr.,  
Director, City Planning Commission

Blaine A. Griffin,  
City Councilman

Frank G. Jackson,  
Mayor, City of Cleveland

Martin J. Keane,  
City Councilman

Valarie J. McCall,  
Chief of Government & International  
Affairs

Matthew L. Spronz, P.E., PMP,  
Capital Projects Director

### GEAUGA COUNTY

Walter "Skip" Claypool,  
County Commissioner

Timothy C. Lennon,  
County Commissioner

Ralph Spidalieri,  
County Commissioner

### LAKE COUNTY

Ben Capelle,  
General Manager, Laketrans

Jerry C. Cirino,  
County Commissioner

James R. Gills, P.E., P.S.,  
County Engineer

John Hamercheck,  
County Commissioner

Daniel P. Troy,  
County Commissioner

### LORAIN COUNTY

Holly C. Brinda, Mayor, City of Elyria

Kenneth P. Carney, Sr., P.E., P.S.,  
County Engineer

Richard Heidecker,  
Trustee, Columbia Township

John D. Hunter,  
Mayor, Village of Sheffield

Ted Kalo,  
County Commissioner

Matt Lundy,  
County Commissioner

Chase M. Ritenauer,  
Mayor, City of Lorain

### MEDINA COUNTY

Jeff Brandon,  
Trustee, Montville Township

Andrew H. Conrad, P.E., P.S.,  
County Engineer

Adam Friedrich,  
County Commissioner

Patrick Patton,  
City Engineer, City of Medina

### REGIONAL AND STATE

Greater Cleveland Regional  
Transit Authority (GCRTA)  
Joseph A. Calabrese,  
CEO and General Manager

Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer  
District (NEORSDD)  
Kyle Dreyfuss-Wells, Chief Executive Officer

Cleveland-Cuyahoga County Port Authority  
William D. Friedman, President/CEO

Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT)  
Myron S. Pakush, Deputy Director, District 12

### Ex Officio Member:

Kurt Princic, Chief, Northeast District Office,  
Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA)

## NOACA DIRECTORS

Grace Gallucci,  
Executive Director

Billie Geyer,  
Comptroller

Marvin Hayes,  
Director of Communications & Public Affairs

Randy Lane,  
Director of Programming

Susanna Merlone, EMBA,  
Director of Administrative Services

Kathy Sarli,  
Director of Planning

Jonathan Giblin,  
Associate Director of Compliance

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

1. Executive Summary .....2

2. Background .....3

3. PART I: 2016 Pavement Condition .....8

4. PART II: 2018 Current Backlog .....13

5. PART III: Maintenance & Rehabilitation (M&R) Program.....14

6. PART IV: Comparative Analysis .....16

7. Appendix.....20

**MAPS**

---

1: City of Avon Location in the NOACA Region .....4

2: 2016 City of Avon Pavement Condition .....10

**FIGURES**

---

1: 2016 Avon Pavement Network Condition Chart by Lane-Miles .....9

2: The PCR Acceptable Level and “Need Year” Relation .....14

3: Average PCR Comparison by the Constraint Scenarios and by Year .....18

**TABLES**

---

1: Selected Pavement Treatments and Their Planning Level Costs.....6

2: 2016 Avon Pavement Network Condition .....8

3: 2016 City of Avon Pavement Condition Listing.....11

4: Performance Comparison of the Constraint Scenarios.....17

**APPENDIX**

---

The “2018 Current Backlog” Pavement Treatment List .....20

The “Maintain 15% Deficiency” Pavement Treatment List.....21

The “Maintain an Average Network PCR of 80” Pavement Treatment List .....23

The “M&R” Pavement Treatment List .....25

The “Maintain Lowest Standard PCR” Pavement Treatment List .....27

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2016 Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) pavement database has 3,626 segment records for the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency (NOACA) region. The NOACA region has a total of 3,330 centerline miles of roadways including freeways and federal-aid highways which is equivalent to 8,561 lane-miles. The regional segment average Pavement Condition Ratings (PCR) is about 77.

In the City of Avon there are 23.86 centerline miles of federal-aid roads, which are equivalent to 52.38 lane-miles within the city boundary that include Interstate 90 (I 90), State Route 2 (SR 2), State Route 611 (SR 611), State Route 254 (SR 254), and State Route 83 (SR 83). The 2016 ODOT pavement database has 26 segment records for the City of Avon roadway system. Each record comprises of several fields of various information and measures such as Street name, Length (miles), Lane-miles length, Number of Lanes, Function Class, Pavement Condition Ratings (PCR), etc.

According to the PCR measure, 49 percent of the pavement lane-miles are currently in the “Good” to “Very Good” condition and only a small percent of pavement is in the “Fair to Poor” status and demands immediate some kind of preventive maintenance and /or rehabilitation treatments.

This pavement study includes four parts:

- Part I: The 2016 pavement network condition,
- Part II: The 2018 backlog,
- Part III: The Maintenance and Rehabilitation (M&R) program,
- Part IV: The Comparative analysis.

Considering the five-year study period of 2018 – 2022, this pavement study focuses on the required preventive maintenance treatments and some rehabilitation techniques rather than reconstruction.

Part I of this study analyzes the 2016 pavement network condition and tabulates the important information of all the 26 road segments in the City of Avon.

In Part II, the backlog is defined as the cost of pavement rehabilitation of all roads within one year (2018) and bringing the average network PCR to 80. Backlog is a “snapshot” or relative measure of outstanding rehabilitation work.

Part III introduces the optimal preventive maintenance and rehabilitation strategy for each segment and its recommended implementation year based on the NOACA maintenance decision tree.

Finally, Part IV compares the backlog and the “M&R” program with the NOACA transportation asset management strategies. All these strategies were compared regarding their costs, the average network PCR and percent of the lane-miles below the acceptable level.


## BACKGROUND

In the 17<sup>th</sup> century what is now Avon, Avon Lake, Bay Village and Westlake was one territory. Various Native American tribes called it home and later moved elsewhere. In 1824 Lorain County was created and name was changed to Avon Township, the township was incorporated into a village in 1917 and in 1961 it became City of Avon.

As of the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency (NOACA) 2015 estimates, the city had a population of 22,276 and employment of 13,420. The City of Avon includes Interstate 90 (I 90), State Route 2 (SR 2), State Route 611 (SR 611), State Route 254 (SR 254), and State Route 83 (SR 83). Cleveland-Hopkins International Airport is the nearest airport.

Map 1 illustrates the City of Avon location in the NOACA region.

Map 1: City of Avon Location in the NOACA Region



For the purpose of this study:

**Pavement Reconstruction** is defined as the replacement or reestablishment of the original pavement structural capacity by the placement of the equivalent or increased pavement structure. Reconstruction may utilize either new or recycle materials for the reconstruction of the complete pavement structure.

**Pavement Rehabilitation** is defined as resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation (3R) work consisting of structural enhancements that extend the service life of an existing pavement and/or improve its structural capacity. Rehabilitation techniques include restoration treatments and/or structural overlays. This may include partial recycling of the existing pavement, placement of additional surface materials, and/or other work necessary to return an existing pavement to a condition of structural or functional adequacy.

**Preventive Maintenance** is considered as cost effective treatments to an existing roadway system and its appurtenances that preserves the system, delays future deterioration, and maintains or improves the functionality condition of the system without increasing structural capacity. Projects that address deficiencies in the pavement structure or increase the structural capacity of the facility are not considered preventive maintenance.

Maintaining the roadways in a state of good repair is essential and experience has shown that, over time it is less expensive to invest in preventive maintenance and/or rehabilitation in an ongoing basis rather than in reconstruction of pavement that has deteriorated to a poor condition.

This pavement study analyzes the current status of the Avon pavement network condition and considers the five-year study period of 2018-2022. It mainly focuses on the required roadway pavement preventive maintenance treatments and some rehabilitation techniques rather than reconstruction. The 2016 Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) pavement database was used as the input data and RoadMatrix software was utilized as the NOACA Pavement Management platform.

Seven roadway pavement preventive maintenance and rehabilitation treatments were considered in the Avon pavement network analysis for the study period and Table 1 illustrates the selected treatment and their associated planning level costs.

**Table 1: Selected Pavement Treatments and Their Planning Level Costs**

Maintenance Treatment Type	Cost per SQ FT (2016\$)	Estimated Cost per 12-FT lane-Mile (2016\$)
Crack Fill	0.08	5,100
Joint Repair	0.24	15,200
Crack Fill and Slurry	0.4	25,300
Preventive Maintenance Minor	0.5	31,700
Micro – Pave Type    Surface Treatment	0.722	45,700
Selective Patch, Mill and 1.5” O/L	1.5	95,000
2.0 inch Hot Mix Mill and Overlay	1.9	120,400

**Pavement Maintenance Treatment Definitions**

**Crack Fill:** it is the placement of asphalt emulsion into non-working cracks to reduce water infiltration and to reinforce the adjacent pavement.

**Slurry Seal:** a mixture of fine aggregate, asphalt emulsion, water, and mineral filler, used when the primary problem is excessive oxidation and hardening of the existing surface. Slurry seals are used to retard surface raveling, and improve surface friction.

**Joint Repair:** used to remove deteriorated concrete pavement long joint/crack repairs. It minimizes infiltration of surface water and incompressible material into the joint system.

**Preventive Maintenance (Minor):** typically applied to pavements in good condition having significant remaining service life. Examples of minor preventive treatments include asphalt crack sealing, chip sealing, slurry or micro-surfacing, thin and ultra-thin hot-mix asphalt overlay, and concrete joint sealing.

**Micro – Pave (Type II Surface Treatment):** consist of the application of a mixture of water, asphalt emulsion, aggregate (very small crushed rock), and chemical additives. It is used to treat surfacing and rut filling on roads that get moderate to heavy levels of traffic.

**2.0in Hot Mix Mill & Overlay:** applied as a maintenance treatment. Thin overlays should only be placed on structurally sound pavements. That is because they offer little structural improvement, but they can renew the surface in terms of functional performance (i.e., ride quality).

**Selective Patching, Mill & 1.5 O/L:** it is primarily done to extend the life of a roadway. Patch mill and overlay projects are designed to remove damaged portions of the roadway and replace it with new smooth pavement.

This report includes the following four parts:

- I. The 2016 status of the Avon pavement network condition,
- II. The 2018 “backlog” treatment list,
- III. The optimal preventive maintenance and rehabilitation strategies, and
- IV. The comparative analysis.

**PART I: 2016 PAVEMENT CONDITION**

In order to provide an accurate assessment of the current status and further pavement analyses, the pavement network is required to be divided into homogeneous discrete sections in terms of surface distress, traffic volumes, pavement structure, etc. The 2016 ODOT pavement database has 26 segment records for the City of Avon roadway system. Each record comprises of several fields of various information and measures such as Street name, Length (miles), Lane-miles length, Number of Lanes, Function Class, Pavement Condition Ratings (PCR), etc.


Based on the utilized ODOT database, there are 23.86 centerline miles of federal-aid eligible roads which are equivalent to 52.38 lane-miles in the City of Avon. The total area of roadway is 4,204,039 Sq. Ft.

The PCR measure is a qualitative description of the structural state of the pavement. The PCR values span a spectrum of descriptive narrative ranging from “Very Good” to “Very Poor”. Each roadway segment is scored from 0 to 100 with 0 representing completely distressed pavement and 100 indicating perfect pavement condition. The lane-mile weighted average of the City of Avon segment PCRs is about 78. Table 2 and Figure 1 summarize the 2016 Avon pavement network conditions by percentages of roadway lane-miles length.

**Table 2: 2016 Avon Pavement Network Condition**

Pavement Condition	PCR Range	Lane-Miles	Percent of Lane-Miles
Very Poor	0 - 39	0	0%
Poor	40 - 54	0	0%
Fair to Poor	55 - 64	5.92	11.3%
Fair	65 - 74	20.82	39.7%
Good	75 - 89	11.24	21.5%
Very Good	90 - 100	14.40	27.5%


**Figure 1: 2016 Avon Pavement Network Condition Chart by Lane-Miles**



As indicated, 49 percent of the pavement lane-miles are currently in the “Good” to “Very Good” condition and the lane-mile weighted average PCR also represents a “Good” condition. About 11 percent of the lane-miles are in the “Fair to Poor” status and demand some kind of immediate maintenance and rehabilitation treatments.

Map 2 illustrates the 2016 Avon roadway pavement condition for each segment record and Table 3 tabulates the 2016 Avon pavement condition listing.

Map 2: 2016 City of Avon Pavement Condition



# THE CITY OF AVON ROADWAY PAVEMENT MAINTENANCE REPORT

**Table 3: 2016 City of Avon Pavement Condition Listing**

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	FUNCTION CLASS	LANE-MILES	PCR
CHESTER RD	0.14 MILES E OF SR 83	LEAR NAGLE RD	MINOR ARTERIAL	2.94	94
CHESTER RD	HOLLOW WOOD LN	SR 83	MINOR ARTERIAL	0.12	86
CHESTER RD	MOORE RD	HOLLOW WOOD LN	MINOR ARTERIAL	2.58	86
CHESTER RD	SR 611	MOORE RD	MAJOR COLLECTOR	1.14	90
CHESTER RD	SR 83	0.14 MILES E OF SR 83	MINOR ARTERIAL	0.28	94
MOORE RD	CHESTER RD	AVON NCL	MAJOR COLLECTOR	1.6	72
NAGLE RD	0.14 MILES N OF CLEVELAND CLINIC BLVD	AVON NCL	MAJOR COLLECTOR	3.12	69
NAGLE RD	0.27 MILES N OF SR 254	CLEVELAND CLINIC BLVD N OF CHESTER RD	MAJOR COLLECTOR	1.62	88
NAGLE RD	CLEVELAND CLINIC BLVD N OF CHESTER RD	0.14 MILES N OF CLEVELAND CLINIC BLVD	MAJOR COLLECTOR	0.84	88
NAGLE RD	MILLS RD	SCHWARTZ RD	MAJOR COLLECTOR	3.22	79
NAGLE RD	SCHWARTZ RD	SR 254	MAJOR COLLECTOR	1.52	94
NAGLE RD	SR 254	0.27 MILES N OF SR 254	MAJOR COLLECTOR	0.54	76
SR 254	AVON WCL	SR 611	MINOR ARTERIAL	4.52	63
SR 254	SR 611	SR 83 (CENTER RD)	MINOR ARTERIAL	1.6	88
SR 254	SR 83	LORAIN / CUYAHOGA COUNTY LINE	MINOR ARTERIAL	5.92	71
SR 611	0.14 MILES WEST OF MOORE RD	SR 254	MINOR ARTERIAL	2.16	93
SR 611	I 90 NORTH RAMPS	0.14 MILES W OF MOORE RD	PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL-OTHER	1.44	95
SR 611	SHEFFIELD ECL	I 90 NORTH RAMPS	PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL-OTHER	2.6	65
SR 83	CHESTER RD	SR 83/CHESTER RD	MINOR ARTERIAL	0.2	79

**Table 3: 2016 City of Avon Pavement Condition Listing (Continued)**

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	FUNCTION CLASS	LANE-MILES	PCR
SR 83	CHESTER RD	AVON NCL	MINOR ARTERIAL	1.58	66
SR 83	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	CHESTER RD (SR 83)	MINOR ARTERIAL	0.52	81
SR 83	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	CHESTER RD	MINOR ARTERIAL	0.52	74
SR 83	MILLS RD	SR 254	MINOR ARTERIAL	5.48	68
SR 83	SR 254	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	MINOR ARTERIAL	0.7	58
SR 83	SR 254	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	MINOR ARTERIAL	0.7	62
STONEY RIDGE RD	MILLS RD	SR 254	MAJOR COLLECTOR	4.92	90

## PART II: 2018 CURRENT BACKLOG

The backlog is defined as the cost of pavement rehabilitation of all roads within the current year (2018) and bringing the average network PCR to 80. Backlog is a “snapshot” or relative measure of outstanding rehabilitation work. The backlog not only represents how far behind the pavement network is in terms of its present physical condition, but also its cost value serves as a benchmark to measure the impact of various funding strategies. Additionally, the current backlog offers a basis for comparison to future and/or past year’s backlogs.

The backlog strategy does not utilize any pavement preventive maintenance treatments, but instead considers rehabilitation or reconstruction treatments. This strategy achieves the average network PCR 80, and also maintains all the pavement conditions above the minimum acceptable level. In this study, the minimum acceptable PCR for the arterial roadway function class is 55 and for the major and minor collector is 50.


The Appendix includes all the backlog pavement treatments. As illustrated, the 2018 backlog treatment list includes segments which their 2018 PCRs are below the minimum acceptable level and are recommended with various reconstruction treatments. There are four segments in the 2018 backlog list with the total of 8.52 lane-miles. The 2018 backlog cost of the recommended treatments is about nine million dollars.

**PART III: MAINTENANCE & REHABILITATION (M&R) PROGRAM**

In order to estimate the preventive maintenance and rehabilitation requirements of a pavement network over a period of time, the first step is to determine the “Need Year” or when a pavement segment requires rehabilitation. The “Need Year” of a pavement is defined as the year in which the pavement condition falls below a critical level. Pavement condition of a road segment deteriorates under traffic, climate, etc. and consequently its PCR value is reduced. Without any treatments and depending on the deteriorating factors, pavements perform differently and Figure 2 depicts the typical acceptable level and “Need Year” relation for several road segments. As shown, the definition of the acceptable level is a critical factor in determining the “Need Year” for any road segment.

In this study, the critical level is set by the minimum acceptable PCR. As mentioned earlier, In the NOACA region, the minimum acceptable PCR for the arterial roadway function class is 55 and for the major and minor collector is 50.

**Figure 2: The PCR Acceptable Level and “Need Year” Relation**



# THE CITY OF AVON ROADWAY PAVEMENT MAINTENANCE REPORT

The second step is to determine any feasible preventive maintenance and/or rehabilitation strategies based on a decision tree approach. The “M&R” program determines the optimal preventive maintenance and rehabilitation strategy for each segment and its recommended implementation year based on the considered decision tree. The Appendix includes all the “M&R” treatments for the identified segments with the implementation year in the period of 2018 to 2022 and the “M&R” program cost includes all the deferred maintenance cost.



PART III

## PART IV: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

The current NOACA transportation asset management policy includes two strategies

- Maintain 15% Deficiency: this strategy attempts to maintain the total lane-miles with PCR below the acceptable level no more than 15%.
- Maintain an Average Network PCR of 80: applies a set of maintenance treatments in order to keep the roadway network average PCR more than, or equal to 80 over the study period.

This section compares the discussed backlog and the “M&R” program treatments with the NOACA transportation asset management strategies.

In addition to the above strategies, this comparative analysis considers another scenario as the minimum benchmark. The “Maintain Lowest Standard PCR” treatment strategy is based on the minimum PCR thresholds of 55 for arterials and 50 for collectors and a set of annual budget constraints. The annual budget constraints are calculated in three steps: First, the segments with the “M&R” recommended implementation in each specific analysis year are selected. Second, a subset of the selected segments which their “Need Years” are in the analysis period are identified. It should be noted that the selected segments with the “Need Year” beyond the analysis period are excluded from the budget constraint calculation. Third, the “M&R” treatment costs for the identified segments in the second step, are added together to provide an annual budget constraint for this scenario.

As discussed, all the above scenarios apply a decision tree approach to determine technically feasible maintenance and rehabilitation strategies for each segment requiring rehabilitation during the five-year period.

Table 4 summarizes the comparison results of all the above scenarios over the five-year period for the City of Avon. In this table, the “5-Year Total Required Dollars” column shows the accumulation of the annual costs over five years calculated based on inflation-adjusted dollars for each strategy. Also, the Network average PCR is the lane-mile weighted average.

**Table 4: Performance Comparison of the Constraint Scenarios**


Maintenance Strategy	Strategy Group	5-Year Total Required Dollars	Network Average PCR	Network PCR at the End of the 5-Year Period	Percent of Pavement below the Minimum PCR
2018 Current Backlog	2018 Backlog	8,964,566	80.5	-	0%
Maintain 15% Deficiency	NOACA Transportation Asset Management Targets	2,689,419	74.1	79.4	11.3%
Maintain an Average Network PCR of 80		2,591,935	79	80.3	11.3%
M&R Program	Scenarios	3,955,457	80.4	86.5	0%
Maintain Lowest Standard PCR		3,603,963	79.6	84.9	0%

Note: The backlog required budget is for the year of 2018 only.

The Appendix lists all the treatments with their implementation years in the period of 2018 to 2022 for the above maintenance strategies.

Figure 3 illustrates the annual network average PCR for the discussed maintenance and rehabilitation strategies. It should be noted that the backlog scenario has only one value of 80.5 for 2018.

**Figure 3: Average PCR Comparison by the Constraint Scenarios and by Year**



## THE CITY OF AVON ROADWAY PAVEMENT MAINTENANCE REPORT

As expected, the treatments of the “M&R” program maintain the pavement network condition with the highest network average PCR. This strategy requires a budget of almost four million dollars during the analysis period without any pavement conditions below the acceptable level. The “Maintain Lowest Standard PCR” scenario provides almost the same level of condition with a similar budget requirement.

The two other scenarios, the “Maintain an Average Network PCR of 80” and the “Maintain Lowest Standard PCR”, provide slightly lower average PCR with a budget requirement of about 2.6 million dollars. However, in both scenarios, more than 10 percent of the pavements will be below the acceptable level at the end of the five-year period.

It should be noted that the backlog cost as the benchmark is more than twice of the “M&R” program cost and its network average PCR is six points less than that of the “M&R” program. This comparison indicates that the annual maintenance investment provides a better pavement management policy with much smaller budget than the reconstruction treatments with high costs.

**APPENDIX**

**2018 Current Backlog**

**Pavement Treatment List**

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDATION TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	TREATMENT COST
SR 83	SR 254	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	MAJOR REHAB/RECONSTRUCTION	0.70	727,799
SR 83	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	SR 254	MINOR REHAB WITH REPAIRS (AC)	0.70	460,939
SR 254	AVON WCL	SR 611	STRUCTURAL CPR (REHAB WITH MORE REPAIR WORK)	4.52	5,238,374
SR 611	SHEFFIELD ECL	I 90 NORTH RAMPS	STRUCTURAL CPR (REHAB WITH MORE REPAIR WORK)	2.60	2,537,454
<b>REQUIRED BACKLOG BUDGET (2018\$)</b>					<b>\$8,964,566</b>

**Maintain 15% Deficiency**

**Pavement Treatment List**

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2019\$)	YEAR
SR 83	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	0.70	74,585	2019
<b>THE 2019 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN 15% DEFICIENCY" STRATEGY</b>					<b>\$74,585</b>	
ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2020\$)	YEAR
SR 83	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	0.70	76,435	2020
SR 83	CHESTER RD	AVON NCL	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	1.58	248,434	2020
<b>THE 2020 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN 15% DEFICIENCY" STRATEGY</b>					<b>\$324,869</b>	
ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2021\$)	YEAR
SR 83	MILLS RD	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	5.48	883,026	2021
<b>THE 2021 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN 15% DEFICIENCY" STRATEGY</b>					<b>\$883,026</b>	

**Maintain 15% Deficiency**

**Pavement Treatment List (Continued)**

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2022\$)	YEAR
SR 83	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	CHESTER RD (SR 83)	PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE MINOR	0.52	23,057	2022
SR 83	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	CRACK FILL	0.70	4,281	2022
SR 254	AVON WCL	SR 611 (COLORADO AVE)	2.0IN. HOT MIX MILL & OVERLAY	4.52	997,962	2022
SR 611	SHEFFIELD ECL	I 90 NORTH RAMPS	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	2.60	381,639	2022
<b>THE 2022 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN 15% DEFICIENCY" STRATEGY</b>					<b>\$1,406,939</b>	

**Note: The "Maintain 15% Deficiency" strategy does not have any pavement maintenance treatments with the recommended implementation year of 2018.**

**Maintain an Average Network PCR of 80**

**Pavement Treatment List**

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2018\$)	YEAR
SR 83	CHESTER RD	SR 83 (CENTER RD) / CHESTER RD	PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE MINOR	0.20	16,635	2018
SR 83	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	0.70	72,780	2018
<b>THE 2018 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN AN AVERAGE NETWORK PCR OF 80" STRATEGY</b>					<b>\$89,415</b>	
ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2019\$)	YEAR
NAGLE RD	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	0.27 MILES NORTH OF SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE MINOR	0.54	16,877	2019
SR 254	AVON WCL	SR 611 (COLORADO AVE)	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	4.52	732,039	2019
SR 611	SHEFFIELD ECL	I 90 NORTH RAMPS	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	2.60	354,598	2019
SR 83	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	CHESTER RD (SR 83)	PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE MINOR	0.52	21,424	2019
<b>THE 2019 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN AN AVERAGE NETWORK PCR OF 80" STRATEGY</b>					<b>\$1,124,938</b>	
ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2020\$)	YEAR
NAGLE RD	MILLS RD	SCHWARTZ RD	PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE MINOR	3.22	103,136	2020
SR 83	CHESTER RD	AVON NCL	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	1.58	248,434	2020
SR 83	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	0.70	76,435	2020
<b>THE 2020 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN AN AVERAGE NETWORK PCR OF 80" STRATEGY</b>					<b>\$428,005</b>	

**Maintain an Average Network PCR of 80**

**Pavement Treatment List (Continued)**

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2021\$)	YEAR
SR 83	MILLS RD	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	5.48	883,026	2021
SR 83	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	CRACK FILL	0.70	4,178	2021
<b>THE 2021 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN AN AVERAGE NETWORK PCR OF 80" STRATEGY</b>					<b>\$887,204</b>	
ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2022\$)	YEAR
SR 254	AVON WCL	SR 611 (COLORADO AVE)	CRACK FILL	4.52	42,019	2022
SR 611	SHEFFIELD ECL	I 90 NORTH RAMPS	CRACK FILL	2.60	20,354	2022
<b>THE 2022 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN AN AVERAGE NETWORK PCR OF 80" STRATEGY</b>					<b>\$62,373</b>	

**M&R Program**

**Pavement Treatment List**

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	M&R TREATMENT RECOMMENDATION	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2018\$)	YEAR
SR 83	CHESTER RD	SR 83 (CENTER RD) / CHESTER RD	PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE MINOR	0.20	16,635	2018
SR 83	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	0.70	72,780	2018
<b>THE 2018 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "M&amp;R" PROGRAM</b>					<b>\$89,415</b>	
ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	M&R TREATMENT RECOMMENDATION	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2019\$)	YEAR
NAGLE RD	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	0.27 MILES NORTH OF SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE MINOR	0.54	16,877	2019
SR 254	AVON WCL	SR 611 (COLORADO AVE)	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	4.52	732,039	2019
SR 611	SHEFFIELD ECL	I 90 NORTH RAMPS	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	2.60	354,598	2019
SR 83	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	0.70	74,585	2019
SR 83	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	CHESTER RD (SR 83)	PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE MINOR	0.52	21,424	2019
<b>THE 2019 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "M&amp;R" PROGRAM</b>					<b>\$1,199,523</b>	
ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	M&R TREATMENT RECOMMENDATION	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2020\$)	YEAR
NAGLE RD	MILLS RD	SCHWARTZ RD	PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE MINOR	3.22	103,136	2020
SR 83	CHESTER RD	AVON NCL	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	1.58	248,434	2020
<b>THE 2020 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "M&amp;R" PROGRAM</b>					<b>\$351,570</b>	

**M&R Program**

**Pavement Treatment List (Continued)**

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	M&R TREATMENT RECOMMENDATION	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2021\$)	YEAR
CHESTER RD	SR 611 (COLORADO AVE)	MOORE RD	CRACK FILL & SLURRY	1.14	48,986	2021
SR 83	MILLS RD	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	5.48	883,026	2021
SR 83	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	CRACK FILL	0.70	4,178	2021
<b>THE 2021 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "M&amp;R" PROGRAM</b>					<b>\$936,190</b>	
ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	M&R TREATMENT RECOMMENDATION	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2022\$)	YEAR
SR 254	AVON WCL	SR 611 (COLORADO AVE)	CRACK FILL	4.52	42,019	2022
SR 254	SR 83 (CENTER RD)	LORAIN / CUYAHOGA COUNTY LINE	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	5.92	1,167,669	2022
SR 611	SHEFFIELD ECL	I 90 NORTH RAMPS	CRACK FILL	2.60	20,354	2022
SR 83	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	CRACK FILL	0.70	4,281	2022
STONE RIDGE RD	MILLS RD	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	CRACK FILL & SLURRY	4.92	144,436	2022
<b>THE 2022 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "M&amp;R" PROGRAM</b>					<b>\$1,378,759</b>	

**Maintain Lowest Standard PCR**

**Pavement Treatment List**


ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2018\$)	YEAR
SR 83	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	0.70	72,780	2018
<b>THE 2018 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN LOWEST STANDARD PCR" STRATEGY</b>					<b>\$72,780</b>	
ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2019\$)	YEAR
SR 254	AVON WCL	SR 611 (COLORADO AVE)	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	4.52	732,039	2019
SR 611	SHEFFIELD ECL	I 90 NORTH RAMPS	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	2.60	354,598	2019
SR 83	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	0.70	74,585	2019
<b>THE 2019 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN LOWEST STANDARD PCR" STRATEGY</b>					<b>\$1,161,222</b>	
ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2020\$)	YEAR
SR 83	CHESTER RD	AVON NCL	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	1.58	248,434	2020
<b>THE 2020 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN LOWEST STANDARD PCR" STRATEGY</b>					<b>\$248,434</b>	

**Maintain Lowest Standard PCR**

**Pavement Treatment List (Continued)**

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2021\$)	YEAR
SR 83	MILLS RD	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	5.48	883,026	2021
SR 83	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	CRACK FILL	0.70	4,178	2021
<b>THE 2021 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN LOWEST STANDARD PCR" STRATEGY</b>					<b>\$887,204</b>	
ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2022\$)	YEAR
SR 254	AVON WCL	SR 611 (COLORADO AVE)	CRACK FILL	4.52	42,019	2022
SR 254	SR 83 (CENTER RD)	LORAIN / CUYAHOGA COUNTY LINE	SELECTIVE PATCH, MILL & 1.5" O/L	5.92	1,167,669	2022
SR 611	SHEFFIELD ECL	I 90 NORTH RAMPS	CRACK FILL	2.60	20,354	2022
SR 83	I 90 SOUTH RAMPS	SR 254 (DETROIT RD)	CRACK FILL	0.70	4,281	2022
<b>THE 2022 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN LOWEST STANDARD PCR" STRATEGY</b>					<b>\$1,234,323</b>	





NORTHEAST OHIO  
AREAWIDE  
COORDINATING  
AGENCY  
1299 Superior Ave.  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Phone: 216-241-2414 FAX: 216-621-3024

[www.noaca.org](http://www.noaca.org)

 [noaca.org](http://noaca.org)  [@noaca\\_mpo](https://twitter.com/noaca_mpo)

*The preparation of this publication was financed through grants received from the Federal Highway Administration and the Ohio Department of Transportation, and appropriations from the counties of and municipalities within Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain and Medina. The contents do not necessarily reflect official views or policies of the U.S. Department of Transportation or the Ohio Department of Transportation. This document does not constitute a standard or regulation.*

**NOACA will STRENGTHEN regional cohesion, PRESERVE existing infrastructure, and BUILD a sustainable multimodal transportation system to SUPPORT economic development and ENHANCE the quality of life in Northeast Ohio NOACA will STRENGTHEN regional cohesion, PRESERVE existing infrastructure, and BUILD a sustainable multimodal transportation system to SUPPORT economic development and ENHANCE the quality of life in Northeast Ohio**