ROADWAY PAVEMENT MAINTENANCE REPORT

NORTHEAST OHIO AREAWIDE COORDINATING AGENCY
Lake, Geauga, Cuyahoga, Lorain, Medina
NOACA: Planning For Greater Cleveland

2020

VILLAGE OF GRAND RIVER

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 46 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 visit http:\\www.noaca.org

2020 NOACA BOARD OF DIRECTORS

BOARD OFFICERS

President: Timothy C. Lennon, Commissioner,Geauga County

First Vice President: Matt Lundy, Commissioner, Lorain County

Second Vice President: John R. Hamercheck, Commissioner, Lake County

Secretary: William F. Hutson, Commissioner, Medina County

Assistant Secretary: John D. Hunter, Mayor, Village of Sheffield

Assistant Secretary: Annette M. Blackwell, Mayor, City of Maple Heights

Treasurer: Armond Budish, County Executive, Cuyahoga County

Assistant Treasurer: Andrew Conrad, P.E., P.S., Medina County Engineer

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

Immediate Past President: Valarie J. McCall, Chief of Communications, Government & International Affairs, City of Cleveland

BOARD MEMBERS

CUYAHOGA COUNTY

Samuel J. Alai,
Mayor, City of Broadview Heights

Larry Antoskiewicz,
Mayor, City of North Royalton

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

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

Meghan George,
Mayor, City of Lakewood

Patrick W. Hewitt, AICP, Interim
Executive Director, Cuyahoga County
Planning Commission

Dale Miller,
County Councilman

David H. Roche,
Mayor, City of Richmond Heights

CITY OF CLEVELAND

Phyllis Cleveland
City Councilwoman

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

Blaine A. Griffin,
City Councilman

Frank G. Jackson,
Mayor, City of Cleveland

Valarie J. McCall,
Chief of Government & International Affairs

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

Matt Zone,
City Councilman

GEAUGA COUNTY

James W. Dvorak,
County Commissioner

Timothy C. Lennon,
County Commissioner

Ralph Spidalieri,
County Commissioner

LAKE COUNTY

Ben Capelle,
General Manager, Laketran

Jerry C. Cirino,
County Commissioner

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

John R. Hamercheck,
County Commissioner

Ron Young,
County Commissioner

LORAIN COUNTY

Jack Bradley, Mayor, City of Lorain

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

Dick Heidecker,
Trustee, Columbia Township

John D. Hunter,
Mayor, Village of Sheffield

Lori Kokoski,
County Commissioner

Matt Lundy,
County Commissioner

Frank Whitfield
Mayor, City of Elyria

MEDINA COUNTY

Jeff Brandon,
Trustee, Montville Township

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

William F. Hutson,
County Commissioner

Robert Patrick,
Public Service Director, City of Wadsworth

REGIONAL AND STATE

Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority (GCRTA)
Dennis Clough,
Board President

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

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

Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT)
John Picuri, P.E., Deputy Director, District 12

Ex Officio Members:
Ferzan M. Ahmed, P.E.
Executive Director,
Ohio Turnpike and Infrastructure Commission

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

NOACA DIRECTORS

Grace Gallucci,
Executive Director

Billie Geyer,
Comptroller

Randy Lane,
Director of Programming

Ali Makarachi, Ph.D,
Director of Transportation Planning and Engineering

Joseph MacDonald, Ph.D,
Director of Strategic and Environmental Planning

Susanna Merlone, EMBA,
Director of Administrative Services

Danielle Render
Director of External Engagement and Public Affairs

Kathy Sarli,
Associate Director of Operations and Chief Operating Officer

Jonathan Giblin,
Associate Director of Compliance

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary 2
2. Background 3
3. Definitions for Pavement Maintenance Terminology 5
4 PART I: 2020 Pavement Condition 10
5. PART II: 2020 Current Backlog 14
6. PART III: Maintenance & Rehabilitation (M&R) Program 15
7. PART IV: Comparative Analysis 18
8. Appendix 22

MAPS

1: Village of Grand River Location in the NOACA Region 4
2: 2020 Village of Grand River Pavement Condition 12

FIGURES

1: Components of Pavement Preservation 5
2: A General Schematic for Timing of Pavement Preservation Components 6
3: 2020 Grand River Pavement Network Condition Chart by Lane-Miles 11
4: The PCR Acceptable Level and "Need Year" Relation 15
5: A Typical Decision Tree Applied for Pavement Maintenance 17
6: Average PCR Comparison by the Constraint Scenarios and by Year 20

TABLES

1: Selected Pavement Treatments and their Planning Level Costs 8
2: 2020 Grand River Pavement Network Condition 10
3: 2020 Village of Grand River Pavement Condition Listing 13
4: Performance Comparison of the Constraint Scenarios 19

APPENDIX

The "2020 Current Backlog" Pavement Treatment List 22
The "Maintain 15% Deficiency" Pavement Treatment List 23
The "Maintain an Average Network PCR of 80" Pavement Treatment List 24
The "M&R" Program Pavement Treatment List 25
The "Maintain Lowest Standard PCR" Pavement Treatment List 27

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The current Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) pavement database has 3,659 segment records for the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency (NOACA) region. The NOACA region has a total of 3,344 centerline miles of roadways including freeways and federal-aid highways which is equivalent to 8,240 lane-miles. The 2020 all road types network average Pavement Condition Rating (PCR) is about 75.

In the Village of Grand River there are 1.07 centerline miles of federal-aid roads, which are equivalent to 2.14 lane-miles within the village boundary that include State Route 44 (SR 44), and State Route 283 (SR 283). The current ODOT pavement database has three segment records for the Village of Grand River 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, PCR, etc.

According to the PCR measure, about 57 percent of the pavement lane-miles are currently in the “Fair” condition. About 13 percent of pavements are in the “Very Poor” status and demand some kind of immediate maintenance and/or rehabilitation treatments.

This pavement study includes four parts:

- Part I: The 2020 Pavement Network Condition
- Part II: The 2020 Backlog
- Part III: The Maintenance and Rehabilitation (M&R) Program
- Part IV: The Comparative Analysis

Considering the five-year study period of 2020 - 2024, this pavement study focuses on the required preventive maintenance treatments and some rehabilitation techniques rather than reconstruction.

Part I of this study analyzes the 2020 pavement network condition and tabulates the important information of all the three road segments in the Village of Grand River.

In Part II, the Backlog is defined as the cost of pavement rehabilitation of all roads within one year (2020) 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

Grand River is a village in Lake County and named for the Grand River. A post office called Grand River has been in operation since 1890.

According to 2020 Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency (NOACA) estimates, the population of village is 416 and there are 160 households. The 2020 estimated employment number is 223.

The Village of Grand River includes State Route 44 (SR 44), and State Route 283 (SR 283). Cleveland-Hopkins International Airport is the nearest airport.

Map 1 illustrates the Village of Grand River location in the NOACA region.

Map 1: Village of Grand River Location in the NOACA Region



DEFINITIONS FOR PAVEMENT MAINTENANCE TERMINOLOGY

Pavement Preservation is "a program employing a network level, long-term strategy that enhances pavement performance by using an integrated, cost-effective set of practices that extend pavement life, improve safety and meet motorist expectations. A pavement preservation program consists primarily of four components: Reactive Maintenance, Preventive Maintenance, Minor Rehabilitation, and Major Rehabilitation/ Reconstruction as shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Components of Pavement Preservation



Reactive Maintenance is also known as routine or corrective maintenance consists of work that is performed to respond to specific conditions and deficiencies on pavements that are distressed and possibly unsafe. These activities are not planned in advance and seldom improve the pavement system performance in a long term.

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.

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.

Minor Rehabilitation consists of non-structural enhancements made to the existing pavement sections to eliminate age-related, top-down surface cracking that develop in flexible pavements due to environmental exposure. Because of the non-structural nature of minor rehabilitation techniques, these types of rehabilitation techniques are placed in the category of pavement preservation.

Major Rehabilitation consists of structural enhancements that both extend the service life of an existing pavement and/or improve its load-carrying capability.

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.

Figure 2 illustrates a general schematic for the timing of the pavement preservation Components.

Figure 2: A General Schematic for Timing of Pavement Preservation Components



Selected Pavement Treatments

Chip Seals is a two-step process which includes first an application of asphalt emulsion and then a layer of crushed rock to an existing asphalt pavement surface. A chip seal gets its name from the “chips” or small crushed rock placed on the surface.

Microsurfacing is similar to slurry seal. It consists of the application of a mixture of water, asphalt emulsion, aggregate (very small crushed rock), and chemical additives to an existing asphalt concrete pavement surface. Polymer is commonly added to the asphalt emulsion to provide better mixture properties. The major difference between slurry seal and microsurfacing is in how they “break” or harden. Slurry relies on evaporation of the water in the asphalt emulsion. The asphalt emulsion used in microsurfacing contains chemical additives which allow it to break without relying on the sun or heat for evaporation to occur. Thus, microsurfacing is an application that hardens quicker than slurry seals and can be used when conditions would not allow slurry seal to be successfully placed. Streets that have a lot of shade and streets that have a lot of traffic are good candidates for microsurfacing.

Thin overlays (1″ – 1½” of asphalt) and ultra thin overlays (less than 1″) offer an economical resurfacing, preservation and renewal paving solution for roads requiring safety and smoothness improvements. Thin asphalt overlays not only provide a new pavement surface for a fraction of the cost of rebuilding a roadway, but they are the only preventive maintenance technique that adds structural value while helping to extend a pavement’s service life.

Patching is the process of filling potholes or excavated areas in the asphalt pavement. Quick repair of potholes or other pavement disintegration helps control further deterioration and expensive repair of the pavement.

Pavement Milling consists of removing the existing surface layer with a milling machine and then transporting the material to a storage facility. New asphalt plant mix, often containing some recycled asphalt pavement (RAP), is installed to replace the milled out material. Milling can also remove distresses from the surface, providing a better driving experience and/or longer roadway life.

Full-Depth Reclamation is an in-place recycling method for reconstruction of existing flexible pavements using the existing pavement section material as the base for the new roadway-wearing surface. This process can include adding chemicals to the base layer in order to increase its strength capacity. The treatment of the base layer and recycled asphalt provides a stronger foundation for present and future traffic. This process effectively produces a cost-effective solution that maximizes limited budgets.

Joint Sealing is to minimize infiltration of surface water and in compressible material into the joint system. Sealants can also reduce dowel bar corrosion potential by reducing entrance of de-icing chemicals.

Load Transfer Retrofit involves the installation of dowel bars into existing concrete pavement to provide load transfer across transverse cracks or joints. Dowel bars are short steel bars that provide a mechanical connection between slabs without restricting horizontal joint movement. They increase load transfer efficiency by allowing the leave slab to assume some of the load before the load is actually over it. This reduces joint deflection and stress in the approach and leave slabs.

Partial-Depth Repairs are defined as the removal and replacement of small areas of deteriorated (or spalled) concrete, typically in joints or cracks. The depth of deterioration can vary from a few millimeters to the full depth of the pavement.

Full-Depth Repair is a concrete pavement restoration (CPR) technique that can be used to restore the structural integrity and ride ability to concrete pavements having certain types of distresses. It involves making lane-width, full-depth saw cuts to remove the deteriorated concrete down to the base, repairing the disturbed base, installing load-transfer devices, and refilling the excavated area with new concrete. It is an effective, permanent treatment to repair pavement distresses particularly those that occur at or near joints and cracks. By removing and replacing isolated areas of deterioration, full-depth repairs may delay or stop further deterioration and restore the pavement close to its original condition. The distresses that can be addressed using full-depth repairs include transverse cracking, corner breaks, longitudinal cracking, deteriorated joints, D-Cracking, blowups, and punch outs.

Table 1 illustrates the typical planning level costs of the above selected treatments.

Table 1: Selected Pavement Treatments and their Planning Level Costs

Treatments for Asphalt Pavements	Typical Cost per SQ FT (2020$)	Estimated Cost per 12- FT Lane-Mile (2020$)	Preservation Component
Crack Sealing, Rejuvenators, Chip Sealing	0.09	5,700	Preventive Maintenance
Microsurfacing, Slurry Seal	0.26	16,500	
Partial Depth Patching, Chip & Seal / Micro-Surface with Partial Depth Patch, Full Depth Patching	0.43	27,200	
Thin Hot Mix Asphalt Overlays without Milling	0.54	34,200	
Pavement Milling	0.78	49,400	Minor Rehabilitation
Full-Depth Reclamation	1.77	112,100	Major Rehabilitation

Table 1: Selected Pavement Treatments and their Planning Level Costs (Continued)

Treatments for Concrete Pavements	Typical Cost per SQ FT (2020$)	Estimated Cost per 12- FT Lane-Mile (2020$)	Preservation Component
Cleaning and Sealing of Joint and Cracks	0.11	7,000	Preventive Maintenance
Load Transfer Retrofit	0.4	25,300	
Partial Depth Repair	1.5	95,000	Minor Rehabilitation
Full-Depth Repair	2.07	131,100	Major Rehabilitation

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 a high cost reconstruction of pavement that has deteriorated to a poor condition.

This pavement preservation study analyzes the current status of the Grand River pavement network condition and considers the five-year study period of 2020-2024. It mainly focuses on the required roadway pavement preventive maintenance treatments and some rehabilitation techniques rather than reconstruction. The current Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) pavement database was used as the input data and RoadMatrix software was utilized as the NOACA Pavement Management platform.

This report includes the following four parts:

I. The 2020 status of the Grand River pavement network condition,
II. The 2020 “Backlog” treatment list,
III. The optimal preventive maintenance and rehabilitation strategies, and
IV. The comparative analysis.

PART I: 2020 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 current ODOT pavement database has three segment records for the Village of Grand River 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, PCR, Pavement Condition Rating (PCR), etc.

Based on the utilized ODOT database, there are 1.07 centerline miles of federal-aid eligible roads which are equivalent to 2.14 lane-miles in the Village of Grand River. The total area of roadway is 119,439 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-miles weighted average of the Village of Grand River segments PCRs is about 61. Table 2 and Figure 3 summarize the 2020 Grand River pavement network condition by percentages of roadway lane-miles length.

Table 2: 2020 Grand River Pavement Network Condition

Pavement Condition	PCR Range	Lane-Miles	Percent of Lane-Miles
Very Poor	0 - 39	0.28	13%
Poor	40 - 54	0.00	0%
Fair to Poor	55 - 64	0.64	30%
Fair	65 - 74	1.22	57%
Good	75 - 89	0.00	0%
Very Good	90 - 100	0	0%

Figure 3: 2020 Grand River Pavement Network Condition Chart by Lane-Miles



As indicated, about 57 percent of the pavement lane-miles are currently in the “Fair” condition and the lane-miles weighted average PCR represents a “Fair to Poor” condition. About 13 percent of pavements are in the “Very Poor” status and demand some kind of immediate maintenance and rehabilitation treatments.

Map 2 illustrates the 2020 Grand River roadway pavement condition for each segment record and Table 3 tabulates the 2020 Grand River pavement condition listing.

Map 2: 2020 Village of Grand River Pavement Condition

Table 3: 2020 Village of Grand River Pavement Condition Listing

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	FUNC CLASS	LANE-MILES	PCR
OLIVE ST	WILLIAMS ST	RIVER ST	MINOR ARTERIAL	0.28	31
RIVER ST	SINGER AVE	OLIVE ST	MINOR ARTERIAL	0.64	63
WILLIAMS ST	GRAND RIVER NCL	OLIVE ST	MINOR ARTERIAL	1.22	68

PART II: 2020 CURRENT BACKLOG

The Backlog is defined as the cost of pavement rehabilitation of all roads within the current year (2020) 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 reconstruction treatment, but instead considers pavement preventive maintenance and rehabilitation 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 2020 Backlog treatment list includes segments which their 2020 PCRs are below the minimum acceptable level and are recommended with various rehabilitation treatments. There are three segments in the 2020 Backlog list with the total of 2.14 lane-miles. The 2020 Backlog cost of the recommended treatments is nearly 110 thousand 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 4 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 4: The PCR Acceptable Level and "Need Year" Relation



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 2020 to 2024 and the “M&R” program cost includes all the deferred maintenance cost. Figure 5 shows a snapshot of a typical decision tree applied for maintenance of flexible pavements along major collectors.

Figure 5: A Typical Decision Tree Applied for Pavement Maintenance



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 percent.
- 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 Village of Grand River. 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-miles 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
2020 Current Backlog	2020 Backlog	107,795	82.1	-	0%
Maintain 15% Deficiency	NOACA Transportation Asset Management Targets	193,710	76.2	86.6	13.1%
Maintain an Average Network PCR of 80		136,140	80.8	80.6	0%
M&R Program	Scenarios	251,606	83.8	97.8	0%
Maintain Lowest Standard PCR		251,606	83.8	97.8	0%

Note: The Backlog required budget is for the year of 2020 only.

The Appendix lists all the treatments with their implementation years in the period of 2020 to 2024 for the above maintenance strategies.

Figure 6 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 82.1 for 2020.

Figure 6: Average PCR Comparison by the Constraint Scenarios and by Year



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 over 250 thousand dollars during the analysis period. The “Maintain Lowest Standard PCR” scenario provides the same level of condition and requires the same budget as the “M&R” program.

The “Maintain an Average Network PCR of 80” scenario requires the lowest budget, and its network average PCR will also be the lowest at the end of the analysis period.

The “Maintain 15% Deficiency” scenario requires a budget of over 190 thousand dollars, and its network average PCR is 11 points less than that of the “M&R” program at the end of the five-year period. Also, as the scenario name indicates, about 13 percent of the pavements will be below the minimum acceptable PCR level.

It should be noted that the Backlog cost as the benchmark is about 43 percent of the “M&R” program budget, and its network average PCR is about 16 points less than that of the “M&R” program at the end of the five-year period.

APPENDIX

The 2020 Current Backlog

Pavement Treatment List

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	TREATMENT RECOMMENDATION	LANE-MILES	COST
OLIVE ST	WILLIAMS ST	RIVER ST	FULL DEPTH RECLAMATION (FDR)	0.28	26,168
RIVER ST	SINGER AVE	OLIVE ST	PAVEMENT MILLING	0.64	26,358
WILLIAMS ST	GRAND RIVER NCL	OLIVE ST	PAVEMENT MILLING	1.22	55,269
REQUIRED BACKLOG BUDGET (2020$)					**$107,795**

The Maintain 15% Deficiency

Pavement Treatment List

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2021$)	YEAR
RIVER ST	SINGER AVE	OLIVE ST	FULL DEPTH RECLAMATION (FDR)	0.64	61,427	2021
THE 2022 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN 15% DEFICIENCY" STRATEGY					**$61,427**	

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2022$)	YEAR
WILLIAMS ST	GRAND RIVER NCL	OLIVE ST	FULL DEPTH RECLAMATION (FDR)	1.22	132,283	2022
THE 2022 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN 15% DEFICIENCY" STRATEGY					**$132,283**	

Note: The "Maintain 15% Deficiency" strategy does not have any pavement maintenance treatments with the recommended implementation years of 2020, 2023 and 2024.

The Maintain an Average Network PCR of 80

Pavement Treatment List

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2020$)	YEAR
OLIVE ST	WILLIAMS ST	RIVER ST	FULL DEPTH RECLAMATION (FDR)	0.28	26,168	2020
RIVER ST	SINGER AVE	OLIVE ST	PAVEMENT MILLING	0.64	26,358	2020
WILLIAMS ST	GRAND RIVER NCL	OLIVE ST	PAVEMENT MILLING	1.22	55,269	2020
THE 2020 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN AN AVERAGE NETWORK PCR OF 80" STRATEGY					**$107,795**	

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2023$)	YEAR
OLIVE ST	WILLIAMS ST	RIVER ST	FULL DEPTH RECLAMATION (FDR)	0.28	28,345	2023
THE 2023 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN AN AVERAGE NETWORK PCR OF 80" STRATEGY					**$28,345**	

Note: The "Maintain an Average Network PCR of 80" strategy does not have any pavement maintenance treatments with the recommended implementation years of 2021, 2022 and 2024.

The M&R Program

Pavement Treatment List

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2020$)	YEAR
OLIVE ST	WILLIAMS ST	RIVER ST	FULL DEPTH RECLAMATION (FDR)	0.28	26,168	2020
THE 2020 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "M&R" PROGRAM					**$26,168**	

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2021$)	YEAR
RIVER ST	SINGER AVE	OLIVE ST	FULL DEPTH RECLAMATION (FDR)	0.64	61,427	2021
THE 2021 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "M&R" PROGRAM					**$61,427**	

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2022$)	YEAR
WILLIAMS ST	GRAND RIVER NCL	OLIVE ST	FULL DEPTH RECLAMATION (FDR)	1.22	132,283	2022
THE 2022 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "M&R" PROGRAM					**$132,283**	

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2023$)	YEAR
OLIVE ST	WILLIAMS ST	RIVER ST	FULL DEPTH RECLAMATION (FDR)	0.28	28,345	2023
THE 2023 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "M&R" PROGRAM					**$28,345**	

The M&R Program

Pavement Treatment List (Continued)

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2024$)	YEAR
RIVER ST	SINGER AVE	OLIVE ST	CRACK SEALING, REJUVENATORS, CHIP SEALING	0.64	3,383	2024
THE 2024 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "M&R" PROGRAM					**$3,383**	

Maintain Lowest Standard PCR

Pavement Treatment List

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2020$)	YEAR
OLIVE ST	WILLIAMS ST	RIVER ST	FULL DEPTH RECLAMATION (FDR)	0.28	26,168	2020
THE 2020 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN LOWEST STANDARD PCR" STRATEGY					**$26,168**	

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2021$)	YEAR
RIVER ST	SINGER AVE	OLIVE ST	FULL DEPTH RECLAMATION (FDR)	0.64	61,427	2021
THE 2021 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN LOWEST STANDARD PCR" STRATEGY					**$61,427**	

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2022$)	YEAR
WILLIAMS ST	GRAND RIVER NCL	OLIVE ST	FULL DEPTH RECLAMATION (FDR)	1.22	132,283	2022
THE 2022 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN LOWEST STANDARD PCR" STRATEGY					**$132,283**	

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2023$)	YEAR
OLIVE ST	WILLIAMS ST	RIVER ST	FULL DEPTH RECLAMATION (FDR)	0.28	28,345	2023
THE 2023 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN LOWEST STANDARD PCR" STRATEGY					**$28,345**	

Maintain Lowest Standard PCR

Pavement Treatment List (Continued)

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	LANE-MILES	IMPLEMENTATION	
					COST (2024$)	YEAR
RIVER ST	SINGER AVE	OLIVE ST	CRACK SEALING, REJUVENATORS, CHIP SEALING	0.64	3,383	2024
THE 2024 REQUIRED BUDGET FOR THE "MAINTAIN LOWEST STANDARD PCR" STRATEGY					**$3,383**	

NORTHEAST OHIO
AREAWIDE
COORDINATING
AGENCY

1299 Superior Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Phone: 216·241·2414 FAX: 216·621·3024

www.noaca.org

noaca.org @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. Deparment 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