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Executive Summary

Since 1985, the Pavement Condition Unit of the Pavement Systems Evaluation Section has been collecting, processing and analyzing the information on the condition and performance of the State Roadway System on an annual basis. The information provided by the Pavement Condition Survey (PCS) program has been critical to the Department’s effort to support informed highway planning, policy and decision making at State and local levels. This includes the apportionment and allocation of funding needs as well as the determination of appropriate cost-effective strategies to rehabilitate and preserve existing highway transportation infrastructure.

The PCS is traditionally performed on the pavement lane that has deteriorated the most in each direction. The beginning and ending of pavement sections to be rated are determined by construction limits and/or uniformity of conditions. All the sections rated are rated in terms of varying levels and amounts of specific distresses, namely, (1) ride quality, (2) surface deterioration, (3) spalling, (4) patching, (5) transverse cracking, (6) longitudinal cracking, (7) corner cracking, (8) shattered slabs, (9) faulting, (10) pumping, and (11) joint condition. Items 2 through 11 are combined to generate a Defect Rating.

The Survey data is collected, reviewed, processed, and analyzed by the Pavement Systems Evaluation Section of the State Materials Office. Once the data collection process is complete, the Central Pavement Management Office is responsible for processing, analysis and making the data available for use by the Department, consultants and others. Thereafter, the Central Program Development Office becomes responsible for reporting the condition of the State Highway System for Pavement Management purposes.

The present report provides essential information on the current condition of the Florida roadway system data collected as part of the PCS program. It also includes a twelve-year historical summary of condition ratings data by District and by system type.
SECTION I

Introduction

The Pavement Systems Evaluation Section of the State Materials Office is responsible for the Department’s Annual PCS. The Survey is conducted on the entire State-maintained Highway System, on an annual basis.

The survey, which covers flexible and rigid pavements, is conducted by a highly trained and experienced staff. It requires each of the four area staff specialists about 25 weeks of travel each year to complete the survey. However, since rigid pavements represent only about 3% of the State-maintained Highway System, much less time is spent evaluating rigid pavement.

The annual PCS is used to accomplish the following main objectives:

- Determine the present condition of the State Roadway System
- Compare the present with past conditions
- Predict deterioration rates
- Predict rehabilitation funding needs
- Provide justification for annual rehabilitation budget
- Provide justification for project rehabilitation, and
- Provide justification for distribution of rehabilitation funds to Districts.

The PCS is conducted in terms of varying levels and amounts of specific distress criteria, namely, (1) defect rating, and (2) ride quality. For each distress type, the pavement sections are rated on a scale of zero to ten, where a rating of ten indicates a section in excellent condition. Currently, any section with a rating of six or less becomes eligible for rehabilitation.

Defect rating is measured using ten different individual distress types. These distresses are counted and/or estimated (depending on the distress type) and are classified according to severity. The rater collects this distress data by evaluating the pavement from the roadway shoulder.
Ride quality is measured using an automated vehicle-mounted instrument called a Profiler that measures the longitudinal profile of the roadway. The ride quality is quantified in terms of Ride Number (RN). Ride Number is a mathematical processing of longitudinal profile measurements to produce an estimate of ride quality or user perception in accordance with ASTM Standard E1489.

In order to ensure a maximum accuracy and repeatability of the data collected, the testing equipment must be well maintained and routinely calibrated. In addition, edit procedures are currently implemented to test both the data accuracy and compliance with other parameters of the Pavement Management System. Comparisons of annual survey data to that of earlier years are also performed to review trends and identify potential errors. The efforts made to upgrade the survey equipment and to improve the data analysis software resulted in increased speed of data collection and substantial improvement in accuracy of the survey results. These improvements now allow in-depth analysis of any segment of the highway system and timely completion of the PCS while maintaining a high level of accuracy.

For more detailed information about the Pavement Condition Surveys, please refer to the latest edition of the Rigid and Flexible Pavement Condition Survey Handbooks located online at:

http://www.dot.state.fl.us/statematerialsoffice/PavementEvaluation/reports.htm

The facts and figures contained in this report are for rigid pavements only unless otherwise noted.
Observations

The review and analysis of the 2004 PCS data have resulted into the following observations:

1. Defect ratings have improved slightly during the past eleven years from an average rating of 6.67 in 1992 to 7.93 in 2004.

2. Ride ratings have remained constant for the past twelve years with a mean rating of 7.36 in 2003 and an overall average of 7.29. In 2004 the PCS saw a severe decline in ride rating with a statewide average of 6.79. This decline is mainly due to the change in sampling rate which was conducted in 2004 at 6-inch intervals compared to 12-inch for previous years.

3. 94.3% of the pavement sections rated this year was within one Defect point compared to previous year's ratings. (*)

4. 79.8% of the pavement sections rated this year for Ride was within one point compared to the previous year’s ratings. (*)

Note: Ultrasonic sensors were replaced with Laser sensors beginning with the 1999 survey, along with the use of Ride Number as the method of calculating Ride ratings. This may explain the increase in serviceability observed thereafter.

* Note: Sections that had undergone notable changes such as new construction or total rehabilitation were excluded from the analysis.

General Notes

1. For multi-lane roadways: The worst lane in each direction is rated (normally the outermost traffic lane).

2. For two-lane roadways: The worst lane is rated (normally the same lane tested the previous year).

3. Rated sections are determined by construction limits and/or significant changes in visual condition of the pavement.

4. Ride rating data is collected using four identical roadway profiler units.

5. Defect Rating is based on manual and visual distress measurements collected by the rater from the shoulder of the roadway.
2004 Production Summary
Statewide

Total Lane Miles: 41,016 Mi. (Flexible and Rigid Combined)
- Flexible: 97.6% (40,039 Mi.)
- Rigid: 2.4% (976 Mi.)

Total Rated Sections: 8,153 (Flexible and Rigid Combined)
- Flexible: 96.7% (7,884 Sections)
- Rigid: 3.3% (269 Sections)
Production History
Lane Miles

Rigid Pavements Only

Year

Lane Miles
0 500 1,000 1,500 2,000 2,500 3,000

278 2,079 2,064 2,052 2,061 2,010 2,020 1,960 1,959 1,739 1,694 1,604 1,694 1,592 1,566 1,476 1,331 1,035 978 976
Production History
Rated Sections

Rigid Pavements Only
SECTION II

DEFECT RATING

BY

SYSTEM AND DISTRICT
SECTION II

Defect Rating by System and District

Defect Rating Criteria

• Ten different distresses are counted and/or estimated then classified by severity levels.

• Each distress has a numeric deduct value based on the severity level assigned by the rater.

• The Defect Rating is obtained by subtracting the deduct value associated with the various forms of distress from 100 and dividing by 10. A Defect Rating of 10 indicates a pavement without observable distress.

For more information on how Defect Rating is calculated see the 2004 Rigid Pavement Condition Survey Handbook.
2004 Defect Distribution by System

Statewide

Note: No Rigid Pavement on Turnpike System
2004 Defect Distribution by System
District 1

ALL SYSTEMS
(53 lane miles)

PRIMARY
(36 lane miles)

INTERSTATE
(17 lane miles)

TOLL
(0 lane miles)

Note: No Rigid Pavement on Turnpike System
2004 Defect Distribution by System

District 2

ALL SYSTEMS
(235 lane miles)

PRIMARY
(104 lane miles)

INTERSTATE
(131 lane miles)

TOLL
(0 lane miles)

Note: No Turnpike System in District 2
2004 Defect Distribution by System
District 3

Note: No Turnpike System in District 3
2004 Defect Distribution by System
District 4

Note: No Rigid Pavement on Turnpike System
2004 Defect Distribution by System

District 5

Note: No Rigid Pavement on Turnpike System
2004 Defect Distribution by System
District 6

Note: No Rigid Pavement on Turnpike System
2004 Defect Distribution by System
District 7

ALL SYSTEMS
(248 lane miles)

PRIMARY
(46 lane miles)

INTERSTATE
(202 lane miles)

TOLL
(0 lane miles)

Note: No Rigid Pavement on Turnpike System
SECTION III

RIDE RATING

BY

SYSTEM AND DISTRICT
SECTION III

Ride Rating by System and District

Ride Rating Criteria

• Ride Ratings measure the ride quality of a pavement section. It is an indication of the degree of smoothness or roughness of the wearing surface.

• Ride Ratings are calculated from Ride Number (ASTM E-1489).

Ride Number x 2 = Ride Rating

Ride Number is a mathematical processing of longitudinal profile measurements to produce an estimate of a driver’s subjective perception of the ride quality of a roadway. Ride Number is based on an algorithm published in the National Cooperative Highway Research Project (NCHRP) 1-23 report and is defined in ASTM Standard E-1489.

• Rideability is greatly affected by factors that include the following:
  ▶ Original pavement profile
  ▶ Profiles from intersecting roads
  ▶ Utility patches and manhole covers, and
  ▶ Surface and structural deterioration

• Ride deficiency is based on a 0 to 10 scale, where 10 represents a pavement with no roughness while ratings of 6 or less represent a pavement with an undesirable ride quality.
Ride Rating by System and District

Average Ride Rating

District 1 | District 2 | District 3 | District 4 | District 5 | District 6 | District 7 | All Districts
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
No Rigid Pavement on Toll System | No Rigid Pavement on Toll System | No Rigid Pavement on Toll System | No Rigid Pavement on Toll System | No Rigid Pavement on Toll System | No Rigid Pavement on Toll System | No Rigid Pavement on Toll System | No Rigid Pavement on Toll System
6.68 | 7.39 | 7.29 | 7.06 | 7.04 | 7.06 | 6.73 | 6.89

Roadway System / Based on Lane Miles
- **Primary**
- **Interstate**
- **Turnpike**
- **Toll**
- **All Systems**
2004 Ride Distribution by System

Statewide

ALL SYSTEMS
(861 lane miles)

PRIMARY
(342 lane miles)

INTERSTATE
(492 lane miles)

TOLL
(27 lane miles)

Note: No Rigid Pavement on Turnpike System
2004 Ride Distribution by System

District 1

ALL SYSTEMS
(53 lane miles)

PRIMARY
(36 lane miles)

INTERSTATE
(17 lane miles)

TOLL
(0 lane miles)

Note: No Rigid Pavement on Turnpike System
2004 Ride Distribution by System
District 2

Note: No Rigid Pavement on Turnpike System
2004 Ride Distribution by System

District 3

ALL SYSTEMS
(30 lane miles)

PRIMARY
(16 lane miles)

INTERSTATE
(14 lane miles)

TOLL
(0 lane miles)

Note: No Rigid Pavement on Turnpike System
2004 Ride Distribution by System

District 4

Note: No Rigid Pavement on Turnpike System
2004 Ride Distribution by System
District 5

ALL SYSTEMS
(179 lane miles)

PRIMARY
(131 lane miles)

INTERSTATE
(25 lane miles)

TOLL
(24 lane miles)

Note: No Rigid Pavement on Turnpike System
2004 Ride Distribution by System

District 6

Note: No Rigid Pavement on Turnpike System
2004 Ride Distribution by System
District 7

Note: No Rigid Pavement on Turnpike System
SECTION IV

HISTORICAL

DISTRESS RATINGS

BY

DISTRICT

(ALL SYSTEMS COMBINED)
Historical Distress Ratings
Statewide (All Systems)

(1) Please note that for the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 inch intervals. (Refer to Item 2 under Observations, on page 4.)
Historical Distress Ratings
District 1 (All Systems)

(1) Please note that for the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 inch intervals. (Refer to Item 2 under Observations, on page 4.)
(1) Please note that for the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 inch intervals. (Refer to Item 2 under Observations, on page 4.)
Historical Distress Ratings
District 3 (All Systems)

Average Rating

Lane Miles Defected


Defect Rating 6.17 7.06 7.04 7.95 7.37 6.94 6.74 6.60 7.01 8.16 8.32 8.69
Ride Rating (1) 6.78 7.21 7.21 7.95 8.14 7.91 7.67 7.01 6.85 6.59 7.25 7.05 6.33
Lane Miles Defected 828 524 524 585 520 571 570 516 443 335 38 29 31

(1) Please note that for the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 inch intervals. (Refer to Item 2 under Observations, on page 4.)
### Historical Distress Ratings

**District 4 (All Systems)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### No Rigid Pavement in District 4

- **Defect Rating**
- **Ride Rating**
- **Lane Miles Defected**
Historical Distress Ratings
District 5 (All Systems)

(1) Please note that for the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 inch intervals. (Refer to Item 2 under Observations, on page 4.)
Historical Distress Ratings
District 6 (All Systems)

Average Rating

(1) Please note that for the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 inch intervals. (Refer to Item 2 under Observations, on page 4.)
Historical Distress Ratings
District 7 (All Systems)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Defect Rating</th>
<th>Ride Rating (1)</th>
<th>Lane Miles Defected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Please note that for the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 inch intervals. (Refer to Item 2 under Observations, on page 4.)
SECTION V

HISTORICAL

DISTRESS RATINGS

BY

SYSTEM

(ALL DISTRICTS COMBINED)
### Historical Distress Ratings

**All Systems (All Districts)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Defect Rating</th>
<th>Ride Rating (1)</th>
<th>Lane Miles Defected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>1632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>1632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>1572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>1434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>1442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>1416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Please note that for the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 inch intervals. (Refer to Item 2 under Observations, on page 4.)
### Historical Distress Ratings

#### Primary System (All Districts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Defect Rating</th>
<th>Ride Rating (1)</th>
<th>Lane Miles Defected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Please note that for the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 inch intervals. (Refer to Item 2 under Observations, on page 4.)
(Best) Historical Distress Ratings
Interstate System (All Districts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Defect Rating</th>
<th>Ride Rating (1)</th>
<th>Lane Miles Defected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>1541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>1167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>1069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>1035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Please note that for the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 inch intervals. (Refer to Item 2 under Observations, on page 4.)
### Historical Distress Ratings
#### Turnpike System (All Districts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Defect Rating</th>
<th>Ride Rating</th>
<th>Lane Miles Defected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No Rigid Pavement on Turnpike System*
Historical Distress Ratings
Toll System (All Districts)

(1) Please note that for the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 inch intervals. (Refer to Item 2 under Observations, on page 4.)
SECTION VI

DEFECT AND RIDE

RATING COMPARISON

2003 VS. 2004
SECTION VI

Defect and Ride Rating Comparison

Rating Comparison Criteria

The following pavement types have been omitted from this comparative analysis since they exhibit notable changes to the pavement surface as indicated below:

Type 0 - Pavement sections not State-maintained, duplicated under another county section number, or added under the flexible pavement condition survey.

Type 1 - Flexible Pavements

Type 2 - Pavement improvements without new construction, such as intersection improvement, bridge approach, crack sealing or grinding.

Type 5 - New Construction

Type 6 - No Ride taken for this section (normally because of length constraint)

Type 7 - Rehabilitated Pavement

Type 8 - Under Construction

Type 9 - Structures or exceptions that are State-maintained
Defect Rating Change
(2003 to 2004)

Approximately 94.3% of the 2004 Defect Ratings are within +/-1 Point as Compared to 2003.

Defect Change

Ride Rating Change
(2003 to 2004)

Approximately 79.8% of the 2004 Ride Ratings are within +/-1 Point as Compared to 2003.

Ride Change

NEGATIVE VALUES INDICATE DETERIORATION IN THE PAVEMENT AND/OR VARIABILITY IN THE DATA COLLECTION PROCESS.

POSITIVE VALUES INDICATE VARIABILITY IN THE DATA COLLECTION PROCESS.
Customer Service Form

In an effort to continue providing useful documentation to our customers, and to further improve documentation such as this, the FDOT Pavement Systems Evaluation Team would like your input.

(Optional)
Your name: ________________________________ Title: _______________________
Company or Organization: _________________________________________________
Address: __________________________________ City/State/Zip: _________________
Phone: (_____)_____ — ____________ e-mail: ______________________________

Please rate each of the following on the scale provided. One corresponds to Very Poor while Five corresponds to Excellent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of Content</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of Data</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Graphical Data</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format of Tables</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Value of This Report</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide a short answer to the questions below.

What was the most useful or informative part of this report? ________________________
________________________________________________________________________

What was the least useful or informative part of this report? ________________________
________________________________________________________________________

What other general comments might benefit the generators of this report? ____________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Detach and mail to: State Materials Office
Attn: Abdenour Nazef
5007 NE 39th Ave.
Gainesville, FL 32609

Or e-mail your comments to: Abdenour.Nazef@dot.state.fl.us