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Executive Summary

The Pavement Condition Unit is one of three functional units of the Pavement Materials System Section, which represents one of four areas of expertise within the State Materials Office (SMO).

Since 1985, this unit 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 the State and local levels. This includes the apportionment and allocation of funding needs to the Districts, as well as the determination of appropriate cost-effective strategies to rehabilitate and preserve existing highway transportation infrastructure.

The PCS traditionally evaluates the pavement lane that is in the worst condition in each roadway direction. The beginning and ending of pavement sections to be rated are determined by construction limits and/or uniformity of conditions. All sections are rated based on the varying levels and extent 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. The ratings for distresses 2 through 11 are combined to generate an overall Defect Rating.

The Central Office's Pavement Management Office is responsible for the data processing and analysis, and for making the data available for use by the Department, consultants, and others. The Central Program Development Office is 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 rigid pavement sections of the Florida State Highway System as part of the PCS program. It also includes a summary of the historical condition rating data.

To obtain an electronic copy of this and other reports, and to learn more about our program, please visit the Pavement Materials Division at SMO’s website:

Intranet  http://materials.dot.state.fl.us/
Internet  http://www.dot.state.fl.us/statematerialsoffice/
Section I

Introduction

The Pavement Condition Unit is responsible for the Department’s Annual Pavement Condition Survey. The survey is conducted on the entire State-maintained Highway System, on an annual basis.

The survey is conducted by a highly-trained and experienced staff, and requires five area staff specialists about 25 weeks of travel each year to complete.

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

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

The PCS rating of rigid pavements is based on two main criteria, namely, 1) Defect Rating, and (2) Ride Rating. A pavement section is rated on a scale of 0 to 10, where a rating of 10 indicates a section in excellent condition. Currently, any section with a rating of 6 or less is eligible for rehabilitation.

The Defect Rating is obtained by evaluating ten different individual distress types, namely, 1) surface deterioration, 2) spalling, 3) patching, 4) transverse cracking, 5) longitudinal cracking, 6) corner cracking, 7) shattered slab, 8) faulting, 9) pumping, and 10) joint condition.

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). RN 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 maximum accuracy and repeatability of the data collected, the testing equipment is well maintained and routinely calibrated. In addition, over 150 edit checks are used to test both the data accuracy and compliance with other known parameters. Comparisons of annual PCS data with earlier years are also performed to review trends and identify potential errors. When necessary, survey equipment and software is upgraded to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of data collection and processing. These types of improvements now allow in-depth analysis of any segment of the highway system and on-time 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, which can be accessed online at: http://materials.dot.state.fl.us/smo/pavement/performance/pcs/pavementconditionsurvey.htm

The facts and figures contained in this report are for rigid pavements only, which represent approximately 2.4% of the entire State Highway System.
Observations

The review and analysis of PCS historical Distress Ratings for rigid pavements have resulted in the following statewide observations:

1. Since 1996 the number of miles of Rigid Pavements on the state-maintained highway system has declined from 1694 lane miles to only 1050 lane miles in 2015. Because of this, the conclusions drawn below may be largely due to the drop in number of miles.
2. The average Defect Ratings have steadily improved from 7.4 in 1998 to 7.8 in 2015.
3. The average Ride Ratings remained constant for the 6 years prior to the 2004 PCS with a mean rating of 7.4 in 2003 and an overall average of 7.3. In 2004 the Ride Rating declined to a statewide average of 6.8. This decline was mainly due to a change in sampling interval used when collecting the data. Prior to 2004, all surveys were conducted using a 12 inch sampling interval. Beginning with the 2004 survey, a 6 inch sampling interval was used. Since 2004, the Ride Rating has steadily improved from 6.8 to 7.2 in 2015.
4. 97% of the pavement sections rated in 2015 for Defect were within one deduct point compared to the 2014 ratings. (1)
5. 100% of the pavement sections rated in 2015 for Ride were within one deduct point compared to the 2014 ratings. (1)

* Note (1): 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. Defect Rating is based on manual and visual distress measurements collected by the rater from the shoulder of the roadway.
5. Rigid Pavement Condition Survey Production History (p.4) and the PCS Production Summary (p.5) is based on total lane miles, including pavement types of No ride, Under construction, and Structures. All other graphs and tables are based on lane miles where given rating index (defect or ride) was measured.
6. Historical Distress Ratings by District (Section IV) and by System (Section V) are based on Lane Miles for Defect Rating.
Rigid Pavement Condition Survey
2015 PCS Production Summary
Statewide

Total Lane Miles: 43516 (Flexible and Rigid Combined)

- Flexible: 97.6% (42466 Mi.)
- Rigid: 2.4% (1050 Mi.)

Total Rated Sections: 8651 (Flexible and Rigid Combined)

- Flexible: 96.8% (8371 rated sections.)
- Rigid: 3.2% (280 rated sections.)
Section II
Defect Rating
By
System and District
Section II
Defect Rating by System and District

Defect Rating Criteria

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

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

3. The Defect Rating is obtained by subtracting the individual deduct values associated with each various form of distress from 100, and then 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 latest Rigid PCS Handbook.
2015 Defect Rating by System and District

### Lane Miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>District-1</th>
<th>District-2</th>
<th>District-3</th>
<th>District-4</th>
<th>District-5</th>
<th>District-6</th>
<th>District-7</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnpike</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Defect Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>District-1</th>
<th>District-2</th>
<th>District-3</th>
<th>District-4</th>
<th>District-5</th>
<th>District-6</th>
<th>District-7</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnpike</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 Defect Distribution by System - Statewide

**Primary**

- 313 Lane Miles, Mean = 7.2

**Interstate**

- 665 Lane Miles, Mean = 8.1

**Turnpike**

- 0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**Toll**

- 4 Lane Miles, Mean = 8.9

**Statewide**

- 982 Lane Miles, Mean = 7.8
2015 Defect Distribution by System - District 1

**Primary**

- 36 Lane Miles, Mean = 6.3

**Interstate**

- 21 Lane Miles, Mean = 9.0

**Turnpike**

- 0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**Toll**

- 0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**All Systems**

- 57 Lane Miles, Mean = 7.3
2015 Defect Distribution by System - District 2

Primary

Defect Rating

Percent of Lane Miles

82 Lane Miles, Mean = 8.3

Interstate

Defect Rating

Percent of Lane Miles

187 Lane Miles, Mean = 9.0

Turnpike

Defect Rating

Percent of Lane Miles

No Turnpike System

0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

Toll

Defect Rating

Percent of Lane Miles

No Toll System

0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

All Systems

Defect Rating

Percent of Lane Miles

269 Lane Miles, Mean = 8.8
2015 Defect Distribution by System - District 3

**Primary**

- Defect Rating: 0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**Interstate**

- Defect Rating: 0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**Turnpike**

- Defect Rating: 15 Lane Miles, Mean = 7.1

**Toll**

- Defect Rating: 0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**All Systems**

- Defect Rating: 15 Lane Miles, Mean = 7.1
2015 Defect Distribution by System - District 4

**Primary**

No Primary System

0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**Interstate**

No Interstate System

0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**Turnpike**

No Turnpike System

0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**Toll**

No Toll System

0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**All Systems**

No Rigid Pavement

0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A
2015 Defect Distribution by System - District 5

**Primary**

126 Lane Miles, Mean = 6.9

**Interstate**

103 Lane Miles, Mean = 8.6

**Turnpike**

0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**Toll**

0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**All Systems**

229 Lane Miles, Mean = 7.7
2015 Defect Distribution by System - District 6

**Primary**

- 5 Lane Miles, Mean = 6.2

**Interstate**

- 127 Lane Miles, Mean = 6.1

**Turnpike**

- 0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**Toll**

- 3 Lane Miles, Mean = 8.8

**All Systems**

- 135 Lane Miles, Mean = 6.2
2015 Defect Distribution by System - District 7

Primary

49 Lane Miles, Mean = 6.7

Interstate

227 Lane Miles, Mean = 8.3

Turnpike

0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

Toll

1 Lane Miles, Mean = 9.4

All Systems

276 Lane Miles, Mean = 8.0
Section III
Ride Rating
By
System and District
Section III

Ride Rating by System and District

Ride Rating Criteria

1. A Ride Rating represents the ride quality of a pavement section. It is an indication of the degree of smoothness or roughness of the wearing surface.

2. A Ride Rating is calculated from Ride Number (RN). Ride Rating = RN * 2

   RN 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. The RN is based on an algorithm published in National Cooperative Highway Research Project (NCHRP) 1-23. RN is defined in ASTM Standard E-1489.

3. The ride quality of a roadway is greatly affected by, but not limited to, factors that include the following:
   - Original pavement profile
   - Profiles of intersecting roads
   - Utility patches and manhole covers
   - Surface and structural deterioration and deformation

4. Ride Rating 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.

   Note that with the start of the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 in. compared to a 12 in. sample interval used in previous years.
2015 Ride Rating by System and District

### Lane Miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>District-1</th>
<th>District-2</th>
<th>District-3</th>
<th>District-4</th>
<th>District-5</th>
<th>District-6</th>
<th>District-7</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnpike</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ride Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>District-1</th>
<th>District-2</th>
<th>District-3</th>
<th>District-4</th>
<th>District-5</th>
<th>District-6</th>
<th>District-7</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnpike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 Ride Distribution by System - Statewide

**Primary**

- Ride Rating:
  - Percent of Lane Miles:
    - 0%: 0.0%
    - 1%: 0.0%
    - 2%: 0.0%
    - 3%: 0.0%
    - 4%: 0.0%
    - 5%: 6.7%
    - 6%: 32.0%
    - 7%: 32.3%
    - 8%: 28.8%
    - 9%: 0.0%
    - 10%: 0.0%

- Ride Rating:
  - Percent of Lane Miles:
    - 0%: 0.0%
    - 1%: 0.0%
    - 2%: 0.0%
    - 3%: 0.0%
    - 4%: 0.0%
    - 5%: 6.7%
    - 6%: 32.0%
    - 7%: 32.3%
    - 8%: 28.8%
    - 9%: 0.0%
    - 10%: 0.0%

- 309 Lane Miles, Mean = 6.8

**Interstate**

- Ride Rating:
  - Percent of Lane Miles:
    - 0%: 0.0%
    - 1%: 0.0%
    - 2%: 0.0%
    - 3%: 0.0%
    - 4%: 0.0%
    - 5%: 2.9%
    - 6%: 9.4%
    - 7%: 35.3%
    - 8%: 46.5%
    - 9%: 8.8%
    - 10%: 0.0%

- Ride Rating:
  - Percent of Lane Miles:
    - 0%: 0.0%
    - 1%: 0.0%
    - 2%: 0.0%
    - 3%: 0.0%
    - 4%: 0.0%
    - 5%: 2.9%
    - 6%: 9.4%
    - 7%: 35.3%
    - 8%: 46.5%
    - 9%: 8.8%
    - 10%: 0.0%

- 665 Lane Miles, Mean = 7.4

**Turnpike**

- Ride Rating:
  - Percent of Lane Miles:
    - 0%: 0.0%
    - 1%: 0.0%
    - 2%: 0.0%
    - 3%: 0.0%
    - 4%: 0.0%
    - 5%: 0.0%
    - 6%: 0.0%
    - 7%: 0.0%
    - 8%: 0.0%
    - 9%: 0.0%
    - 10%: 0.0%

- Ride Rating:
  - Percent of Lane Miles:
    - 0%: 0.0%
    - 1%: 0.0%
    - 2%: 0.0%
    - 3%: 0.0%
    - 4%: 0.0%
    - 5%: 37.0%
    - 6%: 6.2%
    - 7%: 33.4%
    - 8%: 23.4%
    - 9%: 0.0%
    - 10%: 0.0%

- 0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**Toll**

- Ride Rating:
  - Percent of Lane Miles:
    - 0%: 0.0%
    - 1%: 0.0%
    - 2%: 0.0%
    - 3%: 0.0%
    - 4%: 0.0%
    - 5%: 0.0%
    - 6%: 32.2%
    - 7%: 41.0%
    - 8%: 6.2%
    - 9%: 0.0%
    - 10%: 0.0%

- Ride Rating:
  - Percent of Lane Miles:
    - 0%: 0.0%
    - 1%: 0.0%
    - 2%: 0.0%
    - 3%: 0.0%
    - 4%: 0.0%
    - 5%: 37.0%
    - 6%: 6.2%
    - 7%: 33.4%
    - 8%: 23.4%
    - 9%: 0.0%
    - 10%: 0.0%

- 4 Lane Miles, Mean = 7.2

**Statewide**

- Ride Rating:
  - Percent of Lane Miles:
    - 0%: 0.0%
    - 1%: 0.0%
    - 2%: 0.0%
    - 3%: 0.0%
    - 4%: 0.0%
    - 5%: 0.1%
    - 6%: 4.1%
    - 7%: 16.5%
    - 8%: 32.2%
    - 9%: 41.0%
    - 10%: 0.0%

- Ride Rating:
  - Percent of Lane Miles:
    - 0%: 0.0%
    - 1%: 0.0%
    - 2%: 0.0%
    - 3%: 0.0%
    - 4%: 0.0%
    - 5%: 0.1%
    - 6%: 4.1%
    - 7%: 16.5%
    - 8%: 32.2%
    - 9%: 41.0%
    - 10%: 0.0%

- 978 Lane Miles, Mean = 7.2
2015 Ride Distribution by System - District 1

**Primary**

- 34 Lane Miles, Mean = 6.9

**Interstate**

- 21 Lane Miles, Mean = 7.1

**Turnpike**

- No Turnpike System
  - 0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**Toll**

- No Toll System
  - 0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**All Systems**

- 55 Lane Miles, Mean = 6.9
2015 Ride Distribution by System - District 2

**Primary**

81 Lane Miles, Mean = 7.0

**Interstate**

187 Lane Miles, Mean = 7.7

**Turnpike**

0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**Toll**

0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**All Systems**

268 Lane Miles, Mean = 7.5
2015 Ride Distribution by System - District 3

**Primary**

- 15 Lane Miles, Mean = 5.7

**Interstate**

- 0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**Turnpike**

- 0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**Toll**

- 0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**All Systems**

- 15 Lane Miles, Mean = 5.7
2015 Ride Distribution by System - District 4

Primary

No Primary System

Interstate

No Interstate System

Turnpike

No Turnpike System

Toll

No Toll System

All Systems

No Rigid Pavement

0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A
2015 Ride Distribution by System - District 5

**Primary**

- 126 Lane Miles, Mean = 6.7

**Interstate**

- 103 Lane Miles, Mean = 7.4

**Turnpike**

- 0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**Toll**

- 0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**All Systems**

- 229 Lane Miles, Mean = 7.0
2015 Ride Distribution by System - District 6

**Primary**

- 5 Lane Miles, Mean = 5.9

**Interstate**

- 127 Lane Miles, Mean = 6.5

**Turnpike**

- 0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

**Toll**

- 3 Lane Miles, Mean = 6.7

**All Systems**

- 134 Lane Miles, Mean = 6.5
2015 Ride Distribution by System - District 7

Primary

- 49 Lane Miles, Mean = 6.9

Interstate

- 227 Lane Miles, Mean = 7.7

Turnpike

- 0 Lane Miles, Mean = N/A

Toll

- 1 Lane Miles, Mean = 8.8

All Systems

- 276 Lane Miles, Mean = 7.6
Section IV
Historical Distress Ratings
By District
1998 - 2015
Historical Distress Ratings - Statewide
All Systems - All Districts

Note that with the start of the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 in. compared to a 12 in. sample interval used in previous years.
### Historical Distress Ratings - District 1

All Systems

#### Year 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006

| Defect Rating | 6.5 | 6.0 | 6.8 | 7.2 | 7.7 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 6.3 |
| Ride Rating   | 7.3 | 7.0 | 7.3 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.4 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.8 |
| Lane Miles    | 70  | 59  | 76  | 76  | 76  | 76  | 53  | 51  | 50  |


| Defect Rating | 6.5 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 7.9 | 7.6 | 7.5 | 7.3 |
| Ride Rating   | 7.1 | 7.2 | 7.0 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 7.2 | 7.0 | 6.9 | 6.9 |
| Lane Miles    | 54  | 54  | 54  | 54  | 55  | 55  | 55  | 55  | 57  |

Note that with the start of the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 in. compared to a 12 in. sample interval used in previous years.
Note that with the start of the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 in. compared to a 12 in. sample interval used in previous years.
### Historical Distress Ratings - District 3

All Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defect Rating</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride Rating</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Miles</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Defect Rating</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride Rating</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Miles</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that with the start of the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 in. compared to a 12 in. sample interval used in previous years.
Historical Distress Ratings - District 4

All Systems

Note that with the start of the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 in. compared to a 12 in. sample interval used in previous years.
Historical Distress Ratings - District 5
All Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defect Rating</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride Rating</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Miles</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Defect Rating</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride Rating</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Miles</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that with the start of the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 in. compared to a 12 in. sample interval used in previous years.
Note that with the start of the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 in. compared to a 12 in. sample interval used in previous years.
Note that with the start of the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 in. compared to a 12 in. sample interval used in previous years.
Section V
Historical Distress Ratings
By System
1998 - 2015
Note that with the start of the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 in. compared to a 12 in. sample interval used in previous years.
Note that with the start of the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 in. compared to a 12 in. sample interval used in previous years.
Note that with the start of the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 in. compared to a 12 in. sample interval used in previous years.
Historical Distress Ratings - Turnpike System

All Districts

Note that with the start of the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 in. compared to a 12 in. sample interval used in previous years.
Note that with the start of the 2004 PCS, the profile data was collected using a sampling rate of 6 in. compared to a 12 in. sample interval used in previous years.
Section VI
Distress Ratings
Comparison
2014 vs. 2015
Section VI

Defect and Ride Ratings Comparison

Rating Comparison Criteria

Only Type 4 Rigid Pavements are included in the comparison. The following pavement types have been omitted from this comparison 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 Rigid PCS.
Type 1 - Flexible Pavement
Type 2 - Surface Treatment or pavement improvement without new construction, such as intersection improvements, wheel path leveling, bridge approach or area resurfacing.
Type 3 - Skin Patch
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 and Ride Rating Changes

**2014 compared to 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defect Rating Change</th>
<th>Percent of Lane Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ride Rating Change</th>
<th>Percent of Lane Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

97% of the 2015 lane miles were within +/-1 point compared to 2014 survey.

100% of the 2015 lane miles were within +/-1 point compared to 2014 survey.

Negative values are indicative of the deterioration in the pavement and/or the variability in the data collection process. Positive values are indicative of the variability in the data collection process.
Section VII
Customer Service Survey
2015 Rigid Pavement Condition Survey

Facts and Figures

Customer Service Form

In an effort to continuously improve customer service, the Pavement Materials Section asks for your input by filling out and returning this survey form.

(Optional)

Name: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________

Company/Office: ___________________________ City/State/Zip: ___________________________

Address: ___________________________ Phone: ___________________________

E-mail: ___________________________

Please rate each of the following on the scale provided by circling the appropriate number. One corresponds to Very Poor, and Five corresponds to Excellent.

Usefulness of Content .............................................................. 1 2 3 4 5

Organization of Information...................................................... 1 2 3 4 5

Clarity of Graphical Illustrations.............................................. 1 2 3 4 5

Format of Tables ................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5

Overall Value of this Report ..................................................... 1 2 3 4 5

Please provide an answer to the following questions. Attach an additional sheet(s) if needed. What was the most useful/informative part of this report?

What was the least useful/informative part of this report?

What changes do you recommend to improve this report?

Detach and mail to:
State Materials Office, Attention: Stacy Scott, 5007 NE 39th Ave., Gainesville, FL 32609 or send via email to: stacy.scott@dot.state.fl.us