Background
How Did We Get Here?

• CTB discussion / questions regarding the equitable distribution of maintenance funds across systems and localities
  • Payments to Municipalities (functional class)
  • Payments to Arlington & Henrico (all roads)
  • Spending on VDOT Primary and Secondary System by District/Urban vs Rural
  • MN funding may be more equitably distributed by a formula that incorporates a prioritized needs-based factor along with a commitment to maintain our statewide assets, regardless of maintenance responsibility.

• CTB Requested Additional Review over 2011 / 2012
  • CTB subcommittee & Reformation of Local Govt Wrkgrp to:
    • Evaluate equalization of maintenance fund allocations
    • Develop recommendations for the effective and equitable distribution of maintenance funds
    • Develop recommendations to collect add’l local system condition and performance data
Background

• Results of Local Workgroup (presented to CTB June 2012):
  • Maintenance activities in urban localities that maintain their own systems are substantially different than that on most VDOT-maintained county roads.
  • It is very difficult to make direct comparisons between VDOT & Local performance/spending/needs
  • Performance measures must keep the differences in mind when implementing statewide standards
  • An analysis and comparison of needs across systems is desired before recommending changes.
  • Utilize VDOT’s pavement condition contract to collect data on local arterial system
Background

Maintenance activities in urban localities that maintain their own systems are substantially different than on most VDOT maintained county roads.
Background
Local System Spending

Based on FY08 – FY11 Certified Expenditures (Weldon-Cooper)

- **Urban Localities Average Spending:**
  - **Pvmt/Drainage** – $6,941/ln-ml; 44% of total spending
  - **Traffic Devices/Operations** – $2,740/ln-ml; 24% of total spending

- **Arlington Average Spending:**
  - **Pvmt/Drainage** – $9,879/ln-ml; 30% of total spending
  - **Traffic Devices/Operations** – $9,936/ln-ml; 30% of total spending

- **Henrico Average Spending:**
  - **Pvmt/Drainage** – $1,845/ln-ml; 20% of total spending
  - **Traffic Devices/Operations** – $877/ln-ml; 13% of total spending

- VDOT Budgets approx. 36% for P/S Pavements

*Accounts for additional 36% Municipalities and 111% Arlington Spends on Street Maintenance above VDOT MN payments
*Does not account for differences between arterial and collector/local spending
Local Pavement Data Collection
As requested by CTB

• Local Arterials Pavement Condition Analysis
  • Summer 2012 – Spring 2013
  • 84 Localities (82 Cities/Towns, Arlington & Henrico Counties)
  • Collected Arterial Routes Only
    • Collected 5,875 Lane Miles (approximately 20% of Locally Maintained Lane Miles)

• Local Arterial Routes consist of 63% Primary Routes
  • Compared Locality Primary Extensions to VDOT Primary Routes
  • Compared Locality Non-Primary Routes to VDOT Secondary Routes

• Looked at “Deficient” Arterial Pavements
  • Critical Condition Index (CCI) below 60
    • Scale 0 to 100 (100 represents pavement with no visible distresses)
% Deficient Pavement
Local Primaries / VDOT Primaries
% Deficient Pavement
Local Non-Primary / VDOT Secondary

* Does not represent most local roads (37% of Arterial Routes)
Local Government Workgroup – Conclusions

• Local arterial pavement is generally in the same or worse condition than similar roadways maintained by VDOT; This is more significant in more urbanized areas

• Localities are expending ~44% of total spending on pavements
  • VDOT budgets ~36% of maintenance funds for Primary/Secondary pavements

• 71 of the 86 Localities that receive maintenance payments are expending more on maintenance than the amount received from VDOT

• Urbanized streets are not necessarily the same as VDOT maintained streets

• Negligible correlation between deficiency in pavement when compared to:
  • Spending  • % Truck Traffic  • AVMT  • % Population

• Possible Causes:
  • Age  • Quality of CN  • Utility Conflicts

• Even with the data, this is still an incomplete picture.
Local Government Workgroup – Recommendations

• Make no changes in current methodology for Local Government maintenance payment
• Continue to track overall system performance, monitor progress, and assess needs over time
Locally Maintained Pavement Condition Assessment
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