APPENDIX G
DISTRICT RATING FORMS, RATING RESULTS, AND PMIS SCORE COMPARISON

Table G.1 – Sample ACP Pavement Section Rating Form

County: Chambers
Highway: FM 1985
Beginning Reference Marker: 730+1.0
Ending Reference Marker: 730+1.5

Please circle your assessment of the pavement condition for this section.

Very Good

Good

Fair

Poor

Very Poor

Please briefly describe why you selected this assessment.

Place a check mark beside the distresses that affected your assessment in the table below.

Distress	Low	Medium	High
Shallow Rutting			
Deep Rutting			
Patching			
Failures			
Alligator Cracking			
Longitudinal Cracking			
Block Cracking			
Transverse Cracking			
Raveling			
Flushing			
Oxidized Surface			

Ride Quality			
Other (describe) _____			

Please assign a Distress Score to the section on a scale from 1 to 100, with 100 representing a section with no distress. This score reflects your distress assessment (not PMIS). _____

Please assign a Ride Score to the section on a scale from 0.0 to 5.0, with 5 representing excellent ride quality (perfectly smooth). This score reflects your ride quality assessment (not PMIS). _____

Please assign a Condition Score to the section on a scale of 1 to 100, with 100 representing a pavement in excellent condition. This score reflects your distress and ride quality assessment (not PMIS). _____

Do you think this roadway section is due for a treatment (yes/no)?_____

If you answered yes to the above question, when do you think the treatment should be applied.

Now	
In 1 year	
In 2 years	
In 3 to 4 years	
Greater than 4 years	

Please recommend a treatment for this roadway section.

Seal coat	
Microsurface	
ACP overlay	
Mill and ACP overlay	
Base repair and Seal Coat	
Base repair and ACP overlay	
Patching	
Crack sealing	
Full depth recycling	
Reconstruction	
Other – describe _____ _____	

Please write down any other factors that affected your treatment selection:

Table G.2 – Sample CRCP Pavement Section Rating Form

County: Chambers
Highway: IH 10 R lane (Eastbound Mainlane)
Beginning Reference Marker: 798+0.0
Ending Reference Marker: 798+0.5

Please circle your assessment of the pavement condition for this section.

Very Good

Good

Fair

Poor

Very Poor

Please briefly describe why you selected this assessment.

Place a check mark beside the distresses that affected your assessment in the table below.

Distress	Low	Medium	High
Punchouts			
Spalled Cracks			
Asphalt Patches			
Concrete Patches			
Joint or Crack Faulting			
Joint or Crack Separation			
Ride Quality			
Other (describe) _____			

Please assign a Distress Score to the section on a scale from 1 to 100, with 100 representing a section with no distress. This score reflects your distress assessment (not PMIS). _____

Please assign a Ride Score to the section on a scale from 0.0 to 5.0, with 5 representing excellent ride quality (perfectly smooth). This score reflects your ride quality assessment (not PMIS). _____

Please assign a Condition Score to the section on a scale of 1 to 100, with 100 representing a pavement in excellent condition. This score reflects your distress and ride quality assessment (not PMIS).
_____

Do you think this roadway section is due for a treatment (yes/no)?_____

If you answered yes to the above question, when do you think the treatment should be applied.

Now	
In 1 year	
In 2 years	
In 3 to 4 years	
Greater than 4 years	

Please recommend a treatment for this roadway section.

Full Depth Repair of Concrete Pavement (FDRCP)	
FDRCP and ACP Overlay	
ACP Overlay	
Mill and ACP overlay	
Grooving and Grinding	
Unbonded Concrete Overlay	
Bonded Concrete Overlay	
Joint Sealing	
Repair of Spalled Cracks or Joints	
Reconstruction	
Other – describe _____ _____	

Please write down any other factors that affected your treatment selection:

Table G.3 – Sample JCP Pavement Section Rating Form

County: Jefferson
Highway: IH 10 X lane (Westbound Frontage Road)
Beginning Reference Marker: 851+0.5
Ending Reference Marker: 851+0.0

Please circle your assessment of the pavement condition for this section.

Very Good

Good

Fair

Poor

Very Poor

Please briefly describe why you selected this assessment.

Place a check mark beside the distresses that affected your assessment in the table below.

Distress	Low	Medium	High
Failed Joints and Cracks			
Failures			
Shattered Slabs			
Slabs with Longitudinal Cracks			
Concrete Patches			
Asphalt Patches			
Faulted Joints or Cracks			
Separated Joints or Cracks			
Ride Quality			
Other (describe) _____			

Please assign a Distress Score to the section on a scale from 1 to 100, with 100 representing a section with no distress. This score reflects your distress assessment (not PMIS). _____

Please assign a Ride Score to the section on a scale from 0.0 to 5.0, with 5 representing excellent ride quality (perfectly smooth). This score reflects your ride quality assessment (not PMIS). _____

Please assign a Condition Score to the section on a scale of 1 to 100, with 100 representing a pavement in excellent condition. This score reflects your distress and ride quality assessment (not PMIS).
_____

Do you think this roadway section is due for a treatment (yes/no)?_____

If you answered yes to the above question, when do you think the treatment should be applied.

Now	
In 1 year	
In 2 years	
In 3 to 4 years	
Greater than 4 years	

Please recommend a treatment for this roadway section.

Full Depth Repair of Concrete Pavement (FDRCP)	
FDRCP and ACP Overlay	
ACP Overlay	
Mill and ACP overlay	
Grooving and Grinding	
Unbonded Concrete Overlay	
Bonded Concrete Overlay	
Joint Sealing	
Repair of Spalled Cracks or Joints	
Reconstruction	
Other – describe _____ _____	

Please write down any other factors that affected your treatment selection:

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
1	1	BMT	Orange	FM 1136	0434+01.0	0434+01.5	100	100	3.2	Very Good	A	NN	5	2	88000	Very Good	More Flush	95	4	90	FALSE
2	1	BMT	Orange	FM 1136	0434+01.0	0434+01.5	100	100	3.2	Very Good	A	NN	5	2	88000	Good	very shallow rutting in isolated areas, slight flushing in wheel paths, good ride	90	4	90	FALSE
1	2	BMT	Tyler	FM 0092	0398+00.0	0398+0.5	100	100	3.5	Very Good	A	NN	6	2	122500	Very Good	Excellent seal coat	100	4.5	98	FALSE
2	2	BMT	Tyler	FM 0092	0398+00.0	0398+0.5	100	100	3.5	Very Good	A	NN	6	2	122500	Very Good	no observed distresses, very good ride	100	5	100	FALSE
1	3	BMT	Hardin	US 0096 L	0440+01.0	0440+1.5	99	99	3.4	Very Good	C	NN	1	3	470400	Good		90	3.5	80	FALSE
2	3	BMT	Hardin	US 0096 L	0440+01.0	0440+1.5	99	99	3.4	Very Good	C	NN	1	3	470400	Good	One patch, good ride	85	3	80	FALSE
1	4	BMT	Liberty	FM 0160	0454+00.0	0454+00.5	99	99	2.5	Very Good	A	NN	5	1	12500	Good	Edge Patching, ride	80	4	75	TRUE
2	4	BMT	Liberty	FM 0160	0454+00.0	0454+00.5	99	99	2.5	Very Good	A	NN	5	1	12500	Fair	few failures, shallow to severe rutting. Ride is poor.	55	2	40	FALSE
1	5	BMT	Jefferson	SS 0380 R	0446+00.0	0446+00.4	93	93	3.4	Very Good	A	PM	8	3	621500	Very Good	No defects. Ride issue	100	4.5	97	FALSE
2	5	BMT	Jefferson	SS 0380 R	0446+00.0	0446+00.4	93	93	3.4	Very Good	A	PM	8	3	621500	Good	Slight raveling of PFC at driveways, fair ride.	80	3	80	TRUE
1	6	BMT	Chambers	SH 0124 L	0480+00.0	0480+00.5	100	90	3	Very Good	J	NN	2	3	228250	Good	Concrete Faulting	90	4	85	FALSE
2	6	BMT	Chambers	SH 0124 L	0480+00.0	0480+00.5	100	90	3	Very Good	J	NN	2	3	228250	Good	one failure, some minor faulting, good ride	75	3	70	FALSE
1	7	BMT	Jefferson	SS 0136	0448+00.0	0448+00.5	100	78	2.3	Good	J	MRhb	2	2	36500	Fair	joint failure and ride	70	1.5	35	TRUE
2	7	BMT	Jefferson	SS 0136	0448+00.0	0448+00.5	100	78	2.3	Good	J	MRhb	2	2	36500						FALSE
1	8	BMT	Liberty	US 0090 K	0890+00.0	0890+00.5	75	75	3.9	Good	A	PM	5	3	580000	Fair	Crack+Ride	70	3	60	TRUE
2	8	BMT	Liberty	US 0090 K	0890+00.0	0890+00.5	75	75	3.9	Good	A	PM	5	3	580000	Fair	Shallow rutting, alligator cracking, long & transverse cracking, fair ride	45	3	40	TRUE
1	9	BMT	Orange	FM 0105	0456+00.0	0456+00.5	100	71	2.7	Good	A	LRhb	7	3	396000	Very Good	pavement excellent, ride very good	100	4.8	98	FALSE
2	9	BMT	Orange	FM 0105	0456+00.0	0456+00.5	100	71	2.7	Good	A	LRhb	7	3	396000	Very Good	No observed distresses. fairly recent surface. good ride	100	4	95	FALSE
1	10	BMT	Orange	FM 1136	0434+00.0	0434+00.5	100	65	2.1	Fair	A	MRhb	5	2	130500	Good	long failures, ride	90	4	80	TRUE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
2	10	BMT	Orange	FM 1136	0434+00.0	0434+00.5	100	65	2.1	Fair	A	MRhb	5	2	130500	Good	Minor rutting, minor alligator cracking, minor flushing, good ride except at RR crossing.	85	4	85	FALSE
1	11	BMT	Liberty	US 0090 K	0880+00.5	0880+01.0	62	62	3.3	Fair	A	PM	5	3	456500	Fair	Patch, Long Cracks+Ride	75	2.5	60	TRUE
2	11	BMT	Liberty	US 0090 K	0880+00.5	0880+01.0	62	62	3.3	Fair	A	PM	5	3	456500	Fair	Shallow rutting, alligator cracking, patches, long. cracking, fair ride	65	3	60	TRUE
1	12	BMT	Jefferson	FM 0366	0450+01.5	0452+00.0	100	59	2.5	Fair	J	NN	2	3	924000	Good	RR crossing poor, pvt good shape, ride just ok	95	2.5	70	FALSE
2	12	BMT	Jefferson	FM 0366	0450+01.5	0452+00.0	100	59	2.5	Fair	J	NN	2	3	924000	Good	Most of lane has been replaced by newer concrete. good ride except at RR crossing	95	4	95	FALSE
1	13	BMT	Jasper	FM 0105	0426+00.0	0426+00.5	100	43	2.2	Poor	A	MRhb	7	3	350000	Good	No noted potholes, some rock loss	90	4	85	FALSE
2	13	BMT	Jasper	FM 0105	0426+00.0	0426+00.5	100	43	2.2	Poor	A	MRhb	7	3	350000	Fair	rough shallow rutting, areas of oxidation	50	3	60	FALSE
1	14	BMT	Liberty	SL 0573 R	0426+00.5	0426+01.0	36	21	2	Very Poor	C	HRhb	1	2	151250	Fair	ride, crack, failures	40	60	35	TRUE
2	14	BMT	Liberty	SL 0573 R	0426+00.5	0426+01.0	36	21	2	Very Poor	C	HRhb	1	2	151250						FALSE
1	15	BMT	Orange	FM 0105	0452+00.0	0452+00.5	69	1	0.8	Very Poor	A	HRhb	5	3	252000	Good	A few Patches, few edge failures, ride	85	3.5	75	TRUE
2	15	BMT	Orange	FM 0105	0452+00.0	0452+00.5	69	1	0.8	Very Poor	A	HRhb	5	3	252000	Poor	Flushing, shallow to deep rutting, some failures, oxidation, & poor ride.	50	2	40	TRUE
1	16	BMT	Chambers	IH 0010 R	0798+00.0	0798+00.5	100	100	3.9	Very Good	C	NN	1	3	1803425	Very Good	ride	100	4	95	FALSE
2	16	BMT	Chambers	IH 0010 R	0798+00.0	0798+00.5	100	100	3.9	Very Good	C	NN	1	3	1803425	Very Good	No observed distresses, good ride	100	4	95	FALSE
1	17	BMT	Jefferson	IH 0010 A	0851+00.0	0851+00.5	0	0	0	Very Poor	A		8	3	671400	Good	Ride	100	3.5	95	FALSE
2	17	BMT	Jefferson	IH 0010 A	0851+00.0	0851+00.5	0	0	0	Very Poor	A		8	3	671400	Fair	fair ride, minor flushing, transverse cracking at joints in the old concrete pavement	75	3	70	FALSE
1	18	BMT	Jefferson	US 0069 X	0520+00.0	0520+00.5	0	0	0	Very Poor	J		2	3	926550	Very poor	Failures, ride	25	1.5	15	TRUE
2	18	BMT	Jefferson	US 0069 X	0520+00.0	0520+00.5	0	0	0	Very Poor	J		2	3	926550						FALSE
1	19	BMT	Jefferson	IH 0010 X	0851+00.0	0851+00.5	0	0	0	Very Poor	J		2	3	639450	Good	few transverse Cracks + ride	95	3.5	95	FALSE
2	19	BMT	Jefferson	IH 0010 X	0851+00.0	0851+00.5	0	0	0	Very Poor	J		2	3	639450		DIDN'T COMPLETE DUE TO THIS SECTION BEING FLEXIBLE (OVERLAY OVER CONCRETE)				FALSE
1	20	BMT	Chambers	IH 0010 A	0809+00.0	0809+00.5	54	54	3.2	Fair	A	PM	5	1	25650	Poor	Rutting, Surface deterioration, some patching	40	2.5	40	TRUE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
2	20	BMT	Chambers	IH 0010 A	0809+00.0	0809+00.5	54	54	3.2	Fair	A	PM	5	1	25650	Very poor	Several patches, several shallow and deep rutting in the wheel path & shoulder area and very poor ride.	25	2	20	TRUE
1	10	BWD	Lampasas	US0183	0446 +01.0	0446 +01.6	69	58	2.9	Fair	A	MRhb	5	3	751500	Poor	Alligator and Longitudinal Cracking, Patching.	40	3	30	TRUE
2	10	BWD	Lampasas	US0183	0446 +01.0	0446 +01.6	69	58	2.9	Fair	A	MRhb	5	3	751500	Poor	Cracking (fatigue), failures, patching, and ride.	40	2.5	30	TRUE
1	11	BWD	Lampasas	US0183	0446 +01.6	0448A+00.0	83	44	2.4	Poor	A	MRhb	5	3	462000	Poor	Alligator and Longitudinal Cracking, Patching.	40	3	30	TRUE
2	11	BWD	Lampasas	US0183	0446 +01.6	0448A+00.0	83	44	2.4	Poor	A	MRhb	5	3	462000	Poor	Cracking (fatigue), failures, patching, and ride.	40	2.5	30	TRUE
1	12	BWD	San Saba	FM2732	0466 +00.0	0466 +00.5	100	100	3.3	Very Good	A	NN	10	1	15400	Poor	Alligator and Longitudinal Cracking, Patching.	40	3	30	TRUE
2	12	BWD	San Saba	FM2732	0466 +00.0	0466 +00.5	100	100	3.3	Very Good	A	NN	10	1	15400	Fair	Ride, cracking, and patching.	75	2.2	60	TRUE
1	13	BWD	San Saba	FM2732	0466 +00.5	0466 +01.0	93	93	2.4	Very Good	A	LRhb	10	1	15400	Poor	Alligator and Longitudinal Cracking, Patching.	40	3	30	TRUE
2	13	BWD	San Saba	FM2732	0466 +00.5	0466 +01.0	93	93	2.4	Very Good	A	LRhb	10	1	15400	Fair	Ride, cracking, and patching.	75	2.2	60	TRUE
1	14	BWD	San Saba	FM2732	0466 +01.0	0466 +01.5	99	77	1.8	Good	A	MRhb	10	1	15400	Fair	Flushing, alligator cracking, patching.	75		70	TRUE
2	14	BWD	San Saba	FM2732	0466 +01.0	0466 +01.5	99	77	1.8	Good	A	MRhb	10	1	15400	Fair	Ride, cracking, and patching.	75	2.2	60	TRUE
1	15	BWD	San Saba	FM2732	0466 +01.5	0468 +00.0	100	100	3.1	Very Good	A	NN	10	1	15400	Fair	Flushing, alligator cracking, patching.	75		70	TRUE
2	15	BWD	San Saba	FM2732	0466 +01.5	0468 +00.0	100	100	3.1	Very Good	A	NN	10	1	15400	Fair	Ride, cracking, and patching.	75	2.2	60	TRUE
1	16	BWD	Lampasas	FM0580	0518 +00.5	0518 +01.0	96	96	2.9	Very Good	A	NN	10	2	150500	Good	Patching, failures, many overlays	90		80	FALSE
2	16	BWD	Lampasas	FM0580	0518 +00.5	0518 +01.0	96	96	2.9	Very Good	A	NN	10	2	150500	Good	Few Patching.	80	3	80	TRUE
1	17	BWD	Lampasas	FM0580	0518 +01.0	0518 +01.2	55	55	2.8	Fair	A	NN	10	2	150500	Good	Patching, failures, many overlays	90		80	FALSE
2	17	BWD	Lampasas	FM0580	0518 +01.0	0518 +01.2	55	55	2.8	Fair	A	NN	10	2	150500	Good	Few Patching.	80	3	80	TRUE
1	18	BWD	Burnet	FM1478	0392 +00.0	0392 +00.5	96	96	3.4	Very Good	A	NN	10	2	42000	Fair	Patching, failures, edge raveling.	65	2.5	65	TRUE
2	18	BWD	Burnet	FM1478	0392 +00.0	0392 +00.5	96	96	3.4	Very Good	A	NN	10	2	42000	Good	Patching, failures, Rutting	87		87	FALSE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
1	19	BWD	Burnet	FM1478	0392 +00.5	0392 +01.0	99	99	3.6	Very Good	A	NN	10	2	42000	Fair	Patching, failures, edge raveling.	65	2.5	65	TRUE
2	19	BWD	Burnet	FM1478	0392 +00.5	0392 +01.0	99	99	3.6	Very Good	A	NN	10	2	42000	Good	Patching, failures, Rutting	87		87	FALSE
1	20	BWD	Burnet	FM1478	0392 +01.0	0392 +01.5	74	74	3.4	Good	A	NN	10	2	42000	Fair	Patching, failures, edge raveling.	65	2.5	65	TRUE
2	20	BWD	Burnet	FM1478	0392 +01.0	0392 +01.5	74	74	3.4	Good	A	NN	10	2	42000	Good	Patching, failures, Rutting	87		87	FALSE
1	21	BWD	Burnet	FM1478	0392 +01.5	0394 +00.0	74	74	3.4	Good	A	NN	10	2	42000	Fair	Patching, failures, edge raveling.	65	2.5	65	TRUE
2	21	BWD	Burnet	FM1478	0392 +01.5	0394 +00.0	74	74	3.4	Good	A	NN	10	2	42000	Good	Patching, failures, Rutting	87		87	FALSE
1	17	BRY	Walker	IH 45 L	0130+00.0	0130+00.5	72	72	4.5	Good	A	PM	5	3	11193000	Fair	Inside lane slight mill. Inlay crack seal some raveling of cmhb surface mix	86	4	80	TRUE
2	17	BRY	Walker	IH 45 L	0130+00.0	0130+00.5	72	72	4.5	Good	A	PM	5	3	11193000	Good	no bad issue, but old	90	4	90	TRUE
1	11	BRY	Freestone	US 84	0750+00.5	0750+01.0	93	93	3.9	Very Good	A	PM	5	3	803000	Very Good	solid, good	95	4.8	92	FALSE
2	11	BRY	Freestone	US 84	0750+00.5	0750+01.0	93	93	3.9	Very Good	A	PM	5	3	803000	Good	no major pavement problems	90	4.1	90	FALSE
1	16	BRY	Freestone	IH 45 R	0201+00.0	0201+00.5	76	76	4.1	Good	A	PM	8	3	1110550	Good	solid	90	4	92	TRUE
2	16	BRY	Freestone	IH 45 R	0201+00.0	0201+00.5	76	76	4.1	Good	A	PM	8	3	1110550	Poor	left lane cracked severely	80	4.2	80	TRUE
1	19	BRY	Freestone	IH 45 R	0204+00.0	0204+00.5	68	68	4.5	Fair	A	PM	8	3	1110550	Good	solid, minor crack	87	4	90	TRUE
2	19	BRY	Freestone	IH 45 R	0204+00.0	0204+00.5	68	68	4.5	Fair	A	PM	8	3	1110550	Poor	left lane severely cracked	80	4.2	80	TRUE
1	12	BRY	Walker	US 190	0746+00.0	0746+00.5	87	87	3.3	Good	A	NN	5	3	581000	Good		85	3.5	85	FALSE
2	12	BRY	Walker	US 190	0746+00.0	0746+00.5	87	87	3.3	Good	A	NN	5	3	581000	Fair	flushed w.p. Shallow rutting	90	4	90	TRUE
1	18	BRY	Burleson	SH 36	0554+00.0	0554+00.5	69	69	4.7	Fair	A	PM	5	3	484000	Good	lot of crack seal, spot seals	85	4	85	TRUE
2	18	BRY	Burleson	SH 36	0554+00.0	0554+00.5	69	69	4.7	Fair	A	PM	5	3	484000	Good	some, few crack, polished look, few patches	85	3.5	80	FALSE
1	7	BRY	Walker	SH 30 L	0672+00.0	0672+00.5	100	100	4.4	Very Good	A	NN	5	3	414000	Very Good	no issues/needs	98	4.5	90	FALSE
2	7	BRY	Walker	SH 30 L	0672+00.0	0672+00.5	100	100	4.4	Very Good	A	NN	5	3	414000	Very Good	some surface milling from project for ride	99	4.2	99	FALSE
1	22	BRY	Freestone	FM 27	0620+00.0	0620+00.5	87	33	2.1	Very Poor	A	MR	5	3	236500	Fair	flush, level up, patch 80%	85	3.5	80	TRUE
2	22	BRY	Freestone	FM 27	0620+00.0	0620+00.5	87	33	2.1	Very Poor	A	MR	5	3	236500	Poor	Fresh Level-up	80	3	70	TRUE
1	15	BRY	Madison	US 190 K	0708+00.0	0708+00.5	87	83	3.1	Good	A	NN	5	3	288000	Good	no issue that need attention soon	85	4	85	FALSE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
2	15	BRY	Madison	US 190 K	0708+00.0	0708+00.5	87	83	3.1	Good	A	NN	5	3	288000	Good	no failures, worn seal coat, shifting roaddbed, level up done	85	4	85	TRUE
1	2	BRY	Burleson	SH 21 L	0610+00.0	0610+00.5	100	100	4.8	Very Good	A	NN	5	3	210000	Very Good	No cracks, ride good, no signs on weakness	98	5	95	FALSE
2	2	BRY	Burleson	SH 21 L	0610+00.0	0610+00.5	100	100	4.8	Very Good	A	NN	5	3	210000	Very Good	good ride, no major distress	98	4.2	98	FALSE
1	5	BRY	Walker	FM 1696	0670+00.5	0670+01.0	100	100	3.4	Very Good	A	NN	10	2	154000	Very Good	new	99	4.5	95	FALSE
2	5	BRY	Walker	FM 1696	0670+00.5	0670+01.0	100	100	3.4	Very Good	A	NN	10	2	154000	Very Good	new seal coat	100	4	100	FALSE
1	10	BRY	Robertson	FM 485	0606+00.5	0606+01.0	98	98	3.8	Very Good	A	NN	5	2	121000	Good	not smooth, no cracks, flushing, solid	90	3.5	90	FALSE
2	10	BRY	Robertson	FM 485	0606+00.5	0606+01.0	98	98	3.8	Very Good	A	NN	5	2	121000	Good	small level-up patch some ride chatter some flushing	90	4	90	FALSE
1	23	BRY	Burleson	FM 975	0420+00.0	0420+00.5	42	14	1.5	Very Poor	A	HR	5	2	143000	Poor	crack seal, spot level up, section out of shape, poor ride	60	2	45	TRUE
2	23	BRY	Burleson	FM 975	0420+00.0	0420+00.5	42	14	1.5	Very Poor	A	HR	5	2	143000	Poor	cracking, uneven, patches	70	2.5	70	TRUE
1	6	BRY	Burleson	FM 60	0610+01.0	0610+01.5	100	100	3.5	Very Good	A	NN	5	2	99000	Good	flushing, patched, ok but not great, solid	85	3.5	80	FALSE
2	6	BRY	Burleson	FM 60	0610+01.0	0610+01.5	100	100	3.5	Very Good	A	NN	5	2	99000	Good	low cracking, Ride problems some level-up in flushed areas	90	4	90	FALSE
1	8	BRY	Freestone	SH 75	0348+00.0	0348+00.5	100	100	3.1	Very Good	A	NN	5	2	104500	Good	ride poor.	95	3.9	95	FALSE
2	8	BRY	Freestone	SH 75	0348+00.0	0348+00.5	100	100	3.1	Very Good	A	NN	5	2	104500	Fair	uneven, rough, solid, few cracks	80	3	80	TRUE
1	20	BRY	Leon	FM 542	0346+00.0	0346+00.5	100	58	2	Fair	A	MR	5	2	129500	Good	No problem that some flushing and rough in town area	90	3.8	90	FALSE
2	20	BRY	Leon	FM 542	0346+00.0	0346+00.5	100	58	2	Fair	A	MR	5	2	129500	Good	1-2 failures, little rough, flushing	85	3.5	80	FALSE
1	4	BRY	Brazos	SH OSR	0628+00.5	0628+01.0	100	100	2.8	Very Good	A	NN	5	2	73500	Poor	bad ride, halted crack	90	2.5	80	TRUE
2	4	BRY	Brazos	SH OSR	0628+00.5	0628+01.0	100	100	2.8	Very Good	A	NN	5	2	73500	Good	ride poor, fault, needs level-up	87	3.5	85	TRUE
1	9	BRY	Brazos	SH OSR	0624+01.5	0626+00.0	100	99	2.7	Very Good	A	NN	5	2	73500	Good	fault cracking, ride 80/80	90	4	87	FALSE
2	9	BRY	Brazos	SH OSR	0624+01.5	0626+00.0	100	99	2.7	Very Good	A	NN	5	2	73500	Poor	bad ride however Placed hma level-up	90	2.5	80	TRUE
1	14	BRY	Freestone	SH 75	0332+00.0	0332+00.5	84	84	2.9	Good	A	PM	5	2	30800	Fair	rough, flushing	85	3	75	TRUE
2	14	BRY	Freestone	SH 75	0332+00.0	0332+00.5	84	84	2.9	Good	A	PM	5	2	30800	Fair	flushing edge problems (outside of lane)	75	3.5	70	TRUE
1	13	BRY	Grimes	FM 2562	0414+00.0	0414+00.5	85	85	3.3	Good	A	NN	10	1	26600	Good	wp flushing	100	3.9	98	FALSE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
2	13	BRY	Grimes	FM 2562	0414+00.0	0414+00.5	85	85	3.3	Good	A	NN	10	1	26600	Good	Pavement is good condition, but seal coat is flushed	95	4	90	FALSE
1	1	BRY	Brazos	FM 159	0434+00.0	0434+00.5	100	100	3.3	Very Good	A	NN	5	2	35000	Good	new seal coat	95	3.6	90	TRUE
2	1	BRY	Brazos	FM 159	0434+00.0	0434+00.5	100	100	3.3	Very Good	A	NN	5	2	35000	Very Good	new seal coat, no cracks, edges good	95	4	95	FALSE
1	3	BRY	Robertson	FM 2549	0400+00.5	0400+01.0	100	100	3.1	Very Good	A	PM	10	1	21000	Good	above spot	98	3.5	95	FALSE
2	3	BRY	Robertson	FM 2549	0400+00.5	0400+01.0	100	100	3.1	Very Good	A	PM	10	1	21000	Good	solid, chatter	95	4	90	FALSE
1	21	BRY	Freestone	FM 1449	0332+00.0	0332+00.5	90	42	1.3	Poor	A	HR	5	1	3600	Fair	old, oxidize	80	2.5	75	TRUE
2	21	BRY	Freestone	FM 1449	0332+00.0	0332+00.5	90	42	1.3	Poor	A	HR	5	1	3600	Fair	narrow	75	2.9	70	TRUE
1	24	BRY	Washington	US 290 L	0676+00.0	0676+00.5	0	0	3.1	Very Poor	A	0	5	3	660000	Poor	milled surface for skid improvement	60	4	60	TRUE
2	24	BRY	Washington	US 290 L	0676+00.0	0676+00.5	0	0	3.1	Very Poor	A	0	5	3	660000	Poor	pushing of HMA, milled areas for texturing, patches	90	3.5	80	TRUE
1	1	DAL	Kaufman	IH 0020 R	0491+00.0	0491+00.5	100	100	3.8	Very Good	J	NN	3	3	929175	Good	general condition of pavement	95	3.5	90	TRUE
4	1	DAL	Kaufman	IH 0020 R	0491+00.0	0491+00.5	100	100	3.8	Very Good	J	NN	3	3	929175	Good	District pavement office selected	95	5	95	FALSE
7	1	DAL	Kaufman	IH 0020 R	0491+00.0	0491+00.5	100	100	3.8	Very Good	J	NN	3	3	929175	Very Good	smooth ride, very little distress (amount and/or severity)	90	4.2	93	TRUE
8	1	DAL	Kaufman	IH 0020 R	0491+00.0	0491+00.5	100	100	3.8	Very Good	J	NN	3	3	929175	Very Good	No noticeable distresses. Excellent condition for 20 to 25 yr old JCP. It should be noted that other segments of this roadway exhibit very severe longitudinal cracking. The pavement design is almost identical LP 288 in Denton (PVR design).	95	3.8	90	FALSE
1	2	DAL	Navarro	SH 0031 L	0600+00.0	0600+00.5	100	100	3.5	Very Good	C	NN	1	3	210000	Very Good	Fairly new CRCP	95	4.5	95	FALSE
4	2	DAL	Navarro	SH 0031 L	0600+00.0	0600+00.5	100	100	3.5	Very Good	C	NN	1	3	210000	Very Good	District pavement section selected	100	5	100	FALSE
7	2	DAL	Navarro	SH 0031 L	0600+00.0	0600+00.5	100	100	3.5	Very Good	C	NN	1	3	210000	Very Good	rides smooth, no major distress	95	4.8	95	FALSE
8	2	DAL	Navarro	SH 0031 L	0600+00.0	0600+00.5	100	100	3.5	Very Good	C	NN	1	3	210000	Very Good	Recent construction. Ride quality fair.	95	2.7	92	TRUE
1	3	DAL	Navarro	SH 0031	0622+00.0	0622+00.5	99	77	2.8	Good	A	NN	8	3	654500	Fair	overall condition of the pavement, distress & ride	65	2.5	60	TRUE
4	3	DAL	Navarro	SH 0031	0622+00.0	0622+00.5	99	77	2.8	Good	A	NN	8	3	654500	Good	District pavement section selected	75	3.8	75	TRUE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
7	3	DAL	Navarro	SH 0031	0622+00.0	0622+00.5	99	77	2.8	Good	A	NN	8	3	654500	Good	Distresses not too severe causes not bad ride	75	3.8	80	TRUE
8	3	DAL	Navarro	SH 0031	0622+00.0	0622+00.5	99	77	2.8	Good	A	NN	8	3	654500	Fair	Overlay of old JCP. Joints and cracks reflecting through surface. Poor ride quality. Much of the distress is due to moisture damage in the outside lane due to poor drainage of this curb and gutter section.	60	2	50	TRUE
1	4	DAL	Dallas	FM 1382 L	0280+00.0	0280+00.5	100	84	2.9	Good	J	NN	2	3	630000	Good	General Condition	85	3.5	80	FALSE
6	4	DAL	Dallas	FM 1382 L	0280+00.0	0280+00.5	100	84	2.9	Good	J	NN	2	3	630000	Good	there are a few spall areas and a few failed joints (minor) overall pavement looked good	85	4	88	FALSE
7	4	DAL	Dallas	FM 1382 L	0280+00.0	0280+00.5	100	84	2.9	Good	J	NN	2	3	630000	Very Good	Very low distress count and overlay	90	4.6	95	TRUE
8	4	DAL	Dallas	FM 1382 L	0280+00.0	0280+00.5	100	84	2.9	Good	J	NN	2	3	630000	Very Good	Fairly recent construction, very little if any noticeable distresses	96	3.75	93	TRUE
1	5	DAL	Denton	FM 0156	0252+00.0	0252+00.5	100	90	3	Very Good	A	NN	9	3	618000	Good	general condition	85	3.5	90	TRUE
7	5	DAL	Denton	FM 0156	0252+00.0	0252+00.5	100	90	3	Very Good	A	NN	9	3	618000	Good	Little structural distress	88	4	90	TRUE
8	5	DAL	Denton	FM 0156	0252+00.0	0252+00.5	100	90	3	Very Good	A	NN	9	3	618000	Good	Very minor, shallow rutting. New seal coat.	88	3.5	85	TRUE
1	6	DAL	Dallas	IH 0035E A	0445+00.0	0445+00.5	100	78	2.3	Good	J	MRhb	3	2	160200	Good	Condition of the pavement	90	3	90	FALSE
5	6	DAL	Dallas	IH 0035E A	0445+00.0	0445+00.5	100	78	2.3	Good	J	MRhb	3	2	160200	Very Good	Minimal cracking of slabs	90	4.5	90	TRUE
7	6	DAL	Dallas	IH 0035E A	0445+00.0	0445+00.5	100	78	2.3	Good	J	MRhb	3	2	160200	Good	some distress, rides good	85	4	88	TRUE
1	7	DAL	Denton	FM 1173	0560+00.5	0560+01.0	67	64	3.1	Fair	A	PM	5	3	180000	Fair	general condition of pavement	60	3	60	TRUE
7	7	DAL	Denton	FM 1173	0560+00.5	0560+01.0	67	64	3.1	Fair	A	PM	5	3	180000	Good	rate section has 2 typical and type surface	80	4	82	TRUE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
8	7	DAL	Denton	FM 1173	0560+00.5	0560+01.0	67	64	3.1	Fair	A	PM	5	3	180000	Good	Shallow wheel ruts. seal 4 to 5 years old. Wheel paths shiny due to crushing of lightweight aggregate. Probable skid loss.	80	3.6	77	TRUE
1	8	DAL	Denton	FM 2281 L	0246+00.0	0246+00.5	100	84	2.9	Good	C	NN	1	3	660000	Good	general condition	70	2.5	60	TRUE
7	8	DAL	Denton	FM 2281 L	0246+00.0	0246+00.5	100	84	2.9	Good	C	NN	1	3	660000	Good	slightly bumpy at joints	88	3.3	80	FALSE
8	8	DAL	Denton	FM 2281 L	0246+00.0	0246+00.5	100	84	2.9	Good	C	NN	1	3	660000	Very Good	Fairly new construction. One full depth repair in middle lane. good quality patch. No noticeable distress. Good ride quality.	95	4	95	FALSE
1	9	DAL	Ellis	FM 0066	0592+01.5	0594+00.0	100	100	4.5	Very Good	A	PM	9	3	291500	Good	General condition of pavement	85	3.8	90	TRUE
2	9	DAL	Ellis	FM 0066	0592+01.5	0594+00.0	100	100	4.5	Very Good	A	PM	9	3	291500	Good	good ride, no major failures observed, general appearance of pavement is consistent	85	4	88	TRUE
7	9	DAL	Ellis	FM 0066	0592+01.5	0594+00.0	100	100	4.5	Very Good	A	PM	9	3	291500	Good	rides good, very low distress	90	4.6	95	TRUE
8	9	DAL	Ellis	FM 0066	0592+01.5	0594+00.0	100	100	4.5	Very Good	A	PM	9	3	291500	Very Good	light transverse and longitudinal cracking. Cracks are sealed. Good ride. Fairly recent rehabilitation/reconstruction	94	4.5	94	TRUE
1	10	DAL	Dallas	IH 0045 A	0270+00.5	0271+00.0	76	76	3.6	Good	J	LRhb	2	2	50850	Good	General Condition of roadway	90	3.5	75	FALSE
3	10	DAL	Dallas	IH 0045 A	0270+00.5	0271+00.0	76	76	3.6	Good	J	LRhb	2	2	50850	Good	Fairly new concrete pavement, no evidence of distress	99	4.5	90	FALSE
7	10	DAL	Dallas	IH 0045 A	0270+00.5	0271+00.0	76	76	3.6	Good	J	LRhb	2	2	50850	Good	Bumping on old pvt, smooth on new pvt	90	4.5	95	FALSE
1	11	DAL	Denton	SH 0121 X	0268+00.5	0268+01.0	62	62	3	Fair	C	NN	1	2	124300	Good	general condition	90	3.5	90	TRUE
7	11	DAL	Denton	SH 0121 X	0268+00.5	0268+01.0	62	62	3	Fair	C	NN	1	2	124300	Very Good	Ride good, little distress	88	4.5	90	FALSE
8	11	DAL	Denton	SH 0121 X	0268+00.5	0268+01.0	62	62	3	Fair	C	NN	1	2	124300	Very Good	Construction is less than 2 years old. Like new condition. No visible distress. Good ride.	100	4.5	100	FALSE
1	12	DAL	Denton	SL 0288 R	0562+00.0	0562+00.5	57	44	2.8	Poor	J	LRhb	3	3	437250	Fair	general condition	50	2.5	50	TRUE
7	12	DAL	Denton	SL 0288 R	0562+00.0	0562+00.5	57	44	2.8	Poor	J	LRhb	3	3	437250	Fair	Distress, cracks begin to fault, unseal cracks	70	4	75	TRUE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
8	12	DAL	Denton	SL 0288 R	0562+00.0	0562+00.5	57	44	2.8	Poor	J	LRhb	3	3	437250	Fair	Severe longitudinal cracking in the middle of the outside lane. Otherwise pavement is in generally good condition.	70	2	65	TRUE
1	13	DAL	Dallas	SH 0289 L	0262+01.5	0264+00.0	86	56	2.6	Fair	A	PM	8	3	542500	Fair	Visual condition	40	2	40	TRUE
7	13	DAL	Dallas	SH 0289 L	0262+01.5	0264+00.0	86	56	2.6	Fair	A	PM	8	3	542500	Fair	open cracks, bumping	75	2.5	70	TRUE
8	13	DAL	Dallas	SH 0289 L	0262+01.5	0264+00.0	86	56	2.6	Fair	A	PM	8	3	542500	Fair	Old, oxidized patched overlay.	60	2.5	55	TRUE
1	14	DAL	Ellis	US 0287 R	0488+00.0	0488+00.5	81	63	2.8	Fair	A	MRhb	5	3	720000	Very Good	General Condition of the pavement	85	4	90	TRUE
2	14	DAL	Ellis	US 0287 R	0488+00.0	0488+00.5	81	63	2.8	Fair	A	MRhb	5	3	720000	Good	Decent ride, some cracking, no major failures, heave areas are problematic	85	3.5	82	TRUE
7	14	DAL	Ellis	US 0287 R	0488+00.0	0488+00.5	81	63	2.8	Fair	A	MRhb	5	3	720000	Very Good	smooth, very low distress	90	4.7	96	TRUE
8	14	DAL	Ellis	US 0287 R	0488+00.0	0488+00.5	81	63	2.8	Fair	A	MRhb	5	3	720000	Very Good	Fairly recent new construction. No noticeable distresses	99	4	98	TRUE
1	15	DAL	Kaufman	FM 0148	0280+00.0	0280+00.5	46	32	2.2	Very Poor	A	MRhb	10	2	104500	Very poor	general condition	30	1.5	30	TRUE
4	15	DAL	Kaufman	FM 0148	0280+00.0	0280+00.5	46	32	2.2	Very Poor	A	MRhb	10	2	104500	Fair	District pavement office selected	55	2	40	TRUE
7	15	DAL	Kaufman	FM 0148	0280+00.0	0280+00.5	46	32	2.2	Very Poor	A	MRhb	10	2	104500	Poor	Very rough and bumpy ride. Edge, patch, shear failures	35	1.5	30	TRUE
8	15	DAL	Kaufman	FM 0148	0280+00.0	0280+00.5	46	32	2.2	Very Poor	A	MRhb	10	2	104500	Very poor	Quarter point failures with open longitudinal cracks more than one inch wide. Old, oxidized, unsealed blade patches , shallow and deep rutting. No apparent maintenance of any kind done for quite some time.	15	0.5	10	TRUE
1	16	DAL	Ellis	US 0287 R	0492+00.0	0492+00.5	100	100	3.6	Very Good	A	NN	5	3	752125	Good	General condition of the roadway	90	4	90	TRUE
7	16	DAL	Ellis	US 0287 R	0492+00.0	0492+00.5	100	100	3.6	Very Good	A	NN	5	3	752125	Very Good	seal coated recently	90	4	92	TRUE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
8	16	DAL	Ellis	US 0287 R	0492+00.0	0492+00.5	100	100	3.6	Very Good	A	NN	5	3	752125	Very Good	Sealed this past summer. Prior to seal there were a lot of longitudinal shrinkage cracks, but they were sealed and routine maintenance well done.	96	4.5	96	TRUE
1	17	DAL	Dallas	US 0075 A	0264+00.0	0264+00.5	100	43	2.2	Poor	J	MRhb	3	3	371600	Good	General condition of the pavement	85	3	85	FALSE
7	17	DAL	Dallas	US 0075 A	0264+00.0	0264+00.5	100	43	2.2	Poor	J	MRhb	3	3	371600	Very Good	Good ride, no/very little distress	90	4	95	FALSE
8	17	DAL	Dallas	US 0075 A	0264+00.0	0264+00.5	100	43	2.2	Poor	J	MRhb	3	3	371600	Good	Some longitudinal joint separation. Light longitudinal cracking. Ride ok for JCP	90	2.8	85	TRUE
1	18	DAL	Dallas	SL 0012 R	0630+01.0	0630+01.5	68	57	2.9	Fair	C	LRhb	1	3	517500	Poor	Visual condition of the roadway	40	3	50	FALSE
3	18	DAL	Dallas	SL 0012 R	0630+01.0	0630+01.5	68	57	2.9	Fair	C	LRhb	1	3	517500	Fair	This section is in generally fair condition. Only tow areas have been patched/leveled up with asphalt. 95% of transverse cracks are sealed. Good ride quality	75	3.5	75	TRUE
7	18	DAL	Dallas	SL 0012 R	0630+01.0	0630+01.5	68	57	2.9	Fair	C	LRhb	1	3	517500	Fair	Bumpy due to distresses	40	2	30	TRUE
8	18	DAL	Dallas	SL 0012 R	0630+01.0	0630+01.5	68	57	2.9	Fair	C	LRhb	1	3	517500	Fair	Older construction. Longitudinal and transverse cracking (sealed). Some surface spalling. Utility cuts w/ rough patches in outside lane resulting in poor ride.	75	2.5	70	TRUE
1	19	DAL	Ellis	FM 2258	0574+00.0	0574+00.5	27	17	2.1	Very Poor	A	LRhb	10	2	41800	Very poor	General condition of the roadway	25	1.5	30	TRUE
2	19	DAL	Ellis	FM 2258	0574+00.0	0574+00.5	27	17	2.1	Very Poor	A	LRhb	10	2	41800	Poor	Heavy truck traffic from gas wells has caused severe rutting in areas- outside wheel path is most affected	50	2.5	50	TRUE
7	19	DAL	Ellis	FM 2258	0574+00.0	0574+00.5	27	17	2.1	Very Poor	A	LRhb	10	2	41800	Very poor	very rough ride + severe ? And edge failures	20	1	10	TRUE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
8	19	DAL	Ellis	FM 2258	0574+00.0	0574+00.5	27	17	2.1	Very Poor	A	LRhb	10	2	41800	Very poor	Failures, deep quarter point rutting and failures. Longitudinal cracking. Lots of patching. Soil conditions in this area are extremely unfavorable Natural gas compressor station on this roadway	40	1.5	35	TRUE
1	20	DAL	Navarro	FM 1126	0312+01.5	0314+00.0	100	100	4.2	Very Good	A	PM	10	1	21600	Very Good	New ACP	100	4.5	100	FALSE
4	20	DAL	Navarro	FM 1126	0312+01.5	0314+00.0	100	100	4.2	Very Good	A	PM	10	1	21600	Very Good	District Pavement section selected	100	5	100	FALSE
7	20	DAL	Navarro	FM 1126	0312+01.5	0314+00.0	100	100	4.2	Very Good	A	PM	10	1	21600	Very Good	New, additional shoulder	95	4.5	98	FALSE
8	20	DAL	Navarro	FM 1126	0312+01.5	0314+00.0	100	100	4.2	Very Good	A	PM	10	1	21600	Very Good	New rehab and overlay. pavement in new condition. No noticeable distresses.	100	4.8	99	FALSE
1	21	DAL	Collin	FM 0543	0226+00.0	0226+00.5	17	15	2.5	Very Poor	A	MRhb	10	2	45000	Poor	general condition	30	1.5	30	TRUE
7	21	DAL	Collin	FM 0543	0226+00.0	0226+00.5	17	15	2.5	Very Poor	A	MRhb	10	2	45000	Very poor	Severe distresses, shear failures, unsafe to drive on	25	1	20	TRUE
8	21	DAL	Collin	FM 0543	0226+00.0	0226+00.5	17	15	2.5	Very Poor	A	MRhb	10	2	45000	Very poor	Open longitudinal quarter point cracks and failures. Patching of failures appears to be several years old, unsealed and also failed. Deep rutting is also present.	30	2	30	TRUE
1	22	DAL	Dallas	SL 0012 L	0630+00.0	0630+00.5	26	10	2.1	Very Poor	C	HRhb	1	3	517500	Poor	General condition of the pavement	30	2.5	40	TRUE
3	22	DAL	Dallas	SL 0012 L	0630+00.0	0630+00.5	26	10	2.1	Very Poor	C	HRhb	1	3	517500	Poor	1/4 mile section of this roadway has 10-12 areas where concrete has filed. Right lane continues to settle, and joints have separated approximately 2-3" wide.	50	2	49	TRUE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
7	22	DAL	Dallas	SL 0012 L	0630+00.0	0630+00.5	26	10	2.1	Very Poor	C	HRhb	1	3	517500	Fair	Bumpy due to distress	50	3	40	TRUE
8	22	DAL	Dallas	SL 0012 L	0630+00.0	0630+00.5	26	10	2.1	Very Poor	C	HRhb	1	3	517500	Fair	Older construction. Spalled joints, cracks and surface spalling. Ride OK for old crcp.	70	2	65	TRUE
1	23	DAL	Kaufman	FM 0987	0278+00.0	0278+00.5	38	20	2.4	Very Poor	A	MRhb	9	3	181500	Poor	General Condition	40	2	40	TRUE
4	23	DAL	Kaufman	FM 0987	0278+00.0	0278+00.5	38	20	2.4	Very Poor	A	MRhb	9	3	181500	Poor	District pavement section assigned	35	2	35	TRUE
7	23	DAL	Kaufman	FM 0987	0278+00.0	0278+00.5	38	20	2.4	Very Poor	A	MRhb	9	3	181500	Poor	lots of distresses, rough ride	40	2	40	TRUE
8	23	DAL	Kaufman	FM 0987	0278+00.0	0278+00.5	38	20	2.4	Very Poor	A	MRhb	9	3	181500	Poor	Longitudinal cracking, alligator cracking, quarter point patching Some maintenance in the form of quarter point levelup and pothole patching. Widespread surface distresses	20	2.5	15	TRUE
1	24	DAL	Dallas	SH 0078 R	0276+00.0	0276+00.5	0	0	1.6	Very Poor	J		3	3	640000	Poor	General Condition of the pavement	35	2	30	TRUE
7	24	DAL	Dallas	SH 0078 R	0276+00.0	0276+00.5	0	0	1.6	Very Poor	J		3	3	640000	Fair	Patches, joint distresses	75	3.5	78	TRUE
8	24	DAL	Dallas	SH 0078 R	0276+00.0	0276+00.5	0	0	1.6	Very Poor	J		3	3	640000	Fair	Full depth concrete repairs, few spalled joints, some joints not patched. Ride OK	75	3	75	TRUE
1	25	DAL	Navarro	SH 0031	0624+00.0	0624+00.6	92	14	1.5	Very Poor	A	HRhb	8	3	625500	Poor	Too many distresses and poor ride	50	2.5	45	TRUE
4	25	DAL	Navarro	SH 0031	0624+00.0	0624+00.6	92	14	1.5	Very Poor	A	HRhb	8	3	625500	Fair	District Pavement section selected	65	3.3	65	TRUE
7	25	DAL	Navarro	SH 0031	0624+00.0	0624+00.6	92	14	1.5	Very Poor	A	HRhb	8	3	625500	Poor	Distress and humpy ride	50	2	45	TRUE
8	25	DAL	Navarro	SH 0031	0624+00.0	0624+00.6	92	14	1.5	Very Poor	A	HRhb	8	3	625500	Poor	Poor drainage (curb & gutter section) resulting in failures and patching in outside lane Lots of City utility cuts with rough patches resulting in poor ride quality	50	1.5	40	TRUE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
1	26	DAL	Collin	SS 0359 R	0596+01.0	0596+01.5	100	4	0.6	Very Poor	J	MRhb	2	2	147000	Fair	general condition of the pavement	40	2.5	40	TRUE
7	26	DAL	Collin	SS 0359 R	0596+01.0	0596+01.5	100	4	0.6	Very Poor	J	MRhb	2	2	147000	Fair	Bumpy joints, distress	75	3	70	TRUE
8	26	DAL	Collin	SS 0359 R	0596+01.0	0596+01.5	100	4	0.6	Very Poor	J	MRhb	2	2	147000	Good	State of pavement maintenance is good, Full depth repairs have decent ride quality. Cracks are sealed. Overall ride is good for a JCP.	70	3	68	FALSE
1	1	ELP	El Paso	SH0020	0322 +00.5	0322 +01.0	100	100	4	Very Good	A	NN	08	3	1560000	Poor	The amount and type of distresses affected the assessment. The pavement is too young to be experiencing so many problems.	60	3	65	TRUE
1	2	ELP	El Paso	SH0020	0322 +01.0	0322 +01.5	100	100	3.9	Very Good	A	MRhb	08	3	1560000	Poor	The amount and type of distresses affected the assessment. The pavement is too young to be experiencing so many problems.	60	3	65	TRUE
1	3	ELP	El Paso	SH0020	0322 +01.5	0324 +00.0	100	100	3.9	Very Good	A	HRhb	08	3	1560000	Poor	The amount and type of distresses affected the assessment. The pavement is too young to be experiencing so many problems.	60	3	65	TRUE
1	4	ELP	Husdepth	FM0034	0368 +00.0	0368 +00.5	100	41	1.2	Poor	A	MRhb	10	1	4950	Good	The lack of structural distresses and amount of oxidation affected the assessment.	72	2	72	TRUE
1	5	ELP	Husdepth	FM0034	0368 +00.5	0368 +01.0	87	68	1.8	Fair	A	MRhb	10	1	4950	Good	The lack of structural distresses and amount of oxidation affected the assessment.	72	2	72	TRUE
1	6	ELP	Husdepth	FM0034	0368 +01.0	0368 +01.5	100	31	1	Very Poor	A	HRhb	10	1	4950	Good	The lack of structural distresses and amount of oxidation affected the assessment.	72	2	72	TRUE
1	7	ELP	Husdepth	FM0034	0368 +01.5	0370 +00.0	98	89	2	Good	A	LRhb	10	1	4950	Good		72	2	72	TRUE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
1	8	ELP	Husdepth	FM0034	0370 +00.0	0370 +00.6	92	87	2.1	Good	A	MRhb	10	1	4950	Good	The lack of structural distresses and amount of oxidation affected the assessment.	72	2	72	TRUE
1	9	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0058 +00.0	0058 +00.5	73	34	1.3	Very Poor	A	MRhb	10	1	6050	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	10	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0058 +00.5	0058 +01.0	84	71	1.9	Good	A	LRhb	10	1	6050	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	11	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0058 +01.0	0058 +01.5	57	29	1.4	Very Poor	A	MRhb	10	1	6050	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	12	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0058 +01.5	0060 +00.0	69	32	1.3	Very Poor	A	HRhb	10	1	2750	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	13	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0060 +00.0	0060 +00.5	91	71	1.8	Good	A	LRhb	10	1	2750	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	14	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0060 +00.5	0060 +01.0	79	61	1.8	Fair	A	MRhb	10	1	2750	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	15	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0060 +01.0	0060 +01.4	99	98	2.2	Very Good	A	LRhb	10	1	2750	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	16	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0060 +01.4	0062 +00.0	94	85	2	Good	A	LRhb	05	1	2750	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	17	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0062 +00.0	0062 +00.5	100	100	2.3	Very Good	A	NN	10	1	2750	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	18	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0062 +00.5	0062 +01.0	100	95	2.1	Very Good	A	LRhb	10	1	2750	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
1	19	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0062 +01.0	0062 +01.5	85	55	1.6	Fair	A	MRhb	10	1	2750	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	20	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0062 +01.5	0064 +00.0	100	77	1.8	Good	A	MRhb	10	1	2200	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	21	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0064 +00.0	0064 +00.5	98	40	1.2	Poor	A	MRhb	10	1	2200	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	22	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0064 +00.5	0064 +01.0	100	100	2.3	Very Good	A	PM	10	1	2200	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	23	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0064 +01.0	0064 +01.5	81	79	2.2	Good	A	LRhb	10	1	2200	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	24	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0064 +01.5	0066 +00.0	88	62	1.7	Fair	A	MRhb	10	1	2200	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	25	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0066 +00.0	0066 +00.5	90	52	1.5	Fair	A	MRhb	10	1	2200	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	26	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0066 +00.5	0066 +01.0	86	82	2.1	Good	A	LRhb	10	1	2200	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	27	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0066 +01.0	0066 +01.5	65	51	1.8	Fair	A	LRhb	10	1	2200	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	28	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0066 +01.5	0068 +00.0	86	72	1.9	Good	A	LRhb	10	1	2200	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
1	29	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0068 +00.0	0068 +00.5	81	22	0.9	Very Poor	A	HRhb	10	1	2200	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	30	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0068 +00.5	0068 +01.0	83	53	1.6	Fair	A	MRhb	10	1	2200	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	31	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0068 +01.0	0068 +01.5	76	27	1.1	Very Poor	A	HRhb	10	1	2200	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	32	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0068 +01.5	0070 +00.0	72	30	1.2	Very Poor	A	HRhb	10	1	6050	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	33	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0070 +00.0	0070 +00.5	78	18	0.8	Very Poor	A	HRhb	10	1	6050	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	34	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0070 +00.5	0070 +01.0	80	57	1.7	Fair	A	MRhb	10	1	6050	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	35	ELP	Husdepth	FM0192	0070 +01.0	0070 +01.5	93	60	1.6	Fair	A	MRhb	10	1	6050	Poor	The amount of patching, narrow lane width, rolling terrain and low ADT affected the assessment.	65	1.8	63	TRUE
1	36	ELP	El Paso	FM2637	0024 +00.0	0024 +00.5	100	100	2.4	Very Good	A	LRhb	10	1	4400	Very Good	The low ADT and the lack of distresses affected this assessment.	100	3.4	100	FALSE
1	37	ELP	El Paso	FM0259	0010 +01.0	0010 +01.2	82	21	1.8	Very Poor	A	HRhb	10	3	376000	Good	The rough ride, small amount of flushing and soil conditions of area affected the assessment.	87	3.3	85	FALSE
1	38	ELP	El Paso	FM1281	0030 +00.0	0030 +00.5	94	61	2.6	Fair	A	MRhb	06	3	1100000	Good	The lack of structural identification, superficial damage (longitudinal cracking) and ADT (medium-heavy) affected the assessment.	75	2.9	80	TRUE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
1	39	ELP	El Paso	FM1281	0030 +00.5	0030 +01.0	77	60	2.8	Fair	A	MRhb	06	3	1350000	Good	The lack of structural identification, superficial damage (longitudinal cracking) and ADT (medium-heavy) affected the assessment.	75	2.9	80	TRUE
1	40	ELP	Culberson	SH0054	0368 +01.0	0368 +01.5	100	95	2.1	Very Good	A	LRhb	10	1	6600	Fair	The amount of flushing (about 80%) for a this young pavement affected the assessment.	87	2.7	79	TRUE
1	41	ELP	Culberson	SH0054	0368 +01.5	0370 +00.0	100	95	2.1	Very Good	A	LRhb	10	1	6600	Fair	The amount of flushing (about 80%) for a this young pavement affected the assessment.	87	2.7	79	TRUE
1	42	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010R	0091 +00.0	0091 +00.5	100	100	4.1	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Good	The lack of distresses, especially being that it's a 40 year old pavement, affected the assessment.	81	3	85	FALSE
1	43	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010R	0091 +00.5	0092 +00.0	100	100	3.9	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Good	The lack of distresses, especially being that it's a 40 year old pavement, affected the assessment.	81	3	85	FALSE
1	44	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010R	0092 +00.0	0092 +00.5	100	100	4	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Good	The lack of distresses, especially being that it's a 40 year old pavement, affected the assessment.	81	3	85	FALSE
1	45	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010R	0092 +00.5	0093 +00.0	100	100	4.2	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Good	The lack of distresses, especially being that it's a 40 year old pavement, affected the assessment.	81	3	85	FALSE
1	46	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010R	0093 +00.0	0093 +00.5	100	100	3.9	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Good	The lack of distresses, especially being that it's a 40 year old pavement, affected the assessment.	81	3	85	FALSE
1	47	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010R	0093 +00.5	0094 +00.0	100	100	4.2	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Good	The lack of distresses, especially being that it's a 40 year old pavement, affected the assessment.	81	3	85	FALSE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
1	48	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010R	0099 +00.0	0099 +00.5	89	89	3.7	Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of spalling affected the assessment.	79	3.4	73	FALSE
1	49	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010R	0099 +00.5	0099 +00.8	50	50	3.6	Fair	C	NN	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of spalling affected the assessment.	79	3.4	73	FALSE
1	50	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010R	0099 +00.8	0100 +00.0	100	100	3.8	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of spalling affected the assessment.	79	3.4	73	FALSE
1	51	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010R	0100 +00.0	0100 +00.5	99	99	3.9	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of spalling affected the assessment.	79	3.4	73	FALSE
1	52	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010R	0100 +00.5	0101 +00.0	100	100	4.1	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of spalling affected the assessment.	79	3.4	73	FALSE
1	53	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010R	0101 +00.0	0101 +00.5	92	92	3.7	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of spalling affected the assessment.	79	3.4	73	FALSE
1	54	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010R	0101 +00.5	0102 +00.0	100	100	4	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of spalling affected the assessment.	79	3.4	73	FALSE
1	55	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010R	0102 +00.0	0102 +00.5	43	43	3.9	Poor	C	HRhb	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of spalling affected the assessment.	79	3.4	73	FALSE
1	56	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010R	0102 +00.5	0103 +00.0	100	99	3.2	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of spalling affected the assessment.	79	3.4	73	FALSE
1	57	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010R	0103 +00.0	0103 +00.5	89	89	3.7	Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of spalling affected the assessment.	79	3.4	73	FALSE
1	58	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010R	0103 +00.5	0104 +00.0	56	56	3.6	Fair	C	NN	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of spalling affected the assessment.	79	3.4	73	FALSE
1	59	ELP	El Paso	IH0010R	0009 +00.0	0009 +00.5	100	100	3.8	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	2212200	Good	The small amount of distresses like spalling and patching affected this assessment. Spalling should be monitored.	80	3.4	80	FALSE
1	60	ELP	El Paso	IH0010R	0009 +00.5	0010 +00.0	48	48	3.4	Poor	C	HRhb	01	3	2212200	Good	The small amount of distresses like spalling and patching affected this assessment. Spalling should be monitored.	80	3.4	80	FALSE
1	61	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0090 +00.5	0091 +00.0	18	18	3.7	Very Poor	C	HRhb	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of patching and transverse cracking affected the assessment.	77	2.9	77	TRUE
1	62	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0091 +00.0	0091 +00.5	69	69	3.7	Fair	C	NN	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of patching and transverse cracking affected the assessment.	77	2.9	77	TRUE
1	63	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0091 +00.5	0092 +00.0	37	37	4.1	Poor	C	HRhb	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of patching and transverse cracking affected the assessment.	77	2.9	77	TRUE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
1	64	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0092 +00.0	0092 +00.5	62	62	4.1	Fair	C	NN	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of patching and transverse cracking affected the assessment.	77	2.9	77	TRUE
1	65	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0092 +00.5	0093 +00.0	34	34	4.5	Very Poor	C	HRhb	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of patching and transverse cracking affected the assessment.	77	2.9	77	TRUE
1	66	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0093 +00.0	0093 +00.5	78	78	4.3	Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of patching and transverse cracking affected the assessment.	77	2.9	77	TRUE
1	67	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0093 +00.5	0094 +00.0	99	99	4.3	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Fair	The amount of patching and transverse cracking affected the assessment.	77	2.9	77	TRUE
1	68	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0098 +00.0	0098 +00.5	43	43	3.9	Poor	C	HRhb	01	3	447600	Good	The small amount of patching, being that it is an old pavement (30-40 years), and the good traffic flow affected this assessment.	90	3.4	95	FALSE
1	69	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0098 +00.5	0098 +00.7	50	50	3.7	Fair	C	HRhb	01	3	447600	Good	The small amount of patching, being that it is an old pavement (30-40 years), and the good traffic flow affected this assessment.	90	3.4	95	FALSE
1	70	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0098 +00.7	0099 +00.0	39	39	3.7	Poor	C	HRhb	01	3	447600	Good	The small amount of patching, being that it is an old pavement (30-40 years), and the good traffic flow affected this assessment.	90	3.4	95	FALSE
1	71	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0099 +00.0	0099 +00.5	89	89	3.9	Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Good	The small amount of patching, being that it is an old pavement (30-40 years), and the good traffic flow affected this assessment.	90	3.4	95	FALSE
1	72	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0099 +00.5	0099 +00.8	43	43	3.5	Poor	C	HRhb	01	3	447600	Good	The small amount of patching, being that it is an old pavement (30-40 years), and the good traffic flow affected this assessment.	90	3.4	95	FALSE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
1	73	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0099 +00.8	0100 +00.0					C	HRhb	01	3	447600	Good	The small amount of patching, being that it is an old pavement (30-40 years), and the good traffic flow affected this assessment.	90	3.4	95	FALSE
1	74	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0100 +00.0	0100 +00.5	37	37	3.7	Poor	C	HRhb	01	3	447600	Good	The small amount of patching, being that it is an old pavement (30-40 years), and the good traffic flow affected this assessment.	90	3.4	95	FALSE
1	75	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0100 +00.5	0101 +00.0	91	91	3.8	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Good	The small amount of patching, being that it is an old pavement (30-40 years), and the good traffic flow affected this assessment.	90	3.4	95	FALSE
1	76	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0101 +00.0	0101 +00.5	99	99	3.8	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Good	The small amount of patching, being that it is an old pavement (30-40 years), and the good traffic flow affected this assessment.	90	3.4	95	FALSE
1	77	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0101 +00.5	0102 +00.0	99	99	3.8	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Good	The small amount of patching, being that it is an old pavement (30-40 years), and the good traffic flow affected this assessment.	90	3.4	95	FALSE
1	78	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0102 +00.0	0102 +00.5	99	99	3.8	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Good	The small amount of patching, being that it is an old pavement (30-40 years), and the good traffic flow affected this assessment.	90	3.4	95	FALSE
1	79	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0102 +00.5	0103 +00.0	78	78	3.9	Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Good	The small amount of patching, being that it is an old pavement (30-40 years), and the good traffic flow affected this assessment.	90	3.4	95	FALSE
1	80	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0103 +00.0	0103 +00.5	100	100	4	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Good	The small amount of patching, being that it is an old pavement (30-40 years), and the good traffic flow affected this assessment.	90	3.4	95	FALSE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
1	81	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0103 +00.5	0104 +00.0	56	56	3.9	Fair	C	NN	01	3	447600	Good	The small amount of patching, being that it is an old pavement (30-40 years), and the good traffic flow affected this assessment.	90	3.4	95	FALSE
1	82	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0104 +00.0	0104 +00.5	99	99	4.1	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Good	The small amount of patching, being that it is an old pavement (30-40 years), and the good traffic flow affected this assessment.	90	3.4	95	FALSE
1	83	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0104 +00.5	0105 +00.0	78	78	4.1	Good	C	NN	01	3	447600	Good	The small amount of patching, being that it is an old pavement (30-40 years), and the good traffic flow affected this assessment.	90	3.4	95	FALSE
1	84	ELP	Husdepth	IH0010L	0105 +00.0	0105 +00.5	69	69	3.9	Fair	C	NN	01	3	447600	Good	The small amount of patching, being that it is an old pavement (30-40 years), and the good traffic flow affected this assessment.	90	3.4	95	FALSE
1	85	ELP	El Paso	SL0375R	0045 +00.0	0045 +00.5	100	100	4.5	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	1045200	Very Good	The lack of distresses and young age of pavement affected the assessment.	100	3.8	100	FALSE
1	86	ELP	El Paso	SL0375R	0045 +00.5	0046 +00.0	100	100	4.5	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	1045200	Very Good	The lack of distresses and young age of pavement affected the assessment.	100	3.8	100	FALSE
1	87	ELP	El Paso	SL0375L	0040 +00.0	0040 +00.5	100	100	3.9	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	1461600	Very Good	The lack of distresses and young age of pavement affected the assessment.	100	3.8	100	FALSE
1	88	ELP	El Paso	SL0375L	0040 +00.5	0040 +00.7	100	100	4	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	1045200	Very Good	The lack of distresses and young age of pavement affected the assessment.	100	3.8	100	FALSE
1	89	ELP	El Paso	SL0375L	0040 +00.7	0041 +00.0	100	100	4.2	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	1045200	Very Good	The lack of distresses and young age of pavement affected the assessment.	100	3.8	100	FALSE
1	90	ELP	El Paso	SL0375L	0035 +00.0	0035 +00.4	55	55	3.8	Fair	C	HRhb	01	3	518700	Good	The concrete pavement section is in good condition.	87	3.5	95	TRUE
1	91	ELP	El Paso	SL0375L	0035 +00.4	0035 +00.8	100	100	4.1	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	474175	Good	The concrete pavement section is in good condition.	87	3.5	95	TRUE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	County	Highway	BRM	ERM	PMIS Distress Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score 2011	PMIS Ride Score 2011	PMIS Condition Score Class	PMIS Broad Pavement Type	PMIS Needs Estimate 2011	PMIS Detail Pavement Type	Traffic Class Code	Traffic Class Value	Rater Condition Assessment	Rater's Reason for Assessment	Rater's Distress Score	Rater's Ride Score	Rater's Condition Score	Rater's Opinion if Treatment Is Due
1	92	ELP	El Paso	SL0375L	0035 +00.8	0036 +00.0	100	100	4.1	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	437700	Good	The concrete pavement section is in good condition.	87	3.5	95	TRUE
1	93	ELP	El Paso	SL0375L	0025 +00.5	0026 +00.0	100	100	4.2	Very Good	C	NN	01	3	530075	Very Good	The lack of distresses and the good shape of the pavement affected this assessment.	100	3.5	98	FALSE

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
1	1	BMT				NN
2	1	BMT				NN
1	2	BMT				NN
2	2	BMT				NN
1	3	BMT			concrete good shape	NN
2	3	BMT				NN
1	4	BMT	In 1 year	Resurface +slurry seal		LR
2	4	BMT	In 2 years	Base repair and Seal Coat		LR
1	5	BMT				NN
2	5	BMT	Greater than 4 years	fog seal	Recommend fog seal to rejuvenate the PFC	PM
1	6	BMT				NN
2	6	BMT	Greater than 4 years	Clean & Seal joints, FDR as needed, & thin overlay		LR
1	7	BMT	In 2 years	full depth repair of concrete (FDRCP)+Grooving and grinding+joint sealing		LR
2	7	BMT				NN
1	8	BMT	In 2 years	Level+seal	should overlay but funds short	PM
2	8	BMT	Greater than 4 years	Mill and ACP Overlay		LR
1	9	BMT				NN
2	9	BMT				NN
1	10	BMT	Greater than 4 years	level + seal		PM

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
2	10	BMT				NN
1	11	BMT	In 2 years	ACP Overlay, seal coat, ACP overlay		PM
2	11	BMT	Greater than 4 years	Mill and ACP Overlay		LR
1	12	BMT		RR approaches & crossing		NN
2	12	BMT				NN
1	13	BMT				NN
2	13	BMT	Greater than 4 years	Microsurface		NN
1	14	BMT	In 2 years	FDRCP, joint sealing, repair of spalled cracks or joints		LR
2	14	BMT				NN
1	15	BMT	In 3 to 4 years	Level + seal		PM
2	15	BMT	In 2 years	Base repair and overlay		LR
1	16	BMT				NN
2	16	BMT				NN
1	17	BMT				NN
2	17	BMT				NN
1	18	BMT	Now	Patching, crack sealing, reconstruction		HR
2	18	BMT				NN
1	19	BMT				NN
2	19	BMT				NN
1	20	BMT	In 1 year	leveling-seal coat		PM

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
2	20	BMT	Now	Full depth recycling		HR
1	10	BWD	NOW	Mill and ACP overlay, Base repair and ACP overlay, Full depth recycling, and Reconstruction	Needs Funds	HR
2	10	BWD	In 1 year	Reconstruction	Same as assessment. Fatigue cracks, patching, longitudinal cracking, and ride. US Highway with high ADT.	HR
1	11	BWD	NOW	Mill and ACP overlay, Base repair and ACP overlay, Full depth recycling, and Reconstruction	Needs Funds	HR
2	11	BWD	In 1 year	Reconstruction	Same as assessment. Fatigue cracks, patching, longitudinal cracking, and ride. US Highway with high ADT.	HR
1	12	BWD	NOW	Mill and ACP overlay, Base repair and ACP overlay, Full depth recycling, and Reconstruction	Needs Funds	HR
2	12	BWD	Greater than 4 years	Seal coat	Low volume, maintenance for us will be repaired and get sealed every 10 years.	PM
1	13	BWD	NOW	Mill and ACP overlay, Base repair and ACP overlay, Full depth recycling, and Reconstruction	Needs Funds	HR
2	13	BWD	Greater than 4 years	Seal coat	Low volume, maintenance for us will be repaired and get sealed every 10 years.	PM
1	14	BWD	In 1 year	Base repair and Seal Coat	Low AADT	LR
2	14	BWD	Greater than 4 years	Seal coat	Low volume, maintenance for us will be repaired and get sealed every 10 years.	PM
1	15	BWD	In 1 year	Base repair and Seal Coat	Low AADT	LR
2	15	BWD	Greater than 4 years	Seal coat	Low volume, maintenance for us will be repaired and get sealed every 10 years.	PM
1	16	BWD		Seal coat and Mill and ACP overlay		MR
2	16	BWD	In 2 years	Seal coat	Due for a seal coat.	PM
1	17	BWD		Seal coat and Mill and ACP overlay		MR
2	17	BWD	In 2 years	Seal coat	Due for a seal coat.	PM
1	18	BWD	In 1 year	Seal coat	Repair failures and Seal Coat, low ADT.	PM
2	18	BWD		Seal coat and Base repair and Seal Coat		LR

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
1	19	BWD	In 1 year	Seal coat	Repair failures and Seal Coat, low ADT.	PM
2	19	BWD		Seal coat and Base repair and Seal Coat		LR
1	20	BWD	In 1 year	Seal coat	Repair failures and Seal Coat, low ADT.	PM
2	20	BWD		Seal coat and Base repair and Seal Coat		LR
1	21	BWD	In 1 year	Seal coat	Repair failures and Seal Coat, low ADT.	PM
2	21	BWD		Seal coat and Base repair and Seal Coat		LR
1	17	BRY	In 2 years	Mill and ACP overlay		LR
2	17	BRY	Greater than 4 years	Mill and ACP Overlay		LR
1	11	BRY				NN
2	11	BRY		Crack sealing	may need a seal coat/ thin overlay (high traffic) in a couple of years	NN
1	16	BRY	In 3 to 4 years	Mill and ACP Overlay		LR
2	16	BRY	In 2 years	Mill and ACP Overlay	outside lane has already been Milled/inlaid	LR
1	19	BRY	In 3 to 4 years	Mill and ACP Overlay		LR
2	19	BRY	In 2 years	Mill and ACP Overlay	right lane has already been Milled/inlaid	LR
1	12	BRY	Greater than 4 years	ACP Overlay		NN
2	12	BRY	In 1 year	level up	fix rutting improve friction	PM
1	18	BRY	In 2 years	Seal Coat	looks good, a little movement from soil. Ride still good	PM
2	18	BRY	Greater than 4 years	Seal Coat		PM
1	7	BRY	Greater than 4 years	Seal Coat		PM
2	7	BRY	Greater than 4 years	crack sealing		PM
1	22	BRY	Greater than 4 years	ACP Overlay		PM
2	22	BRY	Now	Full depth recycling	need to repair section full depth-level up not working	HR
1	15	BRY	Greater than 4 years	seal coat	No Structural issue	PM

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
2	15	BRY	In 3 to 4 years	ACP Overlay		PM
1	2	BRY	Greater than 4 years	ACP Overlay		PM
2	2	BRY	In 2 years	Crack sealing	routine crack sealing will be needed 2 years	PM
1	5	BRY				NN
2	5	BRY	Greater than 4 years		no problems	NN
1	10	BRY	Greater than 4 years	Seal Coat		PM
2	10	BRY	Greater than 4 years	hydroblast flushing		PM
1	23	BRY	In 1 year	Mill and ACP Overlay	joint moving cracking due to soil-mill because of cant ?? Then overlay	LR
2	23	BRY	In 1 year	Mill and ACP Overlay	?? Section	LR
1	6	BRY	Greater than 4 years	Seal Coat		PM
2	6	BRY	In 2 years	Crack sealing	watch flushing and cracking. May need to check friction in a year. Not an immediate concern.	PM
1	8	BRY		Crack sealing		PM
2	8	BRY	In 3 to 4 years	ACP Overlay		PM
1	20	BRY	Greater than 4 years	seal coat	flushing	PM
2	20	BRY	Greater than 4 years	Base repair and Seal Coat		LR
1	4	BRY	In 1 year	Full depth recycling	reestablish x-slope add geogrid	HR
2	4	BRY	In 1 year	Crack sealing, level up/ chip seal		PM
1	9	BRY	Greater than 4 years			NN
2	9	BRY	In 1 year	Full depth recycling	need to establish cross slope and add left Lane geogrid	HR
1	14	BRY	In 3 to 4 years	ACP Overlay, Mill and ACP overlay		LR
2	14	BRY	In 1 year	Seal Coat-ACP Overlay-Level-up	cracking and flushing poor ride	LR
1	13	BRY			May need some chip seal to restore Friction if flushing	NN

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
2	13	BRY	Greater than 4 years	Seal Coat		NN
1	1	BRY	In 1 year	Crack sealing	bad section for cracking. Will need frequent crack repair/ treatment	PM
2	1	BRY	Greater than 4 years			NN
1	3	BRY				NN
2	3	BRY	Greater than 4 years			NN
1	21	BRY	In 3 to 4 years	Base repair and Seal Coat		LR
2	21	BRY	In 1 year	Seal Coat-? Perfect s.c	narrow low volume road	PM
1	24	BRY	In 1 year	Mill and ACP Overlay-spot repairs, full depth	shoving/ failure appears to be only a problem in top list of milled areas	LR
2	24	BRY	In 2 years	Mill and ACP Overlay		LR
1	1	DAL	Greater than 4 years	ACP Overlay, Grooving and grinding, Joint sealing, Repair of spalled cracks or joints	treatments suggested are possible options, not need all at the same time	PM
4	1	DAL				NN
7	1	DAL	In 2 years	Joint Sealing	Not all seals on main lanes are in existence	PM
8	1	DAL		Monitor for longitudinal cracking		NN
1	2	DAL			about 0.125 mi at (end?) is old overlayed PCD (600+00 to 600+0.12)	NN
4	2	DAL	Greater than 4 years		Good condition concrete pavement	NN
7	2	DAL				NN
8	2	DAL	In 3 to 4 years	Joint Sealing		PM
1	3	DAL	In 2 years	Mill and ACP Overlay	curbed, needs milling before overlay	LR
4	3	DAL	In 2 years	Microsurface, Mill and ACP overlay		LR

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
7	3	DAL	In 2 years	Seal coat, crack sealing	urban	PM
8	3	DAL	Now	Crack sealing	Needs moisture barrier. Traffic and turning movements too high for seal coat.	PM
1	4	DAL	Greater than 4 years	Joint Sealing, Repair of Spalled Cracks or Joints	Fairly new, in good shape	PM
6	4	DAL		Repair of spalled cracks or joints		PM
7	4	DAL	In 3 to 4 years	Joint Sealing	may need to re-seal by then	PM
8	4	DAL	In 3 to 4 years	Joint Sealing	New construction (less than 3 yrs old)	PM
1	5	DAL	Greater than 4 years	Seal Coat	This is nearly widened lane sealed road	PM
7	5	DAL	In 2 years	Seal Coat	Depends on heavy traffic (amount and turnings)	PM
8	5	DAL	In 3 to 4 years	Microsurface, ACP overlay, UTBC if rutting remains shallow	selection of any of the three below should depend on the severity of rutting and cracking at time of application).	PM
1	6	DAL	Greater than 4 years	Joint Sealing, Repair of Spalled Cracks or Joints	First 0.1 mi is old cpcd, Overlay, the rest new CPCD	PM
5	6	DAL	In 2 years	Crack sealing	Minimal visible cracks would repair crack seal	PM
7	6	DAL	In 2 years	seal cracks	monitor cracks	PM
1	7	DAL	In 3 to 4 years	Base repair and ACP overlay, Full depth recycling	This is a split section of newer $ older	LR
7	7	DAL	In 2 years	Seal Coat	seal coat may not cracks and treat raveling and or flushing which may be safety hazard during wet weather. Depends on how heavy & turning measurements	PM

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
8	7	DAL	In 1 year	Microsurface	Old seal w/ shiny wheel ruts due to crushing of lightweight aggregate. Very little cracking. Micro scratch course with a second finish course ideal for this situation.	PM
1	8	DAL	In 3 to 4 years	FDRCP	fairly new CPCD	LR
7	8	DAL				NN
8	8	DAL				NN
1	9	DAL	In 3 to 4 years	Seal Coat	structurally sound	PM
2	9	DAL	In 2 years	Seal Coat		PM
7	9	DAL	Greater than 4 years	Seal Coat, Crack sealing, thin overlay	low volume traffic, no structural distress	PM
8	9	DAL	In 1 year	Crack sealing	Some light distress (cracking) but cracks have been sealed and routine maintenance is well kept up with.	PM
1	10	DAL	Greater than 4 years	Joint Sealing, Repair of Spalled Cracks or Joints	most parts of the section is new concrete (OPCD)	PM
3	10	DAL				NN
7	10	DAL	Greater than 4 years			NN
1	11	DAL	Greater than 4 years	Joint Sealing, repair of spalled cracks or joints	fairly new pavement	PM
7	11	DAL				NN
8	11	DAL				NN
1	12	DAL	Now	FDRCP	long sections need FDR with base and subgrade ?	LR
7	12	DAL	In 2 years	Joint Sealing, staple, cross stich cracks, seal cracks	stabilize long cracks before faulting gets bad	LR

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
8	12	DAL	Now	Crack sealing	Pavement design was not a good choice for the soil conditions. Outside slab too wide (15ft)	PM
1	13	DAL	In 2 years	Mill and ACP Overlay, Base repair and seal coat	Overall mill & Overlay with some full depth base repair	LR
7	13	DAL	In 1 year	Mill and ACP Overlay, crack sealing, ACP overlay with overlay tester requirements	unseal cracks, mill overlay to improve ride	LR
8	13	DAL	In 1 year	Mill and ACP Overlay	Moisture damage at joints. City utility cuts.	LR
1	14	DAL	Greater than 4 years	ACP Overlay	Structurally sound now	LR
2	14	DAL	In 1 year	Seal Coat, Mill and in-lay heave areas		LR
7	14	DAL	Greater than 4 years	Mill and ACP Overlay	Skid number or amount of minor crackings	LR
8	14	DAL	Greater than 4 years	UTBWC_heavt truck traffic – needs moisture barrier	Heavy truck traffic calls for a higher level surface seal	LR
1	15	DAL	Now	Full depth recycling	part of the section is not as bad, but FDR and add shoulder is required	HR
4	15	DAL	Now	Reconstruction		HR
7	15	DAL	Now	ACP Overlay, full depth recycling, add base, widen pavement to add shoulder	Base/subgrade failures. Structural distress mainly unsafe to drive/ride on such pavement condition. Bad foundation. Start from ground up	HR
8	15	DAL	Now	Reconstruction	No sign of any maintenance for the last year or more (probably 2 to 4 years)	HR
1	16	DAL	In 3 to 4 years	ACP Overlay	Fairly new seal coat, losing rock	PM
7	16	DAL	Greater than 4 years	Seal Coat	traffic volume + type will affect the life of the seal coat. No structural distress rating.	PM

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
8	16	DAL	Greater than 4 years	Seal Coat, Microsurface	Choice between treatments should be based on future surface condition and truck volumes	PM
1	17	DAL			In couple years there might a need for resealing some of the joints	NN
7	17	DAL				NN
8	17	DAL	Now	Joint Sealing	longitudinal crack and joint sealing	PM
1	18	DAL	In 2 years	FDRCP, Repair of Spalled Cracks or Joints		MR
3	18	DAL		FDRCP and Overlay	concrete pavement slick	MR
7	18	DAL	In 1 year	FDRCP, Thin overlay with overlay tester req.	Distress that affect ride, polished aggregates	MR
8	18	DAL	In 1 year	Joint Sealing, Repair of Spalled Cracks or Joints		LR
1	19	DAL	Now	Full depth recycling, Reconstruction	Does not seem to have enough base for FDR, reconstruction seems best	HR
2	19	DAL	In 1 year	ACP Overlay, Full depth recycling		HR
7	19	DAL	Now	ACP Overlay, full depth recycling, widen pavement to add shoulder	subgrade and/or base failure. Need structural capacity. Need shoulder to contain wheel load effects. Not safe to ride on this road. Start again from ground/foundation up	HR

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
8	19	DAL	Now	Reconstruction		HR
1	20	DAL			Newly reconstructed	NN
4	20	DAL			Newly constructed-construct not completed	NN
7	20	DAL	In 1 year	Seal Coat, crack sealing	depends if cracks formed from stabilized base/subgrade underneath	PM
8	20	DAL	In 1 year	Crack sealing		PM
1	21	DAL	Now	Full depth recycling	very bad shape, FDR short of reconstr.	HR
7	21	DAL	Now	Full depth recycling, add shoulder, add structure, stabilize subgrade	bad foundation, re-do from ground up	HR
8	21	DAL	Now	seal Coat, crack sealing, full depth recycling, reconstruction, edge widening	If the entire segment cannot be reconstructed then a combination of full depth reclamation, crack sealing, edge repair and widening and seal coat would be needed.	HR
1	22	DAL	Now	FDRCP and Overlay, Repair of Spalled Cracks and Joints	It is in an urban area, thin overlay, same parts are curbed	MR
3	22	DAL	Now	FDRCP and Overlay, joint sealing	Right lane in very poor condition due to concrete blowouts and deteriorating concrete	MR

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
7	22	DAL	In 1 year	FDRCP, thin ACP overlay with overlay tester requirements	Distress that affect ride, polished aggregates	MR
8	22	DAL	In 1 year	Joint sealing, Repair of spalled cracks or joints, describe Ultra-thin bonded wearing course (Nova Chip)	Older construction. Routine maintenance is being done. Condition not bad considering age	LR
1	23	DAL	Now	Full depth recycling	This road is ? For a FDR and overlay	HR
4	23	DAL	Now	Reconstruction		HR
7	23	DAL	In 1 year	ACP Overlay, full depth recycling, add base, add shoulder	need structural capacity. Load associate distress subgrade/base instability	HR
8	23	DAL	Now	ACP Overlay, Full Depth Recycling, reconstruction, Edge Widening	Minimal recent maintenance. Distress have taken a long time to develop and are numerous If reconstruction is not possible then a combination of full depth recycling , widening and overlay would be needed.	HR
1	24	DAL	In 1 year	FDRCP, Joint sealing, Repair of Spalled Cracks or Joints	Curbed in urban area, no room for thick overlay full depth repair and grinding overall for ride	LR
7	24	DAL	In 2 years	Repair of spalled cracks or joints		PM
8	24	DAL	Now	Repair of spalled cracks or joints	Full depth concrete repair and patching done with little impact on ride quality.	PM
1	25	DAL	In 1 year	Mill and ACP Overlay, Base repair and ACP overlay	needs spot base repair, mill and overlay	LR
4	25	DAL	In 1 year	Mill and ACP Overlay		LR
7	25	DAL	In 1 year	Reconstruction	stabilization of subgrade is possible to due to 4 ? Facility to facilitate TCP. If concrete ? Reconstruction due to curb in urban area	HR
8	25	DAL	Now	Crack sealing, Localized base repair level up and UTBWC	Utility cuts, poor patching, poor drainage, bad ride Needs moisture barrier. Traffic and turning movements too high for seal coat.	LR

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
1	26	DAL	In 2 years	Mill and ACP Overlay, Joint sealing, Repair of spalled cracks or joints	Mill and thin overlay (curbed) short of reconst	LR
7	26	DAL	In 3 to 4 years	ACP Overlay with overlay tester, thin overlay	city street, not too many heavy loads, good maintenance practice, if budget permits	LR
8	26	DAL			Ongoing routine maintenance is being addressed. IN MY OPINION THIS IS AN EXAMPLE OF HOW PMIS SCORES CAN PROVIDE A FALSE IMPRESSION OF THE CONDITION OF CONCRETE PAVEMENTS.	NN
1	1	ELP	In 1 year	Patching, Crack sealing, and Check where rutting is occurring to determine if base repair or mill and overlay is needed.	The quantity, distress types, age of pavement and amount of damage in high quality HMA layer affected treatment selection.	PM
1	2	ELP	In 1 year	Patching, Crack sealing, and Check where rutting is occurring to determine if base repair or mill and overlay is needed.	The quantity, distress types, age of pavement and amount of damage in high quality HMA layer affected treatment selection.	PM
1	3	ELP	In 1 year	Patching, Crack sealing, and Check where rutting is occurring to determine if base repair or mill and overlay is needed.	The quantity, distress types, age of pavement and amount of damage in high quality HMA layer affected treatment selection.	PM
1	4	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat	The distress type, quantity of distresses, functional class, and ADT affected the treatment selection.	PM
1	5	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat	The distress type, quantity of distresses, functional class, and ADT affected the treatment selection.	PM
1	6	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat	The distress type, quantity of distresses, functional class, and ADT affected the treatment selection.	PM
1	7	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat	The distress type, quantity of distresses, functional class, and ADT affected the treatment selection.	PM

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
1	8	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat	The distress type, quantity of distresses, functional class, and ADT affected the treatment selection.	PM
1	9	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	10	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	11	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	12	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	13	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	14	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	15	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	16	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	17	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	18	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
1	19	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	20	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	21	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	22	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	23	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	24	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	25	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	26	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	27	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	28	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
1	29	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	30	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	31	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	32	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	33	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	34	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	35	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat, ACP overlay, Patching, and Widening of lanes.	The amount of funding affected the treatment selection.	MR
1	36	ELP				NN
1	37	ELP				NN
1	38	ELP	In 2 years	Mill and ACP overlay (in 2 yrs), and Crack sealing (this winter).	The drainage, ADT, distress types and quantity, and pavement type affected the treatment selection.	LR

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
1	39	ELP	In 2 years	Mill and ACP overlay (in 2 yrs), and Crack sealing (this winter).	The drainage, ADT, distress types and quantity, and pavement type affected the treatment selection.	LR
1	40	ELP	In 1 year	Seal coat	Due to the location of sections, it's a safety issue if the skid score is too low. Therefore, after looking at the skid score, you can decide if treatment should be applied.	PM
1	41	ELP	In 1 year	Seal coat	Due to the location of sections, it's a safety issue if the skid score is too low. Therefore, after looking at the skid score, you can decide if treatment should be applied.	PM
1	42	ELP				
1	43	ELP				
1	44	ELP				
1	45	ELP				
1	46	ELP				
1	47	ELP				

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
1	48	ELP				
1	49	ELP				
1	50	ELP				
1	51	ELP				
1	52	ELP				
1	53	ELP				
1	54	ELP				
1	55	ELP				
1	56	ELP				
1	57	ELP				
1	58	ELP				
1	59	ELP				
1	60	ELP				
1	61	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat and Micro Mill.	The quantity and type of distresses, pavement type, functional class, and ADT affected the treatment selection.	PM
1	62	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat and Micro Mill.	The quantity and type of distresses, pavement type, functional class, and ADT affected the treatment selection.	PM
1	63	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat and Micro Mill.	The quantity and type of distresses, pavement type, functional class, and ADT affected the treatment selection.	PM

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
1	64	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat and Micro Mill.	The quantity and type of distresses, pavement type, functional class, and ADT affected the treatment selection.	PM
1	65	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat and Micro Mill.	The quantity and type of distresses, pavement type, functional class, and ADT affected the treatment selection.	PM
1	66	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat and Micro Mill.	The quantity and type of distresses, pavement type, functional class, and ADT affected the treatment selection.	PM
1	67	ELP	In 2 years	Seal coat and Micro Mill.	The quantity and type of distresses, pavement type, functional class, and ADT affected the treatment selection.	PM
1	68	ELP				
1	69	ELP				
1	70	ELP				
1	71	ELP				
1	72	ELP				

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
1	73	ELP				
1	74	ELP				
1	75	ELP				
1	76	ELP				
1	77	ELP				
1	78	ELP				
1	79	ELP				
1	80	ELP				

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
1	81	ELP				
1	82	ELP				
1	83	ELP				
1	84	ELP				
1	85	ELP				
1	86	ELP				
1	87	ELP				
1	88	ELP				
1	89	ELP				
1	90	ELP	In 2 years	Mill and ACP overlay (in 2 yrs).	ADT, Cracking, and Flushing.	LR
1	91	ELP	In 2 years	Mill and ACP overlay (in 2 yrs).	ADT, Cracking, and Flushing.	LR

Table G.4. District Rating Results and PMIS Data

Rater No.	Section No.	District	Rater's Opinion When Treatment Is Needed	Rater's Recommended Treatment	Other Comments	Rater's Need Estimate
1	92	ELP	In 2 years	Mill and ACP overlay (in 2 yrs).	ADT, Cracking, and Flushing.	LR
1	93	ELP				