

Preventing roads from deteriorating to the point of failure is a goal to which our region should aspire. However, the scoring changes under consideration, which deprioritize reconstruction and rehabilitation in favor of resurfacing, do not offer an effective way to accomplish this goal and are not aligned with the existing infrastructure needs of our region, which still has a large number of roadways at or near the point of failure.

The scoring changes under consideration would drastically slow the rate at which reconstructions can be completed, hindering regional progress on both economic development and safety. Historically, STBG funding has served as the only reliable source of roadway reconstruction funding in our region, whereas other funding sources are available for resurfacing, including programs specifically for small communities.

We recommend revisions to the scoring criteria under consideration that incentivize the most strategically important preventive maintenance equitably in both large and small communities, while recognizing STBG's unique role in addressing the ongoing need for reconstruction funding in our region. Our recommendations aim to position our region to maximally leverage the full range of roadway funding sources available, and to do so in a way that best aligns with the infrastructure needs and goals of MPO jurisdictions. Below, we offer relevant background information, followed by specific recommendations and rationales for revisions to the scoring criteria currently under consideration.

Existing reconstruction need throughout the region

- Roadways in poor condition are far from just a City of Toledo problem – they are widely distributed throughout the region. Nearly every jurisdiction in the MPO has at least one aid-eligible roadway segment at or near the point at which reconstruction is needed, and most have more than one. Excluding Toledo, Lucas and Wood Counties have approximately 166.5 lane miles of roadways with Pavement Condition Ratings (PCRs) below 65 (the threshold at which rehabilitation or reconstruction is generally needed) and approximately 58.5 lane miles below 55 (failure), according to the most recent ODOT PCR data.
- Translated into costs per lane mile, these roadways represent approximately **\$84.8 million in existing reconstruction funding need** and **\$62.1 million in existing rehabilitation funding need** in Lucas County outside Toledo and in Wood County; additional need exists throughout other MPO jurisdictions. Many of these roads are economically important, servicing areas with high densities of jobs and/or workforce housing, or potential future development sites.
- Notably, by prioritizing resurfacing over rehabilitation, the changes under consideration will also make it more difficult to “save” near-failure roads from deteriorating to the point of needing full reconstruction. Given the large number of roads nearing failure but not yet failed in our region, detailed below, this is not a cost-effective strategy. The difference in cost between resurfacing and rehabilitation is relatively small, but the cost difference between rehabilitation and reconstruction is much larger.

Purpose and regional role of STBG funding; balance and proportionality of funding distribution

- Historically, STBG has been the only reliable funding source for reconstructions. Other funding sources are available specifically for safety projects (ODOT HSIP, which has a particularly high success rate), small communities (ODOT Small City and OPWC Small Community), and even urban resurfacing on state routes (ODOT Urban Paving).
- The small project set-aside primarily funds resurfacing, and the increased cap will make more funding available for these projects. Prioritizing reconstruction in STBG is a more strategically sound approach to leveraging the full range of funding sources available to our region.
- Taken as a whole, the distribution of formula funding in our region is more balanced than STBG alone would suggest. CMAQ, in particular, skews toward smaller communities: since 2009, less than 30% of CMAQ funding in the MPO has gone to the City of Toledo (\$24.1M of \$80.9M total).

Proposed Changes and Rationale

Question 19: If this is a roadway project, which of the following best describes the project?

Current scoring

- New: 0 points
- Resurfacing or pavement strengthening: 4 points
- Rehabilitation w/some base replacement and/or significant joint repair: 7 points
- Reconstruct w/full base replacement: 10 points
- Widen/narrow & resurface: 13 points
- Widen/narrow & rehab: 17 points
- Widen/narrow & reconstruct: 20 points

Proposed scoring under consideration

- Resurfacing = 10 points
- Rehabilitation with some base replacement = 8 points
- Reconstruction with full base replacement = 7 points
- Narrow and resurface/rehabilitate/reconstruct = 4 points
- Widen and resurface/rehabilitate/reconstruct = 2 points
- New roadway = 0 points

Recommended changes

- Reconstruction with lane addition or removal = 15 points
- Rehabilitation or resurfacing with lane addition or removal = 13 points
- Reconstruction with full base replacement = 11 points
- Rehabilitation with some base replacement = 10 points
- Resurfacing = 8 points
- New roadway = 0 points

Rationale

- Maximum points to reconstruction with lane addition/removal: balances the ongoing need for reconstruction that can only be reliably funded with STBG with incentivizing changes to roadway design that promote safety (lane removal to address speeding where appropriate; lane addition where necessary to incorporate left-turn lanes and access management interventions such as center median islands)
- Encourages the most strategically important maintenance by incentivizing rehabilitation of near-failure roads to prevent the need for more costly future reconstruction. Given the large number of near-failure roads in our region and the availability of other funding sources for resurfacing, rehab should be prioritized over resurfacing.
- Still rewards preventive maintenance through resurfacing, by significantly increasing the number of points awarded to a resurfacing project (8) from the previous scoring criteria, which awarded 4

Question 17: Pavement Project: What is the existing Pavement Condition Rating (PCR) based on the most recent ODOT scores?

Current scoring

- a. >75: 0 points
- b. 65-74: 2 points
- c. 56-64: 4 points
- d. <55: 6 points

Proposed scoring under consideration

- a. 100-75 = 0 points
- b. 74-65 = 3 points
- c. 64-0 = 6 points

Recommended changes

- a. >75: 0 points
- b. 65-74: 3 points
- c. 56-64: 5 points
- d. 0-55: 6 points

Rationale: Differentiates and incentivizes rehabilitation, which is a key maintenance need regionally.

Question 23: What is the existing number of Average Daily Traffic (ADT) on the locally maintained road?

Scoring comparison: Current, under consideration, and recommended changes

Current	Under Consideration	Recommended
---------	---------------------	-------------

ADT	Points	ADT	Points	ADT	Points
0-4999	0	0-4999	4	0-2499	2
				2500-4999	3
5000-7499	1	5000-9999	5	5000-7499	4
7500-9999	2			7500-9999	5
10000-19999	3	10000-14999	6	10000-14999	6
		15000-19999	7	15000-19999	7
20000-29999	4	>20000	8	>20000	8
30000-39999	5				
40000-49999	6				
50000+	7				

Rationale

- Still provides all projects with some points no matter how low the ADT and increases points available for lower ADTs across the entire scale compared to current scoring (20000+ ADT is currently required for just 4 of 7 points), but shifts some priority away from roads with the lowest ADT compared to scoring under consideration.
- Absolute ADT is still a critically important indicator of a roadway's overall importance in the regional transportation system, and while lower-ADT roadways may still have high relative importance at the local community level, this is already accounted for by question 2 (functional classification).

Question 21: What is the 3-year average accident rate per million vehicles? Or, what is the percentage of fatal and injury crashes over the most recent three years of available crash data? (use best available answer)

Recommendation: Remove the “percentage of fatal and injury crashes” option

Rationale

- Applications that would score well on the fatal and injury crash rate criterion would likely also score well on ODOT Safety funding applications, a dedicated funding source. A more strategic approach to leveraging all available roadway funding sources for our region would emphasize that these projects should utilize this funding source, which has a high success rate, while prioritizing STBG projects for which funding is not readily available elsewhere.
- This question offers points for showing a safety problem without including any requirement to show that your project will help address the problem. While the question

could require applicants to provide data or justification to demonstrate the project's safety benefits, enforcement to ensure that the proposed safety treatments are actually constructed is difficult.

- To avoid this pitfall, the application can incentivize improvements elsewhere in the application that may have safety benefits (i.e., by awarding additional points for including lane addition/removal), but could also offer a broader range of benefits in other areas (i.e., congestion mitigation, efficiency). This approach would provide local jurisdictions more flexibility and discretion to implement the most appropriate improvements for their own transportation contexts, while avoiding the inherent challenges associated with specifically safety-oriented metrics.