

# Gogebic County Road Commission 2024 Transportation Asset Management Plan



A plan describing the Gogebic County Road Commission's transportation assets and conditions

*Prepared by:*  
Philip Strong  
Highway Engineer  
(906) 667-0233



# CONTENTS

Table of Figures .....	ii
Table of Tables .....	iii
Executive Summary .....	iv
Introduction.....	1
1. Pavement Assets .....	3
<i>Inventory of Assets</i> .....	4
<i>Condition, Goals, and Trend</i> .....	5
<i>Modelled Trends, Gap Analysis, and Planned Projects</i> .....	9
2. Bridge Assets .....	12
<i>Inventory of Assets</i> .....	13
<i>Condition, Goals, and Trend</i> .....	14
<i>Programmed/Funded Projects, Gap Analysis, and Planned Projects</i> .....	15
3. Culvert Assets .....	18
<i>Inventory of Assets</i> .....	19
<i>Goals</i> .....	19
<i>Planned Projects</i> .....	19
4. Signal Assets .....	20
<i>Inventory of Assets</i> .....	21
<i>Goals</i> .....	21
<i>Planned Projects</i> .....	21
5. Financial Resources .....	22
<i>Anticipated Revenues &amp; Expenses</i> .....	22
6. Risk of Failure Analysis .....	25
7. Coordination with Other Entities .....	27
8. Proof of Acceptance.....	28
A. Pavement Asset Management Plan .....	29
B. Bridge Asset Management Plan .....	30
C. Culvert Asset Management Plan Supplement .....	31
<i>Culvert Primer</i> .....	31
D. Traffic Signals Asset Management Plan Supplement .....	33
<i>Traffic Signals Primer</i> .....	33
E. Glossary & Acronyms .....	34
<i>Glossary</i> .....	34
<i>List of Acronyms</i> .....	42

# TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Map showing location of roads managed by GCRC and the current condition for paved roads in green for good (PASER 10, 9, 8), yellow for fair (PASER 7, 6, 5), and red for poor (PASER 4, 3, 2, 1) and for unpaved roads in blue .....	4
Figure 2: Pavement type by percentage maintained by GCRC. Undefined pavements have not been inventoried in GCRC's asset management system to date, but will be included as data becomes available.....	5
Figure 3: county primary network condition, goals, and trend .....	6
Figure 4: county local network condition, goals, and trend.....	7
Figure 5: Distribution of IBR numbers for current condition (solid) and for goals (dotted) .....	8
Figure 6 : Map illustrating planned projects for pavement assets.....	10
Figure 7: Map illustrating locations of GCRC's bridge assets .....	13
Figure 8: Condition, projected trend, and goal for GCRC's good/fair and structurally deficient bridges .....	15
Figure 9: Key transportation links in GCRC's road and bridge network.....	26



# TABLE OF TABLES

Table 1: Roadsoft Modelled Trends, Planned Projects, and Gap Analysis for 's Road Assets .....	9
Table 2: Type, Size, and Condition of GCRC's Bridge Assets.....	14
Table 3: Planned Projects and Gap Analysis .....	17
Table 4: Annual Fiscal-Year Revenues & Expenditures per Fiscal Year .....	24

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As conduits for commerce and connections to vital services, roads and bridges are some of the most important assets in any community, and other assets like culverts, traffic signs, traffic signals, and utilities support and affect roads and bridges. The Gogebic County Road Commission's (GCRC) roads, bridges, and support systems are also some of the most valuable and extensive public assets, all of which are paid for with taxes collected from ordinary citizens and businesses. The cost of building and maintaining these assets, their importance to society, and the investment made by taxpayers all place a high level of responsibility on local agencies to plan, build, and maintain roads, bridges, and support assets in an efficient and effective manner. This asset management plan is intended to report on how GCRC is meeting its obligations to maintain the public assets for which it is responsible.

This plan identifies GCRC's assets and condition and how GCRC maintains and plans to improve the overall condition of those assets. An asset management plan is required by Michigan Public Act 325 of 2018, and this document represents fulfillment of some of GCRC's obligations towards meeting these requirements. However, this plan and its supporting documents are intended to be much more than a fulfillment of required reporting. This asset management plan helps to demonstrate GCRC's responsible use of public funds by providing elected and appointed officials as well as the general public with the inventory and condition information of GCRC's assets, and it gives taxpayers the information they need to make informed decisions about investing in GCRC's essential transportation infrastructure.



# INTRODUCTION

Asset management is defined by Public Act 325 of 2018 as “an ongoing process of maintaining, preserving, upgrading, and operating physical assets cost effectively, based on a continuous physical inventory and condition assessment and investment to achieve established performance goals”. In other words, asset management is a process that uses data to manage and track assets, like roads and bridges, in a cost-effective manner using a combination of engineering and business principles. This process is endorsed by leaders in municipal planning and transportation infrastructure, including the Michigan Municipal League, County Road Association of Michigan, the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The Gogebic County Road Commission is supported in its use of asset management principles and processes by the Michigan Transportation Asset Management Council (TAMC), formed by the State of Michigan.

Asset management, in the context of this plan, ensures that public funds are spent as effectively as possible to maximize the condition of the road and bridge network. Asset management also provides a transparent decision-making process that allows the public to understand the technical and financial challenges of managing transportation infrastructure with a limited budget.

The Gogebic County Road Commission (GCRC) has adopted an “asset management” business process to overcome the challenges presented by having limited financial, staffing, and other resources while needing to meet road users’ expectations. GCRC is responsible for maintaining and operating over 592.084 centerline miles of roads and 61 bridge structures. It is also responsible for 2500 culverts and 0 signals.

This 2024 plan identifies GCRC’s transportation assets and their condition as well as the strategy that GCRC uses to maintain and upgrade particular assets given GCRC’s condition goals, priorities of network’s road users, and resources. An updated plan is to be released approximately every three years both to comply with Public Act 325 and to reflect changes in road conditions, finances, and priorities.

Questions regarding the use or content of this plan should be directed to Philip Strongat 200 N Moore Street, Courthouse Annex, Bessemer, MI 49911 or at (906) 667-0233. A copy of this plan can be accessed on our website at <https://gogebiccountyroadcommission.org/>.

# 1. PAVEMENT ASSETS



GCRC is responsible for 592.084 centerline miles of public roads. An inventory of these miles divides them into different network classes based on road purpose/use and funding priorities as identified at the state level: county primary road network, which is prioritized for state-level funding, and county local road network.

## Inventory of Assets




Figure 1: Map showing location of roads managed by GCRC and the current condition for paved roads in green for good (PASER 10, 9, 8), yellow for fair (PASER 7, 6, 5), and red for poor (PASER 4, 3, 2, 1) and for unpaved roads in blue

Of GCRC's 592.084 miles of road, 243.29 miles are classified as county primary and 348.794 miles are classified as county local (Figure 1 identifies these paved roads in green, yellow, and red with the colors being determined based on the road segment's condition). GCRC also manages 0 miles that are classified as part of the National Highway System (NHS); the NHS is subject to special rules and regulations and has its own performance metrics dictated by the FHWA. In addition, GCRC has 275.832 miles of unpaved roads (Figure 1 identifies these unpaved roads in blue).

More detail about these road assets can be found in GCRC's Roadsoft database or by contacting GCRC.

## Types

GCRC has multiple types of pavements in its jurisdiction, including asphalt, sealcoat, and undefined; it also has unpaved roads (i.e., gravel and/or earth). Figure 2 shows a breakdown of these pavement types for all of GCRC's road assets.




Figure 2: Pavement type by percentage maintained by GCRC. Undefined pavements have not been inventoried in GCRC's asset management system to date, but will be included as data becomes available.

## Condition, Goals, and Trend

### *Paved Roads*

Paved roads in Michigan are rated using the Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating (PASER) system, which is a 1 to 10 scale with 10 being a newly constructed surface and 1 being a completely failed surface. PASER scores are grouped into TAMC definition categories of good (8-10), fair (5-7), and poor (1-4) categories. GCRC collects PASER data every two years on 100 percent of those portions of its county primary and county local networks that are eligible for federal funding. In addition, GCRC uses its own staff and resources to collect PASER data on 100 percent of its county primary and county local networks that are not eligible for federal funding every two years.

Currently, the county primary network has 20% of its roads in good condition, 29% in fair condition, and 51% in poor condition, and the county local network has 6% of its roads in good condition, 18% in fair condition, and 76% in poor condition (Figure 3 and Figure 4). GCRC's long-range goal for the county



primary network is to have 40% of roads in good condition, 40% in fair condition, and 20% in poor condition, and for the county local network is to have 20% of roads in good condition, 15% in fair condition, and 65% in poor condition (Figure 3 and Figure 4). Figure 3 and Figure 4 illustrate the historical and current condition (solid bars) of GCRC’s county primary and county local networks, respectively; they also illustrate the projected trend (shaded bars), the overall trend in condition (trendlines), and GCRC’s goal (final solid bar).




Figure 3: county primary network condition, goals, and trend




Figure 4: county local network condition, goals, and trend

### Unpaved Roads

Unpaved roads rated with the Inventory-based Rating System™ receive an IBR number ranging from 1 to 10, with a 9 or 10 (less than one year old) having good surface width, good or fair drainage, and good structural adequacy and a 1 having poor surface width, poor drainage, and poor structural adequacy. IBR numbers can be grouped in a similar fashion as the TAMC definitions into good (8-10), fair (5-7), and poor (1-4) categories. Figure 5 illustrates the historical and/or current condition (solid bar[s]), the projected trend (shaded bars), and GCRC's goal (final solid bar).




Figure 5: Distribution of IBR numbers for current condition (solid) and for goals (dotted)

# Modelled Trends, Gap Analysis, and Planned Projects

**Table 1: Roadsoft Modelled Trends, Planned Projects, and Gap Analysis for 's Road Assets**

Network 1 (<243.29 miles)							
Treatment	Annual Miles of Treatment	Years of Life	Trigger-Reset	Pavement Condition Forecast		Annual Miles of Treatment	Trigger-Reset
				Annual Miles of Treatment	Trigger-Reset		
Crack Seal	20	2	7-7		7-7		7-7
Chip Seal	15	7	5, 6-8	15	5, 6-8		5, 6-8
		9	3, 4-9		3, 4-9		3, 4-9
		20	1, 2, 3-10		1, 2, 3-10		1, 2, 3-10
Cold in Place Recycling & 2" Overlay	3	25	2, 3-10	2.8	2, 3-10		1, 2, 3-10
[Treatment 6]							
[Treatment 7]							
[Treatment 8]							
Network 2 (348.794 miles)							
Treatment	Annual Miles of Treatment	Years of Life	Trigger-Reset	Pavement Condition Forecast		Additional Work Necessary to Overcome Deficit	
				Annual Miles of Treatment	Trigger-Reset	Annual Miles of Treatment	Trigger-Reset
Crack Seal	10	2	7-7		7-7		7-7
Chip Seal		7	5, 6-8	1	5, 6-8	5	5, 6-8
	1	9	3, 4-9	0.5	3, 4-9		3, 4-9
	1.1	20	1, 2, 3-10	2	1, 2, 3-10		1, 2, 3-10
Cold in Place Recycling & 2" Overlay		25	2, 3-10		1, 2, 3-10		2, 3-10
[Treatment 6]							
[Treatment 7]							
[Treatment 8]							

## Modelled Trends & Gap Analysis

The Roadsoft network analysis of GCRC's planned projects for the county primary and county local networks from GCRC's currently-available budget does not allow GCRC to reach its pavement condition goals given the projects planned for the next three years.

Results from the Roadsoft for the county primary and county local network condition models indicate that the necessary additional work needed to meet the agency condition goal would cost an additional \$1,200,000 per year over 10 years.

### ***Planned Projects***

GCRC has projects planned for the next three years. These projects are identified in Figure 6.





Figure 6 : Map illustrating planned projects for pavement assets

The total cost of the projects illustrated in Figure 6 is approximately \$3,100,000.



## 2. BRIDGE ASSETS





GCRC is responsible for 61 bridges that provide safe service to road users across the agency network. GCRC seeks to implement a cost-effective program of preventive maintenance to maximize the useful service life and safety of the local bridges under its jurisdiction.

## Inventory of Assets




Figure 7: Map illustrating locations of GCRC's bridge assets

GCRC has 61 total bridges in its road and bridge network; these bridges connect various points of the road network, as illustrated in Figure 7. These bridge structures can be summarized by type, size, and condition, which are detailed in

Table 2. More information about each of these structures can be found in GCRC's MiBRIDGE database or by contacting GCRC.



**Table 2: Type, Size, and Condition of GCRC's Bridge Assets**

Bridge Type	Total Number of Bridges	Total Deck Area (sq ft)	Condition: Structurally Deficient, Posted, or Closed			2023 Condition		
			Struct. Deficient	Posted	Closed	Poor	Fair	Good
Concrete – Culvert	7	5410	0	0	0	0	4	3
Concrete – Girder and floorbeam	2	4280	2	1	1	2	0	0
Concrete – Tee beam	5	4668	2	1	1	2	3	0
Prestressed concrete – Box beam/girders—multiple	25	55940	1	0	0	1	17	7
Steel – Culvert	3	2174	2	0	0	2	1	0
Steel – Girder and floorbeam	2	5926	1	1	0	1	1	0
Steel – Multistringer	13	15506	6	7	0	6	7	0
Steel – Truss—thru and pony	2	1966	2	0	2	2	4	0
Timber – Multistringer	2	1590	1	2	0	1	1	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total SD/Posted/Closed</b>			<b>17</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>97460</b>				<b>17</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Percentage (%)</b>			<b>28%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>16</b>

## Condition, Goals, and Trend

Bridges in Michigan are given a good, fair, or poor rating based on the National Bridge Inspection Standards (NBIS) rating scale, which was created by the Federal Highway Administration to evaluate a bridge's deficiencies and to ensure the safety of road users. The current condition of GCRC's bridge network based on the NBIS is 10 structures rated good, 34 structures rated fair, and 17 structures rated poor (Table 2).

Bridges are designed to carry legal loads in terms of vehicles and traffic. Due to a decline in condition, a bridge may be "posted" with a restriction for what would be considered safe loads passing over the bridge. On occasion, posting a bridge may also restrict other load-capacity-related elements like speed and number of vehicles on the bridge, but this type of posting designates the bridge differently. GCRC has 12 structures that are posted for load restriction (Table 2). Designating a bridge as "posted" has no influence on its condition rating. A "closed" bridge is one that is closed to all traffic. Closing a bridge is contingent upon its ability to carry a set minimum live load. GCRC has 4 structures that are closed (Table 2).

The goal of the program is the preservation and safety of GCRC's bridge network.

Figure 8 illustrates the baseline condition, projected trend, and goal that GCRC has for its good/fair and its structurally deficient bridges.




Figure 8: Condition, projected trend, and goal for GCRC's good/fair and structurally deficient bridges

## Programmed/Funded Projects, Gap Analysis, and Planned Projects

GCRC will receive \$1,496,250 in total funding for the years 2026. Preventive maintenance is a more effective use of these funds than the costly alternative of major rehabilitation or replacement. Since GCRC recognizes that limited funds are available for improving the bridge network, it seeks to identify those bridges that will benefit from a planned maintenance program, and it plans to spend \$25,000 per

year for the next three years on preventive maintenance of bridges. GCRC plans to replace one bridges within the next three years at a cost of \$1,575,000 . By performing the aforementioned preventive maintenance and replacement of bridge structures, GCRC will not achieve its goal of keeping its overall bridge network at the same condition.

Table 3 illustrates the programmed/funded projects that will be undertaken in order to achieve GCRC's goal. These programmed/funded projects are juxtaposed with priority projects that remain unfunded.

**Table 3: Planned Projects and Gap Analysis**

<b>Strategy</b>	<b>2024</b>	<b>2025</b>	<b>2026</b>	<b>2027</b>	<b>2028</b>	<b>GAP</b>
<b>New</b>						
Subtotal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Replacement</b>						
3032			\$1,516,000			
2987				\$2,589,000		
3005						\$1,674,000
3011						\$2,091,000
3012						\$2,062,000
3013						\$2,091,000
Subtotal	\$0	\$0	\$1,516,000	\$2,589,000	\$0	\$7,918,000
<b>Rehabilitation</b>						
Subtotal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Scheduled Maintenance</b>						
Subtotal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Preventive Maintenance</b>						
Subtotal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Other</b>						
Subtotal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

### 3. CULVERT ASSETS



## **Inventory of Assets**

At present, GCRC tracks inventory data of its culvert assets only. GCRC has inventoried 2220 culverts, which is 89 percent of the estimated 2500 culverts that GCRC owns.

At present, GCRC tracks inventory and condition data of its culvert assets. GCRC has inventoried 2220 culverts, which is 89 percent of the estimated 2500 culverts that GCRC owns. Of GCRC's 815 tracked and rated culverts, GCRC has 385 culverts considered good, 282 culverts considered fair, 148 culverts considered poor, and 35 culverts considered failed based on the culvert rating system that GCRC uses (see Appendix C *Culvert Asset Management Plan Supplement*).

More detail about these culvert assets can be found in GCRC's Roadsoft database or by contacting GCRC.

## **Goals**

The goal of GCRC's asset management program is the preservation of its culvert network. GCRC is responsible for preserving 2220 inventoried culverts as well as any un-inventoried culverts that underlie its entire road network.

## **Planned Projects**

GCRC's policy is to replace or repair culvert assets concurrent with projects affecting road segments carried by the particular culverts. GCRC also includes culvert assets in scheduled maintenance projects affecting road segments carried by the particular culverts.



## 4. SIGNAL ASSETS



## **Inventory of Assets**

At present, GCRC tracks only inventory data for traffic signals. GCRC has inventoried 0 traffic signals, which is all of the actual 0 traffic signals that GCRC owns.

More detail about these traffic signal assets can be obtained by contacting GCRC.

## **Goals**

The goal of GCRC's asset management program is the preservation of its traffic signals. GCRC is responsible for preserving 0 inventoried traffic signals as well as any un-inventoried traffic signals along its entire road network.

## **Planned Projects**

GCRC's policy is to evaluate traffic signal assets based on condition assessment for replacement or repair during any reconstruction, rehabilitation, preventive maintenance, or schedule maintenance activities on the roadway affected by the particular signal. It also conducts replacements or repairs for those traffic signal assets reported as non-functional or as performing with reduced function. GCRC adheres to regular maintenance and servicing policies outlined in the *Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices*.



# 5. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Public entities must balance the quality and extent of services they can provide with the tax resources provided by citizens and businesses, all while maximizing how efficiently funds are used. Therefore, GCRC will overview its general expenditures and financial resources currently devoted to transportation infrastructure maintenance. This financial information is not intended to be a full financial disclosure or a formal report. Full details of GCRC's financial status can be found on our website at <https://gogebiccountyroadcommission.org/transparency-dashboard>.

## Anticipated Revenues & Expenses

GCRC receives funding from the following sources:

- **State funds** – GCRC's principal source of transportation funding is received from the Michigan Transportation Fund (MTF). This fund is supported by vehicle registration fees and the state's per-gallon gas tax. Allocations from the MTF are distributed to state and local governmental units based on a legislated formula, which includes factors such as population, miles of certified roads, and vehicle registration fees for vehicles registered in the agency's jurisdiction. GCRC also receives revenue from the Michigan Department of Transportation to maintain (e.g. plow, patch, mow) the state trunklines within its jurisdictional boundary. Revenue from these maintenance contracts are received on a time and materials basis as resources are expended to maintain the State's roads. While these contracts do not allow for capital gain (profit) and only bring in revenue to cover the cost of the work, they do provide a benefit to GCRC by allowing an economy of scale that enables us to provide better service at a lower cost for GCRC's roads while allowing the same for the State of Michigan. Examples of state grants also include local bridge grants, economic development funds, and metro funds.

- **Federal and state grants for individual projects** – These are typically competitive funding applications that are targeted at a specific project type to accomplish a specific purpose. These may include safety enhancement projects, economic development projects, or other targeted funding. Examples of federal funds include Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds, C and D funds, bridge funds, MDOT payments to private contractors, and negotiated contracts.
- **Local government entities or private developer contributions to construction projects for specific improvements** – This category includes funding received to mitigate the impact of commercial developments as a condition of construction of a specific development project, and can also include funding from a special assessment district levied by another governmental unit. Examples of contributions from local units include city, village, and township contributions to the county; special assessments; county appropriations; bond and note proceeds; contributions from counties to cities and villages; city general fund transfers; city municipal street funds; capital improvement funds; and tax millages (see below).
- **Local tax millages** – Many local agencies in Michigan use local tax millages to supplement their road-funding budget. These taxes can provide for additional construction and maintenance for new or existing roads that are also funded using MTF or MDOT funds. GCRC does not have local tax millages in its road-funding budget. Ironwood Township has a 1 mil that has been utilized for local road improvements. Watersmeet Township has a 0.5 mil in 2021 for local road improvements.
- **Interest** – Interest from invested funds.
- **Permit fees** – Generally, permit fees cover the cost of a permit application review.
- **Other** – Other revenues can be gained through salvage sales, property rentals, land and building sales, sundry refunds, equipment disposition or installation, private sources, and financing.
- **Charges for services** – Funds from partner agencies who contract with GCRC to construct or maintain its roads, or roads under joint or neighboring jurisdictions, including state trunkline maintenance and non-maintenance services and preservation.

GCRC is required to report transportation fund expenditures to the State of Michigan using a prescribed format with predefined expenditure categories. The definitions of these categories according to Public Act 51 of 1951 may differ from common pavement management nomenclature and practice. For the purposes of reporting under PA 51, the expenditure categories are:

- **Construction/Capacity Improvement Funds** – According to PA 51 of 1951, this financial classification of projects includes, “new construction of highways, roads, streets, or bridges, a project that increases the capacity of a highway facility to accommodate that part of traffic having neither an origin nor destination within the local area, widening of a lane width or more, or adding turn lanes of more than 1/2 mile in length.”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Public Act 51 of 1951, 247.660c Definitions

- **Preservation and Structural Improvement Funds** – Preservation and structural improvements are “activit[ies] undertaken to preserve the integrity of the existing roadway system.”<sup>2</sup> Preservation includes items such as a reconstruction of an existing road or bridge, or adding structure to an existing road.
- **Routine and Preventive Maintenance Funds** – Routine maintenance activities are “actions performed on a regular or controllable basis or in response to uncontrollable events upon a highway, road, street, or bridge”.<sup>3</sup> Preventive maintenance activities are “planned strategy[ies] of cost-effective treatments to an existing roadway system and its appurtenances that preserve assets by retarding deterioration and maintaining functional condition without significantly increasing structural capacity”.<sup>4</sup>
- **Winter Maintenance Funds** – Expenditures for snow and ice control.
- **Trunkline Maintenance Funds** – Expenditures spent under GCRC’s maintenance agreement with MDOT for maintenance it performs on MDOT trunkline routes.
- **Administrative Funds** – There are specific items that can and cannot be included in administrative expenditures as specified in PA 51 of 1951. The law also states that the amount of MTF revenues that are spent on administrative expenditures is limited to 10 percent of the annual MTF funds that are received.
- **Other Funds** – Expenditures for equipment, capital outlay, debt principal payment, interest expense, contributions to adjacent governmental units, principal, interest and bank fees, and miscellaneous for cities and villages.

The Table (below) details the revenues and expenditures for GCRC in 2022 (most recent TAMC Data).

**Table 4: Annual Fiscal-Year Revenues & Expenditures per Fiscal Year**

REVENUES			EXPENDITURES		
Item	Estimated \$	Percent of Total	Item	Estimated \$	Percent of Total
State funds	5,047,712	52.7	Construction & capacity improvement (CCI)	0	0
Federal funds	732,861	7.6	Preservation & structural improvement (PSI)	2,644,227	27.5
Contributions for local units	407,814	4.3	Routine maintenance	1,483,832	15.4
Interest, rents, and other	1,626,964	17	Winter maintenance	1,426,683	14.8
Charges for services	1,769,880	18.5	Trunkline maintenance	1,769,880	18.4
			Administrative	425,943	0
			Other	1,875,614	0
TOTAL	9,585,232	100	TOTAL	9,626,180	100
Verify the information in this table. You can find your agency's information in the TAMC dashboard at <a href="https://www.mcgi.state.mi.us/mitrp/tamcDashboards">https://www.mcgi.state.mi.us/mitrp/tamcDashboards</a> .					

<sup>2</sup> Public Act 51 of 1951, 247.660c Definitions

<sup>3</sup> Public Act 51 of 1951, 247.660c Definitions

<sup>4</sup> Public Act 51 of 1951, 247.660c Definitions

# 6. RISK OF FAILURE ANALYSIS

Transportation infrastructure is designed to be resilient. The system of interconnecting roads and bridges maintained by GCRC provides road users with multiple alternate options in the event of an unplanned disruption of one part of the system. There are, however, key links in the transportation system that may cause significant inconvenience to users if they are unexpectedly closed to traffic. Key transportation links include:

- **Geographic divides:** Areas where a geographic feature (river, lake, hilly terrain, or limited access road) limits crossing points of the feature; bridge failures, in particular, can create loss of access to entire regions of the state
- **Emergency alternate routes for high-volume roads and bridges:** Roads and bridges that are routinely used as alternate routes for high-volume assets are included in an emergency response plan
- **Limited access areas:** Roads and bridges that serve remote or limited access areas that result in long detours if closed
- **Main access to key commercial districts:** Areas with a large concentration of businesses or where large-size business will be significantly impacted if a road is unavailable
- Our road and bridge network includes the following critical assets: The 4 bridges on Lake Road in Ironwood Township, the 3 bridges on CR519N in Wakefield Township, the 1 bridge on South Boundary Road in Wakefield Township, the 1 bridge on CR519S in Bessemer Township, the 2 bridges on East Share Road in Marenisco Township, the 1 bridge on Pomeroy Road in Marenisco Township, the 1 bridge on Roddis Road in Watersmeet Township, the 1 bridge on Cisco Lake

Road in Watersmeet Township.. Figure 9 illustrates the key transportation links in GCRC’s road and bridge network.



Figure 9: Key transportation links in GCRC's road and bridge network

## 7. COORDINATION WITH OTHER ENTITIES

An asset management plan provides a significant value for infrastructure owners because it serves as a platform to engage other infrastructure owners using the same shared right of way space. GCRC communicates with both public and private infrastructure owners to coordinate work in the following ways:

Ironwood, Bessemer, Marenisco and Watersmeet Townships all have local water and sewer systems. Wakefield Township has a local water system. A variety of utility companies utilize the road right-of-ways, under permit.

GCRC has a maintenance agreement with the MDOT for snow plowing and routine maintenance on the MDOT roads in Gogebic County (except for some trunk lines within the City of Ironwood and City of Wakefield limits).

GCRC has acted as the Act 51 Transportation Alternative Plan grant recipient for non-motorized trail construction by the Michigan's Western Gateway Trail Authority (MWGTA). Acting as a pass-through grant recipient for the MWGTA has provided this organization (in coordination with the Gogebic County for the Michigan DNR Recreation Grant Funding opportunities) with the funding opportunities to construct non-motorized segments of the Iron Belle Trail in Gogebic County.

GCRC coordinates with utility owners throughout the year regarding planned projects. Infrastructure owners are encouraged to discuss planned projects that would disrupt transportation services or cause damage to pavements. Projects which may cause damage to pavements in good or fair condition are discussed and mitigation measures are proposed to minimize the impact to pavements.

# 8. PROOF OF ACCEPTANCE

## PUBLIC ACT 325

### CERTIFICATION OF TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

Certification Year: 2024

Local Road-owning Agency Name: Gogebic County Road Commission

Beginning October 2019 and on a three-year cycle thereafter, certification must be made for compliance to Public Act 325. A local road-owning agency with 100 certified miles or more must certify that it has developed an asset management plan for the road, bridge, culvert, and traffic signal assets. Signing this form certifies that the hitherto referred agency meets with minimum requirements as outlined by Public Act 325 and agency-defined goals and objectives.

This form must be signed by the chairperson of the local road-owning agency or the county executive and chief financial officer of the local road-owning agency.

Signature 	Signature 
Printed Name Roy D. Antonio	Printed Name Garth C. Stengard
Title Chair	Title Manager
Date 9-23-2024	Date 9-23-2024

Due every three years based on agency submission schedule

Submittal Date: 9/26/2024

See attached council meeting minutes and/or resolution.



## NOTICE OF RESOLUTION

At a meeting of the Board of county Road Commissioners of the County of Gogebic, Michigan, held at 200 North Moore Street, Bessemer, Michigan 49911, on the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of September 2024, at which time a quorum of the board members was present, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by vote taken by ayes and nays and entered at large upon the record of said Board.

### RESOLUTION

**WHEREAS**, the Gogebic County Road Commission is an Act 51 Local Agency with ownership of over 100 certified miles of roadway within the State of Michigan; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Legislature of the state of Michigan has passed Public Act 325 which requires all Act 51 Local Agencies, with ownership of over 100 certified miles of roadway, to adopt a three-year Asset Management Compliance Plan; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Gogebic County Road Commission was selected to be in the inaugural year of this three-year plan submission schedule, requiring an adopted deadline for an Asset Management Compliance to the Michigan Transportation Asset Management Council by October 1, 2024; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Gogebic County Road Commission has created an Asset Management Compliance Plan which satisfies the requirements of Public Act 325; and,

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Board of Road Commissioners of the County of Gogebic by motion from Estola and seconded by Skinner hereby approves the drafted Asset Management Compliance Plan, and directs both the Chairperson of the Board of County Road Commissioners, and the Manager, to approve the Asset Management Compliance Plan in the Proof of Acceptance section.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the above is a full, true and correct copy of the resolution adopted by the Board of County Road Commissioners of the County of Gogebic, Michigan. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto affixed by name as Secretary of the Board of County Road commissioners of the County of Gogebic, Michigan, this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of September 2024.



Patricia J Hagstrom, Secretary to the Board



## **A. PAVEMENT ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN**

An attached pavement asset management plan follows.

# Gogebic County Road Commission 2024 Pavement Asset Management Plan



A plan describing the Gogebic County Road Commission's roadway assets and conditions

*Prepared by:*  
Philip Strong  
Highway Engineer  
(906) 667-0233



# CONTENTS

Table of Figures .....	i
Table of Tables .....	v
Executive Summary .....	vi
Introduction.....	1
<i>Pavement Primer</i> .....	2
1. Pavement Assets .....	12
<i>Inventory</i> .....	13
<i>Goals</i> .....	28
<i>Modelled Trends</i> .....	31
<i>Planned Projects</i> .....	37
<i>Gap Analysis</i> .....	40
2. Financial Resources .....	43
<i>County Primary Network</i> .....	43
<i>County Local Network</i> .....	43
3. Risk of Failure Analysis .....	45
4. Coordination with Other Entities .....	47
Appendix A: <#YOUR CONTENT HERE> Paved County Primary Road Planned Projects.....	49
Appendix B: <#YOUR CONTENT HERE> Paved County Local Road Planned Projects.....	50
Appendix C: <#YOUR CONTENT HERE> Unpaved Road Planned Projects.....	51
Appendix D: A Quick Check of Your Highway Network Health .....	52
Appendix E: Roadsoft Network-level Model Inputs and Outputs .....	58
Appendix F: Meeting Minutes Verifying Plan Acceptance by Governing Body .....	59



# TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1: <i>Top image, right</i> – PASER 8 road that is considered “good” by the TAMC exhibit only minor defects. <i>Second image, right</i> – PASER 5 road that is considered “fair” by the TAMC. Exhibiting structural soundness but could benefit from CPM. <i>Third image, right</i> – PASER 6 road that is considered “fair” by the TAMC. <i>Bottom image, right</i> – PASER 2 road that is considered “poor” by the TAMC exhibiting significant structural distress. ....	5
Figure 2: <i>Top</i> – Road with IBR number of 1 road that has poor surface width, poor drainage adequacy, and poor structural adequacy. <i>Middle</i> – Road IBR number of 7 that has fair surface width, fair drainage adequacy, and fair structural adequacy. <i>Bottom</i> – Road with IBR number of 9 road that has good surface width, good drainage adequacy, and good structural adequacy.....	6
Figure 3: Examples of reconstruction treatments—(left) reconstructing a road and (right) road prepared for full-depth repair. ....	7
Figure 4: Examples of structural improvement treatments—(from left) HMA overlay on an unmilled pavement, milling asphalt pavement, and pulverization of a road during a crush-and-shape project.....	8
Figure 5: Examples of capital preventive maintenance treatments—(from left) crack seal, fog seal, chip seal, and slurry seal/microsurface.....	9
Figure 6: Examples of capital preventive maintenance treatments, cont’d—(from left) concrete road prepared for partial-depth repair, gravel road undergoing maintenance grading, and gravel road receiving dust control application (dust control photo courtesy of Weld County, Colorado, weldgov.com). ....	11
Figure 7: Map showing location of GCRC’s paved roads (i.e., those managed by GCRC) and their current condition for paved roads with green for good (i.e., PASER 10, 9, 8), yellow for fair (i.e., PASER 7, 6, 5), and red for poor (i.e., PASER 4, 3, 2, 1), as well as the location of GCRC’s unpaved roads in blue.....	13
Figure 8: Percentage of county primary and county local roads for GCRC. ....	14
Figure 9: county primary and county local roads by township for GCRC’s jurisdiction.....	14
Figure 10: Miles of roads managed by GCRC that are part of the National Highway System and condition.....	15
Figure 11: Pavement type by percentage maintained by GCRC Undefined pavements have not been inventoried in GCRC’s asset management system to date, but will be included as data becomes available.....	16
Figure 12: Pavement type by township within GCRC’s jurisdiction. Undefined pavements have not been inventoried in GCRC’s asset management system to date, but will be included as data becomes available.....	16
Figure 13: (A) Left: GCRC paved county primary road network conditions by percentage of good, fair, or poor, and (B) Right: paved county local road network conditions by percentage of good, fair, or poor.....	18
Figure 14: (A) Left: Statewide paved county primary road network conditions by percentage of good, fair, or poor, and (B) Right: paved county local road network conditions by percentage of good, fair, or poor .....	19
Figure 15: GCRC paved county primary road network conditions. Bar graph colors correspond to good/fair/poor TAMC designations. ....	20

Figure 16: GCRC paved county local network condition by PASER rating. Bar graph colors correspond to good/fair/poor TAMC designations.....	20
Figure 17: Number of miles of paved road in each township divided in categories of good (PASER 10, 9, 8), fair (PASER 7, 6, 5), and poor (PASER 4, 3, 2, 1). .....	21
Figure 18: Map of the current paved road condition in good (PASER 10, 9, 8) shown in green, fair (PASER 7, 6, 5) shown in yellow, and poor (PASER 4, 3, 2, 1) shown in red. Only Roads owned by GCRC are shown. ....	22
Figure 19: Historical GCRC paved county primary road network condition trend .....	23
Figure 20: Historical statewide county primary road network condition trend .....	23
Figure 21: Historical GCRC paved county local road network condition trend.....	24
Figure 22: Historical statewide paved county local road network condition trend.....	24
Figure 23: GCRC's unpaved road network condition by percentage of roads with IBR numbers of 10, 9, and 8; roads with IBR numbers of 7, 6, and 5; and IBR numbers of 4, 3, 2, and 1. ....	25
Figure 24: Number of miles of unpaved road in each township divided in categories of roads with IBR numbers of 10, 9, and 8; IBR numbers of 7, 6, and 5; and IBR numbers of 4, 3, 2, and 1. ....	26
Figure 25: Map of the current IBR for surface width with good (22' and greater) shown in green, fair (16' to 21') shown in orange, and poor (15' or less) shown in red. Only unpaved roads owned by GCRC are shown.....	26
Figure 26: Map of the current IBR for drainage adequacy with good (2' or more) shown in green, fair (0.5' to less than 2') shown in orange, and poor (less than 0.5') shown in red. Only unpaved roads owned by GCRC are shown. ....	27
Figure 27: Map of the current IBR structural adequacy good (greater than 7") shown in green, fair (4" to 7") shown in orange, and poor (less than 4") shown in red. Only unpaved roads owned by GCRC are shown. ....	28
Figure 28: GCRC's 2024 county primary road network condition by percentage of good/fair/poor .....	29
Figure 29: GCRC 2024 paved county local road network condition by percentage of good/fair/poor.....	30
Figure 30: GCRC's 2024 unpaved road network condition by percentage of good/fair/poor .....	31
Figure 31: Pavement condition forecast model in the software program Roadsoft. ....	34
Figure 32: Forecast good/fair/poor changes to GCRC network condition from planned projects on the county primary road network. ....	35
Figure 33: Pavement condition forecast model in the software program Roadsoft. ....	36
Figure 34: Forecast good/fair/poor changes to GCRC network condition from planned projects on the paved county local road network.....	37
Figure 35: Map showing paved county primary road projects planned for 2018. ....	38
Figure 36: Map showing paved county primary road projects planned for 2019. ....	38
Figure 37: Map showing paved county primary road projects planned for 2020. ....	39
Figure 38: Map showing paved county local road projects planned for 2018. ....	39
Figure 39: Map showing paved county local road projects planned for 2019. ....	39
Figure 40: Map showing paved county local road projects planned for 2020. ....	39
Figure 41: Map showing unpaved road projects planned for 2018-2020. ....	40

Figure 42: Forecast good/fair/poor Changes to GCRC Network Condition from planned projects on the county local paved road network.....	42
Figure 43: Key transportation links in GCRC’s road network .....	46





# TABLE OF TABLES

Table 1: Service Life Extension (in Years) for Pavement Types Gained by Fix Type <sup>1</sup> .....	33
Table 2: Roadsoft Modelled Trends, Planned Projects, and Gap Analysis for 's Road Assets— Modelled Trends: NCPP Quick Check Method for Paved County Primary Road Network (243.29 miles).....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 3: Roadsoft Modelled Trends, Planned Projects, and Gap Analysis for 's Road Assets— Modelled Trends: NCPP Quick Check Method for Paved County Local Road Network (348.794 miles).....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 4: Roadsoft Modelled Trends, Planned Projects, and Gap Analysis for 's Road Assets— Modelled Trends: Roadsoft Annual Work Program for the Paved County Primary Road Network Forecast .....	35
Table 5: Roadsoft Modelled Trends, Planned Projects, and Gap Analysis for 's Road Assets— Modelled Trends: Roadsoft Annual Work Program for the Paved County Local Road Network Forecast .....	36
Table 6: Roadsoft Modelled Trends, Planned Projects, and Gap Analysis for 's Road Assets— Pavement Condition Forecast and Gap Analysis: NCPP Quick Check Method for Paved County Primary Road Network (243.29 miles).....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 7: Roadsoft Modelled Trends, Planned Projects, and Gap Analysis for 's Road Assets— Pavement Condition Forecast and Gap Analysis: NCPP Quick Check Method for Paved County Local Road Network (348.794 miles).....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 8: Roadsoft Modelled Trends, Planned Projects, and Gap Analysis for 's Road Assets— Pavement Condition Forecast and Gap Analysis: Roadsoft Annual Work Program for Paved County Primary Road Network Forecast.....	40
Table 9: Roadsoft Modelled Trends, Planned Projects, and Gap Analysis for 's Road Assets— Pavement Condition Forecast and Gap Analysis: Roadsoft Annual Work Program for Paved County Local Road Network Forecast.....	41



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As conduits for commerce and connections to vital services, roads are among the most important assets in any community along with other assets like bridges, culverts, traffic signs, traffic signals, and utilities that support and affect roads. The Gogebic County Road Commission's (GCRC) roads, other transportation assets, and support systems are also some of the most valuable and extensive public assets, all of which are paid for with taxes collected from ordinary citizens and businesses. The cost of building and maintaining roads, their importance to society, and the investment made by taxpayers all place a high level of responsibility on local agencies to plan, build, and maintain the road network in an efficient and effective manner. This asset management plan is intended to report on how GCRC is meeting its obligations to maintain the public assets for which it is responsible.

This plan overviews GCRC's road assets and condition, and explains how GCRC works to maintain and improve the overall condition of those assets. These explanations can help answer the following questions:


- What kinds of road assets GCRC has in its jurisdiction, who owns them, and the different options for maintaining these assets.
- What tools and processes GCRC uses to track and manage road assets and funds.
- What condition GCRC's road assets are in compared to statewide averages.
- Why some road assets are in better condition than others and the path to maintaining and improving road asset conditions through proper planning and maintenance.
- How agency transportation assets are funded and where those funds come from.
- How funds are used and the costs incurred during GCRC's road assets' normal life cycle.
- What condition GCRC can expect its road assets if those assets continue to be funded at the current funding levels
- How changes in funding levels can affect the overall condition of all of GCRC's road assets.

GCRC owns and/or manages 592.084 centerline of roads. This road network can be divided into the county primary network, the county local network, the unpaved road network, and the National Highway System (NHS) network based on the different factors these roads have that influence asset management decisions. A summary of GCRC historical and current network conditions, projected trends, and goals for county primary network and county local network can be seen in the two figures, below:





A summary of GCRC historical and current network conditions, projected trend and goal for the unpaved road network can be seen in the figure, below:



An asset management plan is required by Michigan Public Act 325 of 2018, and this document represents fulfillment of some of GCRC's obligations towards meeting these requirements. This asset management plan also helps demonstrate GCRC's responsible use of public funds by providing elected and appointed officials as well as the general public with inventory and condition information of GCRC's road assets, and gives taxpayers the information they need to make informed decisions about investing in its essential transportation infrastructure.

# INTRODUCTION

Asset management is defined by Public Act 325 of 2018 as “an ongoing process of maintaining, preserving, upgrading, and operating physical assets cost effectively, based on a continuous physical inventory and condition assessment and investment to achieve established performance goals”. In other words, asset management is a process that uses data to manage and track assets, like roads and bridges, in a cost-effective manner using a combination of engineering and business principles. This process is endorsed by leaders in municipal planning and transportation infrastructure, including the Michigan Municipal League, County Road Association of Michigan, the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). GCRC is supported in its use of asset management principles and processes by the Michigan Transportation Asset Management Council (TAMC), formed by the State of Michigan.

Asset management, in the context of this plan, ensures that public funds are spent as effectively as possible to maximize the condition of the road network. Asset management also provides a transparent decision-making process that allows the public to understand the technical and financial challenges of managing road infrastructure with a limited budget.

The Gogebic County Road Commission (GCRC) has adopted an “asset management” business process to overcome the challenges presented by having limited financial, staffing, and other resources while needing to meet road users’ expectations. GCRC is responsible for maintaining and operating over 592.084 centerline of roads.

This plan outlines how GCRC determines its strategy to maintain and upgrade road asset condition given agency goals, priorities of its road users, and resources provided. An updated plan is to be released approximately every three years to reflect changes in road conditions, finances, and priorities.

Questions regarding the use or content of this plan should be directed to Philip Strong at 200 N. Moore Street, Courthouse Annex, Bessemer, MI or at (906)667-0233.

<https://gogebiccountyroadcommission.org/> Key terms used in this plan are defined in GCRC’s

comprehensive transportation asset management plan (also known as the “compliance plan”) used for compliance with PA 325 or 2018.

Knowing the basic features of the asset classes themselves is a crucial starting point to understanding the rationale behind an asset management approach. The following primer provides an introduction to pavements.

## **Pavement Primer**

Roads come in two basic forms—paved and unpaved. Paved roads have hard surfaces. These hard surfaces can be constructed from asphalt, concrete, composite (asphalt and concrete), sealcoat, and brick and block materials. On the other hand, unpaved roads have no hard surfaces. Examples of these surfaces are gravel and unimproved earth.

The decision to pave with a particular material as well as the decision to leave a road unpaved allows road-owning agencies to tailor a road to a particular purpose, environment, and budget. Thus, selecting a pavement type or leaving a road unpaved depends upon purpose, materials available, and budget. Each choice represents a trade-off between budget and costs for construction and maintenance.

Maintenance enables the road to fulfill its particular purpose. To achieve the maximum service for a pavement or an unpaved road, continual monitoring of a road’s pavement condition is essential for choosing the right time to apply the right fix in the right place.

Here is a brief overview of the different types of pavements, how condition is assessed, and treatment options that can lengthen a road’s service life.

### ***Surfacing***

Pavement type is influenced by several different factors, such as cost of construction, cost of maintenance, frequency of maintenance, and type of maintenance. These factors can have benefits affecting asset life and road user experience.

### ***Paved Surfacing***

Typical benefits and tradeoffs for hard surface types include:

- **Concrete pavement:** Concrete pavement, which is sometimes called a rigid pavement, is durable and lasts a long time when properly constructed and maintained. Concrete pavement can have longer service periods between maintenance activities, which can help reduce maintenance-related traffic disruptions. However, concrete pavements have a high initial cost and can be challenging to rehabilitate and maintain at the end of their service life. A typical concrete pavement design life will provide service for 30 years before major rehabilitation is necessary.
- **Hot-mix asphalt pavement (HMA):** HMA pavement, sometimes known as asphalt or flexible pavement, is currently less expensive to construct than concrete pavement (this is, in some part, due to the closer link between HMA material costs and oil prices that HMA pavements have in comparison with other pavement types). However, they require frequent maintenance activities to



maximize their service life. A typical HMA pavement design life will provide service for 18 years before major rehabilitation is necessary. The vast majority of local-agency-owned pavements are HMA pavements.

- **Composite pavements:** Composite pavement is a combination of concrete and asphalt layers. Typically, composite pavements are old concrete pavements exhibiting ride-related issues that were overlaid by several inches of HMA in order to gain more service life from the pavement before it would need reconstruction. Converting a concrete pavement to a composite pavement is typically used as a “holding pattern” treatment to maintain the road in usable condition until reconstruction funds become available.
- **Sealcoat pavement:** Sealcoat pavement is a gravel road that have been sealed with a thin asphalt binder coating that has stone chips spread on top (not to be confused with a chip seal treatment over HMA pavement). This type of a pavement relies on the gravel layer to provide structure to support traffic, and the asphalt binder coating and stone chips shed water and eliminate the need for maintenance grading. Nonetheless, sealcoat pavement does require additional maintenance steps that asphalt and gravel do not require and does not last as long as HMA pavement, but it provides a low-cost alternative for lightly-trafficked areas and competes with asphalt for ride quality when properly constructed and maintained. Sealcoat pavement can provide service for ten or more years before the surface layer deteriorates and needs to be replaced.

### ***Unpaved Surfacing***

Typical benefits and tradeoffs for non-hard surfacing include:

- **Gravel:** Gravel is a low-cost, easy-to-maintain road surface made from layers of soil and aggregate (gravel). However, there are several potential drawbacks such as dust, mud, and ride smoothness when maintenance is delayed or traffic volume exceeds design expectations. Gravel roads require frequent low-cost maintenance activities. Gravel can be very cost effective for lower-volume, lower-speed roads. In the right conditions, a properly constructed and maintained gravel road can provide a service life comparable to an HMA pavement and can be significantly less expensive than the other pavement types.

### ***Pavement Condition***

Besides traffic congestion, pavement condition is what road users typically notice most about the quality of the roads that they regularly use—the better the pavement condition, the more satisfied users are with the service provided by the roadwork performed by road-owning agencies. Pavement condition is also a major factor in determining the most cost-effective treatment—that is, routine maintenance, capital preventive maintenance, or structural improvement—for a given section of pavement. As pavements age, they transition between “windows” of opportunity when a specific type of treatment can be applied to gain an increase in quality and extension of service life. Routine maintenance is day-to-day, regularly-scheduled, low-cost activity applied to “good” roads to prevent water or debris intrusion. Capital preventive maintenance (CPM) is a planned set of cost-effective treatments for “fair” roads that corrects pavement defects, slows further deterioration, and maintains the functional condition without increasing

structural capacity. GCRC uses pavement condition and age to anticipate when a specific section of pavement will be a potential candidate for preventive maintenance. More detail on this topic is included in the *Pavement Treatment* section of this primer.

Pavement condition data is also important because it allows road owners to evaluate the benefits of preventive maintenance projects. This data helps road owners to identify the most cost-effective use of road construction and maintenance dollars. Further, historic pavement condition data can enable road owners to predict future road conditions based on budget constraints and to determine if a road network's condition will improve, stay the same, or degrade at the current or planned investment level. This analysis can help determine how much additional funding is necessary to meet a network's condition improvement goals.

### ***Paved Road Condition Rating System***

GCRC is committed to monitoring the condition of its road network and using pavement condition data to drive cost-effective decision-making and preservation of valuable road assets. GCRC uses the Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating (PASER) system to assess its paved roads. PASER was developed by the University of Wisconsin Transportation Information Center to provide a simple, efficient, and consistent method for evaluating road condition through visual inspection. The widely-used PASER system has specific criteria for assessing asphalt, concrete, sealcoat, and brick and block pavements. Information regarding the PASER system and PASER manuals may be found on the TAMC website at: [http://www.michigan.gov/tamc/0,7308,7-356-82158\\_82627---,00.html](http://www.michigan.gov/tamc/0,7308,7-356-82158_82627---,00.html).

The TAMC has adopted the PASER system for measuring statewide pavement conditions in Michigan for asphalt, concrete, composite, sealcoat, and brick-and-block paved roads. Broad use of the PASER system means that data collected at GCRC is consistent with data collected statewide. PASER data is collected using trained inspectors in a slow-moving vehicle using GPS-enabled data collection software provided to road-owning agencies at no cost to them. The method does not require extensive training or specialized equipment, and data can be collected rapidly, which minimizes the expense for collecting and maintaining this data.

The PASER system rates surface condition using a 1-10 scale where 10 is a brand new road with no defects that can be treated with routine maintenance, 5 is a road with distresses but is structurally sound that can be treated with preventive maintenance, and 1 is a road with extensive surface and structural distresses that is in need of total reconstruction.

Roads with lower PASER scores generally require costlier treatments to restore their quality than roads with higher PASER scores. The cost effectiveness of treatments generally decreases as the PASER number decreases. In other words, as a road deteriorates, it costs more dollars per mile to fix it, and the dollars spent are less efficient in increasing the road's service life. Nationwide experience and asset management principles tell us that a road that has deteriorated to a PASER 4 or less will cost more to improve and the dollars spent are less efficient. Understanding this cost principle helps to draw meaning from the current PASER condition assessment.

The TAMC has developed statewide definitions of road condition by creating three simplified condition categories—“good”, “fair”, and “poor”—that represent bin ranges of PASER scores having similar contexts with regard to maintenance and/or reconstruction. The definitions of these rating conditions are:

- “Good” roads, according to the TAMC, have PASER scores of 8, 9, or 10. Roads in this category have very few, if any, defects and only require minimal maintenance; they may be kept in this category longer using PPM. These roads may include those that have been recently seal coated or newly constructed. Figure 1 illustrates an example of a road in this category.
- “Fair” roads, according to the TAMC, have PASER scores of 5, 6, or 7. Roads in this category still show good structural support, but their surface is starting to deteriorate. Figure 1 illustrates two road examples in this category. CPM can be cost effective for maintaining the road’s “fair” condition or even raising it to “good” condition before the structural integrity of the pavement has been severely impacted. CPM treatments can be likened to shingles on a roof of a house: while the shingles add no structural value, they protect the house from structural damage by maintaining the protective function of a roof covering.
- “Poor” roads, according to the TAMC, have PASER scores of 1, 2, 3, or 4. These roads exhibit evidence that the underlying structure is failing, such as alligator cracking and rutting. These roads must be rehabilitated with treatments like a heavy overlay, crush and shape, or total reconstruction. Figure 1 illustrates a road in this category.




Figure 1: *Top image, right*– PASER 8 road that is considered “good” by the TAMC exhibit only minor defects. *Second image, right*– PASER 5 road that is considered “fair” by the TAMC. Exhibiting structural soundness but could benefit from CPM. *Third image, right*– PASER 6 road that is considered “fair” by the TAMC. *Bottom image, right*– PASER 2 road that is considered “poor” by the TAMC exhibiting significant structural distress.

The TAMC’s good, fair, and poor categories are based solely on the definitions, above. Therefore, caution should be exercised when comparing other condition assessments with these categories because other

condition assessments may have “good”, “fair”, or “poor” designations similar to the TAMC condition categories but may not share the same definition. Often, other condition assessment systems define the “good”, “fair”, and “poor” categories differently, thus rendering the data of little use for cross-system comparison. The TAMC’s definitions provide a statewide standard for all of Michigan’s road-owning agencies to use for comparison purposes.

PASER data is collected 100 percent every two years on all federal-aid-eligible roads in Michigan. The TAMC dictates and funds the required training and the format for this collection, and it shares the data regionally and statewide. In addition, GCRC collects approximately 100 percent of its paved non-federal-aid-eligible network using its own staff and resources every two to three years.

### ***Unpaved Road Condition Rating System (IBR System™)***

The condition of unpaved roads can be rapidly changing, which makes it difficult to obtain a consistent surface condition rating over the course of weeks or even days. The PASER system works well on most paved roads, which have a relatively-stable surface condition over several months, but it is difficult to adapt to unpaved roads. To address the need for a reliable condition assessment system for unpaved roads, the TAMC adopted the Inventory Based Rating (IBR) System™, and GCRC also uses the IBR System™ for rating its unpaved roads. Information about the IBR System™ can be found at <http://ctt.mtu.edu/inventory-based-rating-system>.

The IBR System™ gathers reliable condition assessment data for unpaved road by evaluating three features—surface width, drainage adequacy, and structural adequacy—in comparison to a baseline, or generally considered “good”, road. These three assessments come together to generate an overall 1-10 IBR number. A high IBR number reflects a road with wide surface width, good drainage, and a well-designed and well-constructed base, whereas a low IBR number reflects a narrow road with no ditches and little gravel. A good, fair, or poor assessment of each feature is not an endorsement or indictment of a road’s suitability for use but simply provides context on how these road elements compare to a baseline condition.

Figure 2 illustrates the range over which features may be assessed. The top example in Figure 2 shows an unpaved road with a narrow surface width, little or no drainage, and very little gravel thickness. Using the IBR System™, these assessments would yield an IBR number of “1” for this road.

The middle example in Figure 2 shows a road with fair surface width, fair drainage adequacy, and fair



Figure 2: *Top*— Road with IBR number of 1 road that has poor surface width, poor drainage adequacy, and poor structural adequacy. *Middle*— Road IBR number of 7 that has fair surface width, fair drainage adequacy, and fair structural adequacy. *Bottom*— Road with IBR number of 9 road that has good surface width, good drainage adequacy, and good structural adequacy.



structural adequacy. These assessments would yield an IBR number of “7” for this road. The bottom example in Figure 2 shows a road with good surface width, good drainage adequacy, and good structural adequacy. These assessments would yield an IBR number of “9” for this road.

Unpaved roads are constructed and used differently throughout Michigan. A narrow, unpaved road with no ditches and very little gravel (low IBR number) may be perfectly acceptable in a short, terminal end of the road network, for example, on a road segment that ends at a lake or serves a limited number of unoccupied private properties. However, high-volume unpaved roads that serve agricultural or other industrial activities with heavy trucks and equipment will require wide surface width, good drainage, and a well-designed and well-constructed base structure (high IBR number). Where the unpaved road is and how it is used determines how the road must be constructed and maintained: just because a road has a low IBR number does not necessarily mean that it needs to be upgraded. The IBR number are not an endorsement or indictment of the road’s suitability for use but rather, an indication of a road’s capabilities to support different traffic volumes and types in all weather.

## ***Pavement Treatments***

Selection of repair treatments for roads aims to balance costs, benefits, and road life expectancy. All pavements are damaged by water, traffic weight, freeze/thaw cycles, and sunlight. Each of the following treatments and strategies—reconstruction, structural improvements, capital preventive maintenance, and others used by GCRC—counters at least one of these pavement-damaging forces.

### ***Reconstruction***

Pavement reconstruction treats failing or failed pavements by completely removing the old pavement and base and constructing an entirely new road (Figure 3). Every pavement has to eventually be reconstructed and it is usually done as a last resort after more cost-effective treatments are done, or if the road requires significant changes to road geometry, base, or buried utilities. Compared to the other treatments, which are all improvements of the existing road, reconstruction is the most extensive rehabilitation of the roadway and therefore, also the most expensive per mile and most disruptive to regular traffic patterns. Reconstructed pavement will subsequently require one or more of the previous maintenance treatments to maximize service life and performance. A reconstructed road lasts approximately 15 years and costs



Figure 3: Examples of reconstruction treatments—(left) reconstructing a road and (right) road prepared for full-depth repair.

\$250,000 per lane mile. The following descriptions outline the main reconstruction treatments used by GCRC.

### *Ditching (for Unpaved Roads)*

Water needs to drain away from any roadway to delay softening of the pavement structure, and proper drainage is critical for unpaved roads where there is no hard surface on top to stop water infiltration into the road surface and base. To improve drainage, new ditches are dug or old ones are cleaned out. Unpaved roads typically need to be re-ditched every 15 years at a cost of \$20,000 per mile.

### *Gravel Overlay (for Unpaved Roads)*

Unpaved roads will exhibit gravel loss over time due to traffic, wind, and rain. Gravel on an unpaved road provides a wear surface and contributes to the structure of the entire road. Unpaved roads typically need to be overlaid with four inches of new gravel every 15 years at a cost of \$50,000 per mile.

## ***Structural Improvement***

Roads requiring structural improvements exhibit alligator cracking and rutting and rated poor in the TAMC scale. Road rutting is evidence that the underlying structure is beginning to fail and it must be either rehabilitated with a structural treatment. Examples of structural improvement treatments include HMA overlay with or without milling, crush and shape (Figure 4), Cold in Place Recycling, and Full Depth Reclamation. The following descriptions outline the main structural improvement treatments used




Figure 4: Examples of structural improvement treatments—(from left) HMA overlay on an unmilled pavement, milling asphalt pavement, and pulverization of a road during a crush-and-shape project.

by GCRC.

### ***Hot-mix Asphalt (HMA) Overlay with/without Milling***

An HMA overlay is a layer of new asphalt (liquid asphalt and stones) placed on an existing pavement (Figure 4). Depending on the overlay thickness, this treatment can add significant structural strength. This treatment also creates a new wearing surface for traffic and seals the pavement from water, debris, and sunlight damage. An HMA overlay lasts approximately five to ten years and costs \$75,000 to \$125,000 per lane mile. The top layer of severely damaged pavement can be removed by the milling, a technique that helps prevent structural problems from being quickly reflected up to the new surface. Milling is also done to keep roads at the same height of curb and gutter that is not being raised or reinstalled in the project. Milling adds \$20,000 per lane mile to the HMA overlay cost.

### *Crush and Shape*

During a crush and shape treatment, the existing pavement and base are pulverized and then the road surface is reshaped to correct imperfections in the road's profile (Figure 4). An additional layer of gravel is often added along with a new wearing surface such as an HMA overlay or chip seal. Additional gravel and an HMA overlay give an increase in the pavements structural capacity. This treatment is usually done on rural roads with severe structural distress; Adding gravel and a wearing surface makes it more prohibitive for urban roads if the curb and gutter is not raised up. Crush and shape treatments last approximately 14 years and cost \$200,000 per lane mile.

### *Capital Preventive Maintenance*

Capital preventive maintenance (CPM) addresses pavement problems of fair-rated roads before the structural integrity of the pavement has been severely impacted. CPM is a planned set of cost-effective treatments applied to an existing roadway that slows further deterioration and that maintains or improves the functional condition of the system without significantly increasing the structural capacity. Examples of such treatments include crack seal, fog seal, chip seal, slurry seal, and microsurface (Figure 5). The purpose of the following CPM treatments is to protect the pavement structure, slow the rate of deterioration, and/or correct pavement surface deficiencies. The following descriptions outline the main CPM treatments used by GCRC.



Figure 5: Examples of capital preventive maintenance treatments—(from left) crack seal, fog seal, chip seal, and slurry seal/microsurface.

### *Crack Seal*

Water that infiltrates the pavement surface softens the pavement structure and allows traffic loads to cause more damage to the pavement than in normal dry conditions. Crack sealing helps prevent water infiltration by sealing cracks in the pavement with asphalt sealant (Figure 5). GCRC seals pavement cracks early in the life of the pavement to keep it functioning as strong as it can and for as long as it can. Crack sealing lasts approximately two years and costs \$4,000 per lane mile. Even though it does not last very long compared to other treatments, it does not cost very much compared to other treatments. This makes it a very cost effective treatment when GCRC looks at what crack filling costs per year of the treatment's life.

### *Fog Seal*

Fog sealing sprays a liquid asphalt coating onto the entire pavement surface to fill hairline cracks and prevent damage from sunlight (Figure 5). Fog seals are best for good to very good pavements and last approximately two years at a cost of \$2,000 per lane mile.

### *Chip Seal*

A chip seal, also known as a sealcoat, is a two-part treatment that starts with liquid asphalt sprayed onto the old pavement surface followed by a single layer of small stone chips spread onto the wet liquid asphalt layer (Figure 5). The liquid asphalt seals the pavement from water and debris and holds the stone chips in place, providing a new wearing surface for traffic that can correct friction problems and helping to prevent further surface deterioration. Chip seals are best applied to pavements that are not exhibiting problems with strength, and their purpose is to help preserve that strength. These treatments last approximately five years and cost \$18,000 per lane mile.

### *Slurry Seal/Microsurface*

A slurry seal or microsurface's purpose is to protect existing pavement from being damaged by water and sunlight. The primary ingredients are liquid asphalt (slurry seal) or modified liquid asphalt (microsurface), small stones, water and portland cement applied in a very thin (less than a half an inch) layer (Figure 5). The main difference between a slurry seal and a microsurface is the modified liquid asphalt used in microsurfacing provides different curing and durability properties, which allows microsurfacing to be used for filling pavement ruts. Since the application is very thin, these treatments do not add any strength to the pavement and only serves to protect the pavement's existing strength by sealing the pavement from sunlight and water damage. These treatments work best when applied before cracks are too wide and too numerous. A slurry seal treatment lasts approximately four years and costs \$40,000 per lane mile, while a microsurface treatment tends to last for seven years and costs \$40,000 per lane mile.

### *Maintenance Grading (for Unpaved Roads)*

Maintenance grading involves regrading an unpaved road to remove isolated potholes, washboarding, and ruts then restoring the compacted crust layer (Figure 6). Crust on an unpaved road is a very tightly compacted surface that sheds water with ease but takes time to be created, so destroying a crusted surface with maintenance grading requires a plan to restore the crust. Maintenance grading often needs to be performed three to five times per year and each grading costs \$500 per mile.





Figure 6: Examples of capital preventive maintenance treatments, cont'd—(from left) concrete road prepared for partial-depth repair, gravel road undergoing maintenance grading, and gravel road receiving dust control application (dust control photo courtesy of Weld County, Colorado, weldgov.com).

### ***Innovative Treatments***

Innovative treatments are those newer, unique, non-standard treatments that provide ways of treating pavements using established engineering principles in new and cost-effective ways. GCRC strives to be innovative with its pavement treatments by looking for ways to prevent pavement damage and save taxpayer dollars.

#### ***Cold in Place Recycling***

Cold in place recycling (CIR) is a structural improvement process that grinds up the existing two to five inches of asphalt and mixing the crushed asphalt with an asphalt stabilizing material. Such as engineered emulsion or foamed asphalt. CIR has been utilized in the Midwest since the 1980's, but only recently on GCRC roads. CIR is an alternative to crush and shape, that in some situations is more cost effective... depending on the existing materials on the road grade. The 2021 CIR project cost ~\$92,000 per lane mile to recycle and HMA overlay the roadway. We hope that the CIR base will provide a resilient base that will withstand our frost heaves and require less long-term maintenance for the GCRC. Additional investigation work during the planning phase is required to determine the suitability of CIR to a particular road.

Click or tap here to enter text.

### ***Maintenance***

Maintenance is the most cost-effective strategy for managing road infrastructure and prevents good and fair roads from reaching the poor category, which require costly rehabilitation and reconstruction treatments to create a year of service life. It is most effective to spend money on routine maintenance and CPM treatments, first; then, when all maintenance project candidates are treated, reconstruction and rehabilitation can be performed as money is available. This strategy is called a “mix-of-fixes” approach to managing pavements.

# 1. PAVEMENT ASSETS

Building a mile of new road can cost over \$1 million due to the large volume of materials and equipment that are necessary. The high cost of constructing road assets underlines the critical nature of properly managing and maintaining the investments made in this vital infrastructure. The specific needs of every mile of road within an agency's overall road network is a complex assessment, especially when considering rapidly changing conditions and the varying requisites of road users; understanding each road-mile's needs is an essential duty of the road-owning agency.

In Michigan, many different governmental units (or agencies) own and maintain roads, so it can be difficult for the public to understand who is responsible for items such as planning and funding construction projects, [patching] repairs, traffic control, safety, and winter maintenance for any given road. MDOT is responsible for state trunkline roads, which are typically named with "M", "I", or "US" designations regardless of their geographic location in Michigan. Cities and villages are typically responsible for all public roads within their geographic boundary with the exception of the previously mentioned state trunkline roads managed by MDOT. County road commissions (or departments) are typically responsible for all public roads within the county's geographic boundary, with the exception of those managed by cities, villages, and MDOT.

In cases where non-trunkline roads fall along jurisdictional borders, local and intergovernmental agreements dictate ownership and maintenance responsibility. Quite frequently, roads owned by one agency may be maintained by another agency because of geographic features that make it more cost effective for a neighboring agency to maintain the road instead of the actual road owner. Other times, road-owning agencies may mutually agree to coordinate maintenance activities in order to create economies of scale and take advantage of those efficiencies.

The GCRC is responsible for a total of 592.084 centerline of public roads, as shown in Figure 7.




Figure 7: Map showing location of GCRC's paved roads (i.e., those managed by GCRC) and their current condition for paved roads with green for good (i.e., PASER 10, 9, 8), yellow for fair (i.e., PASER 7, 6, 5), and red for poor (i.e., PASER 4, 3, 2, 1), as well as the location of GCRC's unpaved roads in blue

## Inventory

Michigan Public Act 51 of 1951 (PA 51), which defines how funds from the Michigan Transportation Fund (MTF) are distributed to and spent by road-owning agencies, classifies roads owned by GCRC as either county primary or county local roads. State statute prioritizes expenditures on the county primary road network.

Of the 592.084 centerline of public roads owned and/or managed by GCRC, approximately 82% of all County Primary roads are classified as federal aid eligible, which allows them to receive federal funding for their maintenance and construction. Only 1% of County Local roads are considered federal aid eligible, which means state and local funds must be used to manage these roads.

Figure 8 illustrates the percentage of roads owned by GCRC that are classified as county primary and county local roads. ..Figure 9 illustrates this breakdown of these road networks by township boundary within GCRC's jurisdiction.





Figure 8: Percentage of county primary and county local roads for GCRC.



..Figure 9: county primary and county local roads by township for GCRC's jurisdiction.

GCRC manages 0 miles of roads that are part of the National Highway System (NHS)—in other words, those roads that are critical to the nation's economy, defense, and mobility—and monitors and maintains their condition. The NHS is subject to special rules and regulations and has its own performance metrics dictated by the FHWA. While most NHS roads in Michigan are managed by MDOT, GCRC manages a percentage of those roads located in its jurisdiction, as shown in Figure 10.




Figure 10: Miles of roads managed by GCRC that are part of the National Highway System and condition.

GCRC also owns and manages 275.832 miles of unpaved roads.

### ***Types***

GCRC has multiple types of pavements in its jurisdiction, including: asphalt, sealcoat, and undefined; it also has unpaved roads (i.e., gravel and/or earth). Factors influencing pavement type include cost of construction, cost of maintenance, frequency of maintenance, type of maintenance, asset life, and road user experience. More information on pavement types is available in the Introduction's Pavement Primer.

Figure 11 illustrates the percentage of various pavement types that GCRC has in its network. Figure 12 shows the pavement type by Township boundary for GCRC's jurisdiction.




Figure 11: Pavement type by percentage maintained by GCRC Undefined pavements have not been inventoried in GCRC's asset management system to date, but will be included as data becomes available.




Figure 12: Pavement type by township within GCRC's jurisdiction. Undefined pavements have not been inventoried in GCRC's asset management system to date, but will be included as data becomes available.

## Locations

Locations and sizes of each asset can be found in GCRC's Roadsoft database. For more detail, please refer to the agency contact listed in the *Introduction* of this pavement asset management plan.

## **Condition**

The road characteristic that road users most readily notice is pavement condition. Pavement condition is a major factor in determining the most cost-effective treatment—that is, routine maintenance, capital preventive maintenance, or structural improvement—for a given section of pavement. GCRC uses pavement condition and age to anticipate when a specific section of pavement will be a potential candidate for preventive maintenance. Pavement condition data enables GCRC to evaluate the benefits of preventive maintenance projects and to identify the most cost-effective use of road construction and maintenance dollars. Historic pavement condition data can be used to predict future road conditions based on budget constraints and to determine if a road network’s condition will improve, stay the same, or degrade at the current or planned investment level. This analysis helps to determine how much additional funding is necessary to meet a network’s condition improvement goals. More detail on this topic is included in the Introduction’s *Pavement Primer*.

## **Paved Roads**

GCRC is committed to monitoring the condition of its road network and using pavement condition data to drive cost-effective decision-making and preservation of valuable road assets. GCRC uses the Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating (PASER) system, which has been adopted by the TAMC for measuring statewide pavement conditions, to assess its paved roads. The PASER system provides a simple, efficient, and consistent method for evaluating road condition through visual inspection. More information regarding the PASER system can be found in the Introduction’s *Pavement Primer*.

GCRC collects 100 percent of its PASER data every two years on all federal-aid-eligible roads in Michigan. In addition, GCRC collects 33 percent of its paved non-federal-aid-eligible network annually using its own staff and resources.

GCRC’s 2024 paved county primary road network has 20 percent of roads in the TAMC good condition category, 29 percent in fair, and 51 percent in poor (Figure 13A). The paved county local road network has 6 percent in good, 18 percent in fair, and 76 percent in poor (Figure 13B).




Figure 13: (A) Left: GCRC paved county primary road network conditions by percentage of good, fair, or poor, and (B) Right: paved county local road network conditions by percentage of good, fair, or poor

In comparison, the statewide paved county primary road network has 40 percent of roads in the TAMC good condition category, 40 percent in fair, and 20 percent in poor (Figure 14A). The statewide paved county local road network has 20 percent in good, 15 percent in fair, and 65 percent in poor (Figure 14B). Comparing Figure 13A and Figure 14A shows that GCRC's paved county primary road network is worse than similarly-classified roads in the rest of the state, while Figure 13B and Figure 14B show that GCRC's paved county local road network is worse than similarly-classified roads in the rest of the state. Other road condition graphs can be viewed on the TAMC pavement condition dashboard at: <http://www.mcgi.state.mi.us/mitrp/Data/PaserDashboard.aspx>.






Figure 14: (A) Left: Statewide paved county primary road network conditions by percentage of good, fair, or poor, and (B) Right: paved county local road network conditions by percentage of good, fair, or poor

The GCRC network is exposed to high seasonal tourist traffic volumes, commercial timber harvest and harsh winter conditions that adversely affect our road network conditions.

Figure 15 and Figure 16 show the number of miles for GCRC's roads with PASER scores expressed in TAMC definition categories for the paved county primary road network (Figure 15) and the paved county local road network (Figure 16). GCRC considers road miles on the transition line between good and fair (PASER 8) and the transition line between fair and poor (PASER 5) as representing parts of the road network where there is a risk of losing the opportunity to apply less expensive treatments that gain significant improvements in service life.




Figure 15: GCRC paved county primary road network conditions. Bar graph colors correspond to good/fair/poor TAMC designations.




Figure 16: GCRC paved county local network condition by PASER rating. Bar graph colors correspond to good/fair/poor TAMC designations.

Figure 17 illustrates GCRC's entire paved road network divided by township into the TAMC good/fair/poor designations.

Figure 18 provides a map illustrating the geographic location of paved roads and their respective PASER condition. An online version of the most recent PASER data is located at <https://www.mcgi.state.mi.us/tamcMap/>.





Figure 17: Number of miles of paved road in each township divided in categories of good (PASER 10, 9, 8), fair (PASER 7, 6, 5), and poor (PASER 4, 3, 2, 1).

Figure 18: Map of the current paved road condition in good (PASER 10, 9, 8) shown in green, fair (PASER 7, 6, 5) shown in yellow,



and poor (PASER 4, 3, 2, 1) shown in red. Only Roads owned by GCRC are shown.

Historically, the overall quality of GCRC's paved county primary roads have been decreasing, as can be observed in Figure 19. Stagnant funding sources compared to rapidly rising construction costs add up in our detriment.

Comparing GCRC's paved county primary road condition trends illustrated in Figure 19 with overall statewide condition trends for similarly-classified roads, which are illustrated in Figure 20, shows a different trend locally as in the rest of the state.




Figure 19: Historical GCRC paved county primary road network condition trend




Figure 20: Historical statewide county primary road network condition trend

Historically, the overall quality of GCRC’s paved county local roads have been decreasing than the paved county primary road network because they lack a source of state and federal funding and therefore must be supported locally. Figure 21 illustrates the condition of the paved county local road network in GCRC while Figure 22 illustrates these conditions statewide.

Comparing GCRC’s paved county local road condition trends illustrated in Figure 21 with overall statewide condition trends for all paved county local roads illustrated in Figure 22 indicates a different

trend locally as in the rest of the state. The year-to-year variation in the paved county local road network is likely due to the fact that only a portion of the network is collected each year, both locally and statewide. This variation is likely a result of reporting bias since a representative sample of roads is not collected each year.




Figure 21: Historical GCRC paved county local road network condition trend




Figure 22: Historical statewide paved county local road network condition trend

### ***Unpaved Roads***

The condition of unpaved roads can be rapidly changing, which makes it difficult to obtain a consistent surface condition rating over the course of weeks or even days. The TAMC adopted the Inventory Based Rating (IBR) System™ for rating unpaved roads, and GCRC uses the IBR System™ for rating its unpaved roads. More information regarding the IBR System™ can be found in Introduction's Pavement Primer.

Figure 23 shows the percentage of unpaved roads in each IBR number ranges of 10, 9, and 8; 7, 6, and 5; and 4, 3, 2, and 1, for all roads. Figure 24 illustrates the miles of unpaved roads in IBR number ranges of 10, 9, and 8; 7, 6, and 5; and 4, 3, 2, and 1, for each township.




Figure 23: GCRC's unpaved road network condition by percentage of roads with IBR numbers of 10, 9, and 8; roads with IBR numbers of 7, 6, and 5; and IBR numbers of 4, 3, 2, and 1.




Figure 24: Number of miles of unpaved road in each township divided in categories of roads with IBR numbers of 10, 9, and 8; IBR numbers of 7, 6, and 5; and IBR numbers of 4, 3, 2, and 1.

Figure 25, Figure 26, and Figure 27 are maps illustrating the geographic location of unpaved roads and the assessment of the IBR elements, respectively: surface width, drainage adequacy, and structural adequacy.




Figure 25: Map of the current IBR for surface width with good (22' and greater) shown in green, fair (16' to 21') shown in orange, and poor (15' or less) shown in red. Only unpaved roads owned by GCRC are shown.





Figure 26: Map of the current IBR for drainage adequacy with good (2' or more) shown in green, fair (0.5' to less than 2') shown in orange, and poor (less than 0.5') shown in red. Only unpaved roads owned by GCRC are shown.




Figure 27: Map of the current IBR structural adequacy good (greater than 7") shown in green, fair (4" to 7") shown in orange, and poor (less than 4") shown in red. Only unpaved roads owned by GCRC are shown.

## Goals

Goals help set expectations to how pavement conditions will change in the future. Pavement condition changes are influenced by water infiltration, soil conditions, sunlight exposure, traffic loading, and repair work performed. GCRC is not able to control any of these factors fully due to seasonal weather changes, traffic pattern changes, and its limited budget. In spite of the uncontrollable variables, it is still important to set realistic network condition goals that efficiently use budget resources to build and maintain roads meeting taxpayer expectations. An assessment of the progress toward these goals is provided in the *1. Pavement Assets: Gap Analysis* section of this plan.

### Goals for Paved County Primary Roads

The overall goal for GCRC's paved county primary road network is to maintain or improve road conditions network-wide at 2024 levels. The baseline condition for this goal is illustrated in Figure 28.




Figure 28: GCRC's 2024 county primary road network condition by percentage of good/fair/poor

GCRC's network-level pavement condition strategy for paved county primary roads is:

1. Prevent its good and fair (PASER 10 - 5) paved county primary from becoming poor (PASER 4 - 1).
2. Move 31 percent of paved county primary roads out of the poor category.

### ***Goals for Paved County Local Roads***

The overall goal for GCRC's paved county local road network is to maintain or improve road conditions network-wide at 2024 levels. The baseline condition for this goal is illustrated in Figure 29.




Figure 29: GCRC 2024 paved county local road network condition by percentage of good/fair/poor

GCRC's network-level pavement condition strategy for paved county local roads is:

1. Prevent its good and fair (PASER 10 - 5) paved county local roads from becoming poor (PASER 4 - 1).
2. Move 11 percent of paved county local roads out of the poor category.

### ***Goals for Unpaved Roads***

The overall goal for GCRC's unpaved road network is to maintain or improve road conditions network-wide at 2024 levels. The baseline condition for this goal is illustrated in Figure 30.




Figure 30: GCRC's 2024 unpaved road network condition by percentage of good/fair/poor

Our year-round unpaved roads will be maintained at their current structural adequacy assessments and current drainage adequacy assessments for roads where these two IBR elements are assessed as good or fair. Currently, 38.9 percent of GCRC's year-round unpaved roads have good or fair structural adequacy and 38.9 percent have good or fair drainage adequacy. Year-round unpaved roads that have either or both of these two categories assessed as poor will be strategically upgraded as funding is available to address, first, drainage issues and, then, structural issues. Surface widths will be addressed on an as-needed basis to provide service or to address safety issues. Seasonal roads will be addressed to provide passability and safety but do not have a goal associated with them.

## Modelled Trends

Roads age and deteriorate just like any other asset. All pavements are damaged by water, traffic weight, freeze/thaw cycles, sunlight, and traffic weight. To offset natural deterioration and normal wear-and-tear on the road, GCRC must complete treatment projects that either protect and/or add life to its pavements. The year-end condition of the whole network depends upon changes or preservation of individual road section condition that preservation treatments have affected.

GCRC uses many types of repair treatments for its roads, each selected to balance costs, benefits, and road life expectancy. When agency trends are modelled, any gap between goals and accomplishable work becomes evident. Financial resources influence how much work can be accomplished across the network within agency budget and what treatments and strategies can be afforded; a full discussion of GCRC's financial resources can be found in the 5. *Financial Resources* section.

Treatments and strategies that counter pavement-damaging forces include reconstruction, structural improvement, capital preventive maintenance, innovative treatments, and maintenance. For a complete discussion on the pavement treatment tools, refer to the *1. Introduction's Pavement Primer*.

Correlating with each PASER score are specific types of treatments best performed either to protect the pavement (CPM) or to add strength back into the pavement (structural improvement) (Table 1). MDOT provides guidance regarding when a specific pavement may be a candidate for a particular treatment. These identified PASER scores “trigger” the timing of projects appropriately to direct the right pavement fix at the right time, thereby providing the best chance for a successful project. The information provided in Table 1 is a guide for identifying potential projects; however, this table should not be the sole criteria for pavement treatment selection. Other information such as future development, traffic volume, utility projects, and budget play a role in project selection. This table should not be a substitute for engineering judgement.

**Table 1: Service Life Extension (in Years) for Pavement Types Gained by Fix Type<sup>1</sup>**

Fix Type	Life Extension (in years)*			
	Flexible	Composite	Rigid	PASER
HMA crack treatment	1-3	1-3	N/A	6-7
Overband crack filling	1-2	1-2	N/A	6-7
One course non-structural HMA overlay	5-7	4-7	N/A	4-5****
Mill and one course non-structural HMA overlay	5-7	4-7	N/A	3-5
Single course chip seal	3-6	N/A	N/A	5-7 <sup>†</sup>
Double chip seal	4-7	3-6	N/A	5-7 <sup>†</sup>
Single course microsurface	3-5	**	N/A	5-6
Multiple course microsurface	4-6	**	N/A	4-6****
Ultra-thin HMA overlay	3-6	3-6	N/A	4-6****
Paver placed surface seal	4-6	**	N/A	5-7
Full-depth concrete repair	N/A	N/A	3-10	4-5***
Concrete joint resealing	N/A	N/A	1-3	5-8
Concrete spall repair	N/A	N/A	1-3	5-7
Concrete crack sealing	N/A	N/A	1-3	4-7
Diamond grinding	N/A	N/A	3-5	4-6
Dowel bar retrofit	N/A	N/A	2-3	3-5***
Longitudinal HMA wedge/scratch coat with surface treatment	3-7	N/A	N/A	3-5****
Flexible patching	**	**	N/A	N/A
Mastic joint repair	1-3	1-3	N/A	4-7
Cape seal	4-7	4-7	N/A	4-7
Flexible interlayer "A"	4-7	4-7	N/A	4-7
Flexible interlayer "B" (SAMI)	4-7	4-7	N/A	3-7
Flexible interlayer "C"	4-7	4-7	N/A	3-7
Fiber reinforced flexible membrane	4-7	4-7	N/A	3-7
Fog seal	**	**	N/A	7-10
GSB 88	**	**	N/A	7-10
Mastic surface treatment	**	**	N/A	7-10
Scrub seal	**	**	N/A	4-8

\* The time range is the expected life extending benefit given to the pavement, not the anticipated longevity of the treatment.

\*\* Data is not available to quantify the life extension.

\*\*\* The concrete slabs must be in fair to good condition.

\*\*\*\* Can be used on a pavement with a PASER equal to 3 when the sole reason for rating is rutting or severe raveling of the surface asphalt layer.

<sup>†</sup> For PASER 4 or less providing structural soundness exists and that additional pre-treatment will be required for example, wedging, bar seals, spot double chip seals, injection spray patching or other pre-treatments.

<sup>1</sup> Part of Appendix D-1 from *MDOT Local Agency Programs Guidelines for Geometrics on Local Agency Projects* 2017 Edition Approved Preventive Maintenance Treatments

## Roadsoft Pavement Condition Forecast to Forecast Future Trends

GCRC uses Roadsoft, an asset management software suite, to manage road- and bridge-related infrastructure. Roadsoft is developed by Michigan Technological University and is available for Michigan local agencies at no cost to them. Roadsoft uses pavement condition data to drive network-level deterioration models that forecast future road conditions based on planned construction and maintenance work. A screenshot of Roadsoft's pavement condition model and the associated output is shown in Figure 31.




Figure 31: Pavement condition forecast model in the software program Roadsoft.

## Paved County Primary Roads

Table 4 illustrates the network-level model inputs for Roadsoft on the paved county primary road network. Other pavement types in this network were neglected due to their small numbers relative to HMA pavements. The treatments outlined in Table 4 are the average treatment volume of planned



projects scheduled to be completed in 2024 – 2026. See Appendix A of this plan for details on planned projects. Full model inputs and outputs are included in Appendix D.

**Table 4: Roadsoft Modelled Trends, Planned Projects, and Gap Analysis for 's Road Assets—Modelled Trends: Roadsoft Annual Work Program for the Paved County Primary Road Network Forecast**

Treatment Name	Annual Miles of Treatment	Years of Life	Trigger-Reset
Crack Seal	20	2	7–7
Chip Seal	15	7	5, 6-8
		9	3, 4–9
		20	1, 2, 3-10
Cold in Place Recycling & 2" Overlay	3	25	2, 3-10
[Treatment 6]			
[Treatment 7]			
[Treatment 8]			

Results from the Roadsoft network condition model for the county primary roads are shown in Figure 32. The Roadsoft network analysis of GCRC's planned projects from its currently-available budget does not allow GCRC to reach its pavement condition goals given the projects planned for the next three years.




Figure 32: Forecast good/fair/poor changes to GCRC network condition from planned projects on the county primary road network.

### *Paved County Local Road*

A screenshot of Roadsoft's pavement condition model and the associated output is shown in Figure 33.

Figure 33: Pavement condition forecast model in the software program Roadsoft.




Table 5 illustrates the network-level model inputs for Roadsoft on the paved county local road network. Other pavement types in this network were neglected due to their small numbers relative to HMA pavements. The treatments outlined in Table 5 are the average treatment volume of planned projects scheduled to be completed in 2024 – 2026. Details on planned projects are included in Appendix A, and full model inputs and outputs are included in Appendix D.

**Table 5: Roadsoft Modelled Trends, Planned Projects, and Gap Analysis for 's Road Assets—Modelled Trends: Roadsoft Annual Work Program for the Paved County Local Road Network Forecast**

Treatment Name	Annual Miles of Treatment	Years of Life	Trigger-Reset
Crack Seal	10	2	7–7
Chip Seal	0 - 5	7	5, 6-8
HMA Overlay	1	9	3, 4-9
Pulverize and Pave	1.1	20	1, 2, 3-10
Cold in Place Recycling & 2" Overlay		25	2, 3-10

Results from the Roadsoft network condition model for the paved county local roads are shown in Figure 34. The Roadsoft network analysis of GCRC's planned projects from its currently available budget does not allow GCRC to reach its pavement condition goal given the projects planned for the next three years.




Figure 34: Forecast good/fair/poor changes to GCRC network condition from planned projects on the paved county local road network.

## Planned Projects

GCRC plans construction and maintenance projects several years in advance. A multi-year planning threshold is required due to the time necessary to plan, design, and finance construction and maintenance projects on the paved county primary road network. This includes planning and programming requirements from state and federal agencies that must be met prior to starting a project and can include studies on environmental and archeological impacts, review of construction and design documents and plans, documentation of rights-of-way ownership, planning and permitting for storm water discharges, and other regulatory and administrative requirements.

Per PA 499 of 2002 (later amended by PA 199 of 2007), road projects for the upcoming three years are required to be reported annually to the TAMC. Planned projects represent the best estimate of future activity; however, changes in design, funding, and permitting may require GCRC to alter initial plans. Project planning information is used to predict the future condition of the road networks that GCRC maintains. The *1. Pavement Assets: Modelled Trends* section of this plan provides a detailed analysis of the impact of the proposed projects on their respective road networks.

For 2024-2026, GCRC plans to do the following projects:

### *Paved County Primary Projects*

GCRC is currently planning the construction and maintenance projects listed in Appendix A for the paved county primary road network. The locations of these projects are shown in Figure 35, Figure 36, and Figure 37. The total cost of these projects is approximately \$7,075,000.



Figure 35: Map showing paved county primary road projects planned for 2024.




Figure 36: Map showing paved county primary road projects planned for 2025.




Figure 37: Map showing paved county primary road projects planned for 2026.

### ***Paved County Local Projects***

GCRC is currently planning the construction and maintenance projects listed in Appendix B for the paved county local road network. We plan to do approximately \$800,000 in local roads projects per year with Townships. Townships have not provided their 3 year plans yet, so we can't share any maps.

Figure 38: Map showing paved county local road projects planned for 2024.

Figure 39: Map showing paved county local road projects planned for 2025.

Figure 40: Map showing paved county local road projects planned for 2026.

### ***Unpaved Road Projects***

GCRC is currently planning the construction and maintenance projects listed in Appendix C for the unpaved road network. The location of these projects are shown in Figure 41. The total cost of these projects varies year to year based on available budget.

Figure 41: Map showing unpaved road projects planned for 2024-2026.

More detailed information on these projects can be found in Appendix A-C.

## Gap Analysis

The current funding levels that GCRC receives are not sufficient to meet the goals for the paved county primary road network, the paved county local road network, and the unpaved road network. The *I. Pavement Assets: Goals* section of this plan provides further detail about the goals and the *I. Pavement Assets: Modelled Trends* section provides further detail on the shortfall given the current budget. However, GCRC believes that the overall condition of this network can be maintained or improved with additional funding for construction and maintenance. An alternate strategy may be used to overcome the current shortfall and meet the goals on the paved county primary road network, the paved county local road network, and the unpaved road network:

### *Roadsoft Pavement Condition Forecast for the Paved County Primary and County Local Network*

GCRC used Roadsoft to forecast the necessary additional construction and maintenance work for meeting agency goals on the paved county primary and county local road networks. Table 8 and Table 9 illustrate the network-level model inputs used for this simulation. Full model inputs and outputs are included in Appendix D.

<b>Table 8: Roadsoft Modelled Trends, Planned Projects, and Gap Analysis for 's Road Assets—Pavement Condition Forecast and Gap Analysis: Roadsoft Annual Work Program for Paved County Primary Road Network Forecast</b>			
<b>Pavement Condition Forecast</b>			
<b>Treatment Name</b>	<b>Annual Miles of Treatment</b>	<b>Years of Life</b>	<b>Trigger-Reset</b>
Crack Seal	15	2	7–7
Chip Seal		7	5, 6-8
		9	3, 4-9
	2.8	20	1, 2, 3-10
Cold in Place Recycling & 2" Overlay		25	2, 3-10
[Treatment 6]			
[Treatment 7]			
[Treatment 8]			

<b>Treatment</b>	<b>Annual Miles of Treatment</b>	<b>Years of Life</b>	<b>Trigger-Reset</b>
Crack Seal		2	7–7
Chip Seal		7	5, 6-8
		9	3, 4-9
		20	1, 2, 3-10
Cold in Place Recycling & 2" Overlay		25	1, 2, 3-10
[Treatment 6]			
[Treatment 7]			
[Treatment 8]			

**Table 9: Roadsoft Modelled Trends, Planned Projects, and Gap Analysis for 's Road Assets—Pavement Condition Forecast and Gap Analysis: Roadsoft Annual Work Program for Paved County Local Road Network Forecast**

<b>Pavement Condition Forecast</b>			
<b>Treatment Name</b>	<b>Annual Miles of Treatment</b>	<b>Years of Life</b>	<b>Trigger-Reset</b>
Crack Seal		2	7–7
Chip Seal	1	7	5, 6-8
	0.5	9	3, 4-9
	2	20	1, 2, 3-10
Cold in Place Recycling & 2" Overlay		25	1, 2, 3-10

[Treatment 6]			
[Treatment 7]			
[Treatment 8]			
<b>Additional Work Necessary to Overcome Deficit</b>			
<b>Treatment</b>	<b>Annual Miles of Treatment</b>	<b>Years of Life</b>	<b>Trigger-Reset</b>
Crack Seal		2	7–7
Chip Seal	5	7	5, 6-8
		9	3, 4-9
		20	1, 2, 3-10
Cold in Place Recycling & 2" Overlay		25	2, 3-10
[Treatment 6]			
[Treatment 7]			
[Treatment 8]			

Results for the paved county local road network from the Roadsoft network condition model given the inputs in Table 9 are shown in Figure 42 below. Results indicate that the necessary additional work needed to meet the agency condition goal would cost and additional \$1,100,00 per year.




Figure 42: Forecast good/fair/poor Changes to GCRC Network Condition from planned projects on the county local paved road network.

Planned projects on the Local paved network will vary year by year, as funding from the Township and GCRC budgets allow. GCRC plans to invest in local paved road network with total patching, crack filling, chip sealing, HMA overlay and pulverize/repave – as funds allow and per the needs of the Township that the road is located in.



## 2. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Public entities must balance the quality and extent of services they can provide with the tax resources provided by citizens and businesses, all while maximizing how efficiently funds are used. GCRC will overview its general expenditures and financial resources currently devoted to pavement maintenance and construction. This financial information is not intended to be a full financial disclosure or a formal report. Michigan agencies are required to submit an Act 51 Report to the Michigan Department of Transportation each year; this is a full financial report that outlines revenues and expenditures. This report can be obtained on our website at <https://gogebiccountyroadcommission.org/transparency-dashboard>.

GCRC has a total budget for pavement asset management of \$1,700,000.

### **County Primary Network**

GCRC has historically spent \$1,700,000 annually on pavement-related projects. Over the next three years, GCRC plans to spend \$1,700,000 on county primary-network projects consisting of, but not limited to, reconstruction, overlay, culvert replacement, and preventive maintenance. Spending on projects depends on revenue from Michigan Transportation Fund (MTF), and federal/state programs.

### **County Local Network**

GCRC has historically spent \$600,000 annually on pavement-related projects. Over the next three years, GCRC plans to spend \$600,000 on county local-network projects consisting of, but not limited to, reconstruction, overlay, culvert replacement, and preventive maintenance. Spending on projects depends on revenue from Michigan Transportation Fund (MTF), township contributions. Many local agencies in Michigan use local tax millages to supplement their road-funding budget. These taxes can provide for

additional construction and maintenance for new or existing roads that are also funded using MTF or MDOT funds. GCRC does not have local tax millages in its road-funding budget. Ironwood Township has a 1 mil that has been utilized for local road improvements. Watersmeet Township has a 0.5 mil in 2021 for local road improvements..

# 3. RISK OF FAILURE ANALYSIS

Transportation infrastructure is designed to be resilient. The system of interconnecting roads and bridges maintained by GCRC provides road users with multiple alternate options in the event of an unplanned disruption of one part of the system. There are, however, key links in the transportation system that may cause significant inconvenience to users if they are unexpectedly closed to traffic. Figure 43 illustrates the key transportation links in GCRC's road network, including those that meet the following types of situations:

- **Geographic divides:** Areas where a geographic feature (river, lake, mountain or limited access road) limits crossing points of the feature
- **Emergency alternate routes for high-volume roads:** Roads which are routinely used as alternate routes for high volume roads or roads that are included in an emergency response plan
- **Limited access areas:** Roads that serve remote or limited access areas that result in long detours if closed
- **Main access to key commercial districts:** Areas where large number or large size business will be significantly impacted if a road is unavailable.

Our road network includes the following critical assets: Lake Road, Jackson Road, Country Club Road, Big Powderhorn Road, Black River Road, Chaney Lake Road, Presque Isle Road, East Shore Road, Roddis Road, Thousand Island Lake Road, Old US-2 and Indian Village Road. (see Figure 43).



Figure 43: Key transportation links in GCRC's road network

## 4. COORDINATION WITH OTHER ENTITIES

An asset management plan provides a significant value for infrastructure owners because it serves as a platform to engage other infrastructure owners using the same shared right of way space. GCRC communicates with both public and private infrastructure owners to coordinate work in the following ways:


There are water and sewer assets in the following Townships: Ironwood, Bessemer, Wakefield, Marenisco and Watersmeet. A variety of utility companies utilize the public road right-of-ways, under permit.

### **COORDINATED PLANNING TEXT**

Multiple Townships maintains drinking water, sanitary and storm sewer assets within the GCRC public ROW. GCRC coordinates with Townships annually regarding planned projects. To take advantage of other work throughout the County. GCRC takes advantage of coordinated infrastructure work to reduce cost and maximize value using the following policies: E. Subsurface infrastructure projects which will cause damage to pavements in good condition will be delayed as long as possible, or will consider methods that do not require pavement cuts. F. Subsurface utility projects will be coordinated to allow all under pavement assets to be upgraded in the same project regardless of ownership. GCRC takes advantage of coordinated infrastructure work to reduce cost and maximize value using the following policies:

GCRC coordinates with utility owners throughout the year regarding planned projects. Infrastructure owners are encouraged to discuss planned projects that would disrupt transportation services or cause damage to pavements. Projects which may cause damage to pavements in good or fair condition are discussed and mitigation measures are proposed to minimize the impact to pavements.

# APPENDIX A: 2024 - 2026 PAVED COUNTY PRIMARY ROAD PLANNED PROJECTS



Project #/ID	Location	Surface Subt...	Treatment	Status	Start Date	Completed ...	Est. Costs	Total Costs	Rating	Description
2024 ERFO	2024 Thayer Culverts	Gravel-Stand...	Major Drainage Structure	Planned	5/13/2024	9/27/2024	\$1,500,000.00	\$0.00	0	
2024 Hall	2024 Hall	Asphalt-Stan...	HMA Overlay 2"	Planned	5/13/2024	9/20/2024	\$80,000.00	\$0.00	9	
2024 Hannu ...	2024 Hannu Skyway	Asphalt-Pulv...	Asphalt New 3"	Planned	5/13/2024	9/20/2024	\$300,000.00	\$0.00	10	
2024 Puumula	2024 Puumula	Asphalt-Stan...	Millings Overlay	Planned	5/15/2024	8/30/2024	\$80,000.00	\$0.00	8	
2024 Curtis	2024 Curtis	Asphalt-Stan...	HMA Overlay 2"	Planned	5/20/2024	9/27/2024	\$50,000.00	\$0.00	9	
203395	Kimberly Road 2024 CIR & 2" HMA	Asphalt-Stan...	FDR & 2" HMA	Planned	6/1/2024	9/30/2024	\$788,849.00	\$0.00	10	Kimberly Roa...
2025 Ironwo...	2025 Vanderhagen Road	Asphalt-Stan...	Crush, Reshape and Overlay	Planned	6/1/2025	9/26/2025	\$250,000.00	\$250,000.00	10	
2025 Lake R...	2025 Lake RD Chip Seal	Asphalt-Stan...	Chip Seal - Single	Planned	6/1/2025	8/15/2025	\$350,000.00	\$350,000.00	8	
2025 Old US...	2025 Old US2 E Chip Seal	Asphalt-Stan...	Chip Seal - Single	Planned	6/1/2025	8/15/2025	\$200,000.00	\$200,000.00	8	
JN 220998	2025 Indianhead Road STP	Asphalt-Stan...	FDR & 2" HMA	Planned	6/1/2025	9/26/2025	\$699,000.00	\$699,000.00	10	
TEDF Cat F G...	2025 Lake Road Cat F Grant	Asphalt-Stan...	FDR & 2" HMA	Planned	6/1/2025	9/26/2025	\$574,660.00	\$574,660.00	10	
JN 220565	2025 Airport ER Paving	Asphalt-Stan...	Crush, Reshape and Overlay	Planned	7/7/2025	9/26/2025	\$1,560,000.00	\$156,000.00	10	
JN 214919	2026 E Shore Rd	Asphalt-Stan...	FDR & 2" HMA	Planned	6/1/2026	9/25/2026	\$743,000.00	\$743,000.00	10	

## **APPENDIX B: 2024 - 2026 PAVED COUNTY LOCAL ROAD PLANNED PROJECTS**

TBD year to year by township



## **APPENDIX C: 2024 – 2026 UNPAVED ROAD PLANNED PROJECTS**

TBD year to year by local road need and budget.

## APPENDIX D

### **A Quick Check of Your Highway Network Health**

*By Larry Galehouse, Director, National Center for Pavement Preservation  
and*

*Jim Sorenson, Team Leader, FHWA Office of Asset Management*

Historically, many highway agency managers and administrators have tended to view their highway systems as simply a collection of projects. By viewing the network in this manner, there is a certain comfort derived from the ability to match pavement actions with their physical/functional needs. However, by only focusing on projects, opportunities for strategically managing entire road networks and asset needs are overlooked. While the “bottom up” approach is analytically possible, managing networks this way can be a daunting prospect. Instead, road agency administrators have tackled the network problem from the “top down” by allocating budgets and resources based on historical estimates of need. Implicit in this approach, is a belief that the allocated resources will be wisely used and prove adequate to achieve desirable network service levels.

Using a quick checkup tool, road agency managers and administrators can assess the needs of their network and other highway assets and determine the adequacy of their resource allocation effort. A quick checkup is readily available and can be usefully applied with minimum calculations.

It is essential to know whether present and planned program actions (reconstruction, rehabilitation, and preservation) will produce a net improvement in the condition of the network. However, before the effects of any planned actions on the highway network can be analyzed, some basic concepts should be considered.

Assume every lane-mile segment of road in the network was rated by the number of years remaining until the end of life (terminal condition). Remember that terminal condition does not mean a failed road. Rather, it is the level of deterioration that management has set as a minimum operating condition for that road or network. Consider the rated result of the current network condition as shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1 – Current Condition




Figure 2 – Condition 1-Year Later

If no improvements are made for one year, then the number of years remaining until the end of life will decrease by one year for each road segment, except for those stacked at zero. The zero- stack will increase significantly because it maintains its previous balance and also becomes the recipient of those roads having previously been stacked with one year remaining. Thus, the entire network will age one year to the condition shown in Figure 2, with the net lane-miles in the zero stack raised from 4% to 8% of the network.

Some highway agencies still subscribe to the old practice of assigning their highest priorities to the reconstruction or rehabilitation of the worst roads. This practice of “worst first”, i.e., continually addressing only those roads in the zero-stack, is a proven death spiral strategy because reconstruction and rehabilitation are the most expensive ways to maintain or restore serviceability. Rarely does sufficient funding exist to sustain such a strategy.

The measurable loss of pavement life can be thought of as the network’s total lane-miles multiplied by 1 year, i.e., lane-mile-years. Consider the following quantitative illustration. Suppose your agency’s highway network consisted of 4,356 lane-miles. Figure 3 shows that without intervention, it will lose 4,356 lane-mile-years per year.




Figure 3 – Network Lane Miles

To offset this amount of deterioration over the entire network, the agency would need to annually perform a quantity of work equal to the total number of lane-mile-years lost just to maintain the status quo. Performing work which produces fewer than 4,356 lane-mile-years would lessen the natural decline of the overall network, but still fall short of maintaining the

status quo. However, if the agency produces more than 4,356 lane-mile-years, it will improve the network.

In the following example, an agency can easily identify the effect of an annual program consisting of reconstruction, rehabilitation, and preservation projects on its network. This assessment involves knowing the only two components for reconstruction and rehabilitation projects: lane-miles and design life of each project fix. Figure 4 displays the agency's programmed activities for reconstruction and Figure 5 displays it for rehabilitation.

### Reconstruction Evaluation

Projects this Year = 2

Project	Design Life	Lane Miles	Lane Mile Years	Lane Mile Cost	Total Cost
No. 1	25 yrs	22	550	\$463,425	\$10,195,350
No. 2	30 yrs	18	540	\$556,110	\$10,009,980
Total =			1,090		\$20,205,330

Figure 4 - Reconstruction

### Rehabilitation Evaluation

Projects this Year = 3

Project	Design Life	Lane Miles	Lane Mile Years	Lane Mile Cost	Total Cost
No. 10	18 yrs	22	396	\$263,268	\$5,791,896
No. 11	15 yrs	28	420	\$219,390	\$6,142,920
No. 12	12 yrs	32	384	\$115,848	\$3,707,136
Total =			1,200		\$15,641,952

Figure 5 – Rehabilitation

When evaluating pavement preservation treatments in this analysis, it is appropriate to think in terms of “extended life” rather than design life. The term design life, as used in the reconstruction and rehabilitation tables, relates better to the new pavement's structural adequacy to handle repetitive loadings and environmental factors. This is not the goal of pavement preservation. Each type of treatment/repair has unique benefits that should be targeted to the specific mode of pavement deterioration. This means that life extension depends on factors such as type and severity of distress, traffic volume, environment, etc. Figure 6 exhibits the agency's programmed activities for preservation.

## Preservation Evaluation

Project	Life Extension	Lane Miles	Lane Mile Years	Lane Mile Cost	Total Cost
No. 101	2 yrs	12	24	\$2,562	\$30,744
No. 102	3 yrs	22	66	\$7,743	\$170,346
No. 103	5 yrs	26	130	\$13,980	\$363,480
No. 104	7 yrs	16	112	\$29,750	\$476,000
No. 105	10 yrs	8	80	\$54,410	\$435,280
<b>Total</b>			<b>= 412</b>		\$1,475,850

Figure 6 – Preservation

To satisfy the needs of its highway network, the agency must accomplish 4,356 lane-mile-years of work per year. The agency's program will derive 1,090 lane-mile-years from reconstruction, 1,200 lane-mile-years from rehabilitation, and 412 lane-mile-years from pavement preservation, for a total of 2,702 lane-mile-years. Thus, these programmed activities fall short of the minimum required to maintain the status quo, and hence would contribute to a net loss in network pavement condition of 1,653 lane-mile-years. The agency's programmed tally is shown in Figure 7.

## Network Trend

Programmed Activity	Lane-Mile-Years	Total Cost
Reconstruction	1,090	\$20,205,330
Rehabilitation	1,200	\$15,641,952
Preservation	412	\$1,475,850
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,702</b>	<b>\$37,323,132</b>
Network Needs (Loss)	( - ) 4,356	
<b>Deficit =</b>		<b>- 1,654</b>

Figure 7 – Programmed Tally

This exercise can be performed for any pavement network to benchmark its current trend. Using this approach, it is possible to see how various long-term strategies could be devised and evaluated against a policy objective related to total-network condition.

Once the pavement network is benchmarked, an opportunity exists to correct any shortcomings in the programmed tally. A decision must first be made whether to improve the

network condition or just to maintain the status quo. This is a management decision and system goal.

Continuing with the previous example, a strategy will be proposed to prevent further network deterioration until additional funding is secured.

The first step is to modify the reconstruction and rehabilitation (R&R) programs. An agonizing decision must be made about which projects to defer, eliminate, or phase differently with multi- year activity. In Figure 8, reductions are made in the R&R programs to recover funds for less costly treatments in the pavement preservation program. The result of this decision recovered slightly over \$6 million.

### Program Modification

<u>Programmed Activity</u>	<u>Lane-Mile-Years</u>	<u>Cost Savings</u>
<b>Reconstruction</b> <i>31 lane miles</i> ( <del>40 lane miles</del> )	<i>820</i> ( <del>1,090</del> )	<b>\$5,004,990</b>
<b>Rehabilitation</b> <i>77 lane miles</i> ( <del>82 lane miles</del> )	<i>1,125</i> ( <del>1,200</del> )	<b>\$1,096,950</b>
<b>Pavement Preservation</b> ( 84 lane-miles )	( 412 )	<b>0</b>
<b>Total =</b>	<i><b>2,357</b></i> ( <b>2,702</b> )	<b>\$6,101,940</b>

Figure 8 – Revised R & R Programs

Modifying the reconstruction and rehabilitation programs has reduced the number of lane-mile- years added to the network from 2,702 to 2,357 lane-mile-years. However, using less costly treatments elsewhere in the network to address roads in better condition will increase the number of lane-mile-years added to the network. A palette of pavement preservation treatments, or mix of fixes, is available to address the network needs at a much lower cost than traditional methods.

Preservation treatments are only suitable if the right treatment is used on the right road at the right time. In Figure 9, the added treatments used include concrete joint resealing, thin hot-mix asphalt (HMA) overlay ( $\leq 1.5''$ ), microsurfacing, chip seal, and crack seal. By knowing the cost per lane-mile and the treatment life-extension, it is possible to create a new strategy (costing \$36,781,144) that satisfies the network need. In this example, the agency saved in excess of \$500,000 from traditional methods (costing \$37,323,132), while erasing the 1,653 lane-mile-year deficit produced by the initial program tally. Network Strategy

Programmed Activity	Lane Mile Years	Total Cost
Reconstruction ( 31 lane-miles )	820	\$15,200,340
Rehabilitation ( 77 lane-miles )	1,125	\$14,545,002
Pavement Preservation (84 lane-miles)	412	\$1,475,850
Concrete Resealing (4 years x 31 lane-miles)	124	\$979,600
Thin HMA Overlay (10 years x 16 lane-miles)	160	\$870,560
Microsurfacing (7 years x 44 lane-miles)	308	\$1,309,000
Chip Seal (5 years x 79 lane-miles)	395	\$1,104,420
Crack Seal (2 years x 506 lane-miles)	1,012	\$1,296,372
Total =	4,356	\$36,781,144

Figure 9 – New Program Tally

In a real-world situation, the highway agency would program its budget to achieve the greatest impact on its network condition. Funds allocated for reconstruction and rehabilitation projects must be viewed as investments in the infrastructure. Conversely, funds directed for preservation projects must be regarded as protecting and preserving past infrastructure investments.

Integrating reconstruction, rehabilitation, and preservation in the proper proportions will substantially improve network conditions for the taxpayer while safeguarding the highway investment.

## **APPENDIX E: ROADSOFT NETWORK-LEVEL MODEL INPUTS AND OUTPUTS**



## **APPENDIX F: MEETING MINUTES VERIFYING PLAN ACCEPTANCE BY GOVERNING BODY**

# 8. PROOF OF ACCEPTANCE

## PUBLIC ACT 325

### CERTIFICATION OF TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

Certification Year: 2024

Local Road-owning Agency Name: Gogebic County Road Commission

Beginning October 2019 and on a three-year cycle thereafter, certification must be made for compliance to Public Act 325. A local road-owning agency with 100 certified miles or more must certify that it has developed an asset management plan for the road, bridge, culvert, and traffic signal assets. Signing this form certifies that the hitherto referred agency meets with minimum requirements as outlined by Public Act 325 and agency-defined goals and objectives.

This form must be signed by the chairperson of the local road-owning agency or the county executive and chief financial officer of the local road-owning agency.

Signature 	Signature 
Printed Name Roy D. Antonio	Printed Name Garth C. Stengard
Title Chair	Title Manager
Date 9-23-2024	Date 9-23-2024

Due every three years based on agency submission schedule

Submittal Date: 9/26/2024

See attached council meeting minutes and/or resolution.

## NOTICE OF RESOLUTION

At a meeting of the Board of county Road Commissioners of the County of Gogebic, Michigan, held at 200 North Moore Street, Bessemer, Michigan 49911, on the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of September 2024, at which time a quorum of the board members was present, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by vote taken by ayes and nays and entered at large upon the record of said Board.

### RESOLUTION

**WHEREAS**, the Gogebic County Road Commission is an Act 51 Local Agency with ownership of over 100 certified miles of roadway within the State of Michigan; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Legislature of the state of Michigan has passed Public Act 325 which requires all Act 51 Local Agencies, with ownership of over 100 certified miles of roadway, to adopt a three-year Asset Management Compliance Plan; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Gogebic County Road Commission was selected to be in the inaugural year of this three-year plan submission schedule, requiring an adopted deadline for an Asset Management Compliance to the Michigan Transportation Asset Management Council by October 1, 2024; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Gogebic County Road Commission has created an Asset Management Compliance Plan which satisfies the requirements of Public Act 325; and,

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Board of Road Commissioners of the County of Gogebic by motion from Estola and seconded by Skinner hereby approves the drafted Asset Management Compliance Plan, and directs both the Chairperson of the Board of County Road Commissioners, and the Manager, to approve the Asset Management Compliance Plan in the Proof of Acceptance section.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the above is a full, true and correct copy of the resolution adopted by the Board of County Road Commissioners of the County of Gogebic, Michigan. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto affixed by name as Secretary of the Board of County Road commissioners of the County of Gogebic, Michigan, this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of September 2024.



Patricia J Hagstrom, Secretary to the Board



## **B. BRIDGE ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN**

An attached bridge asset management plan follows.

# Gogebic County Road Commission 2024 Bridge Asset Management Plan



A plan describing the Gogebic County Road Commission's transportation assets and conditions

*Prepared by:*  
Philip Strong, P.E.  
Highway Engineer  
200 N. Moore Street  
Courthouse Annex  
Bessemer, MI 49911



# CONTENTS

Table of Figures .....	iii
Table of Tables .....	iv
Executive Summary .....	v
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>Bridge Primer</i> .....	2
<b>1. Bridge Assets .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<i>Inventory</i> .....	9
<i>Goals</i> .....	11
<i>Prioritization, Programmed/Funded Projects, and Planned Projects</i> .....	12
<i>Gap Analysis</i> .....	18
<b>2. Financial Resources .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<i>Anticipated Revenues</i> .....	19
<i>Anticipated Expenses</i> .....	19
<b>3. Risk Management .....</b>	<b>20</b>
Appendix 1 .....	24
Appendix 2 .....	25
Appendix 3 .....	26
Appendix 4 .....	27
Appendix 5 .....	28





# TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Girder bridge .....	2
Figure 2: Slab bridge .....	2
Figure 3: Truss bridge.....	2
Figure 4: Three-sided box bridge .....	2
Figure 5: Examples of common bridge construction materials used in Michigan.....	3
Figure 6: Diagram of basic elements of a bridge.....	4
Figure 7: Map illustrating locations GCRC's of bridge assets .....	10
Figure 8: Progress tracking graph indicating GCRC's historic and current bridge conditions, projected trends, and goals. ....	12

# TABLE OF TABLES

Table 1: Summary of the NBI Rating Scale .....	3
Table 2: Bridge Assets by Type: Inventory, Size, and Condition.....	11
Table 3: Summary of Preservation Criteria .....	13
Table 4: Cost Projection Table .....	18
Table 5: Bridges that are Considered Scour Critical.....	21
Table 6: Posted or Close Bridges that are Critical Links .....	22

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As conduits for commerce and connections to vital services, bridges are among the most important assets in any community along with other assets like roads, culverts, traffic signs, traffic signals, and utilities that support and affect the road network. The Gogebic County Road Commission's (GCRC) bridges, other road-related assets, and support systems are some of the most valuable and extensive public assets, all of which are paid for with taxes collected from ordinary citizens and businesses. The cost of building and maintaining bridges, their importance to society, and the investment made by taxpayers all place a high level of responsibility on local agencies to plan, build, and maintain the road and bridge network in an efficient and effective manner. This asset management plan is intended to report on how GCRC is meeting its obligations to maintain the bridges for which it is responsible.

This plan overviews GCRC's bridge assets and conditions and explains how Gogebic County Road Commission works to maintain and improve the overall condition of those assets. These explanations can help answer:

- What kinds of bridge assets GCRC has in its jurisdiction and the different options for maintaining these assets.
- What tools and processes GCRC uses to track and manage bridge assets and funds.
- What condition GCRC's bridge assets are in compared to statewide averages.
- Why some bridge assets are in better condition than others and the path to maintaining and improving bridge asset conditions through proper planning and maintenance.
- How agency bridge assets are funded and where those funds come from.
- How funds are used and the costs incurred during GCRC's bridge assets' normal life cycle.
- What condition GCRC can expect of its bridge assets if those assets continue to be funded at the current funding levels
- How changes in funding levels can affect the overall condition of all of GCRC's bridge assets.

GCRC owns and/or manages 61 bridges. A summary of its historical and current bridge asset conditions, projected trends, and goals can be seen in the figure, below.



An asset management plan is required by Michigan Public Act 325 of 2018, and this document represents fulfillment of some of GCRC's obligations towards meeting these requirements. This asset management plan also helps demonstrate GCRC's responsible use of public funds by providing elected and appointed officials as well as the general public with inventory and condition information of GCRC's bridge assets, and gives taxpayers the information they need to make informed decisions about investing in essential transportation infrastructure.

# INTRODUCTION

Asset management is defined by Public Act 325 of 2018 as “an ongoing process of maintaining, preserving, upgrading, and operating physical assets cost effectively, based on a continuous physical inventory and condition assessment and investment to achieve established performance goals”. In other words, asset management is a process that uses data to manage and track assets, like roads and bridges, in a cost-effective manner using a combination of engineering and business principles. This process is endorsed by leaders in municipal planning and transportation infrastructure, including the Michigan Municipal League, County Road Association of Michigan, the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The Gogebic County Road Commission is supported in its use of asset management principles and processes by the Michigan Transportation Asset Management Council (TAMC), formed by the State of Michigan.

Asset management, in the context of this plan, ensures that public funds are spent as effectively as possible to maximize the condition of the bridges in Gogebic County Road Commission’s road network. Asset management also provides a transparent decision-making process that allows the public to understand the technical and financial challenges of managing infrastructure with a limited budget.

The Gogebic County Road Commission (GCRC) has adopted an “asset management” business process to overcome the challenges presented by having limited financial, staffing, and other resources while needing to meet safety standards and bridge users’ expectations. GCRC is responsible for maintaining and operating 61 bridges.

This 2024 plan outlines how GCRC determines its strategy to maintain and upgrade bridge asset condition given agency goals, priorities of its bridge users, and resources provided. An updated plan is to be released approximately every three years to reflect changes in bridge conditions, finances, and priorities.

Questions regarding the use or content of this plan should be directed to Phil Strong at 200 N Moore Street, Courthouse Annex, Bessemer, Michigan 49911 or at (906) 667-0233. A copy of this plan can be accessed on our website at <https://gogebiccountyroadcommission.org/>.

Key terms used in this plan are defined in GCRC’s comprehensive transportation asset management plan (also known as the “compliance plan”) used for compliance with PA 325 or 2018.

Knowing the basic features of an asset class is a crucial starting point to understanding the rationale behind an asset management approach. The following primer provides an introduction to bridges.

## Bridge Primer

### ***Bridge Types***

Bridges are structures that span 20 feet or more. These bridges can extend across one or multiple spans.

If culverts are placed side by side to form a span of 20 feet or more (for example, three 6-foot culverts with one-foot between each culvert), then this culvert system would be defined as a bridge. (Note: The Compliance Plan Appendix C contains a primer on culverts not defined as bridges.)

Bridge types are classified based on two features: design and material.

The most common bridge design is the **girder system** (Figure 1). With this design, the bridge deck transfers vehicle loads to girders (or beams) that, in turn, transfer the load to the piers or abutments (see Figure 6).

A similar design that lacks girders (or beams) is a **slab bridge** (Figure 2, and see Figure 6). A slab bridge transfers the vehicle load directly to the abutments and, if necessary, piers.

**Truss bridges** were once quite common and consist of a support structure that is created when structural members are connected at joints to form interconnected triangles (Figure 4). Structural members may consist of steel tubes or angles connected at joints with gusset plates.

Another common bridge design in Michigan is the three-sided pre-cast box or arch bridge (Figure 4).

Michigan is also home to several unique bridge designs.

Adding another layer of complexity to bridge typing is the primary construction materials used (Figure 5). Bridges are generally constructed from concrete, steel, pre-stressed concrete, or timber. Some historical bridges or bridge components in Michigan may be constructed from stone or masonry.



Figure 1: Girder bridge



Figure 2: Slab bridge



Figure 3: Truss bridge



Figure 4: Three-sided box bridge



Figure 5: Examples of common bridge construction materials used in Michigan

## Bridge Condition

Michigan inspectors rate bridge condition on a 0-9 scale known as the National Bridge Inventory (NBI) rating scale (see Table for a summary of the NBI Rating scale). Elements of the bridge's superstructure, deck, and substructure receive a 9 if they are in excellent condition down to a 0 if they are in failed condition. A complete guide for Michigan bridge condition rating according to the NBI can be found in the MDOT Bridge Field Services' *Bridge Safety Inspection NBI Rating Guidelines* ([https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mdot/BIR\\_Ratings\\_Guide\\_Combined\\_2017-10-30\\_606610\\_7.pdf](https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mdot/BIR_Ratings_Guide_Combined_2017-10-30_606610_7.pdf)).

Table 1: Summary of the NBI Rating Scale	
NBI Rating	General Condition
9-7	Like new/good
6-5	Fair
4-3	Poor/serious
2-0	Critical/failed

## Bridge Treatments

### Replacement

Replacement work is typically performed when a bridge is in poor condition (NBI rating of 4 or less) and will improve the bridge to good condition (NBI rating of 7 or more). The Local Bridge Program, a part of MDOT's Local Agency Program, defines bridge replacement as full replacement, which removes the entire bridge (superstructure, deck, and substructure) before re-building a bridge at the same location (Figure 6). The decision to perform a total replacement over rehabilitation (see below) should be made based on a life-cycle cost analysis. Generally, replacement is selected if rehabilitation costs more than two-thirds of the cost of replacement. Replacement is generally the most expensive of the treatment options.






Figure 6: Diagram of basic elements of a bridge

### ***Rehabilitation***

Rehabilitation involves repairs that improve the existing condition and extend the service life of the structure and the riding surface. Most often, rehabilitation options are associated with bridges that have degraded beyond what can be fixed with preventive maintenance. Rehabilitation is typically performed on poor-rated elements (NBI rating of 4 or less) to improve them to fair or good condition (NBI rating of 5 or more). Rehabilitation can include superstructure replacement (removal and replacement of beams and deck) or deck replacement. While typically more expensive than general maintenance, rehabilitation treatments may be more cost-effective than replacing the entire structure.

- **Railing retrofit/replacement:** A railing retrofit or replacement either reinforces the existing railing or replaces it entirely (Figure 6). This rehabilitation is driven by a need for safety improvements on poor-rated railings or barriers (NBI rating less than 5).
- **Beam repair:** Beam repair corrects damage that has reduced beam strength (Figure 6). In the case of steel beams, it is performed if there is 25 percent or more of section loss in an area of the beam that affects load-carrying capacity. In the case of concrete beams, this is performed if there is 50 percent or more spalling (i.e., loss of material) at the ends of beams.
- **Substructure concrete patching and repair:** Patching and repairing the substructure is essential to keep a bridge in service. These rehabilitation efforts are performed when the abutments or piers are fair or poor (NBI rating of 5 or 4), or if spalling and delamination affect less than 30 percent of the bridge surface.

## ***Preventive Maintenance***

The Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) *Bridge Preservation Guide* (2018) defines preventive maintenance as "a strategy of extending service life by applying cost-effective treatments to bridge elements...[that] retard future deterioration and avoid large expenses in bridge rehabilitation or replacements."

Preventive maintenance work is typically done on bridges rated fair (NBI rating of 5 or 6) in order to slow the rate of deterioration and keep them from falling into poor condition.

- **Concrete deck overlay:** A concrete deck overlay involves removing and replacing the driving surface. Typically, this is done when the deck surface is poor (NBI rating is less than 5) and the underneath portion of the deck is at least fair (NBI rating greater than 4). A shallow or deep concrete overlay may be performed depending on the condition of the bottom of the deck. The MDOT *Bridge Deck Preservation* matrices provide more detail on concrete deck overlays (see [https://www.michigan.gov/mdot/0,4616,7-151-9625\\_24768\\_24773---,00.html](https://www.michigan.gov/mdot/0,4616,7-151-9625_24768_24773---,00.html)).
- **Deck repairs:** Deck repairs include three common techniques: HMA overlay with or without waterproof membranes, concrete patching, deck sealing, crack sealing, and joint repair/replacement. An HMA overlay with an underlying waterproof membrane can be placed on bridge decks with a surface rating of fair or lower (NBI of 5 or less) and with deficiencies that cover between 15 and 30 percent of the deck surface and deck bottom. An HMA overlay without a waterproof membrane should be used on a bridge deck with a deck surface and deck bottom rating of serious condition or lower (NBI rating of 3 or less) and with deficiencies that cover greater than 30 percent of the deck surface and bottom; this is considered a temporary holdover to improve ride quality when a bridge deck is scheduled to undergo major rehabilitation within five years. All HMA overlays need to be accompanied by an updated load rating. Patching of the concrete on a bridge deck is done in response to an inspector's work recommendation or when the deck surface is in good, satisfactory, or fair condition (NBI rating of 7, 6, or 5) with minor delamination and spalling. To preserve a good bridge deck in good condition, a deck sealer can be used.

Deck sealing should only be done when the bridge deck has surface rating of fair or better (NBI of 5 or more). Concrete sealers should only be used when the top and bottom surfaces of the deck are free from major deficiencies, cracks, and spalling. An epoxy overlay may be used when between 2 and 5 percent of the deck surface has delaminations and spalls, but these deficiencies must be repaired prior to the overlay. An epoxy overlay may also be used to repair an existing epoxy overlay. Concrete crack sealing is an option to maintain concrete in otherwise good condition that has visible cracks with the potential of reaching the steel reinforcement. Crack sealing may be performed on concrete with a surface rating of good, satisfactory, or fair (NBIS rating of 7, 6, or 5) with minor surface spalling and delamination; it may also be performed in response to a work recommendation by an inspector who has determined that the frequency and size of the cracks require sealing.

- **Steel bearing repair/replacement:** Rather than sitting directly on the piers, a bridge superstructure is separated from the piers by bearings. Bearings allow for a certain degree of movement due to temperature changes or other forces. Repairing or replacing the bearings is considered preventive maintenance. Girders and a deck in at least fair condition (NBI of 5 or higher) and bearings in poor condition (NBI rating of 4 or less) identifies candidates for this maintenance activity.
- **Painting:** Re-painting a bridge structure can either be done in totality or in part. Total re-painting is done in response to an inspector's work recommendation or when the paint condition is in serious condition (NBI rating of 3 or less). Partial re-painting can either consist of zone re-painting, which is a preventive maintenance technique, or spot re-painting, which is scheduled maintenance (see below). Zone re-painting is done when less than 15 percent of the paint in a smaller area, or zone, has failed while the rest of the bridge is in good or fair condition. It is also done if the paint condition is fair or poor (NBI rating of 5 or 4).
- **Channel improvements:** Occasionally, it is necessary to make improvements to the waterway that flows underneath the bridge. Such channel improvements are driven by an inspector's work recommendation based on a hydraulic analysis or to remove vegetation, debris, or sediment from the channel and banks (Figure 6).
- **Scour countermeasures:** An inspector's work recommendations or a hydraulic analysis may require scour countermeasures (see the *Risk Management* section of this plan for more information on scour). This is done when a structure is categorized as scour critical and is not scheduled for replacement or when NBI comments in abutment and pier ratings indicate the presence of scour holes.
- **Approach repaving:** A bridge's approach is the transition area between the roadway leading up to and away from the bridge and the bridge deck. Repaving the approach areas is performed in response to an inspector's work recommendation, when the pavement surface is in poor condition (NBI rating of 4 or less), or when the bridge deck is replaced or rehabilitated (e.g., concrete overlay).
- **Guardrail repair/replacement:** A guardrail is a safety feature on many roads and bridges that prevents or minimizes the effects of lane departure incidents. Keeping bridge guardrails in good condition is important. Repair or replacement of bridge guardrail should be done when a guardrail is missing or damaged, or when it needs a safety improvement.

### ***Scheduled Maintenance***

Scheduled maintenance activities are those activities or treatments that are regularly scheduled and intend to maintain serviceability while reducing the rate of deterioration.

- **Superstructure washing:** Washing the superstructure, or the main structure supporting the bridge, typically occurs in response to an inspector's work recommendation or when salt-

contaminated dirt and debris collected on the superstructure is causing corrosion or deterioration by trapping moisture.

- **Drainage system cleanout/repair:** Keeping a bridge's drainage system clean and in good working order allows the bridge to shed water effectively. An inspector's work recommendation may indicate drainage system cleanout/repair. Signs that a drainage system needs cleaning or repair include clogs and broken, deteriorated, or damaged drainage elements.
- **Spot painting:** Spot painting is a form of partial bridge painting. This scheduled maintenance technique involves painting a small portion of a bridge. Generally, this is done in response to an inspector's work recommendation and is used for zinc-based paint systems only.
- **Slope repair/reinforcement:** The terrain on either side of the bridge that slopes down toward the channel is called the slope. At times, it is necessary to repair the slope. Situations that call for slope repair include when the slope is degraded, when the slope has significant areas of distress or failure, when the slope has settled, or if the slope is in fair or poor condition (NBI rating of 5 or less). Other times, it is necessary to reinforce the slope. Reinforcement can be added by installing Riprap, which is a side-slope covering made of stones. Riprap protects the stability of side slopes of channel banks when erosion threatens the surface.
- **Vegetation control and debris removal:** Keeping the area around a bridge structure free of vegetation and debris safeguards the bridge structure from these potentially damaging forces. Removing or restricting vegetation around bridges prevents damage to the structure. Vegetation control is done in response to an inspector's work recommendation or when vegetation traps moisture on structural elements or is growing from joints or cracks. Debris in the water channel or in the bridge can also cause damage to the structure. Removing this debris is typically done in response to an inspector's work recommendation or when vegetation, debris, or sediment accumulates on the structure or channel.
- **Miscellaneous repairs:** These are uncategorized repairs in response to an inspector's work recommendation.

# 1. BRIDGE ASSETS

GCRC seeks to implement an asset management program for its bridge structures. This program balances the decision to perform reconstruction, rehabilitation, preventive maintenance, scheduled maintenance, or new construction, with GCRC's bridge funding in order to maximize the useful service life and to ensure the safety of the local bridges under its jurisdiction. In other words, GCRC's bridge asset management program aims to preserve and/or improve the condition of its local bridge network within the means of its financial resources.

Nonetheless, GCRC recognizes that limited funds are available for improving the bridge network. Since preservation strategies like preventive maintenance are generally a more effective use of these funds than costly alternative management strategies like major rehabilitation or replacement, GCRC seeks to identify those bridges that will benefit from a planned maintenance program while addressing those bridges that pose usability and/or safety concerns.

The three-fold goal of GCRC's asset management program is the preservation and safety of its bridge network, increase of its bridge assets' useful service life by extending of the time that bridges remain in good and fair condition, and reduction of future maintenance costs. To quantify this goal, GCRC specifically aims to have to have 72% or more of the agency's local bridges in fair to good condition and to have less than 28% classify as structurally deficient over its three-year plan.

Thus, GCRC's asset management plan objectives are:

- To establish the current condition of the county's bridges
- To develop a "mix of fixes" that will:
  - Program scheduled maintenance actions to impede deterioration of bridges in good condition
  - Implement selective corrective repairs or rehabilitation for degraded bridge elements order to restore functionality
  - Identify and program those eligible bridges in need of replacement
- To identify available funding sources, such as:

- Dedicated county resources
- County funding through Michigan’s Local Bridge Program
- Opportunities to obtain other funding
- To prioritize the programmed actions within available funding limitations
- To improve the condition of bridges currently rated poor (4 or lower) and preserve bridges currently rated fair (5) or higher in their current condition in order to extend their useful service life.

## **Inventory**

GCRC is responsible for 61 local bridges. Table 2 summarizes GCRC’s bridge assets by type, sizes by bridge type, and condition by bridge type. Additional inventory data, condition ratings, and proposed preventive maintenance actions for each bridge are contained in the tables in Appendixes 3, 4, and 5. The bridge inventory data was obtained from MDOT MiBRIDGE and other sources, and the 2023 condition data and maintenance actions are taken from the inspector’s summary report (see Appendix 2).

### ***Types***

Of the GCRC’s 61 structures, 14 are concrete bridges, 20 are steel bridges, 25 are pre-stressed concrete bridges, and 2 are timber bridges.

### ***Locations and Sizes***

Figure 7 illustrates the locations of bridge assets owned by GCRC. Details about the locations and sizes of each individual asset can be found in GCRC’s MiBRIDGE database. For more information, please refer to the agency contact listed in the *Introduction* of this bridge asset management plan.




Figure 7: Map illustrating locations GCRC's of bridge assets

## Condition

GCRC evaluates its bridges according to the National Bridge Inspection Standards rating scale, with a rating of 9 to 7 being like new to good condition, a rating of 6 and 5 being fair condition, and a rating of 4 or lower being poor or serious/critical condition. The current condition of GCRC's bridge network is 10 (16%) are good, 34 (56%) are fair, and 17 (28%) are poor or lower.

Another layer of classification of GCRC's bridge inventory classifies 17 (28%) bridges as structurally deficient, 12 (20%) bridges as posted, and 4 (7%) bridges as closed. Structurally deficient bridges are those with a deck, superstructure, substructure, and/or culvert rated as "poor" according to the NBI rating scale, with a load-carrying capacity significantly below design standards, or with a waterway that regularly overtops the bridge during floods. Posted bridges are those that have declined in condition to a point where a restriction is necessary for what would be considered a safe vehicular or traffic load passing over the bridge; designating a bridge as "posted" has no influence on its condition rating. Closed bridges are those that are closed to all traffic; closing a bridge is contingent upon its ability to carry a set minimum live load.

<b>Table 2: Bridge Assets by Type: Inventory, Size, and Condition</b>								
<b>Bridge Type</b>	<b>Total Number of Bridges</b>	<b>Total Deck Area (sq ft)</b>	<b>Condition: Structurally Deficient, Posted, Closed</b>			<b>2023 Condition</b>		
			<b>Struct. Defic.</b>	<b>Posted</b>	<b>Closed</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>
Concrete – Culvert	7	5,410	0	0	0	0	4	3
Concrete – Girder and floorbeam	2	4,280	2	1	1	2	0	0
Concrete – Tee beam	5	4,668	2	1	1	2	3	0
Prestressed concrete – Box beam/girders—multiple	25	55,940	1	0	0	1	17	7
Steel – Culvert	3	2,174	2	0	0	2	1	0
Steel – Girder and floorbeam	2	5,926	1	1	0	1	1	0
Steel – Multistringer	13	15,506	6	7	0	6	7	0
Steel – Truss—thru and pony	2	1,966	2	0	2	2	4	0
Timber – Multistringer	2	1,590	1	2	0	1	1	0
<b>Total SD/Posted/Closed</b>			<b>17</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>97,460</b>				<b>17</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Percentage (%)</b>			<b>28%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>16%</b>

Statewide, MDOT’s statistics for local agency bridges show that 14% are poor and 86% are good/fair, indicating that the GCRC has a greater percentage of poor bridges compared to the statewide average for local agencies. Correspondingly, GCRC has 72% of its bridges in fair/good condition versus the statewide average of 86% for local agency bridges. Statewide, 8% of local agency bridge deck area classifies as structurally deficient compared to 28% of GCRC’s bridge deck area.

## Goals

The goal of GCRC’s asset management program is the preservation and safety of its bridge network; it also aims to extend the period of time that bridges remain in good and fair condition, thereby increasing their useful service life and reducing future maintenance costs.

Specifically, this goal translates into long-range goals of having 72% of its bridges rated fair/good and having less than 28% classify as structurally deficient within three years. These goals are juxtaposed with the historic and current condition and the projected trend in Figure 8.

Several metrics will be used to assess the effectiveness of this asset management program. GCRC will monitor and report the annual change in the number of its bridges rated fair/good (5 or higher) and the annual change in the number of its bridges classified as structurally deficient.





Figure 8: Progress tracking graph indicating GCRC's historic and current bridge conditions, projected trends, and goals.

Based on past inspection records and condition ratings, GCRC will establish a baseline of past performance by determining the average period of time that a bridge remains in good or fair condition. The performance measure will be the increased average amount of time a bridge is in the good or fair condition status after implementation of the asset management strategy when compared to the baseline time before implementation.

## Prioritization, Programmed/Funded Projects, and Planned Projects

### ***Prioritization***

GCRC's asset management program aims to address the structures of critical concern by targeting elements rated as being in poor condition and to improve and maintain the overall condition of the bridge network to good or fair condition through a "mix of fixes" strategy. Therefore, GCRC prioritizes bridges for projects by evaluating five factors and weighting them as follows: condition –10%, load capacity –25%, traffic –25%, safety –10%, and detour –30%. There are several components within each factor that are used to arrive at its score. Each project under consideration is scored, and its total score is then compared with other proposed project to establish a priority order.

GCRC annually reviews the current condition of each of its bridges using the NBIS inspection data contained in the *MDOT Bridge Safety Inspection Report* and the inspector's work recommendations contained in MDOT's *Bridge Inspection Report*. The inspection inventory and condition data are consolidated in spreadsheet format for GCRC's bridges in Appendix 3. GCRC then determines management and preservation needs and corresponding actions for each bridge (Appendix 4) As well as inspection follow-up actions (Appendix 5). The management and preservation actions are selected in accordance with criteria contained in the *Summary of Preservation Criteria* table (below) and adapted to GCRC's specific bridge network.

<b>Table 3: Summary of Preservation Criteria</b>		
<b>Preservation Action</b>	<b>Bridge Selection Criteria</b>	<b>Expected Service Life</b>
<b>Replacement</b>		
Total Replacement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NBI rating of 3 or less [1] [2]</li> <li>• OR Cost of rehabilitation exceeds cost of replacement [1]</li> <li>• OR Bridge is scour critical with no counter-measures available [1]</li> </ul>	70 years
<b>Rehabilitation</b>		
Superstructure Replacement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NBI rating of 4 or less for the superstructure [1] [2]</li> <li>• OR Cost of superstructure and deck rehabilitation exceeds cost of replacement [1]</li> </ul>	40 years <sup>[1]</sup>
Deck Replacement Epoxy Coated Steel Black Steel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use guidelines in MDOT's Bridge Deck Preservation Matrix [3] [4]</li> <li>• NBI rating of 4 or less for the deck surface and deck bottom [1] [2]</li> <li>• Deck bottom has more than 25% total area with deficiencies [1]</li> <li>• OR Replacement cost of deck is competitive with rehabilitation [1]</li> </ul>	60+ years <sup>[3] [4]</sup>
Substructure Replacement (Full or Partial)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NBI rating of 4 or less for abutments, piers, or pier cap [1] [2]</li> <li>• Has open vertical cracks, signs of differential settlement, or active movement [1]</li> <li>• Pontis rating of 3 or 5 for more than 30 percent of the substructure [1] [5]</li> <li>• OR Bridge is scour critical with no counter-measures available</li> </ul>	40 years <sup>[1*]</sup>
Steel Beam Repair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than 25% section loss in an area of the beam that affects load carrying capacity [1]</li> <li>• OR To correct impact damage that impairs beam strength [1]</li> </ul>	40 years <sup>[1*]</sup>
Prestressed Concrete Beam Repair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than 5% spalling at ends of prestressed I-beams [1]</li> <li>• OR Impact damage that impairs beam strength or exposes prestressing strands [1]</li> </ul>	40 years <sup>[1*]</sup>
Substructure Concrete Patching and Repair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NBI rating of 5 or 4 for abutments or piers, and surface has less than 30% area spalled and delaminated [1] [2]</li> <li>• OR Pontis rating of 3 or 4 for the column or pile extension, pier wall, and/or abutment wall and surface has between 2% and 30% area with deficiencies [1] [5]</li> <li>• OR In response to inspector's work recommendation for substructure patching [1]</li> </ul>	
Abutment Repair/Replacement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NBI rating of 4 or less for the abutment [1] [2]</li> <li>• OR Has open vertical cracks, signs of differential settlement, or active movement</li> </ul>	

Table 3: Summary of Preservation Criteria		
Preservation Action	Bridge Selection Criteria	Expected Service Life
Railing/Barrier Replacement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NBI rating greater than 5 for the deck [1] [2]</li> <li>NBI rating less than 5 for the railing with more than 30% total area having deficiencies [1] [2]</li> <li>OR Pontis rating is 4 for railing [1] [5]</li> <li>OR Safety improvement is needed [1]</li> </ul>	
Culvert Repair/Replacement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NBI rating of 4 or less for culvert or drainage outlet structure</li> <li>OR Has open vertical cracks, signs of deformation, movement, or differential settlement</li> </ul>	
<b>Preventive Maintenance</b>		
Shallow Concrete Deck Overlay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NBI rating is 5 or less for deck surface, and deck surface has more than 15% area with deficiencies [1] [2]</li> <li>NBI rating of 4 or 5 for deck bottom, and deck bottom has between 5% and 30% area with deficiencies [1] [2]</li> <li>OR In response to inspector's work recommendation [1]</li> </ul>	12 years
Deep Concrete Deck Overlay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NBI rating of 5 or less for deck surface, and deck surface has more than 15% area with deficiencies [1] [2]</li> <li>NBI deck bottom rating is 5 or 6, and deck bottom has less than 10% area with deficiencies [1] [2]</li> <li>OR In response to inspector's work recommendation [1]</li> </ul>	25 years
HMA Overlay with Waterproofing Membrane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NBI rating of 5 or less for deck surface, and both deck surface and bottom have between 15% and 30% area with deficiencies [1] [2]</li> <li>OR Bridge is in poor condition and will be replaced in the near future and the most cost-effective fix is HMA overlay [1]</li> </ul>	
HMA Overlay Cap without Membrane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note: All HMA caps should have membranes unless scheduled for replacement within five years.</li> <li>NBI rating of 3 or less for deck surface and deck bottom, and deck surface and deck bottom have more than 30% area with deficiencies. Temporary holdover to improve ride quality for a bridge in the five-year plan for rehab/replacement. [1] [2]</li> </ul>	3 years
Concrete Deck Patching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NBI rating of 5, 6, or 7 for deck surface, and deck surface has between 2% and 5% area with delamination and spalling [1] [2]</li> <li>OR In response to inspector's work recommendation [1]</li> </ul>	5 years
Steel Bearing Repair/Replacement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NBI rating of 5 or more for superstructure and deck, and NBI rating 4 or less for bearing [2]</li> </ul>	
Deck Joint Replacement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Always include when doing deep or shallow concrete overlays [1]</li> <li>NBI rating of 4 or less for joints [1] [2]</li> <li>OR Joint leaking heavily [1]</li> <li>OR In response to inspector's work recommendation for replacement [1]</li> </ul>	
Pin and Hanger Replacement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NBI rating of 4 or less for superstructure for pins and hangers [1] [2]</li> <li>Pontis rating of 1, 2, or 3 for a frozen or deformed pin and hanger [1] [5]</li> <li>OR Presence of excessive section loss, severe pack rust, or out-of-plane distortion [1]</li> </ul>	15 years
Zone Repainting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NBI rating of 5 or 4 for paint condition, and paint has 3% to 15% total area failing [1] [2]</li> </ul>	10 years

Table 3: Summary of Preservation Criteria		
Preservation Action	Bridge Selection Criteria	Expected Service Life
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OR During routine maintenance on beam ends or pins and hangers [1]</li> <li>• OR less than 15% of existing paint area has failed and remainder of paint system is in good or fair condition [1]</li> </ul>	
Complete Repainting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NBI rating of 3 or less for paint condition [1] [2]</li> <li>• OR Painted steel beams that have greater than 15% of the existing paint area failing [1]</li> </ul>	
Partial Repainting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Zone or Spot Painting</li> </ul>	
Channel Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of vegetation, debris, or sediment from channel and banks to improve channel flow</li> <li>• OR in response to inspector's work recommendation</li> </ul>	
Scour Countermeasures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pontis scour rating of 2 or 3 and is not scheduled for replacement [1] [5]</li> <li>• OR NBI comments in abutment and pier ratings indicate presence of scour holes [1] [2]</li> </ul>	
Approach Repaving	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach pavement relief joints should be included in all projects that contain a significant amount of concrete roadway (in excess of 1000' adjacent to the structure). The purpose is to alleviate the effects of pavement growth that may cause distress to the structure. Signs of pavement growth include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Abutment spalling under bearings [1]</li> <li>○ Beam end contact [1]</li> <li>○ Closed expansion joints and/or pin and hangers [1]</li> <li>○ Damaged railing and deck fascia at joints [1]</li> <li>○ Cracking in deck at reference line (45 degree angle) [1]</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Guard Rail Repair/Replacement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guard rail missing or damaged <sup>[2*]</sup></li> <li>• OR Safety improvement is needed <sup>[2*]</sup></li> </ul>	
<b>Scheduled Maintenance</b>		
Superstructure Washing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When salt contaminated dirt and debris collected on superstructure is causing corrosion or deterioration by trapping moisture [1]</li> <li>• OR Expansion or construction joints are to be replaced and the steel is not to be repainted [1]</li> <li>• OR Prior to a detailed replacement [1]</li> <li>• OR In response to inspector's work recommendation [1]</li> </ul>	2 years
Drainage System Clean-Out/Repair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When drainage system is clogged with debris [1]</li> <li>• OR Drainage elements are broken, deteriorated, or damaged [1]</li> <li>• OR NBI rating comments for drainage system indicate need for cleaning or repair [1] [2]</li> </ul>	2 years
Spot Repainting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For zinc-based paint systems only. Do not spot paint with lead-based paints.</li> <li>• Less than 5% of paint area has failed in isolated areas [1]</li> <li>• OR In response to inspector's work recommendation [1]</li> </ul>	5 years
Slope Paving Repair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NBI rating is 5 or less for slope protection [1] [2]</li> <li>• OR Slope is degraded or sloughed</li> <li>• OR Slope paving has significant areas of distress, failure, or has settled [1]</li> </ul>	

<b>Table 3: Summary of Preservation Criteria</b>		
<b>Preservation Action</b>	<b>Bridge Selection Criteria</b>	<b>Expected Service Life</b>
Riprap Installation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To protect surface when erosion threatens the stability of side slopes of channel banks</li> </ul>	
Vegetation Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When vegetation traps moisture on structural elements [1]</li> <li>OR Vegetation is growing from joints or cracks [1]</li> <li>OR In response to inspector's work recommendation for brush cut [1]</li> </ul>	1 year
Debris Removal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When vegetation, debris, or sediment accumulates on the structure or in the channel</li> <li>OR In response to inspectors work recommendation</li> </ul>	1 year
Deck Joint Repair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not repair compression joint seals, assembly joint seals, steel armor expansions joints, and block out expansion joints; these should always be replaced. [1]</li> <li>NBI rating is 5 for joint [1] [2]</li> <li>OR In response to inspector's work recommendation for repair [1]</li> </ul>	
Concrete Sealing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Top surface of pier or abutments are below deck joints and, when contaminated with salt, salt can collect on the surface [1]</li> <li>OR Surface of the concrete has heavy salt exposure. Horizontal surfaces of substructure elements are directly below expansion joints [1]</li> </ul>	
Concrete Crack Sealing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concrete is in good or fair condition, and cracks extend to the depth of the steel reinforcement [1]</li> <li>OR NBI rating of 5, 6, or 7 for deck surface, and deck surface has between 2% and 5% area with deficiencies [1] [2]</li> <li>OR Unsealed cracks exist that are narrow and/or less than 1/8" wide and spaced more than 8' apart [1]</li> <li>OR In response to inspector's work recommendation [1]</li> </ul>	5 years
Minor Concrete Patching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Repair minor delaminations and spalling that cover less than 30% of the concrete substructure [1]</li> <li>OR NBI rating of 5 or 4 for abutments or piers, and comments indicate that their surface has less than 30% spalling or delamination [1] [2]</li> <li>OR Pontis rating of 3 or 4 for the column or pile extension, pier wall and/or abutment wall, and surface has between 2% and 30% area with deficiencies [1] [5]</li> <li>OR In response to inspector's work recommendation [1]</li> </ul>	
HMA Surface Repair/Replacement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HMA surface is in poor condition</li> <li>OR In response to inspector's work recommendation</li> </ul>	
Seal HMA Cracks/Joints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HMA surface is in good or fair condition, and cracks extend to the surface of the underlying slab or sub course</li> <li>OR In response to inspector's work recommendation</li> </ul>	
Timber Repair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NBI rating of 4 or less for substructure for timber members</li> <li>OR To repair extensive rot, checking, or insect infestation</li> </ul>	
Miscellaneous Repair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uncategorized repairs in response to inspector's work recommendation</li> </ul>	
<p>This table was produced by TransSystems and includes information from the following sources:  [1] MDOT, <i>Project Scoping Manual</i>, MDOT, 2019.  [2] MDOT, <i>MDOT NBI Rating Guidelines</i>, MDOT, 2017.</p>		

Table 3: Summary of Preservation Criteria		
Preservation Action	Bridge Selection Criteria	Expected Service Life
	<p>[3] MDOT, <i>Bridge Deck Preservation Matrix - Decks with Uncoated "Black" Rebar</i>, MDOT, 2017.</p> <p>[4] MDOT, <i>Bridge Deck Preservation Matrix - Decks with Epoxy Coated Rebar</i>, 2017.</p> <p>[5] MDOT, <i>Pontis Bridge Inspection Manual</i>, MDOT, 2009.</p> <p>* From source with interpretation added.</p>	

In terms of management and preservation actions, GCRC's asset management program uses a "mix of fixes" strategy that is made up of replacement and preventive maintenance.

**Replacement** involves substantial changes to the existing structure, such as bridge deck replacement, superstructure replacement, or complete structure replacement, and is intended to improve critical or closed bridges to a good condition rating.

**Rehabilitation** is undertaken to extend the service life of existing bridges. The work will restore deficient bridges to a condition of structural or functional adequacy, and may include upgrading geometric features. Rehabilitation actions are intended to improve the poor or fair condition bridges to fair or good condition.

**Preventive maintenance** work will improve and extend the service life of fair bridges, and will be performed with the understanding that future rehabilitation or replacement projects will contain appropriate safety and geometric enhancements. Preventive maintenance projects are directed at limited bridge elements that are rated in fair condition with the intent of improving these elements to a good rating. Most preventive maintenance projects will be one-time actions in response to a condition state need. Routine preventive work will be performed by the agency's in-house maintenance crews.

GCRC's **scheduled maintenance** program is an integral part of the preservation plan, and is intended to extend the service life of fair and good structures by preserving the bridges in their current condition for a longer period of time. Scheduled maintenance is proactive and not necessarily condition driven. In-house maintenance crews will perform much of this work.

Certain of the severely degraded and structurally deficient bridges require replacement or major rehabilitation. Several of the remaining bridges require one-time preventive maintenance actions to repair defects and restore the structure to a higher condition rating. Most bridges are included in a scheduled maintenance plan with appropriate maintenance actions programmed for groups of bridges of similar material and type, bundled by location.

The replacement, rehabilitation, and preventive maintenance projects are generally eligible for funding under the local bridge program, and any requests for funding will be submitted with Gogebic County Road Commission's annual applications.

To achieve its goals, a primary objective of GCRC's asset management program is improvement of one bridges rated poor (4 or lower) to a rating of fair (5) or higher within a three-year time period through

management and/or preservation activities. The primary work activities that will be used to meet this improvement objective include replacement. The work has been prioritized by considering each individual bridge's needs, its importance, the present costs of improvements, and the impact of deferral (i.e., cost increase due to increased degradation). Additionally, GCRC's asset management program incorporates preservation of bridges currently rated fair (5) or higher in their current condition in order to extend their useful service life. The primary work activities used to meet this preservation objective include preventive maintenance. A bridge-by-bridge preservation—or maintenance—plan is presented in the Appendix 4.

### ***Programmed/Funded Projects***

GCRC received \$1,496,250 in total funding per year for the years 2026. To achieve its goals, GCRC plans to spend \$25,000 per year on preventive maintenance of bridges. GCRC plans to replace one bridges at a cost of \$1,575,000. By performing the aforementioned preventive maintenance and replacement of bridge structures, GCRC will not meet its overall bridge network condition goals.

GCRC computes the estimated cost of each typical management and/or preservation action using unit prices in the latest *Bridge Repair Cost Estimate* spreadsheet contained in MDOT's *Local Bridge Program Call for Projects*. The cost of items of varying complexity, such as maintenance of traffic, staged construction, scour counter-measures, and so forth, are computed on a bridge-by-bridge basis. The cost estimates are reviewed and updated annually. A summary of the programmed/funded projects and investments can be found in Table 4, the Cost Projection table, below.

### ***Planned Projects***

GCRC identifies additional priority projects that remain unfunded. These are identified according to high, medium, and low priority in Table 4.

**Table 4: Cost Projection Table**

Strategy	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	GAP
<b>Replacement</b>						
1376			\$1,575,000			
Subtotal	\$0	\$0	\$1,575,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$0	\$0	\$1,575,000	\$0	\$0	\$0

## **Gap Analysis**

When GCRC compares its funding and its programmed/funded projects with all of its prioritized projects as shown in Table 4, GCRC believes it should be able to achieve some of its asset management goals for the period of this plan. For projects that it is unable to complete, GCRC will continue to monitor those bridge assets and take any necessary steps within its budget to prevent or mitigate a condition decline or a need to post or close the structure.

## 2. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

### **Anticipated Revenues**

GCRC has programmed projects and/or has been granted funding from several sources including, but not limited to MDOT local aid, a county appropriation of monies for bridge preservation, and federal programs, for the purpose(s) of replacement for the following bridge(s): 3032. This funding is intended for use in the following funding year(s): 2026.

GCRC applied for MDOT local-aid funding and federal funding in 2024 for the purpose(s) of replacement for the following bridge(s): 2987, 2998, 3020, 3027. This funding would be intended for use in the following funding year(s): 2027 GCRC also applied for a county appropriation of monies for bridge preservation in as needed for the purpose(s) of preventive maintenance for the following bridge(s): as needed. This funding would be intended for use in the following funding year(s): 2024 thru 2026.

Any projects submitted to the local aid program that are not selected for funding will be added to the agency's program.

### **Anticipated Expenses**

Scheduled maintenance activities and minor repairs that are not affiliated with any applications, grants, or other funded projects will be performed by the agency's in-house maintenance forces and funded through the agency's annual operating budget.



# 3. RISK MANAGEMENT

GCRC recognizes that the potential risks associated with bridges generally fall into several categories:

- Personal injury and property damage resulting from a bridge collapse or partial failure;
- Loss of access to a region or individual properties resulting from bridge closures, restricted load postings, or extended outages for rehabilitation and repair activities; and
- Delays, congestion, and inconvenience due to serviceability issues, such as poor quality riding surface, loose expansion joints, or missing expansion joints.

GCRC addresses these risks by implementing regular bridge inspections and a preservation strategy consisting of preventive maintenance.

GCRC administers the biennial inspection of its bridges in accordance with NBIS and MDOT requirements. The inspection reports document the condition of GCRC's bridges and evaluates them in order to identify new defects and monitor advancing deterioration. The summary inspection report in Appendix 1 identifies items needing follow-up, special inspection actions, and recommended bridge-by-bridge maintenance activities.

Bridges that are considered “scour critical” pose a risk to GCRC’s road and bridge network. Scour is the depletion of sediment from around the foundation elements of a bridge commonly caused by fast-moving water. According to MDOT’s *Michigan Structure Inventory and Appraisal Coding Guide*, a scour critical bridge is one that has unstable abutment(s) and/or pier(s) due to observed or potential (based on an evaluation study) scour. Bridges receiving a scour rating of 3 or less are considered scour critical. GCRC has scour critical bridges, which are listed in Table 5.

**Table 5: Bridges that are Considered Scour Critical**

<b>Scour Critical Bridges</b>	
<b>Bridge Structure Number</b>	<b>Scour Critical Rating</b>
2980	3
2983	3
2987	3
2991	3
2998	3
3014	3
3015	3
3018	3
3019	3
3034	3

GCRC has posted or closed bridges that are critical to accessing entire areas or individual properties within its jurisdiction. These bridges are listed in Table 6.

**Table 6: Posted or Close Bridges that are Critical Links**

<b>Posted/Closed Bridges that are Critical Links</b>		
<b>Bridge Structure Number</b>	<b>P/K</b>	<b>Comments</b>
2991	P	Ormes Langford Rd over Tenderfoot Creek. Primary Road
2996	P	Sucker Lake Rd over Two Mile Creek. Primary Road
3005	P	Mosinee Grade over Black River. Primary Road
3019	P	Old US-2 over Tenderfoot Creek
3020	K	Old US-2 over Grosbeck Creek
3021	P	Wittanen Road over Jackson Creek. Dead end road beyond bridge
3022	P	Morgan Mine Rd over Jackson Creek. Dead end road beyond bridge
3024	P	Planter Road over Jackson Creek. Dead end road beyond bridge
3028	P	Old US-2 over Cisco Br. Ontonagon River. Primary Road
3029	P	Fire Tower Rd over Middle Br Ontonagon River. Dead end road beyond bridge
3032	P	Buck Lake Road over Middle Br Ontonagon River
3034	P	Crozer Street over Middle Br Ontonagon River

The preservation strategy identifies actions in the operations and maintenance plan that are preventive or are responsive to specific bridge conditions. The actions are prioritized to correct critical structural safety and traffic issues first, and then to address other needs based on the operational importance of each bridge

and the long-term preservation of the network. The inspection results serve as a basis for modifying and updating the operations and maintenance plan annually.

# Appendix 1

## ***GCRC 2023 Bridge Inspection Report Summary of Additional Inspection Recommendations***

2983	Lake Road over Montreal River: Underwater inspection every 60 months.
2987	Chaney Lake Road over Little Black River: Underwater inspection every 36 months and 12 month inspection frequency.
2998	Copps Mine Road over Presque Isle River: 12 month inspection frequency.
3030	Old US-2 over Middle Br Ontonagon River: 12 month inspection frequency.
3027	Miller Road over Cisco Br Ontonagon River: 12 month inspection frequency.
3029	Fire Tower Road over Middle Br Ontonagon River: 12 month inspection frequency.
3028	Old US-2 over Cisco: 12 month inspection frequency.
3024	Planter Road over Jackson Creek: 12 month inspection frequency.
3034	Crozer Street over Middle Br Ontonagon River: 12 month inspection frequency.
3020	Old US-2 over Grosbeck Creek: 12 month inspection frequency.
3001	Elm Lane over Black River: 12 month inspection frequency.
3011	Vanderhagen Road over Welch Creek: 12 month inspection frequency.
3013	Vanderhagen Road over Welch Creek: 12 month inspection frequency.
2976	Old County Road over Black River: 12 month inspection frequency.

## **Appendix 2**

### ***GCRC 2023 Bridge Inspection Report Executive Summary***

#### ***General Recommendations***

- Remove brush from around guardrail
- Repair guardrail
- Stabilize slopes
- Replace HMA overlay
- Replace expansion joint
- Seal bridge deck
- Paint beams
- Schedule bridge for replacement

# Appendix 3

Bridge Type	Structure Number	Bridge ID	Facility Carried	Features Intersected	Primary or Secondary Route	Structure Type Main Span (Item 43A - Material)	Structure Type Main Span (Item 43B)	Number of Main Span (Item 45)	Total Br Length (Item 48)	Year Built (Item 27)	Year Reconst (Item 106)	ADT	Year of ADT	Inspection Date	Operational Status (Item 41)	Deck Rating (Item 58)	Deck Bottom Rating (Item 59)	Superior Rating (Item 59)	Substr Rating (Item 60)	Channel Rating (Item 61)	Culvert Rating (Item 62)	Surface Rating (Item 58A)	Pavt Mtg	Exp Joint Rating (Item XX)	Other Joints	Structure Evaluation	Structurally Deficient	Sufficiency Rating	Section Loss	Sever Critical (Item 113)				
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2975	27200040008010	OLD US-2	BLACK RIVER	Primary	5	5	1	85	1991		1111	1998	9/13/2022	A	7	N	7	7	7	7	N	2	N		5	G		87.6	3	8			
Concrete - girder and floorbeam	2976	27200050008010	OLD COUNTY ROAD	BLACK RIVER	Primary	1	3	3	129.9	1922		391	1998	9/20/2023	K	3	3	3	5	6	N	4	N	N	N	P	Struct Def		16.7	1	(U)			
Steel - Corrug and floorbeam	2977	27200060008010	SOUTH BOUNDARY	PRESQUE LIL RIVER	Primary	3	6	2	113.9	1926	1961	21	1998	9/14/2022	A	6	N	6	6	5	N	6	5	3	3	F			91.9	2	4			
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2978	272000710008010	JONES ROAD	SPRING CREEK	Primary	5	5	1	89.8	1988		250	1998	9/13/2022	A	5	N	7	8	7	N	8	7	N		5	F		95.0	3	8			
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2979	272000813008010	VAN BUREN ROAD	MONTREAL RIVER	Primary	5	5	1	55.8	1975		183	1998	9/13/2022	A	9	N	6	7	6	7	N	8		9	F			97.8	3	7			
Concrete - Tee beam	2980	272000910008010	LAKE ROAD	SPRING CREEK	Primary	1	4	1	26.9	1926		692	1998	9/13/2022	A	6	N	6	6	5	6	N	6	N			F			96.7	3	8		
Steel - Multi-stringer	2981	272001010008010	LAKE ROAD	MUD CREEK	Primary	3	2	1	91	1932		368	1998	9/13/2022	A	5	5	5	5	7	N	6	3			F			87	2	(U)			
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2982	2720011000808020	LAKE ROAD	OWAGS CREEK	Primary	5	5	1	62	2008		339	2007	9/13/2022	A	7	N	8	7	7	7	N	7	N	N	6	G			96.8	3	8		
Steel - Multi-stringer	2983	2720012000808010	LAKE ROAD	MONTREAL RIVER	Primary	3	2	2	200	1926	1987	388	2017	9/13/2022	A	6	6	6	6	6	7	N	5	5	7	8	F			98.7	2	5		
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2984	2720013000808010	S BLACK RIVER RD	BLACK RIVER	Primary	5	5	1	69.9	1992		80	1998	9/13/2022	A	6	N	7	8	6	6	N	9	N		6	F			97.9	3	8		
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2985	2720014000808010	JOHNSON ROAD	BLACK RIVER	Primary	5	5	1	82	2000		230	1998	9/13/2022	A	5	N	6	8	7	N	7	N	N	6	F				92.8	3	8		
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2986	2720015000808010	BLACK RIVER ROAD	POWERSVILLE CREEK	Primary	5	5	1	90	2001		400	2000	9/13/2022	A	4	N	7	7	7	N	4	N			5	P	Struct Def		88.8	3	8		
Steel - Multi-stringer	2987	2720016000808010	CHANNY LAKE ROAD	LITTLE BLACK RIVER	Primary	3	2	1	49	1934		329	1998	9/13/2023	A	4	5	5	3	5	N	6	4	N	7	P	Struct Def			47.8	2	3		
Concrete - Culvert	2988	2720017000808010	PRESQUE LIL RIVER	PLANTER CREEK	Primary	1	19	2	24	1986		544	1998	9/13/2022	A	N	N	N	N	6	7					G				99.7	8			
Concrete - Culvert	2989	2720018000808010	PRESQUE LIL RIVER	NORTH BR PLANTER CREEK	Primary	1	19	2	24	1986		544	1998	9/13/2022	A	N	N	N	N	6	7					G				94.7	3	8		
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2990	2720019000808010	PRESQUE LIL RIVER	JACKSON CREEK	Primary	5	5	2	100	1986		264	2012	9/14/2022	A	8	N	8	7	6	N	7			6	7	G			98.5	3	8		
Concrete - Tee beam	2991	2720020000808010	CHIMES VANGUARD RD	TENNESSEE CREEK	Primary	1	4	1	39.8	1913		21	1998	9/14/2022	P	6	N	6	6	7	N	4	N			N	N	F	Struct Obs		49.9	1	8	
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2992	2720021000808010	WEST CISCOLA LAKE RD	CISCO BR ONTARIO RIVER	Primary	5	5	1	155	2008		60	2006	9/14/2022	A	7	N	7	8	8	N	7	N							99.9	3	8		
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2993	2720022000808010	RODOLFO ROAD	UNDOLY LAKE CHANNEL	Primary	5	5	3	150	1973		37	2015	9/14/2022	A	7	N	7	6	7	N	7	N	6	N	F				94.7	3	8		
Concrete - Culvert	2994	2720023000808010	OLD US-2	DUCK CREEK	Primary	1	19	2	24.8	1991		603	1998	9/15/2023	A	N	N	N	N	7	6					G				99.9	3	8		
Concrete - Culvert	2995	2720024000808010	OLD US-2	MORRISON CREEK	Primary	1	19	1	21.6	1993		130	1998	9/15/2022	A	N	N	N	N	6	7					G				99.9	8			
Timber - Multi-stringer	2996	2720025000808010	SUCKER LAKE ROAD	TWOMILE CREEK	Primary	7	2	1	25.9	1969		25	1998	9/15/2022	P	6	5	6	5	7	N	7				G				79	8			
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2997	2720026000808010	COPPS MINE ROAD	PRESQUE LIL RIVER	Primary	5	5	3	110	1984		12	2015	9/14/2022	A	7	N	7	7	6	N	7	N			G	N	G			99	3	8	
Steel - Truss - thru and pony	2998	2720027000808010	COPPS MINE ROAD	PRESQUE LIL RIVER	Primary	3	10	1	69.9	1906		10	1998	9/17/2023	K	1	1	4	2	7	N	1	2	N	N	P	Struct Def			13	1	3		
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2999	27200281000808010	LAKE GOSPER ROAD	SLATE RIVER	Primary	5	5	3	84.8	1978		400	2017	9/13/2022	A	7	N	6	6	7	N	5	N	7	N	F				89.4	2	8		
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3000	27200291000808010	NORTH TAYLOR ROAD	CISCO BR ONTARIO RIVER	Primary	1	4	1	43	1924		46	1998	9/15/2022	A	6	7	7	5	6	N	5	N	N			F	Struct Obs			56.8	3	(U)	
Steel - Multi-stringer	3001	2720100000808010	ELM LANE	BLACK RIVER	Secondary	3	2	4	65	1940	2003	10	1998	9/15/2023	A	6	7	5	3	6	N	5	4	N	N	P	Struct Def			37.2	2	8		
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3002	2720100000808010	VANDER ROAD	BLACK RIVER	Secondary	5	5	1	69.9	1992		135	1998	9/15/2022	A	5	N	6	7	5	N	6	N	N	5	F				94	2	8		
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3003	2720100000808010	BLACK LANE ROAD	BLACK RIVER	Secondary	5	5	1	45	2000		630	2000	9/15/2022	A	5	N	7	7	7	N	5	N							88.2	3	8		
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3004	2720100000808010	BLACK LANE ROAD	BLACK RIVER	Secondary	5	5	1	80	2020		126	2019	9/13/2022	A	9	N	9	9	9	N	8	N	N	8	G				93.8	3	8		
Steel - Multi-stringer	3005	27202000178010	MOSINE GRASS ROAD	BLACK RIVER	Secondary	1	2	1	96	1928	2003	18	1998	9/13/2022	P	6	7	6	7	7	N	6	3	N	N	F				74.6	2	(U)		
Concrete - Culvert	3006	27202000178010	MOSINE GRASS ROAD	MCDONALD CREEK	Secondary	1	19	2	21	1985		10	1998	9/13/2022	A	N	N	N	N	7										98.7	8			
Steel - Multi-stringer	3007	27202000408010	KETOLA BRIDGE ROAD	BLACK RIVER	Secondary	3	2	1	28	1994		3	1998	9/13/2022	A	6	6	5	4	7	N	6	2			P	Struct Def			50	2	(U)		
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3008	27202000408010	KETOLA BRIDGE ROAD	BLACK RIVER	Secondary	5	5	1	69.9	1993		182	1998	9/13/2022	A	5	N	6	7	7	N	5	N			5	F			95	1	8		
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3009	27203000008010	VANDORCHADEN ROAD	NORTH BR SPRING CREEK	Secondary	5	5	1	45	2002		190	2004	9/13/2022	A	5	N	5	8	7	N	5				6	F			88	3	8		
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3010	27203000408010	NYLAND ROAD	MONTREAL RIVER	Secondary	5	5	1	69.9	1991		14	1998	9/13/2022	A	5	N	7	8	6	N	8			8	F				96	1	8		
Steel - Culvert	3011	2720300000808010	VANDORCHADEN ROAD	WELCH CREEK	Secondary	3	19	3	24	1968		182	1998	9/15/2023	A	N	N	N	5	4							P	Struct Def			71.9	8		
Steel - Culvert	3012	2720300000808010	VANDORCHADEN ROAD	WELCH CREEK	Secondary	3	19	4	29.9	1968		182	1998	9/15/2022	A	N	N	N	5	5										85.9	8			
Steel - Culvert	3013	2720300000808010	VANDORCHADEN ROAD	WELCH CREEK	Secondary	3	19	3	24	1968		182	1998	9/15/2023	A	N	N	N	6	4										71.9	8			
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3014	2720300000808010	RODRIGUE ROAD	BLACK RIVER	Secondary	5	5	1	69.9	1980		340	1998	9/13/2022	A	5	N	7	8	6	N	5				5	F			96.9	3	8		
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3015	2720300000808010	NORTH MOORE ROAD	BLACK RIVER	Secondary	5	5	1	69.9	1982		174	1998	9/13/2022	A	6	N	7	7	7	N	6				5	F			97.9	3	8		
Concrete - Culvert	3016	27204000008010	DUNHAM ROAD	LITTLE PRESQUE LIL RIVER	Secondary	1	19	2	22	1990		120	1998	9/14/2022	A	N	N	N	7	6										99.8	8			
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3017	27204000008010	DUNHAM ROAD	PRESQUE LIL RIVER	Secondary	5	5	3	185	1983		164	2017	9/13/2022	A	7	N	6	5	7	N	7	N			6	N	F			88.0	3	8	
Steel - Multi-stringer	3018	27204000008010	MAZANEC ROAD	EBR PRESQUE LIL RIVER	Secondary	3	2	1	40	1844	2010	2	1998	9/14/2022	P	8	8	5	7	7	N	8	4	N	N	F				40.6	2	3		
Steel - Multi-stringer	3019	27204000008010	OLD US-2	TENNESSEE CREEK	Secondary	5	2	1	46.9	1927		6	1998	9/14/2023	P	6	6	4	4	7	N	6	4	N			5	F	Struct Def			56.9	1	8
Concrete - Tee beam	3020	27204000008010	OLD US-2	CROSS CREEK	Secondary	1	4	1	21	1927		7	1998	9/17/2023	K	6	6	5	2	6	N	4	N	4	P	Struct Def				41	2	(U)		
Steel - Multi-stringer	3021	2720400000808010	WITTENEN ROAD	JACKSON CREEK	Secondary	3	2	1	38	1949	2003	5	2004	9/13/2022	P	6	7	5	7	6	N	6	2	N	N	F	Struct Obs			46	2	(U)		
Steel - Multi-stringer	3022	2720400000808010	MORGAN MINE ROAD	JACKSON CREEK	Secondary	5	2	1	55.8	1960	2003	2	1998	9/13/2022	P	7	7	5	6	7	N	5	2			2	F	Struct Obs			23.2	2	(U)	
Reinforced concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3023	2720400000808010	SAMPSON ROAD	MICHELLE CREEK	Secondary	5	5	1	44	2008		25	2007	9/13/2022	A	7	N	8	8	7	N	7			7	G				93.8	3	8		
Steel - Girder and floorbeam	3024	27205000008010	PLANTER ROAD	JACKSON CREEK	Secondary	3	3	1	51.8	1923		34	19																					

## 27

27



# Appendix 5

APPENDIX A-3																		
Inventory Data																		
Bridge Type	Structure Number	Bridge ID	Facility Carried	Features Intersected	Structure Type Main Span (Item 43A - Material)	Structure Type Main Span (Item 43B)	Number of Main Span (Item 45)	Total Str Length (Item 49)	Total Str Width (Item 52)	Total Str (sq ft)	Initial Inspection	In Depth Steel Inspection	Pin and Hanger Inspection	Diving Inspection	Provide Monitoring	Review Scour Criticality	Load Rating	Update SIA
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2975	272000040008010	OLD US-2	BLACK RIVER	5	5	1	65	37.1	2412								
Concrete - girder and floorbeam	2976	272000050008010	OLD COUNTY ROAD	BLACK RIVER	3	3	3	129.9	26.9	3494								
Steel - Girder and floorbeam	2977	272000090008010	SOUTH BOUNDARY RD	PRESQUE ISLE RIVER	5	5	2	153.9	31.2	4802								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2978	272000120008010	JUNET ROAD	SPRING CREEK	5	5	1	69.9	27.9	1950								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2979	272000130008010	VAN BUSKIRK ROAD	MONTREAL RIVER	5	5	1	55.8	30.2	1685								
Concrete - Tee beam	2980	272000150008010	LAKE ROAD	SPRING CREEK	3	4	1	26.9	50.2	1350								
Steel - Multistring	2981	272000160008010	LAKE ROAD	MUD CREEK	3	2	1	43	33.8	1386								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2982	272000150008020	LAKE ROAD	OWENS CREEK	5	5	1	62	31.1	1928								
Steel - Multistring	2983	272000160008030	LAKE ROAD	MONTREAL RIVER	3	2	2	100	32	3200				x				
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2984	272000240008010	S BLACK RIVER RD	BLACK RIVER	5	5	1	69.9	30.8	2153								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2985	272000240008020	JOHNSON ROAD	BLACK RIVER	5	5	1	82	31.2	2558								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2986	272000260008010	BLACK RIVER ROAD	POWDERHILL CREEK	5	5	1	50	31.1	1555								
Steel - Multistring	2987	272000280008010	CHANEY LAKE ROAD	LITTLE BLACK RIVER	3	2	1	40	33.5	1340								
Concrete - Culvert	2988	272000290008010	PRESQUE ISLE ROAD	PLANTERS CREEK	1	19	2	24	71.8	71.8								
Concrete - Culvert	2989	272000290008020	PRESQUE ISLE ROAD	NORTH BR PLANTERS CREEK	1	19	2	24	71.8	71.8								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2990	272000290008030	PRESQUE ISLE ROAD	JACKSON CREEK	5	5	2	100	34.5	3450								
Concrete - Tee beam	2991	272000310008010	CRIMES LANSFORD RD	TENDERFOOT CREEK	1	4	1	30.8	17.7	545								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2992	272000360008010	WEST CISCO LAKE RD	CISCO BR ONTONAGON RIVER	5	5	1	55	24.8	1364								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2993	272000380008010	RODDIS ROAD	LINDSEY LAKE CHANNEL	5	5	3	150	30.2	4530								
Concrete - Culvert	2994	272000430008010	OLD US-2	DUCK CREEK	1	19	2	24.9	74.5	74.5								
Concrete - Culvert	2995	272000430008020	OLD US-2	MORRISON CREEK	1	19	1	21.6	36	778								
Timber - Multistring	2996	272000460008010	SUCKER LAKE ROAD	TWO MILE CREEK	2	2	3	25.9	29.2	752								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2997	272000480008010	COPPS MINE ROAD	PRESQUE ISLE RIVER	5	5	3	130	31.1	3421								
Steel - Truss - thru and pony	2998	272000480008020	COPPS MINE ROAD	PRESQUE ISLE RIVER	3	10	1	69.9	13.8	965								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	2999	272000510008010	LAKE GOSBERG ROAD	SLATE RIVER	5	5	3	94.8	30.4	2882								
Concrete - Tee beam	3000	272000550008010	NORTH THAYER ROAD	CISCO BR ONTONAGON RIVER	1	4	1	43	17.7	761								
Steel - Multistring	3001	273014000038010	ELM LANE	BLACK RIVER	3	2	4	65	15.7	1021								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3002	27301A0000208010	SANDERS ROAD	BLACK RIVER	5	5	1	69.9	28.2	1971								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3003	27301A0000528010	BLACKJACK ROAD	LITTLE BLACK RIVER	5	1	45	31.1	1400									
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3004	27301A000098010	BLACKJACK SERV DR	BLACK RIVER	5	5	3	94.8	30.4	2882								
Steel - Multistring	3005	27302C000178010	MOSINEE GRADE ROAD	BLACK RIVER	3	2	1	50	21	1050								
Concrete - Culvert	3006	27302C000178020	MOSINEE GRADE ROAD	MCDONALD CREEK	1	19	2	21	55.8	1172								
Steel - Multistring	3007	27302C000488010	KETOLA GRADE ROAD	BLACK RIVER	3	2	1	28	34	392								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3008	27302C000488020	KETOLA GRADE ROAD	BLACK RIVER	5	5	1	69.9	28.2	1971								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3009	27303000018010	VANDERHAGEN ROAD	NORTH BR SPRING CREEK	5	5	1	45	31.1	1400								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3010	273030000418010	NYLUND ROAD	MONTREAL RIVER	5	5	1	69.9	28.2	1971								
Steel - Culvert	3011	27303000508010	VANDERHAGEN ROAD	WELCH CREEK	3	19	3	24	670	670								
Steel - Culvert	3012	27303000508020	VANDERHAGEN ROAD	WELCH CREEK	3	19	4	29.9	83.4	83.4								
Steel - Culvert	3013	27303000508030	VANDERHAGEN ROAD	WELCH CREEK	3	19	3	24	670	670								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3014	27303000608010	HEDBERG ROAD	BLACK RIVER	5	5	1	68.9	31	2136								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3015	27303000768010	NORTH MOORE ROAD	BLACK RIVER	5	5	1	68.9	31	2136								
Concrete - Culvert	3016	27304000028010	DUNHAM ROAD	LITTLE PRESQUE ISLE RIV	1	19	2	22	52.8	52.8								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3017	27304000038010	KIMBERLY ROAD	PRESQUE ISLE RIVER	5	5	3	135	34.3	4631								
Steel - Multistring	3018	273040000428010	MAZANEC ROAD	E BR PRESQUE ISLE RIVER	3	2	1	40	13.8	552								
Steel - Multistring	3019	27304000058010	OLD US-2	TENDERFOOT CREEK	3	2	1	46.9	36.7	1721								
Concrete - Tee beam	3020	27304000058020	OLD US-2	GROSBECK CREEK	1	4	1	21	38.1	800								
Steel - Multistring	3021	27305000068010	WITTANEN ROAD	JACKSON CREEK	3	2	1	38	16	608								
Steel - Multistring	3022	27305000078010	MORGAN MINE ROAD	JACKSON CREEK	3	2	1	35.8	15.8	566								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3023	273050000538010	SAMPSON ROAD	MCVICHIE CREEK	5	5	1	44	24.8	1091								
Steel - Girder and floorbeam	3024	273050000938010	PLANTER ROAD	JACKSON CREEK	3	2	1	51.8	21.4	1204								
Steel - Multistring	3025	273050000568010	INDIANHEAD VALLEY	JACKSON CREEK	3	2	1	51.8	23.3	1207								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3026	273050000408010	KORPELA ROAD	JACKSON CREEK	5	5	1	50	24.8	1240								
Steel - Truss - thru and pony	3027	273060000048010	KILLER ROAD	CISCO BR ONTONAGON RIVER	3	10	1	65	15.4	1001								
Steel - Multistring	3028	273060000078010	OLD US-2	CISCO BR ONTONAGON RIVER	3	2	1	59.7	36.4	2173								
Steel - Multistring	3029	273060000118010	FIRE TOWER ROAD	MIDDLE BR ONTONAGON RIV	3	2	1	21	13.8	280								
Concrete - Tee beam	3030	273060000168010	OLD US-2	MIDDLE BR ONTONAGON RIV	1	4	1	31.8	38.1	1212								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	3031	273060000228010	RUSS ROAD	MIDDLE BR ONTONAGON RIV	5	5	1	47.9	24.6	1178								
Timber - Multistring	3032	273060000248010	BLACK LAKE ROAD	MIDDLE BR ONTONAGON RIV	7	2	2	11.8	16.1	814								
Concrete - Culvert	3033	273060D273118010	D STREET	DUCK CREEK	1	19	2	26.9	75.1	75.1								
Concrete - Girder and floorbeam	3034	273060D274218010	CROZER STREET	MIDDLE BR ONTONAGON RIV	3	1	1	34.8	22.6	788								
Prestressed concrete - Box beam/girders - multi	31115	272000520008010	EAST SHORE RD	ROLY BROCK	5	5	1	70	31.3	2191								

## C. CULVERT ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN SUPPLEMENT

### Culvert Primer

Culverts are structures that lie underneath roads, enabling water to flow from one side of the roadway to the other (Figure C-1 and Figure C-2). The important distinguishing factor between a culvert and a bridge is the size. Culverts are considered anything under 20 feet while bridges, according to the Federal Highway Administration, are 20 feet or more. While similar in function to storm sewers, culverts differ from storm sewers in that culverts are open on both ends, are constructed as straight-line conduits, and lack intermediate drainage structures like manholes and catch basins. Culverts are critical to the service life of a road because of the important role they play in keeping the pavement layers well drained and free from the forces of water building up on one side of the roadway.




Figure C-1: Diagram of a culvert structure



Figure C-2: Examples of culverts. Culverts allow water to pass under the roadway (left), they are straight-line conduits with no intermediate drainage structures (middle), and they come in various materials (left: metal; middle and right: concrete) and shapes (left: arch; middle: round; right: box).

## **Culvert Types**

Michigan conducted its first pilot data collection on local agency culverts in the state in 2018. Of almost 50,000 culverts inventoried as part of the state-wide pilot project, the material type used for constructing culverts ranged from (in order of predominance) corrugated steel, concrete, plastic, aluminum, and masonry/tile, to timber materials. The shapes of the culverts were (in order of predominance) circular, pipe arch, arch, rectangular, horizontal ellipse, or box. The diameter for the majority of culverts ranged from less than 12 inches to 24 inches; a portion, however, ranged from 30 inches to more than 48 inches.

## **Culvert Condition**

Several culvert condition assessment practices exist. The FHWA has an evaluation method in its 1986 *Culvert Inspection Manual*. In conjunction with descriptions and details in the Ohio Department of Transportation's 2017 *Culvert Inspection Manual* and Wisconsin DOT's *Bridge Inspection Field Manual*, the FHWA method served as the method for evaluating Michigan culverts in the pilot. In 2018, Michigan local agencies participated in a culvert pilot data collection, gathering inventory and condition data; full detail on the condition assessment system used in the data collection can be found in Appendix G of the final report ([https://www.michigan.gov/documents/tamc/TAMC\\_2018\\_Culvert\\_Pilot\\_Report\\_Complete\\_634795\\_7.pdf](https://www.michigan.gov/documents/tamc/TAMC_2018_Culvert_Pilot_Report_Complete_634795_7.pdf)).

The Michigan culvert pilot data collection used a 1 through 10 rating system, where 10 is considered a new culvert with no deterioration or distress and 1 is considered total failure. Each of the different culvert material types requires the assessment of features unique to that material type, including structural deterioration, invert deterioration, section deformation, blockage(s) and scour. Corrugated metal pipe, concrete pipe, plastic pipe, and masonry culverts require an additional assessment of joints and seams. Slab abutment culverts require an additional assessment of the concrete abutment and the masonry abutment. Assessment of timber culverts only relied on blockage(s) and scour. The assessments come together to generate condition rating categories of good (rated as 10, 9, or 8), fair (rated as 7 or 6), poor (rated as 5 or 4), or failed (rated as 3, 2, or 1).

## **Culvert Treatments**

The *MDOT Drainage Manual* addresses culvert design and treatments. Of most importance to the longevity of culverts is regular cleaning to prevent clogs. More extensive treatments may include re-positioning the pipe to improve its grade and lining a culvert to achieve more service life after structural deterioration has begun.

## D. TRAFFIC SIGNALS ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN SUPPLEMENT

### Traffic Signals Primer

#### *Types*

Electronic traffic control devices come in a large array of configurations, which include case signs (e.g., keep right/left, no right/left turn, reversible lanes), controllers, detection (e.g., cameras, push buttons), flashing beacons, interconnects (e.g., DSL, fire station, phone line, radio), pedestrian heads (e.g., hand-man), and traffic signals. This asset management plan is only concerned with traffic signals (Figure D-1) as a functioning unit and does not consider other electronic traffic control devices.



Figure D-1: Example of traffic signals

#### *Condition*

Traffic signal assessment considers the functioning of basic tests on a pass/fail basis. These tests include battery backup testing, components testing, conflict monitor testing, radio testing, and underground detection.

#### *Treatments*

Traffic signals are maintained in accordance with the *Michigan Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*. Maintenance of traffic signals includes regular maintenance of all components, cleaning and servicing to prevent undue failures, immediate maintenance in the case of emergency calls, and provision of stand-by equipment. Timing changes are restricted to authorized personnel only.

## E. GLOSSARY & ACRONYMS

### Glossary

**Alligator cracking:** Cracking of the surface layer of an asphalt pavement that creates a pattern of interconnected cracks resembling alligator hide. This is often due to overloading a pavement, sub-base failure, or poor drainage.<sup>5</sup>

**Asset management:** A process that uses data to manage and track road assets in a cost-effective manner using a combination of engineering and business principles. Public Act 325 of 2018 provides a legal definition: “an ongoing process of maintaining, preserving, upgrading, and operating physical assets cost effectively, based on a continuous physical inventory and condition assessment and investment to achieve established performance goals”.<sup>6</sup>

**Biennial inspection:** Inspection of an agency’s bridges every other year, which happens in accordance with National Bridge Inspection Standards and Michigan Department of Transportation requirements.

**Bridge inspection program:** A program implemented by a local agency to inspect the bridges within its jurisdiction systematically in order to ensure proper functioning and structural soundness.

**Capital preventative maintenance:** Also known as CPM, a planned set of cost-effective treatments to address of fair-rated infrastructure before the structural integrity of the system has been severely impacted. These treatments aim to slow deterioration and to maintain or improve the functional condition of the system without significantly increasing the structural capacity. Light capital preventive maintenance is a set of treatments designed to seal isolated areas of the pavement from water, such as crack and joint sealing, to protect and restore pavement surface from oxidation with limited surface thickness material, such as fog seal; generally, application of a light CPM treatment does not provide a corresponding increase in a segment’s PASER score. Heavy capital preventive maintenance is a set of surface treatments designed to protect pavement from water intrusion or environmental weathering without adding significant structural strength, such as slurry seal, chip seal, or thin (less than 1.5-inch) overlays for bituminous surfaces or patching or partial-depth (less than 1/3 of pavement depth) repair for concrete surfaces.

**Chip seal:** An asphalt pavement treatment method consisting of, first, spraying liquid asphalt onto the old pavement surface and, then, a single layer of small stone chips spread onto the wet asphalt layer.

**City major:** A road classification, defined in Michigan Public Act 51, that encompasses the generally more important roads in a city or village. City major roads are designated by a municipality’s governing body and are subject to approval by the State Transportation Commission. These roads do not include roads under the jurisdiction of a county road commission or trunkline highways.

**City minor:** A road classification, defined in Michigan Public Act 51, that encompasses the generally less important roads in a city or village. These roads include all city or village roads that are not city major road and do not include roads under the jurisdiction of a county road commission.

---

<sup>5</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Crocodile\\_cracking](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Crocodile_cracking)

<sup>6</sup> Inventory-based Rating System for Gravel Roads: Training Manual

**Composite pavement:** A pavement consisting of concrete and asphalt layers. Typically, composite pavements are old concrete pavements that were overlaid with HMA in order to gain more service life.

**Concrete joint resealing:** Resealing the joints of a concrete pavement with a flexible sealant to prevent moisture and debris from entering the joints. When debris becomes lodged inside a joint, it inhibits proper movement of the pavement and leads to joint deterioration and spalling.

**Concrete pavement:** Also known as rigid pavement, a pavement made from portland cement concrete. Concrete pavement has an average service life of 30 years and typically does not require as much periodic maintenance as HMA.

**Cost per lane mile:** Associated cost of construction, measured on a per lane, per mile basis. Also see *lane-mile segment*.

**County local:** A road classification, defined in Michigan Public Act 51, that encompasses the generally less important and low-traffic roads in a county. This includes all county roads that are not classified as county primary roads.

**County primary:** A road classification, defined in Michigan Public Act 51, that encompasses the generally more important and high-traffic roads in a county. County primary roads are designated by board members of the county road commissions and are subject to approval by the State Transportation Commission.

**CPM:** See *Capital preventive maintenance*.

**Crack and seat:** A concrete pavement treatment method that involves breaking old concrete pavement into small chunks and leaving the broken pavement in place to provide a base for a new surface. This provides a new wear surface that resists water infiltration and helps prevent damaged concrete from reflecting up to the new surface.

**Crack seal:** A pavement treatment method for both asphalt and concrete pavements that fills cracks with asphalt materials, which seals out water and debris and slows down the deterioration of the pavement. Crack seal may encompass the term “crack filling”.

**Crush and shape:** An asphalt pavement treatment method that involves pulverizing the existing asphalt pavement and base and then reshaping the road surface to correct imperfections in the road’s profile. Often, a layer of gravel is added along with a new wearing surface such as an HMA overlay or chip seal.

**Crust:** A very tightly compacted surface on an unpaved road that sheds water with ease but takes time to be created.

**Culvert:** A pipe or structure used under a roadway that allows cross-road drainage while allowing traffic to pass without being impeded; culverts span up to 20 feet.<sup>7</sup>

**Dowel bar retrofit repair:** A concrete pavement treatment method that involves cutting slots in a cracked concrete slab, inserting steel bars into the slots, and placing concrete to cover the new bars and fill the slots. It aims to reinforce cracks in a concrete pavement.

---

<sup>7</sup> Adapted from Inventory-based Rating System for Gravel Roads: Training Manual

**Dust control:** A gravel road surface treatment method that involves spraying chloride or other chemicals on the gravel surface to reduce dust loss, aggregate loss, and maintenance. This is a relatively short-term fix that helps create a crusted surface.

**Expansion joint:** Joints in a bridge that allow for slight expansion and contraction changes in response to temperature. Expansion joints prevent the build up of excessive pressure, which can cause structural damage to the bridge.

**Federal Highway Administration:** Also known as FHWA, this is an agency within the U.S. Department of Transportation that supports state and local governments in the design, construction, and maintenance of the nation's highway system.<sup>8</sup>

**Federal-aid network:** Portion of road network that is comprised of federal-aid routes. According to Title 23 of the United States Code, federal-aid-eligible roads are “highways on the federal-aid highways systems and all other public roads not classified as local roads or rural minor collectors”.<sup>9</sup> Roads that are part of the federal-aid network are eligible for federal gas-tax monies.

**FHWA:** See *Federal Highway Administration*.

**Flexible pavement:** See *hot-mix asphalt pavement*.

**Fog seal:** An asphalt pavement treatment method that involves spraying a liquid asphalt coating onto the entire pavement surface to fill hairline cracks and prevent damage from sunlight and oxidation. This method works best for good to very good pavements.

**Full-depth concrete repair:** A concrete pavement treatment method that involves removing sections of damaged concrete pavement and replacing it with new concrete of the same dimensions in order to restore the riding surface, delay water infiltration, restore load transfer from one slab to the next, and eliminate the need to perform costly temporary patching.

**Geographic divides:** Areas where a geographic feature (e.g., river, lake, mountain) limits crossing points of the feature.

**Grants:** Competitive funding gained through an application process and targeted at a specific project type to accomplish a specific purpose. Grants can be provided both on the federal and state level and often make up part of the funds that a transportation agency receives.

**Gravel surfacing:** A low-cost, easy-to-maintain road surface made from aggregate and fines.

**Heavy capital preventive maintenance:** See *Capital preventive maintenance*.

**HMA:** See *hot-mix asphalt pavement*.

**Hot-mix asphalt overlay:** Also known as HMA overlay, this a surface treatment that involves layering new asphalt over an existing pavement, either asphalt or concrete. It creates a new wearing surface for traffic and to seal the pavement from water, debris, and sunlight damage, and it often adds significant structural strength.

**Hot-mix asphalt pavement:** Also known as HMA pavement, this type of asphalt creates a flexible pavement composed of aggregates, asphalt binder, and air voids. HMA is heated for placement and

---

<sup>8</sup> Federal Highway Administration webpage <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>

<sup>9</sup> Inventory-based Rating System for Gravel Roads: Training Manual



compaction at high temperatures. HMA is less expensive to construct than concrete pavement, however it requires frequent maintenance activities and generally lasts 18 years before major rehabilitation is necessary. HMA makes up the vast majority of local-agency-owned pavements.

**IBR:** See *IBR element*, *IBR number*, and/or *Inventory-based Rating System*<sup>TM</sup>.

**IBR element:** A feature used in the IBR System<sup>TM</sup> for assessing the condition of roads. The system relies on assessing three elements: surface width, drainage adequacy, and structural adequacy.<sup>10</sup>

**IBR number:** The 1-10 rating determined from assessments of the weighted IBR elements. The weighting relates each element to the intensity road work needed to improve or enhance the IBR element category.<sup>11</sup>

**Interstate highway system:** The road system owned and operated by each state consisting of routes that cross between states, make travel easier and faster. The interstate roads are denoted by the prefix “I” or “U.S.” and then a number, where odd routes run north-south and even routes run east-west. Examples are I-75 or U.S. 2.<sup>12</sup>

**Inventory-based Rating System**<sup>TM</sup>: Also known as the IBR System<sup>TM</sup>, a rating system designed to assess the capabilities of gravel and unpaved roads to support intended traffic volumes and types year round. It assesses roads based on how three IBR elements, or features—surface width, drainage adequacy, and structural adequacy—compare to a baseline, or “good”, road.<sup>13</sup>

**Investment Reporting Tool:** Also known as IRT, a web-based system used to manage the process for submitting required items to the Michigan Transportation Asset Management Council. Required items include planned and completed maintenance and construction activity for roads and bridges and comprehensive asset management plans.

**IRT:** See *Investment Reporting Tool*.

**Jurisdiction:** Administrative power of an entity to make decisions for something. In Michigan, the three levels of jurisdiction classification for transportation assets are state highways, county roads, and city and village streets. State highways are under the jurisdiction of the Michigan Department of Transportation, county roads are under the jurisdiction of the road commission for the county in which the roads are located, and city and village streets are under the jurisdiction of the municipality in which the roads are located.

**Jurisdictional borders:** Borders between two road-owning-agency jurisdictions, or where the roads owned by one agency turn into roads owned by another agency. Examples of jurisdictional borders are township or county lines.

**Lane-mile segment:** A segment of road that is measured by multiplying the centerline miles of a roadway by the number of lanes present.

**Lane-mile-years:** A network’s total lane-miles multiplied by one year; a method to quantify the measurable loss of pavement life.

---

<sup>10</sup> Inventory-based Rating System for Gravel Roads: Training Manual

<sup>11</sup> Inventory-based Rating System for Gravel Roads: Training Manual

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/interstate/faq.cfm#question3>

<sup>13</sup> Adapted from Inventory-based Rating System for Gravel Roads: Training Manual



**Light capital preventive maintenance:** See *Capital preventive maintenance*.

**Limited access areas:** Areas—typically remote areas—serviced by few or seasonal roads that require long detours routes if servicing roads are closed.

**Main access to key commercial districts:** Areas where large number or large size business will be significantly impacted if a road is unavailable.

**Maintenance grading:** A surface treatment method for unpaved roads that involves re-grading the road to remove isolated potholes, washboarding, and ruts, and then restoring the compacted crust layer.

**MDOT:** See *Michigan Department of Transportation*.

**MDOT's Local Bridge Program Call for Projects:** A call for project proposals for replacement, rehabilitation, and/or preventive maintenance of local bridges that, if granted, receives bridge funding from the Michigan Department of Transportation. The Call for Projects is made by the Local Bridge Program.

**MGF:** See *Michigan Geographic Framework*.

**Michigan Department of Transportation:** Also known as MDOT, this is the state of Michigan's department of transportation, which oversees roads and bridges owned by the state or federal government in Michigan.

**Michigan Geographic Framework:** Also known as MGF, this is the state of Michigan's official digital base map that contains location and road information necessary to conduct state business. The Michigan Department of Transportation uses the MGF to link transportation assets to a physical location.

**Michigan Public Act 51 of 1951:** Also known as PA 51, this is a Michigan legislative act that served as the foundation for establishing a road funding structure by creating transportation funding distribution methods and means. It has been amended many times.<sup>14</sup>

**Michigan Public Act 325 of 2018:** Also known as PA 325, this legislation modified PA 51 of 1951 in regards to asset management in Michigan, specifically 1) re-designating the TAMC under Michigan Infrastructure Council (MIC); 2) promoting and overseeing the implementation of recommendations from the regional infrastructure asset management pilot program; 3) requiring local road three-year asset management plans beginning October 1, 2020; 4) adding asset classes that impact system performance, safety or risk management, including culverts and signals; 5) allowing MDOT to withhold funds if no asset management plan submitted; and 6) prohibiting shifting finds from a country primary to a county local, or from a city major to a city minor if no progress toward achieving the condition goals described in its asset plan.<sup>15</sup>

**Michigan Public Act 499 of 2002:** Also known as PA 499, this legislation requires road projects for the upcoming three years to be reported to the TAMC.

**Michigan Transportation Asset Management Council:** Also known as the TAMC, a council comprised of professionals from county road commissions, cities, a county commissioner, a township official, regional and metropolitan planning organizations, and state transportation department personnel. The

---

<sup>14</sup> Inventory-based Rating System for Gravel Roads: Training Manual

<sup>15</sup> Inventory-based Rating System for Gravel Roads: Training Manual

council reports directly to the Michigan Infrastructure Council.<sup>16</sup> The TAMC provides resources and support to Michigan's road-owning agencies, and serves as a liaison in data collection requirements between agencies and the state.

**Michigan Transportation Fund:** Also known as MTF, this is a source of transportation funding supported by vehicle registration fees and the state's per-gallon gas tax.

**Microsurface treatment:** An asphalt pavement treatment method that involves applying modified liquid asphalt, small stones, water, and portland cement for the purpose of protecting a pavement from damage caused by water and sunlight.

**Mill and hot-mix asphalt overlay:** Also known as a mill and HMA overlay, this is a surface treatment that involves the removal of the top layer of pavement by milling and the replacement of the removed layer with a new HMA layer.

**Mix-of-fixes:** A strategy of maintaining roads and bridges that includes generally prioritizes the spending of money on routine maintenance and capital preventive maintenance treatments to impede deterioration and then, as money is available, performing reconstruction and rehabilitation.

**MTF:** See *Michigan Transportation Fund*.

**National Bridge Inspection Standards:** Also known as NBIS, standards created by the Federal Highway Administration to locate and evaluate existing bridge deficiencies in the federal-aid highway system to ensure the safety of the traveling public. The standards define the proper safety for inspection and evaluation of all highway bridges.<sup>17</sup>

**National Center for Pavement Preservation:** Also known as the NCPP, a center that offers education, research, and outreach in current and innovative pavement preservation practices. This collaborative effort of government, industry, and academia entities was established at Michigan State University.

**National Functional Class:** Also known as NFC, a federal grouping system for public roads that classifies roads according to the type of service that the road is intended to provide.

**National highway system:** Also known as NHS, this is a network of roads that includes the interstate highway system and other major roads managed by state and local agencies that serve major airports, marine, rail, pipelines, truck terminals, railway stations, military bases, and other strategic facilities.

**NBIS:** See *National Bridge Inspection Standards*.

**NCPP:** See *National Center for Pavement Preservation*.

**NCPP Quick Check:** A system created by the National Center for Pavement Preservation that works under the premise that a one-mile road segment loses one year of life each year that it is not treated with a maintenance, rehabilitation, or reconstruction project.

**NFC:** See *National Functional Class*.

**Non-trunkline:** A local road intended to be used over short distances but not recommended for long-distance travel.

---

<sup>16</sup> Inventory-based Rating System for Gravel Roads: Training Manual

<sup>17</sup> <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bridge/nbis/>

**Other funds:** Expenditures for equipment, capital outlay, debt principal payment, interest expense, contributions to adjacent governmental units, principal, interest and bank fees, and miscellaneous for cities and villages.

**PA:** See *Michigan Public Act 51*, *Michigan Public Act 325*, and/or *Michigan Public Act 499*.

**Partial-depth concrete repair:** A concrete pavement treatment method that involves removing spalled or delaminated areas of concrete pavement, usually near joints and cracks, and replacing with new concrete. This is done to provide a new wearing surface in isolated areas, to slow down water infiltration, and to help delay further freeze-thaw damage.

**PASER:** See *Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating system*.

**Pavement reconstruction:** A complete removal of the old pavement and base and construction of an entirely new road. This is the most expensive rehabilitation of the roadway and also the most disruptive to traffic patterns.

**Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating system:** Also known as the PASER system, the PASER system rates surface condition on a 1-10 scale, where 10 is a brand new road with no defects, 5 is a road with distress but that is structurally sound and requires only preventative maintenance, and 1 is a road with extensive surface and structural distresses that is in need of total reconstruction. This system provides a simple, efficient, and consistent method for evaluating the condition of paved roads.<sup>18</sup>

**Pothole:** A defect in a road that produces a localized depression.<sup>19</sup>

**Preventive maintenance:** Planned treatments to an existing asset to prevent deterioration and maintain functional condition. This can be a more effective use of funds than the costly alternative of major rehabilitation or replacement.

**Proactive preventive maintenance:** Also known as PPM, a method of performing capital preventive maintenance treatments very early in a pavement's life, often before it exhibits signs of pavement defect.

**Public Act 51:** See *Michigan Public Act 51 of 1951*

**Public Act 325:** See *Michigan Public Act 325 of 2018*

**Public Act 499:** See *Michigan Public Act 499 of 2002*

**Reconstruction and rehabilitation programs:** Programs intended to reconstruct and rehabilitate a road.

**Restricted load postings:** A restriction enacted on a bridge structure when is incapable of transporting a state's legal vehicle loads.

**Rights-of-way ownership:** The owning of the right-of-way, which is the land over which a road or bridge travels. In order to build a road, road agencies must own the right-of-way or get permission to build on it.

**Rigid pavement:** See *concrete pavement*.

---

<sup>18</sup> Adapted from Inventory-based Rating System for Gravel Roads: Training Manual

<sup>19</sup> Inventory-based Rating System for Gravel Roads: Training Manual

**Road infrastructure:** An agency's road network and assets necessary to make it function, such as traffic signage and ditches.

**Road:** The area consisting of the roadway (i.e., the travelled way or the portion of the road on which vehicles are intended to drive), shoulders, ditches, and areas of the right of way containing signage.<sup>20</sup>

**Roadsoft:** An asset management software suit that enables agencies to manage road and bridge related infrastructure. The software provides tools for collecting, storing, and analyzing data associated with transportation infrastructure. Built on an optimum combination of database engine and GIS mapping tools, Roadsoft provides a quick, smooth user experience and almost unlimited data handling capabilities.<sup>21</sup>

**Ruts/rutting:** Deformation of a road that usually forms as a permanent depression concentrated under the wheel path parallel to the direction of travel.<sup>22</sup>

**Scheduled maintenance:** Low-cost, day-to-day activities applied to bridges on a scheduled basis that mitigates deterioration.<sup>23</sup>

**Sealcoat pavement:** A gravel road that has been sealed with a thin asphalt binder coating that has stone chips spread on top.

**Service life:** Time from when a road or treatment is first constructed to when it reaches a point where the distresses present change from age-related to structural-related (also known as the critical distress point).<sup>24</sup>

**Slurry seal:** An asphalt pavement treatment method that involves applying liquid asphalt, small stones, water, and portland cement in a very thin layer with the purpose of protecting an existing pavement from being damaged by water and sunlight.

**Structural improvement:** Pavement treatment that adds strength to the pavement. Roads requiring structural improvement exhibit alligator cracking and rutting and are considered poor by the TAMC definitions for condition.

**Subsurface infrastructure:** Infrastructure maintained by local agencies that reside underground, for example, drinking water distribution systems, wastewater collection systems, and storm sewer systems.

**TAMC:** See *Michigan Transportation Asset Management Council*.

**TAMC pavement condition dashboard:** Website for viewing graphs of pavement and bridge conditions, traffic and miles travelled, safety statistics, maintenance activities, and financial data for Michigan's cities and villages, counties, and regions, as well as the state of Michigan.

**TAMC's good/fair/poor condition classes:** Classification of road conditions defined by the Michigan Transportation Asset Management Council based on bin ranges of PASER scores and similarities in defects and treatment options. Good roads have PASER scores of 8, 9, or 10, have very few defects, and require minimal maintenance. Fair roads have PASER scores of 5, 6, or 7, have good structural support but a deteriorating surface, and can be maintained with CPM treatments. Poor roads have PASER scores

---

<sup>20</sup> Inventory-based Rating System for Gravel Roads: Training Manual

<sup>21</sup> Inventory-based Rating System for Gravel Roads: Training Manual

<sup>22</sup> Paving Class Glossary

<sup>23</sup> Inventory-based Rating System for Gravel Roads: Training Manual

<sup>24</sup> Inventory-based Rating System for Gravel Roads: Training Manual

of 1, 2, 3, or 4, exhibit evidence that the underlying structure is failing, such as alligator cracking and rutting. These roads must be rehabilitated with treatments like heavy overlay, crush and shape, or total reconstruction.

**Tax millages:** Local tax implemented to supplement an agency's budget, such as road funding.

**Thin hot-mix asphalt overlay:** Application of a thin layer of hot-mix asphalt on an existing road to re-seal the road and protect it from damage caused by water. This also improves the ride quality and provides a smoother, uniform appearance that improves visibility of pavement markings.<sup>25</sup>

**Transportation infrastructure:** All of the elements that work together to make the surface transportation system function including roads, bridges, culverts, traffic signals, and signage.

**Trigger:** When a PASER score gives insight to the preferred timeline of a project for applying the correct treatment at the correct time.

**Trunkline abbreviations:** The prefixes *M-*, *I-*, and *US* indicate roads in Michigan that are part of the state trunkline system, the Interstate system, and the US Highway system. These roads consist of anything from 10-lane urban freeways to two-lane rural highways and even one non-motorized highway; they cover 9,668 centerline miles. Most of the roads are maintained by MDOT.

**Trunkline bridges:** Bridge present on a trunkline road, which typically connects cities or other strategic places and is the recommended route for long-distance travel.<sup>26</sup>

**Trunkline maintenance funds:** Expenditures under a maintenance agreement with MDOT for maintenance activities performed on MDOT trunkline routes.

**Trunkline:** Major road that typically connects cities or other strategic places and is the recommended route for long-distance travel.<sup>27</sup>

**Washboarding:** Ripples in the road surface that are perpendicular to the direction of travel.<sup>28</sup>

**Wedge/patch sealcoat treatment:** An asphalt pavement treatment method that involves correcting the damage frequently found at the edge of a pavement by installing a narrow, 2- to 6-foot-wide wedge along the entire outside edge of a lane and layering with HMA. This extends the life of an HMA pavement or chip seal overlay by adding strength to significantly settled areas of the pavement.

**Worst-first strategy:** Asset management strategy that treats only the problems, often addressing the worst problems first, and ignoring preventive maintenance. This strategy is the opposite of the "mix of fixes" strategy. An example of a worst-first approach would be purchasing a new automobile, never changing the oil, and waiting till the engine fails to address any deterioration of the car.

## List of Acronyms

CPM: capital preventive maintenance

---

<sup>25</sup> [second sentence] <http://www.kentcountyroads.net/road-work/road-treatments/ultra-thin-overlay>

<sup>26</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trunk\\_road](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trunk_road)

<sup>27</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trunk\\_road](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trunk_road)

<sup>28</sup> Inventory-based Rating System for Gravel Roads: Training Manual

FHWA: Federal Highway Administration  
HMA: hot-mix asphalt  
I: trunkline abbreviation for routes on the Interstate system  
IBR: Inventory-based Rating  
M: trunkline abbreviation for Michigan state highways  
MDOT: Michigan Department of Transportation  
MTF: Michigan Transportation Fund  
NBIS: National Bridge Inspection Standards  
NCPP: National Center for Pavement Preservation  
NHS: National Highway System  
PA 51: Michigan Public Act 51 of 1951  
PASER: Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating  
R&R: reconstruction and rehabilitation programs  
TAMC: (Michigan) Transportation Asset Management Council  
US: trunkline abbreviation for routes on the US Highway system