

**METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT PAVEMENT ENGINEERS COUNCIL
2011 SURVEY RESULTS**

28 Surveys

In an effort to better address the needs of our membership and the roadway construction and maintenance providers, the MGPEC Steering committee would like your feedback. In the past MGPEC has sponsored training courses covering various topics including Superpave, asphalt pavements (design, construction, maintenance, materials) and concrete pavements (design, materials, and maintenance/rehabilitation). Please take a minute to complete this survey and return it to the MGPEC Administrative Assistant (see contact information below) or bring it with you to the Annual Meeting on March 23, 2011.

Mark any that apply:

I would like to see MGPEC training in the following areas:

<u>10</u>	Adoption and use of MGPEC Specifications	
<u>11</u>	Use of Superpave Technology in Design & Construction	
<u>13</u>	Asphalt Pavement Maintenance and Rehabilitation	
<u>11</u>	Concrete Pavement Design and Construction	
<u>8</u>	Concrete Maintenance and Rehabilitation	
<u>9</u>	Trenching and Repair Techniques	
<u>5</u>	Achieving Pavement Smoothness	
<u>1</u>	Thickness Design & Subgrade Prep	Write-in
<u>1</u>	Pavement Preservation	Write-in
<u>1</u>	Chipsealing	Write-in
<u>1</u>	Joint construction, asphalt	Write-in
<u>1</u>	HMA Mix Design	Write-in
<u>1</u>	Race track paving	Write-in

Has your agency formally adopted the use of MGPEC Specifications:

<u>7</u>	Capital Improvement Projects
<u>3</u>	Development Projects
<u>5</u>	Asphalt Specifications only
<u>5</u>	Pavement Design Methodology
<u>5</u>	Subgrade Treatments and other Specifications
<u>2</u>	Partial Adoption
<u>2</u>	What sections? <u>Item 9 / Form 9</u>

Does your agency informally or formally require the use of MGPEC Specification in any of the above listed areas? If so, what sections?

<u>NO</u>	<u>SECTIONS</u>	Agency Name: <u>Boulder County</u>
<u>1</u>		
<u>1</u>	<u>We follow the recommendations but have not formally adopted any specifications</u>	Agency Name: <u>Not listed</u>

<u>YES</u>	<u>SECTIONS</u>	Agency Name: <u>City & County of Denver</u>
<u>1</u>		
<u>1</u>	<u>Asphalt Mixes</u>	Agency Name: <u>Town of Castle Rock</u>
<u>1</u>	<u>Form 9 Asphalt / Pavement Mix Design</u>	Agency Name: <u>Greenwood Village</u>
<u>1</u>	<u>Items 7, 9, 11, 17, 18</u>	Agency Name: <u>City of Greeley</u>

Do you currently use Item 9 Specifications and Form #9 for Hot Mix Asphalt Pavement?

<u>16</u>	Yes
<u>9</u>	No
<u>1</u>	If No, Why? <u>Always stage with our spec</u>
<u>1</u>	If No, Why? <u>No need at this time</u>
<u>1</u>	If No, Why? <u>Waiting for the mix design criteria to be finalized</u>
<u>1</u>	If No, Why? <u>Use CDOT specs</u>
<u>1</u>	If No, Why? <u>CDOT use own specs & form</u>
<u>1</u>	If No, Why? <u>Pueblo's Form #9 as of 2010</u> ?

Pamela Weimer
MGPEC Administrative Assistant
6540 S. Tabor Street
Littleton, Colorado 80127

Phone: 303-979-2190
Fax: 303-979-2190
E-mail: Pamela@mgpec.org

**METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT PAVEMENT ENGINEERS COUNCIL
2011 SURVEY RESULTS**

28 Surveys

Do you anticipate adopting and using MGPEC Specifications in the future?

15	Yes
1	Yes <u>Only if the design methodology addresses and includes FDR and overlays</u>
9	No
1	If No, Why? <u>Possibility but we probably will tweak it to our needs</u>
1	If No, Why? <u>The additional cost of pavement (?) (?) passed on to owners</u>
1	If No, Why? <u>CDOT ones</u>
1	If No, Why? <u>Not sure, probably not any time soon</u>
1	Possibly

MGPEC currently has Task Forces investigating subgrade rehabilitation, smoothness specifications and life cycle analysis. What other Task Forces would you be interested in? Add details if appropriate.

11	Pavement Design
6	Asphalt Specifications
6	Concrete Specifications
12	Subgrade Preparation
5	Warranties and Pay Incentives/Disincentives
6	Geotextiles
3	Crack Seal/Crack Fillers
5	Roadway Rehabilitation Techniques and Specifications
6	Training Programs
0	Marketing
3	ADA
5	Sustainability
1	Others <u>Trenching & repair techniques</u>
1	Others <u>ADA within right-of-way</u>
1	Others <u>Task force for stormwater on reconstruct project, in (?) in requiring water quality</u>

Would you be interested in participating on a task force?

11	Yes (List available upon request)
18	No
	If yes, what type? <u>Concrete specs, trenching/patching</u>
	If yes, what type? <u>Pavement design</u>
	If yes, what type? <u>Thickness design, subgrade swell mitigation</u>
	If yes, what type? <u>Pavement design, subgrade prep & pay incentives/disincentives & warranties</u>
	If yes, what type? <u>Asphalt, preventative maintenance, subgrade</u>
	If yes, what type? <u>Soil stabilization, flashfill-flowfill</u>

Should MGPEC work with DRCOG and local agencies to discuss the feasibility of a Regional Transportation Authority similar to the Colorado Springs metro area and the San Francisco Bay area whose purpose would be to coordinate infrastructure management, condition assessment and funding throughout the Denver Metro area?

12	Yes
1	Yes <u>But depends on scope. Need to allow local issues to supersede as necessary</u>
1	Yes <u>But only if traffic volumes are included in the design equations (or EDLs) for smaller communities</u>
1	Yes <u>Would result in smart growth & win/win for all local agencies & surrounding areas</u>
1	Yes <u>But only if local agencies can maintain a significant authority for autonomous decision making and operations</u>
3	No
1	No <u>MGPEC should remain independent</u>
1	<u>It could be effective but would this just add another step in the process?</u>

**METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT PAVEMENT ENGINEERS COUNCIL
2011 SURVEY RESULTS**

28 Surveys

Will free access of MGPEC Standards and Specifications online decrease the likelihood of continued paid membership by your agency in the future?

<u>2</u>	Yes
<u>3</u>	Possibly
<u>1</u>	Unsure
<u>11</u>	No
<u>1</u>	No <u>It is the best way to get new membership. How can agencies evaluate your standards if they do not have access?</u>
<u>1</u>	No <u>We support MGPEC and want to have internet access</u>
<u>1</u>	No <u>I believe that this would be a great benefit to members</u>
<u>1</u>	No <u>MGPEC is a valued organization</u>
<u>1</u>	No <u>It is great to have access to these electronically</u>

How can MGPEC improve to better serve your needs?

<u>Figure out pavement thickness design issues to correct the stepfunction and get the software out</u>
<u>Finish the pavement design software and standard specifications and submit them for approval and adoption by members. We have been waiting too long!</u>
<u>Expand membership to all involved with pavements</u>
<u>As is. Doing great job</u>
<u>Reconsider the wide-spread use of aggregate base course</u>
<u>Updated information of concrete & asphalt technologies</u>
<u>More meetings instead of Annual</u>
<u>I'm new into this program & need to go through everything you offer</u>

Which one of the following best describes your employment?

<u>18</u>	Local Government – Engineering
<u>4</u>	Local Government – Maintenance
<u>2</u>	State or Federal Government
<u>6</u>	Consultant
<u>4</u>	Private Industry
<u>0</u>	Industry Representative
<u>1</u>	Other <u>Manufacturer</u>
<u>2</u>	Other <u>RTD – Engineering</u>

Additional Comments or concerns that you would like MGPEC to address?

<u>Come to a resolution on the design equation and update the software</u>
<u>Review concrete pavement smoothness spec</u>

**METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT PAVEMENT ENGINEERS COUNCIL
2011 SURVEY RESULTS**

28 Surveys

If filling out this survey at the Annual Meeting, please give us your opinion of the meeting. Did you feel the topics were interesting and presented well? Did you like the format/time/length/location of the meeting? Do you have suggestions on how we can improve the Annual Meeting? What topics would you like to see covered in the future? Additional comments/suggestions: _____

I like the facility but the door should be unlocked & the microphone should be turned on. Get an idea of head count for the breakouts so we can size rooms properly. Breakout A was standing room only.
Good this year. Enjoyed warm mix & thin lift presentations
Ok. Need to give speakers time limits so all can present with adequate time.
Yes
I thought the meeting was very informative on showing new products & techniques.
Put all presentations in general session so nobody will miss any presentation. Maybe longer day will be needed.
Topics very interesting; problem is break-out sessions limit attendance to only one. Thanks for your time & work Pam!!
Excellent discussions. It is a benefit to listen to how other municipalities handle road maintenance. "Thin lift overlay".
The topics were timely & relevant. And the length is good.
Well done.
Yes, it was perfect.
Topics were great.
(?)/Flash fill discussion very worthwhile.
Great sessions.
Topics were informative. Especially liked new materials & technology regarding street cut repairs.
Good Annual Meeting. Interesting & informative.
Information in breakouts were very interesting with the meeting to share pavement repair and (?) and maintenance procedures there could be a more (?) breakout sessions to provide options for the participants. It was a little dry. Very informative.
Very interesting & informative; format/time/L good
They were good, however the breakout session should provide the start and end time of each speaker so that one can switch over from one to another room to listen to the subject of one's own interest.
Very good coverage of topics. Could you post the presentations to the MGPEC website since there are other topics that we wanted to see but did not (wanted to see frost heave but was in the partial depth repair session).
Good info presented. Handouts would be great on the presentations. Only had one person offer.
Topics were interesting and very well presented.
Topics were well presented. Room was large enough not crowded, temp. was maintained & comfortable, lighting good, audio weak.