Title: Rockfall Mitigation Measures

Authors:
- Tommy C. Hopkins
  University of Kentucky
- Tony L. Beckham
  University of Kentucky
- William A. Puckett
  University of Kentucky

This paper is posted at UKnowledge.
https://uknowledge.uky.edu/ktc_researchreports/391
Research Report
KTC-96-9

ROCKFALL MITIGATION MEASURES

by

TOMMY C. HOPKINS
Chief Research Engineer
and
Head of Geotechnology

TONY L. BECKHAM
Research Geologist

and

William A. Puckett
Graduate Assistant

Kentucky Transportation Center
College of Engineering
University of Kentucky

in cooperation with the
Kentucky Transportation Cabinet
The Commonwealth of Kentucky
and
Federal Highway Administration

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the University of Kentucky, Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, nor the Federal Highway Administration. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

March 1996
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330 West Broadway  
Frankfort, Kentucky 40602-0536


Dear Mr. Toussaint:

Many highway routes in Kentucky under the jurisdiction of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet are aging. Ages of many of these roadways are greater than forty years. Several sections of these roadways contain many rock slopes. Rockfall from these slopes represents hazards to the traveling public. As the roadway system ages, these highway rock cut slopes deteriorate because of weathering. Consequently, the potential for rockfall and rockslides increases. Large **sums of money** are spent each year removing fallen rock from roadways and drainage ditches. Stability of these rock slopes is a major concern of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet because of the aging and weathering of these slopes.

Some **bodily injuries and traffic fatalities** have been reported in past years. The average amount of rockfall, or rockfall-related, claims filed with the Kentucky Board of Claims was about **157,000 dollars per year**. This amount is small because Kentucky is one of a few states in the nation that still has sovereign immunity—in most states this immunity has been thrown out by the courts.

This study represents the start of an effort by the Cabinet to develop a **proactive stance**—in contrast to a reactive stance—and policy toward preventing, minimizing, or mitigating the rockfall problem on roadways under the jurisdiction of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. This effort was undertaken in an attempt to make our highways in Kentucky safer to motorists. The general aims of this study were to establish a highway rock cut slope policy and devise a statewide system of dealing with this problem. This study also represents an effort by the Cabinet to establish a **highway rockfall risk management system**. The objectives of this study were accomplished.
The vast majority of rockfall and rockfall problems in Kentucky, as shown by this study, occur in counties located east of Interstate 75. Differential weathering and structural characteristics (and aging) -- jointing and unfavorable orientations-- were the major causes of rockfall on Kentucky’s highways. Preliminary ratings of all rock cut slopes--some 5,270 slopes-- on the Interstates, Parkways, most Primary routes, and some secondary routes in Kentucky were performed using the Rockfall Hazardous Rating System (RHRS) -- devised by Pierson and Van Vickle of Oregon DOT. The intention here was to develop firsthand experience and to test the reliability of the Pierson-Van Vickle rating system. Based on this experience, this rating method appears to be a good system for rating the potential for rockfall at a given highway rock cut location. For example, rockfall occurred at two rock cut slopes, which scored the highest values (664 and 660) of all slopes rated, a short time after the slopes had been rated. It was much beyond the scope of this study to rate all rock cut slopes on 27,000 miles of roadway under the jurisdiction of the Cabinet. During the study, we sent several of our engineers of the mountainous Highway Districts to a training session, which was arranged by personnel of the University of Kentucky Transportation Center, to learn the Rockfall Hazardous Rating System.

In this study, some 181 “A” slopes-- a designation used in the RHR System-- which visually appeared hazardous, were identified. A detailed, numerical rating of those slopes was performed using the RHR System. Some 1264 of the 4894 slopes were rated in a preliminary survey as “B” slopes. Only about 30 of those slopes were rated numerically. When money becomes available, it is our intention to perform detailed ratings of all of the “B” slopes identified in this study. We believe this could be accomplished by using engineering college students trained and supervised by the personnel of the Kentucky Transportation Center. Moreover, we have intentions to perform surveys of our secondary routes. It is also our intention to estimate the mitigation measures, or repair methods, necessary to correct the 181 hazardous rock cut slopes identified in this study when money becomes available.

The rock cut slope design guidelines used by the Cabinet’s geologists and geotechnical engineers generally seem sound. For the sedimentary rock strata in Kentucky, benching of rock slopes appears to be very effective in preventing, or mitigating, rockfall on Kentucky’s highways. The basic problem is not design standards, but the fact that many highway rock slopes are aging, weathering, and deteriorating. With aging, rockfall problems will continue to increase with time.

The rockfall computer simulation program devised by Colorado engineers is a very powerful analytical tool for assessing the stability and safety of existing rock slopes and newly designed rock slopes. In this study, several rockfall case studies were examined using this computer program. Results obtained from this program seem reasonable. This program will be extremely useful in devising remedial and mitigating plans at rockfall sites. We are considering using this program routinely when analyzing problem rock slopes and in the design of new slopes.

We believe that the establishment of a rockfall risk management system will provide a good approach for allocating funding for mitigating, or repairing, rockfall problem sites and will aid in long-range planning. A program of this type will provide a proactive stance for the Cabinet and will provide some legal protection -- since it will show that the state does not have the total amount of money required at once to deal with all repairs and safety related rock slope issues.
Implementation Statement

The effort described in this study is a good example of the start of assessing the state and conditions of the highways under the jurisdiction of the Cabinet. Consequently, when money becomes available, we intend to continue these efforts to establish a permanent highway rock cut slope risk management program in Kentucky. To ensure the success of this program, we are seeking permanent funding for these efforts. By establishing a permanent program, data obtained periodically can be used to determine maintenance funding levels for repairing, or mitigating hazardous sites. This type of information will be useful for determining budget requests. The conditions of our aging highways in Kentucky and the need to provide sufficient maintenance funds to repair our highways are also major concerns.

When funding becomes available, we believe that a research study is needed to evaluate, in more detail, the long-term effectiveness of present rock cut slope design standards and to develop a correlation between the rate of weathering of different types of problem shales that are often found in rock cuts and some type of geotechnical index, such as slake durability. To avoid rockfall from long-term, differential weathering, this correlation is needed so that rock cut slopes may be designed effectively.

Sincerely,

J. M. Yowell, P.E.
State Highway Engineer
### Abstract

Highways in Kentucky contain numerous rock slopes and rockfall from these slopes represent potential dangers to motorists. As these highway rock cut slopes age and deteriorate because of weathering, the potential for rockfall and rock slides increases. Some bodily injuries and traffic fatalities have been reported in past years. The general aims of this study were to establish a highway rock cut slope policy and devise a statewide system of dealing with this problem. This study represents the start of an effort by the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet to develop a proactive stance and policy toward preventing, minimizing, or mitigating the rockfall problem on the Cabinet's highways and to establish a rockfall risk management program. As this study shows, the vast majority of rockfall problems in Kentucky occur in counties located east of Interstate 75. Preliminary rockfall hazardous ratings of all rock cut slopes—some 5270 slopes—on the Interstates, Parkways, and most Primary routes were performed using the rockfall hazardous rating system (RHRS) devised by Pierson and Vickle of Oregon DOT. This approach appears to be a good system for rating the potential for rockfall at a given highway rock cut location. Some 180 slopes were identified as hazardous. Detailed numerical ratings were performed at those locations. Differential weathering and structural characteristics—jointing and unfavorable orientations—were the major causes of rockfall. Few mitigation measures have been used on Kentucky’s highways. For the sedimentary rock strata in Kentucky, benching of rock slopes appears to be very effective in preventing, or mitigating, rockfall on Kentucky’s highways. The rock cut slope design guidelines used by the Cabinet appear to be sound. The basic problem is not design standards, but the fact that many of the highway rock slopes are aging, weathering, and deteriorating. With aging, rockfall problems will continue to increase with time. The computer rockfall simulation program devised by Colorado engineers was used to analyze several case studies of rockfall. This program appears to be a very good analytical tool for assessing the stability and safety of existing rock slopes and newly designed rock slopes and will be useful in devising remedial and mitigating plans at rockfall sites.
### SI (Modern Metric) Conversion Factors

**Approximate Conversions to SI Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>When You Know</th>
<th>Multiply By</th>
<th>To Find</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in.</td>
<td>inches</td>
<td>25.40000</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ft</td>
<td>feet</td>
<td>0.30480</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yd</td>
<td>yards</td>
<td>0.91440</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>1.60934</td>
<td>km</td>
<td>km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in.²</td>
<td>square inches</td>
<td>645.16000</td>
<td>mm²</td>
<td>mm²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ft²</td>
<td>square feet</td>
<td>0.09290</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yd²</td>
<td>square yards</td>
<td>0.83613</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ac</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td>0.40469</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi²</td>
<td>square miles</td>
<td>2.58999</td>
<td>km²</td>
<td>km²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fl oz</td>
<td>fluid ounces</td>
<td>29.57353</td>
<td>ml</td>
<td>ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gal</td>
<td>gallons</td>
<td>3.78541</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ft³</td>
<td>cubic feet</td>
<td>0.02832</td>
<td>m³</td>
<td>m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yd³</td>
<td>cubic yards</td>
<td>0.76455</td>
<td>m³</td>
<td>m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volume</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oz</td>
<td>ounces</td>
<td>28.34952</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lb</td>
<td>pounds</td>
<td>0.45359</td>
<td>kg</td>
<td>kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>short tons (2000 lb)</td>
<td>0.90718</td>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>Mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mass</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lbf</td>
<td>pound-force</td>
<td>4.44822</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psi</td>
<td>pound-force</td>
<td>6.89476</td>
<td>kPa</td>
<td>kPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Force and Pressure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fc</td>
<td>foot-candles</td>
<td>10.76426</td>
<td>lx</td>
<td>lx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fl</td>
<td>foot-Lamberts</td>
<td>3.42583</td>
<td>cd/m²</td>
<td>cd/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°F</td>
<td>Fahrenheit</td>
<td>5(F-32)/9</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illumination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°C</td>
<td>Celsius</td>
<td>1.8C + 32</td>
<td>°F</td>
<td>°F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approximate Conversions from SI Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>When You Know</th>
<th>Multiply By</th>
<th>To Find</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm</td>
<td>millimeters</td>
<td>0.03937</td>
<td>inches</td>
<td>in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>metres</td>
<td>3.28084</td>
<td>feet</td>
<td>ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>metres</td>
<td>1.09361</td>
<td>yards</td>
<td>yd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>km</td>
<td>kilometres</td>
<td>0.62137</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm²</td>
<td>millimetres</td>
<td>0.00155</td>
<td>square inches</td>
<td>in.²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m²</td>
<td>metres squared</td>
<td>10.76392</td>
<td>square feet</td>
<td>ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m²</td>
<td>metres squared</td>
<td>1.19599</td>
<td>square yards</td>
<td>yd²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha</td>
<td>hectares</td>
<td>2.47103</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td>ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>km²</td>
<td>kilometres</td>
<td>0.38610</td>
<td>square miles</td>
<td>mi²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ml</td>
<td>millilitres</td>
<td>0.03381</td>
<td>fluid ounces</td>
<td>fl oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>litres</td>
<td>0.26417</td>
<td>gallons</td>
<td>gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m³</td>
<td>metres cubed</td>
<td>35.31448</td>
<td>cubic feet</td>
<td>ft³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m³</td>
<td>metres cubed</td>
<td>1.30795</td>
<td>cubic yards</td>
<td>yd³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volume</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>grams</td>
<td>0.03527</td>
<td>ounces</td>
<td>oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kg</td>
<td>kilograms</td>
<td>2.20462</td>
<td>pounds</td>
<td>lb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>megagrams</td>
<td>1.10231</td>
<td>short tons (2000 lb)</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mass</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>newtons</td>
<td>0.22481</td>
<td>pound-force</td>
<td>lbf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kPa</td>
<td>kilopascal</td>
<td>0.14504</td>
<td>pound-force</td>
<td>psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Force and Pressure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lx</td>
<td>lux</td>
<td>0.09290</td>
<td>foot-candles</td>
<td>fc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cd/m²</td>
<td>candela/m²</td>
<td>0.29190</td>
<td>foot-Lamberts</td>
<td>fl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°C</td>
<td>Celsius</td>
<td>1.8C + 32</td>
<td>Fahrenheit</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SI is the symbol for the International System of units. Appropriate rounding should be used to comply with Section 4 of ASTM E283.*
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Highways in Kentucky contain numerous rock slopes and rockfall from these slopes represents potential hazards to the traveling public. As these highway rock cut slopes age and deteriorate due to weathering, the potential for rockfall and rock slides increases. Large sums of money are spent each year removing fallen rock from roadways and drainage ditches. Some bodily injuries and traffic fatalities have been reported in past years. The general aims of this study were to establish a highway rock cut slope policy and devise a statewide system of dealing with this problem. This study represents the start of an effort by the Cabinet to develop a proactive stance and policy toward preventing, minimizing, or mitigating the rockfall problem on the Cabinet's highways instead of continuing a policy of taking a reactive stance.

The objectives of this study were to identify and classify the common types of rockfall and rock slides, which occur in Kentucky, identify the common causes of rockfall, collect and examine historical records of rockfall, identify and document litigation cases (including traffic fatalities), formulate guidelines and methods for effectively dealing with rockfall for any locality, develop, or acquire, methods of analyzing the stability of rock cut slopes so that mitigation measures can be implemented at hazardous sites in Kentucky, review current design practices and, finally, establish the framework for implementing a statewide rockfall hazardous rating system and a rock slope policy. These objectives were essentially met.

To develop a statewide rock slope risk management system for Kentucky, this study was divided into two major phases. The first phase consisted of examining a large number of rock slopes in Kentucky. A portion of this phase consisted of performing a preliminary survey of numerous rock slopes. Some 5,270 rock cut slopes on all Interstates, Parkways, Primary routes, and some secondary routes in Kentucky were examined. The majority of hazardous locations on those routes were identified. In the second part of Phase 1, a detailed examination was made of several rock slopes that were deemed hazardous, or the risk of rockfall was identified as high. These slopes were rated numerically using a rockfall hazardous rating system. In the second phase, detailed rock slope analyses of selected sites were performed using a rock slope computer simulation program developed by Pfeiffer(1993) of Colorado. Several case histories--cases submitted by the Cabinet's District personnel--were analyzed using the rockfall computer simulation program. At two sites, which scored the highest hazardous rating scores in Kentucky, rockfall occurred a few months after they were rated. These two slopes were repaired at a cost in excess of 350,000 dollars. Computer rockfall simulation analyses of the repaired slopes showed that the slopes were not safe. The rating system and simulation program had targeted the slopes as likely to fail.

Based on extensive observations of rockfall and rockfall problems on Kentucky's highways, the following conclusions were made:

- The rock cut slope design guidelines used by the Cabinet appear to be sound. The basic problem is not design standards, but the fact that many of the
Executive Summary

Highway rock slopes are aging, weathering, and deteriorating. With aging, rockfall problems will continue to increase with time.

- Preliminary rockfall hazardous ratings of all rock cut slopes on the Interstates, Parkways, and most Primary routes were performed.

- The vast majority of rockfall and rockfall problems in Kentucky occur in counties located east of Interstate 75.

- The average amount of a rockfall, or rockfall-related, claim filed with the Kentucky Board of Claims was about 157,000 dollars per year (this amount is relatively small because Kentucky is one of the few states in the nation that still has sovereign immunity—in most states this immunity has been thrown out by most courts.)

- Differential weathering and structural characteristics — jointing and unfavorable orientations—were the major causes of rockfall on Kentucky’s highways.

- The Rockfall Hazardous Rating System (RHRS) — devised by Pierson and Vickle of Oregon DOT— is a good system for rating the potential for rockfall at a given highway rock cut location.

- Few mitigation measures have been used on Kentucky’s highways.

- For the sedimentary rock strata in Kentucky, benching of rock slopes appears to be very effective in preventing, or mitigating, rockfall on Kentucky’s highways.

- Detailed scores, based on the RHRS procedure, of potentially hazardous highway rock slopes on interstates and parkways ranged from about 280 to 520.

The following recommendations were made:

- Preliminary ratings of all rock cut slopes on secondary routes under the jurisdiction of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet should be performed.

- The Rockfall Hazardous Rating System should be implemented statewide. Whenever a rockfall occurs on a roadway under the jurisdiction of the Cabinet, the rock slope should be rated using the RHRS procedure. Detailed ratings on all slopes that classified as “B” should be completed—this was not within the scope of this study. Also, all “A” and “B” slopes identified on secondary routes should be detail rated. All rated slope data should be maintained, including updates, in a central file.

- The computer rockfall simulation program devised by Colorado engineers is a
very powerful analytical tool for assessing the stability and safety of existing rock slopes and newly designed rock slopes. This program appears to be extremely useful in devising remedial and mitigating plans at rockfall sites. It is recommended that this program be used when analyzing problem rock slopes.

- **There is a need to devise remedial, or mitigation, solutions for the most hazardous rock cut slopes identified in this study.** After these measures have been identified for each site, cost estimates should be determined. Ratios of estimated cost of the remedial, or mitigation, measures for each site to the RHRS scores of the sites need to be determined. Using these ratios, a priority list can be devised.

- A permanent, highway rock slope risk management program should be established by the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. **To insure the success of this program, permanent funding should be established.** Data in this program should be reviewed annually and updated when appropriate. All hazardous sites should be detailed rated about every five years. *(The establishment of rockfall risk management system will provide the means to make good decisions on allocating funding for mitigating or repairing, rockfall problem sites. It will provide a proactive stance for the Cabinet and will provide some legal protection -- since it will show that the state does not have money necessary to repair all slopes at one time and deal with all safety related rock slope issues.)*

- After cost estimates of remedial, or mitigation, measures of the most hazardous rock slopes and the establishment of a priority list has been made, the Cabinet should provide yearly funds for implementing rockfall mitigation and rock slope remedial measures should be earmarked or established for the most hazardous sites. This may require making a request to the Kentucky Legislators for such funding. It should be noted that there are instances where several slopes could be grouped into one contract and repaired or mitigated. In these instances, savings in repair, or mitigation, costs can be realized.

- At all sites where remedial, or mitigating, measures have been used, the effectiveness of these measures should be monitored. Appropriate funding should be made available for this purpose.

- Appropriate measures should be established to monitor the effectiveness of Ritchie ditches.

- In using the Colorado rockfall computer simulation program, there is a need to check the coefficients -- used in the program -- of Kentucky rocks. Also, surface roughness for different situations should be evaluated. This would involve observing actual trajectories of rocks for different situations at selected sites.

- **A research study is needed to evaluate the long-term effectiveness of present rock cut slope design standards and to develop a correlation between the rate of**
weathering of different types of problem shales that are often found in rock cuts and some type of geotechnical index, such as slake-durability. This correlation is needed to effectively design rock cut slopes against differential weathering.
INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

Highways in Kentucky contain numerous rock slopes and rockfall from these slopes represents potential hazards to the traveling public. As these rock cut slopes age and deteriorate, due to weathering, the potential for rockfall and rock slides increases. Large sums of money are spent each year removing fallen rock from roadways and drainage ditches. Some bodily injuries and fatalities have been reported in past years (Agent and Pigman, 1990). However, the scope of this problem and the money required each year to clear highways of fallen rock debris in the state are largely unknown. Currently, the state lacks a highway rock slope policy and a statewide system of dealing with this problem. The present practice may be described as somewhat reactive, that is, measures are performed after rockfall has occurred. There is a need to develop a proactive stance and policy in an effort to prevent, minimize, or mitigate the rockfall problem.

Objectives

The objectives of this study are as follows:

- to identify and classify the common types of rockfall and rock slides that occur in Kentucky;
- to identify causes of rockfall which include stress relief, joints, fractures, angles of joints, and their relationship to physiographic and geological structures;
- to collect and examine the historical record of rockfall in Kentucky so that the scope of this problem may be defined and document annual maintenance costs, if possible;
- to identify and document any litigation cases, bodily injuries, and fatalities that may have been caused by rockfall;
- to establish the framework for implementing a statewide rockfall hazardous rating system and a rock slope policy and review current design practices;
- to implement certain mitigation measures at selected sites that have been identified as particularly hazardous to the traveling public and
observe the long-term performance of new rockfall mitigation measures to be introduced as well as observe the performance of mitigation measures that have been constructed at sites in Kentucky, and

- to formulate guidelines for dealing effectively with rockfall for any given locality.

Scope

To develop a statewide rock slope risk management system for Kentucky, this study was divided into two major phases. The first phase consisted of examining a large number of rock slopes in Kentucky. The first part of this phase consisted of performing a preliminary survey of numerous rock slopes. In the second part of Phase 1, a detailed examination was made of several rock slopes that were deemed hazardous, or the risk of rockfall was identified as high. In the second phase, detailed rock slope analyses of selected sites were performed using a rock slope computer simulation program developed by Pfeiffer (1993).

BACKGROUND

Rockfall may be defined as the movement of rock of any size from a slope or cliff that is so steep that the rock fragment(s) continues to move down a slope. Since the beginning of the highway system, rockfall has occurred. Rockfall problems exist at numerous locations in the state. A large number of rockfall sites occur in the Eastern and Knobs physiographical regions. Many rock-cut slopes have been constructed in the past in the state without the benefit of a geological study that might have foreseen future rockfall problems. In some instances, massive rock slope slides have occurred. Historically, rockfall removal and control measures have been applied by maintenance forces. The annual cost of this type of maintenance and the scope of the problem in the state are unknown. However, it is very sizable based on a review of the costs of repairs.

Rock Type and General Geology of Kentucky

Bedrock materials in Kentucky consist mainly of sedimentary rocks, Figure 1. Sedimentary rocks were formed by consolidation, or cementation, of sediment, or fragments, of other rocks deposited in water. Occasional partings filled by metamorphic rock or unconsolidated material are sometimes present. Examples of sedimentary rock are limestone, sandstone, dolomite, and shale. These rocks were formed during the Ordovician, Silurian, Devonian, Mississippian, and
Pennsylvanian geological periods. Except for unconsolidated deposits of the Tertiary and Cretaceous geological periods, and deep alluvium deposits found in large streams, the vast majority of Kentucky consists of shallow overburden (residual) soils that typically range in thicknesses from a few centimeters to 9 meters (30 feet). Hence, in most instances, highway cuts are usually composed of sedimentary rocks. In many instances, the cut slope may consist of several different materials. For example, the cut slope may consist of limestone, shale, coal seams, and sandstone geological formations.

Traffic Accidents and Rockfall Legal Claims

Data (Agent 1994; Turner and Agent, 1995) compiled by the Traffic and Safety Section of the Kentucky Transportation Center indicate that the traffic claims due to rockfall filed with the Board of Claims averages about 157,661 dollars per year. Traffic fatalities due to falling rock have averaged about one every three years. Total dollar
The amounts of rockfall claims per year from 1981 to 1994 (claims of $50,000 dollars or more) are shown in Figure 2. Only about 20 percent of those claims have been paid each year. As shown in Figure 3, the number of claims related to rockfall increases throughout the period 1981-1994. These claims are, perhaps, small because the Commonwealth of Kentucky is one of the few states in the country that still retains sovereign immunity. The principles of sovereign immunity became well established by 1812 in the United States. This concept essentially states that “no one can sue the government without the government’s permission and even if the government could be sued, it is not responsible for the acts of the employees.” Although, by 1978 this concept was a valid defense in only 16 states, the courts have nullified, or weakened this defense in many other locations. The majority of states have lost this immunity. In the future, this method of defense may be cast out by the courts.

Recently, there has been a trend for victims and their lawyers to sue individual state employees for negligence. Therefore, to minimize risk to the state and to individuals, a proactive stance is recommended. According to Turner and Agent(1995), risk management involves four steps. These are as follows:

- **Identify and evaluate** the frequency, probability, etc., of the involved risks of a particular highway problem;
- Determine the most appropriate risk management methods (that is, suitable control techniques, risk finance technique, policies, and financial commitments necessary to administer the method);

- Implement the appropriate methods; and

- Monitor the methods and adjust as necessary.

The intent of this study was to establish a rockfall risk management program. The purpose of such a program is to minimize liability by using risk management procedures to limit exposure to the extent possible. Although the program proposed herein will help identify hazardous rockfall locations, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet faces a major difficulty in that mitigation, cannot be performed instantly because of the great expense involved and the time required to implement control measures. However, the intent here is to provide the mechanism for redressing these problem slopes. Consequently, because of the lack of funding to mitigate, or repair those sites, the only course of action available to the Cabinet is to warn the traveling public of the relative dangers of a particular site, appeal to legislators for appropriate funding, establish a program to analyze each situation, and implement measures as funding becomes available.

Highway Design Guidelines for New Rock Cut Slopes

Guidelines for designing cut slopes in rock in Kentucky have been formulated by the Geotechnical Branch of the Division of Materials, Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, and are contained in the 1993 Geotechnical Manual. Current policies regarding rock cut slopes are contained in that manual and pertinent sections have been reproduced below in Table 1 and Figures 4 through 11. Designing rock cut slopes is an art and varies from state to state. Methods that may be successful in one state may not be appropriate for conditions in another state. Methods used are very dependent on the types of materials present in the slope, the number and inclination of joints, and the continuity of the joints. The design is also influenced by the lithology, or the structure and composition of a rock formation. The basic principle guiding the design of rock slopes is that each cut slope must be designed independently using all subsurface information and field information at a given site.

Because there are many different types of rock formations, jointing patterns, and layer orientations, specific rules cannot be formulated for designing rock cut slopes. Rather, only general guidelines can be formulated based on local experiences. Rock cut design in Kentucky has evolved over a considerable period of time based on the past experiences of geologists and geotechnical engineers. Consequently, some general guidelines based on past Kentucky experiences have evolved as summarized in Table
Table 1. Suggested, typical rock slope configurations are based on the types of rocks that may exist in a cut slope.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Materials</th>
<th>Slake Durability Index (Percent)</th>
<th>Jar Slake Number</th>
<th>Typical Lift Cut Slope Recommendations</th>
<th>Typical Intermediate Benches</th>
<th>Roadside Benches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondurable</td>
<td>49 ≤</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>2 : 1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shale with or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without laminations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondurable</td>
<td>50 - 79.</td>
<td>3 or 4</td>
<td>1 : 1 to 1/2 : 1</td>
<td>9.14 m (30 ft Max.)</td>
<td>5.5 m (18 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondurable</td>
<td>80 - 89.</td>
<td>4 or 5</td>
<td>3/4 : 1 to 1/4 : 1</td>
<td>9.14 m (30 ft)</td>
<td>5.5 m (18 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable</td>
<td>≥90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1/2 : 1 to 1/4 : 1</td>
<td>9.14 m (30 ft) to 13.72 m (45 ft)</td>
<td>5.5 m (18 ft) to 6.1 m (20 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/2 : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone or Sandstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to 1:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaley</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 : 1 to 1/2 : 1</td>
<td>9.14 m (30 ft) to 13.72 m (45 ft)</td>
<td>5.5 m (18 ft) to 6.1 m (20 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone or Sandstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Examples of typical slope configurations described in Table 1 are illustrated in Figures 4 through 7. As shown in Figures 4 through 6, the guidelines recognize three different classes of nondurable shales. Class I shales are defined as shales that have a slake-durability index (Hopkins 1986) -- performed according to KM-64-513 (Kentucky Methods 1993) -- equal to or less than 49 percent. Classes I and II are defined as shales that have slake-durability indexes ranging from 80 to 89 and 50 to 79 percent, respectively. Durable shales are defined as those shales that have a slake-durability index equal to or greater than 90 percent.

Other guidelines pertaining to the design of cut slopes in massive limestone, or sandstone, and in shaley limestone, or sandstone, are shown in Figures 8 and 9, respectively. Provisions are also in the guidelines for using serrated slopes. This
Figure 4. Typical cut slope recommendation for a Class III nondurable shale with or without laminations.

Figure 5. Typical cut slope recommendation for a Class II nondurable shale.
Figure 6. *Typical cut slope recommendation for a Class I nondurable shale.*

**Typical Slope Configuration**  
**Class I Nondurable Shale**  
(Typical slope varies from 3/4:1 to 1/4:1)

---

**Figure 7. Typical cut slope recommendation for a durable shale.**

**Typical Slope Configuration**  
**Class I Durable Shale**  
(Typical slope varies from 1/2:1 to 1/4:1)

---
Rockfall Mitigation Measures-Hopkins, Beckham, and Puckett

Figure 8. Typical cut slope configuration used in massive limestone or sandstone.

Figure 9. Typical slope configuration recommended for shaley limestone or sandstone.
technique is sometimes used in soft rock formations, shale, or other material that can be excavated by bulldozing or ripping to control erosion by aiding in the establishment of vegetation. A typical slope configuration of a serrated slope is illustrated in Figure 10.

A roadside ditch bench is recommended in the guidelines when a cut slope is steeper than 1 1/2: 1 and the 9.14- m (30-ft) safety clear zone, which is measured from the edge of a pavement to the cut slope, is not required. If the cut slope is less than about 9.14 m (30 ft) in height, then the width of the roadside ditch bench, as measured from a pavement edge to the cut slope, is usually 3.66 m (12 ft). When the cut slope is greater than 9.14 m (30 ft) in height, the bench width is 4.27 m (14 ft).

When the cut slope design does not contain intermediate benches, the guidelines
specify that a ditch-catchment area be constructed. The criteria used to design the continuous cut slope and catchment area are illustrated in Figure 11. Conditions when continuous cut slope design may be considered are as follows:

- Rock in the cut slope is homogenous;
- Joints are discontinuous and massive failures are unlikely;
- Intermediate benches will accumulate debris and become ineffective;
- Rock consists of limestones of low RQD numbers that are interbedded with shale of low slake-durability (SDI) numbers.

Figure 11. Design criteria for roadside ditch catchment area (modified after Richie’s design criteria in FHWA Rock Slope Engineering Manual)
ROCKFALL HAZARDOUS RATING PROGRAM

Description of Rating System

Preliminary rating

To build a statewide rockfall risk management program and define the scope of this problem in Kentucky, a survey of rock slope problems was performed. In performing this survey, the rockfall hazard rating system (RHRS) devised by Pierson and Vickle (1993) of the Oregon Department of Transportation was used. This system is a rather simple procedure for evaluating the potential for rockfall to occur at a selected rock cut slope. The system provides a uniform means of identifying potentially dangerous rockfall slopes and a means of developing a priority list of sites where protective measures, or repairs, may be needed. The numerical rating system provides a means of allocating maintenance money.

The rating system consists of two parts. The potential for rock fall at a rock slope is initially classified, subjectively, and assigned to one of the three following categories:

- A slope-- High
- B slope-- moderate
- C slope-- low, or none.

By classifying a rock cut slope according to one of these categories, a quick assessment of each slope on a highway may be made. Slopes that are classified as “C” are not considered dangerous and no further attention need be devoted to those types of slopes. A slope that classifies as “A” or “B” is considered potentially dangerous. In these cases, future attention and action should be considered for these types of slopes.

Detailed numerical rating

Slopes that were classified as “A” or “B” were rated numerically using the RHRS approach. Nine parameters are considered vital in this system for rating the rockfall potential at a given location. These parameters include slope height, ditch effectiveness, average vehicle risk, sight distance, roadway width, geologic character of slope, block size, rockfall history, and climate. Definitions and descriptions of each of these terms are given by Pierson and Vickle (1993). A field coding sheet for rating numerically the rockfall potential of a slope is shown in APPENDIX A. The
parameters, height of slope, ditch effectiveness, average vehicle risk, sight distance, roadway width, block size, and rockfall history are quantities that may be measured fairly objectively. In Kentucky, the climate across the state is fairly uniform, that is, temperature and rainfall are essentially the same across the state. Therefore, eight of the nine parameters can be evaluated fairly objectively. Rating the geologic character of a rock slope is somewhat subjective. Generally, the conditions that cause rockfall fit into two categories, as noted by Pierson and Vickle. Case one sites are those where joints, bedding planes, or other discontinuities are the dominant structural features that lead to rockfall. Case two sites are those where differential erosion or over steepening is the dominant condition that controls rockfall. In examining each of these parameters devised by Pierson and Vickle, it appeared that this system was readily adaptable to rock slope conditions in Kentucky.

Rated Highway Rock Slopes in Kentucky

To test the reliability of the system devised by Pierson and Vickle and to develop firsthand experience with this rockfall rating system, several highway routes containing numerous rock slopes were selected. Additionally, a large of number of slopes was selected in an attempt to obtain an indication of the range of numerical values of rock slopes in Kentucky. The highway routes selected for some potential rockfall ratings included all interstates passing through Kentucky, parkways, most primary routes, and some secondary routes. Not all secondary routes were surveyed because this task was beyond the scope of this study.

Two teams of college students were used to perform the ratings. These students included three civil engineering students (Sophomores and Juniors) and a nontechnical student. Each team member had completed at least one college course in basic geology. Each team was trained for two weeks by a registered (PG) professional geologist. Several slopes were initially rated by the two teams under the auspices of the

![Figure 12. Total number of observed slopes and percentages of slopes identified as “A”, “B”, and “C”.](image)
professional geologist.

As of June of 1995, some 5,270 rock cut slopes were rated by the two teams of students. Results of the preliminary survey of the 5,270 rock slopes are illustrated in Figure 12. Some 72.6 percent of the slopes were classified as “C” slopes while some 24.0 percent were classified as “B” slopes. Only 181 of the 5,270 slopes were classified as “A” slopes.

As shown in Figure 13, the majority (about 90 percent) of all slopes classified as “A” and “B” were located in the portion of Kentucky located east of Interstate 75--mainly the mountainous areas of eastern Kentucky. Only about 10 percent of the “A” and “B” slopes were located west of Interstate 75.

Distribution of the “A” and “B” slopes according to the highway districts of Kentucky is shown in Figures 14 and 15. Basically, the rock slope problems in Kentucky are concentrated in Highway Districts numbered 7 through 12. About 99 percent of the problem rock slopes are located in Highway Districts 7, 8, 9,
10, 11, and 12. Approximately one-third of the most hazardous slopes were located in District 12.

Numerical hazardous rating scores of 181 slopes initially assigned to the “A” category and 36 slopes initially labeled “B” are shown in Figure 16. Scores of the slopes initially identified as “A” ranged from 239 to 664. A listing of the slopes identified as “A” is given in APPENDIX B. Detailed RHRS coding sheets of the 181 slopes are given in APPENDIX C. The RHRS scores of the majority of the slopes initially identified as “A” slopes were equal to or greater than 350 (85th percentile test

Figure 15. Highway District Percentages of slopes identified as “A”

Figure 16. Detailed numerical scores of 181 “A” slopes and about 36 slopes identified as “B”.
value, as shown in Figure 17. For the 36 slopes initially identified as "B," the RHRS scores ranged from about 228 to 438, as shown in Figure 18. At the 22\textsuperscript{nd} percentile test value (RHRS score), the score was about 350. That is, 78 percent of the slopes identified as "B" could be expected to score below 350. Therefore, in the majority of cases, "A" could be expected to score above 350 while a "B" could be expected to score below 350.

Figure 17. Percentile test value as a function of the numerical values of slopes initially identified as "A" slopes.

Figure 18. Percentile test value as a function of numerical values of slopes identified initially as "B".
Geological Character of Rated Rock Cut Slopes

One of the parameters used in establishing a numerical rating of a rock cut slope is the geological character of the rock formations in the rock cut. In the RHR system, the geological character is predominantly described as a structural problem, or a differential weathering problem. In the slopes where detailed ratings were obtained, structural condition-unfavorable jointing and fracturing-- was predominantly the major feature causing instability in about 60 percent of the rated slopes. In 40 percent of the observed cases, the primary cause of instability was differential weathering--a condition where a softer layer was eroding much faster than a harder layer founded on top of the weaker layer. In many cases, both structural conditions were present.

Because many cut slopes in Kentucky contain rock layers of different engineering properties, which leads to differential weathering, and considering that many formations are jointed and fractured, the use of continuous slopes in Kentucky may be limited to the situations listed above on page 11. For example, the use of a continuous slope, as illustrated in Figure 11, in situations where rock formations are highly susceptible to different erosional rates would lead frequently to the situation depicted in Figure 20.
CASE HISTORIES

Rockfall Computer Simulation Analysis

Data entry parameters

The analyses of several rockfall case histories described below were performed using the Colorado Rockfall Simulation Program--CRSP-- (Pfeiffer and Bowen, 1989). In performing rockfall analysis using this rockfall computer simulation program, four types of data input are required. These include a slope profile (line segments called cells), an estimation of the roughness of the slope profile within each cell, coefficients that portray the frictional and elastic properties of the slope, and the size, shape, and the starting location of the rocks involved in the rockfall. Rockfall is influenced by slope geometry, slope properties, rock geometry, and rock materials properties (Ritchie, 1963). Details of this program are given by Pfeiffer (1993).

The surface roughness is defined as the perpendicular variation of the slope within a slope distance equal to the radius of the rock, as shown in the left portion of Figure 21. The maximum allowable variation in the slope angle ($\theta_{\text{max}}$) is defined as:

$$\theta_{\text{max}} = \tan^{-1}(S/R)$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

The impact angle is a function of rock trajectory, slope angle, and slope variation, as shown in Figure 21. According to Pfeiffer (1993), the surface roughness may be...
obtained by stretching a string parallel to the slope and measuring the distance to the slope perpendicular to the string, as shown in Figures 21 and 22. If cells, or areas of the slope that contain uniform conditions, are inaccessible, then surface roughness for each cell is estimated. If more than one size of rock is being considered in the analysis, then different surface roughness values must be measured, or estimated. Other data that may be entered into the program include the tangential and normal coefficients. The tangential coefficient is dependent on the vegetation on the slope and the slope material. Values of this coefficient, as suggested by Pfeiffer (1993), range from 0.7 (a brush-covered slope) to a high value of 0.90 (a smooth hard surface, such as a pavement or smooth bedrock). The normal coefficient is a function of the rigidity of the slope surface. Suggested values range from a low of 0.25 (a soft soil slope) to a high of 0.4 (a smooth hard surface, such as a pavement). Various categories of these coefficients are given by Pfeiffer (1993).

**Sensitivity analysis**

To obtain some indication of the effect of surface roughness, the tangential coefficient, and the normal coefficient on the percentage of rock that could enter a roadway, the example slope shown in Figure 23 was analyzed. The normal coefficient was ranged from a value of 0.25 to 0.40. The value of the tangential coefficient was ranged from about 0.70 to 0.90. The surface roughness coefficient was varied from a value that was slightly larger than zero to one. Results of this analysis are shown in Figure 24. The percentage of rockfall that moves beyond the point of analysis ranges from about 5 percent to 51 percent when values of surface roughness are ranged from about zero to one. When the surface roughness is equal to or greater than 0.5, the percentages of rock going beyond the point of analysis ranges from only five to 16. In this case, the slope is approaching a rough condition. However, when the surface roughness is less than, or equal to 0.5-- the slope is approaching a smooth condition-- the percentages
of rock reaching beyond the point of analysis ranges from about nine to 51. Therefore, for this condition, the percentage of rock reaching the roadway is very dependent on the value of surface roughness. At any selected value of surface roughness, and for values of tangential and normal coefficients ranging from the minimum to maximum suggested values, the difference in percentages of rock reaching beyond the point of analysis does not exceed a value of 12. When the surface roughness is equal to, or greater than 0.5, the percentage difference is equal to, or less than, about five. Therefore, variation in the coefficients has a small effect on the percentage of rock going beyond the point of analysis.

Figure 23. Slope used to illustrate the variation of the percentage of rock entering the roadway when surface roughness, the tangential coefficient, and normal coefficient are varied.

Figure 24. Sensivity analyses of the slope at Station 101 + 580.
Rockfall Sites

**KY Route 1098 Breathitt County**

A hazardous slope (Figure 25) near mile marker 0.25 on KY Route 1098 in Breathitt County was rated in June 1994. The total score for the rating was 664, making it the highest rated slope in the state using the Rockfall Hazard Rating System (RHRS). This slope was also selected by District Operations’ personnel as the most hazardous slope in District 10. Cross sections were submitted to the University of Kentucky Transportation Center for rockfall computer simulation analysis. The Study Advisory Committee of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet had previously recommended that the mountainous Highway Districts submit dangerous rock slopes for analyses. The slope consisted of interbedded shale, siltstone, and coal reaching from the ditch line to a height of approximately 12.2 m (40 ft). Above the interbedded layers was a thick sandstone unit—approximately 15.2 m (50 ft). Differential weathering of the interbedded shale, siltstone, and coal caused the more resistant sandstone unit to overhang. As seen in Figure 25, the sandstone was situated directly above the eastbound driving lane.

![Figure 25. Rock slope, KY Route 1098, Breathitt County, before failure in November 1994.](image)

Analysis of the slope using the Colorado Rockfall Simulation Program (CRSP) showed that all rocks falling from the sandstone unit would reach the roadway as shown in Figure 26. In those analyses, the diameters of the falling rocks were assumed to be 0.3, 0.6, and 1.6 m (1, 2, and 5 ft), respectively. Results of additional analyses of various design scenarios are shown in Table 2. Also, the shapes of the rocks were assumed to be spherical. The bench in the analysis represents a distance at the base of the sandstone unit.
A large failure, as shown in Figure 27, occurred on November 24, 1994 at approximately 7:40 A.M. and blocked both lanes of the two-lane roadway. Large blocks measuring up to 3.0 m (10 ft) long and 0.9 m (3 ft) thick of the overhanging sandstone fell entirely and blocked the roadway. The fall was heard by personnel at the county maintenance headquarters located across the valley from the site. Operations’ personnel immediately went to the site to investigate. Upon arrival at the site, an additional fall occurred just before cleanup operations began. A large amount of rock was still hanging over the roadway after the

Table 2. Results of rockfall simulations for KY Route 1098, Breathitt County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remedial Measure</th>
<th>Percent of Rocks Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 m (5 ft) Diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Slope</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 m (20 ft) Bench</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2 m (40 ft) Bench</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 m (30 ft) Bench with 3.0 m (10 ft) drop zone and a Jersey Barrier</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 m (30 ft) Bench with 3.0 m (10 ft) drop zone. No Jersey Barrier</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

falls. Joints and tension cracks in the rock unit indicated more falls were likely to occur. An emergency cleanup and slope restoration contract was required to clear the roadway and repair the slope. Cost of the repairs exceeded $100,000 and the road was closed for several days. Repairs were completed in early January 1995.
A view of the repaired slope is shown in Figure 28. Rockfall computer simulation analyses of the repaired slope show that no 0.3-m (1-ft) diameter rocks will fall into the traffic lanes. This analysis is based on dropping 500 rocks from the top of the slope. If the diameters of the falling rocks are assumed to be 0.6 m (2 ft), then 1.6 percent of 500 falling rocks of that size would enter the roadway. When the diameters of the falling rocks are assumed to be 1.5 m (5 ft), 2.6 percent of the assumed number of falling rocks enter the roadway. Cross sections of the original and repaired slopes are compared in figure 29.
Figure 29. Comparison of the original and reconstructed cross sections at Station 1+39, KY 1098, Breathitt County.

Figure 30. Existing profile of slope at Station 48+50, KY Route 32, Rowan County.

KY Route 32 Rowan County

A cross section of a rock cut, Figure 30, near mile marker 6.2 on Ky Route 32 and located between 1-64 and downtown Morehead, was submitted for analysis by personnel of Highway District 9. The cross section selected for analysis was located at station 48+50. The slope was rated using the
Rockfall Hazardous Rating System by Transportation Center personnel in August 1994. The RHRS score of the slope was 454.

Geology of the slope consisted of interbedded shale and siltstone. Weathering of the shale, as shown in Figure 31, allows the more durable siltstone to overhang and eventually fail.

Two mitigation measures were also submitted for analysis. Results of the rockfall computer simulation analysis, as shown in Figure 32, indicated that 5.8 percent of falling rocks, measuring 0.3 m (1 ft) in diameter, on the "as is" slope would reach the roadway. These analyses were based on an assumed value of 500 falling rocks. Constructing a concrete barrier at the edge of the pavement reduced the amount of rock reaching the roadway to 0.8 percent. The barrier created a catchment zone for the falling rocks. This approach is similar to the concept of a Ritchie (Ritchie 1963) catchment ditch. The addition of a 3-m (10-ft) fence on top of the barrier reduced the percent of falling rocks reaching the roadway to 0.1. The slope was mitigated with a concrete barrier as shown in Figures 33 and 34.

Figure 31. Slope analyzed on KY Route 32 before mitigation.

Figure 32. Results of rockfall computer simulation analysis.
US Route 119 Bell County (Varilla Hill)

A geotechnical investigation (Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, 1987) was performed at this site (Figure 35) in 1987 by the Geotechnical Branch, Division of Materials, Kentucky Transportation Cabinet to formulate rockfall mitigation designs. Design measures were performed for a stretch of roadway extending from Station 390 + 50 to 413 + 00 (686 m or 2,250 ft).

Bedrock in the slope consisted of shale layers founded below a sandstone unit. Differential weathering of the underlying shales and large joints in the sandstone contributed to large rockfall that impacted the highway. Forty-six joints, three areas with unstable wedges due to the intersection of joints and weathering of shales, four areas of unstable sandstone blocks due to jointing and undercutting, and 11 areas of slaking shales were identified in the report. The slope was rated by the Transportation Center in July 1994 and divided into three slopes for rating purposes. The slope at mile point 6.92 was scored 660 which ranked this slope as the second most hazardous highway rockfall site in Kentucky. At mile point 6.97, the rating was 638, and at mile point 7.16, the rating was 570. These two slopes ranked 7th and 24th, respectively, statewide.
The geotechnical report, and three critical cross sections at stations 398+00 (Figure 36), 402+50 (Figure 37), and 410+00 (Figure 38), were submitted to the Transportation Center by District 11 officials for analysis. The following four alternatives and estimated 1987 costs were proposed in the geotechnical report conducted by the Transportation Cabinet to mitigate the rockfall problem:

1. Redesign the entire cut. $3,148,367
2. Shift the alignment to create a rockfall area. $1,853,856
3. Partial redesign with trimming and scaling $968,557
4. Install a warning system $25,000

Alternative number 1 specified a reconstruction of the slope using 5.5- and 6.1-m (18- and 20-ft) wide benches, which were to be located at the base of the unstable sandstone units. A 3-m (10-ft) shoulder and a 4.3-m (14-ft) ditch to collect fallen rocks also was included in the plan. The second proposed alternative consisted of shifting the highway 14.3 m (47 ft) right by constructing five retaining walls in existing drains and excavating material on the right side. A 4.6-m (15-ft) barrier wall would be constructed from station 393+00 to 411+00 creating a fallout zone. Sandstone caps located between stations 395+00 to 399+50 would be removed. An intermediate bench, stretching from station 408+50 to 410+50 at the base of the sandstone, would be constructed. Trimming and scaling of loose material throughout the cut were also recommended. This solution would provide a new roadway with passing lanes, shoulders, and a 12.2-m (40-ft) fall-out zone.

The third proposed alternative was a combination of a partial redesign of the slope and trimming and scaling of the slope. The upper sandstone unit would be removed between the following stations and elevations:
- 395+00 to 396+50 Elevation 378.9 - 394.1 m (1243 - 1293 ft)
- 397+00 to 399+50 Elevation 386.8 - 401.7 m (1269 - 1318 ft)
- 401+50 to 403+50 Elevation 387.7 - 424.6 m (1272 - 1393 ft)
- 404+50 to 406+50 Elevation 395.3 - 424.9 m (1297 - 1394 ft)
- 408+50 to 410+50 Elevation 395.6 - 424.3 m (1298 - 1392 ft)

Figure 36. Cross sections of original slope and slopes of alternative plans identified as numbers one, two, and three, Station 398+00, US 119, Bell County.
Figure 37. Cross sections of the original slope and slopes of alternative plans identified as numbers one, two, and three, station 402+50, US 119, Bell County.
Figure 38. Cross sections of original slope and slopes of alternative plans identified as numbers one, two, and three, Station 410+00, US 119, Bell County.
Any unstable wedges caused by intersecting joints and potential shale failures would be removed. The lower sandstone unit would be scaled, trimmed, and blasted. In this alternate solution, no fallout zone is provided. This plan is more of a temporary solution to minimize immediate hazards of falling rocks.

A fourth proposed alternative consisted of the erection of lights and signs which would warn the traveling public of the occurrence of rock and debris in the roadway. This solution requires motorists to assume some responsibility for traveling the area safely.

Analyses using CRSP were performed to evaluate the original slope and the first three alternative mitigation measures. As seen graphically in Figures 39, 40, and 41 and in Table 3, design alternative number 2 prevents all rocks from reaching the roadway.
Table 3. Results of rockfall simulations for US Route 119, Bell County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Design Alternate</th>
<th>Percent of Rocks Reaching the Roadway</th>
<th>Rock Diameter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2 m (0.5 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398+50</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>74.8 (%)</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate #1</td>
<td>0.0 (%)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate #2</td>
<td>0.0 (%)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate #3</td>
<td>1.3 (%)</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402+50</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>100.0 (%)</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate #1</td>
<td>0.0 (%)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate #2</td>
<td>0.0 (%)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate #3</td>
<td>0.2 (%)</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410+00</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>100.0 (%)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate #1</td>
<td>0.0 (%)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate #2</td>
<td>0.0 (%)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate #3</td>
<td>1.5 (%)</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In February 1995, a large failure occurred in the upper sandstone unit. A contract was issued to remove the remaining unstable blocks of sandstone near the top of the cut between approximate stations 394+50 to 396+50 and 397+00 to 399+00. The cost for removing the sandstone and repairing the roadway was approximately $250,000.

This emergency repair work was similar to the proposed alternative number 3. As shown in figures 36 through 38, the rockfall computer simulation analyses show that if additional rock falls in the future, then some of this rock, potentially, may enter the roadway. However, the work performed at the site during the emergency was limited because sufficient funding was not available to execute more appropriate plans. More corrective actions may be required in the future at this site and close monitoring of this situation will be required.
KY 1426 Pike County

A cut extending from mile marker 6.03 to 6.24 (Figure 42) on State Route 1426 (Old US Route 23) in Pikeville was selected by District 12 personnel to rate during the RHRS training seminar held in Pikeville in May 1994. Several incidents of rockfall had previously occurred at the site including one in 1979 and one in June 1983 when claims were filed against the Transportation Cabinet.

The slope was rated and scored 606 (ranked 13th in the state for the highest score). The predominant cause of large rockfall is the differential weathering of shale beneath a more resistant sandstone unit. Jointing in the sandstone unit increases the chances for failure.

Many small falls occur almost constantly. Rocks are removed semimonthly to weekly, depending on weather conditions, from the site.

Shotcreting of the shale located beneath the sandstone was one suggested, mitigation method. This technique would reduce further differential erosion provided adequate drainage is installed to insure a good bond between the shotcrete and shale. Adequate drainage would be installed and any loose material scaled before installation of shotcrete. However, to date, sufficient funding was not available to implement this plan.

KY Route 1274 Menifee County

Seven slopes along route 1274 in Menifee County were rated by the Transportation Center in June 1994. The ratings were performed after discussions with District Operations' personnel noted that daily checks were conducted to monitor falling rocks.
at this location. RHRS scores ranged from a high of 605 (14th statewide) to 477 (66th). Five slopes ranged from 467 to 352 (75th to 161st). Twenty-six additional slopes (11 in Rowan County) have been identified as “B” slopes along this route. A “B” rating means the potential for rockfall exists but not to the degree of an “A” slope. The “B” slopes along this route were not given detailed (scored) ratings during the study.

Most of the falling rocks are due to differential erosion between shale and siltstone units, and along fractures, as shown in Figure 43. The fractures are present in cut sections throughout the length of the roadway, which indicates that over blasting occurred during construction. The cuts are nearly vertical with very small fallout areas.

Arrangements were made through the Transportation Cabinet to perform rockfall computer simulation analyses on four cut sections being designed to mitigate rockfall problems. Critical sections of the cuts were located at stations 138+00, 142+00, 170+00, and 179+00 (Figures 44 through 47). The mitigation measure consisted of relocating
the existing alignment 7.3 m (24 ft) right to create a fallout zone. The slope at station 170+00 was designed with a Brugg® impact fence (Figure 48) in addition to the realignment. An impact fence is designed to prevent falling rocks from entering the roadway by using a cable braking system. As falling rocks impact the fence, large cables with loops for braking, located in the top and bottom of the fence, allow the fence to flex. When the loops in the cables fully tighten, the cables act as a brake to stop the fence and rock from moving further. A large amount of energy created by the falling rocks is absorbed when the fence flexes.

Results of rockfall simulation analysis are shown in Figures 49 through 52 and Table 4. Shifting the alignment reduced the
percentage of falling rocks reaching the roadway to zero at three sites without an impact fence. The addition of an impact fence further reduced the percentage of falling rocks reaching the highway to zero and 0.04, respectively, for 0.3-m (1-ft) and 0.6-m (2-ft) diameter rocks.

A contract was awarded in October 1995 to realign the roadway and install approximately 152.4 m (500 linear feet) of impact fence at the cut near station 170+00. Installation of the impact fence is expected in the summer of 1996.
Figure 51. Computer rockfall simulation results, station 170 + 00.

Figure 52. Computer rockfall simulation results, Station 179 + 00.

Table 4. Results of rockfall simulations for KY Route 1274, Menifee County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>“As Is” Section</th>
<th>Station Number</th>
<th>Diameter of Rock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diameter of Rock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3 m (1 ft)</td>
<td>0.6 m (2 ft)</td>
<td>0.3m (1 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138+00</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142+00</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170+00 with Brugg® Fence</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170+00 without Brugg® Fence</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179+00</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Interstate Route 64 Franklin County**

The Kentucky Transportation Center was requested to perform computer rockfall simulations on slopes being designed for reconstruction of I-64 in Franklin County. In the proposed plan, the number of lanes of this route will be increased from four to six. Ten slopes had previously been rated by Center personnel. Two of the ten slopes had previously been identified as “A” slopes. The other eight slopes had been identified as “B” slopes. Detailed numerical rating scores of the ten slopes ranged from 406 to 239 (statewide rankings of 119th to 213th). An additional 39 “B” slopes were identified along I-64 in Franklin County but those slopes were not rated. Original and design cross sections at three stations, identified as 102+300, 104+820, and 104+880 (in meters), were submitted for rockfall computer simulation analyses.

In the rockfall computer simulation analyses, different slope configurations were evaluated at Stations 101+580 and 102+300. At Station 101+580, analyses were performed on the existing slope and a continuous slope, as illustrated in Figures 53 and 54, respectively. Results of these analyses are shown in Figure 55. Some 24 and 45 percent, respectively, of rocks of 0.30-m (1-ft) and 0.61-m (2-ft) diameters reach the roadway, according to the computer simulation analyses. When a continuous slope is used, some seven and 53 percent of the rockfall, respectively, reach the roadway.
In Figures 56 through 58, different slope configurations of Station 102 +300 are shown. The intent of the different design analyses at this station was to determine the benefits of using intermediate benching. The existing slope configuration at Station 102 +300 (a left-hand side) is shown in Figure 56. A continuous slope design is illustrated in Figure 57. A benched slope design is considered in Figure 58. Results of the rockfall computer simulation analyses of the three different slope configurations are shown in Figure 59. In these analyses, spherical rocks, which had diameters of 0.30 m (1 ft) and 0.61 m (2 ft), were used. Also, in the analyses, some 500 rocks were dropped. The analyses show that some 23 and 31 percent, respectively, of 500 dropped rocks of 0.30-m (1-ft) and 0.61-m (2-ft) diameters would enter the roadway of the existing slope. When the configuration of the slope is continuous, some 17 and 73 percent of the 0.30-m (1-ft) and 0.61-m (2-ft) diameter rocks, respectively, would enter the roadway. However, when the slope is benched, as shown in Figure 59, no rocks enter the roadway.
Rockfall computer simulation analyses of benched sections at Stations 104+820 and 104+880 were also performed. Original and design sections at those two locations are shown in Figures 60 through 63, respectively. Results of the computer analyses of the design cuts are shown in Figures 64 and 65 and in Table 5. At Station 104 + 820, the percentage of rock entering the roadway was zero for the three different sizes of rock.

**Figure 60. Original cross section at Station 104 + 820, Interstate.**

**Figure 61. Design cross section at Station 104 + 820, Interstate 64.**

**Figure 62. Original cross section at Station 104 + 880, Interstate.**

**Figure 63. Design cross section at Station 104 + 880, Interstate 64.**
Figure 64. Results of rockfall computer simulation analyses of benched slopes at Station 102 +300, Interstate 64

Figure 65. Results of rockfall computer simulation analyses of benched slopes at Station 104 +880, Interstate 64.

Table 5. Results of rockfall simulations for I-64, Franklin County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>0.15 m (0.5 ft)</th>
<th>0.3 m (1 ft)</th>
<th>0.6 m (2 ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102+300 R</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104+820 R</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104+880 R</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Filled Ditches and Benches

When highway ditches become filled with fallen rock, or when rock debris accumulates on benches of rock cut slopes, the rock debris may act as a launching pad for rock that may fall in the future. To illustrate these conditions, a slope was analyzed using the rockfall simulation program. Four cases were analyzed, as shown in Figure 66. In the first case, a clean slope was considered while in the second case, the ditch founded at the toe of the slope, was assumed to be filled. In the third case, the bench of the slope was assumed to be filled. In the fourth case, the bench and ditch were assumed to be filled. Results of the analyses are shown in Figure 67. When the slope is clean and no rock debris is present, no rocks enter the roadway. When the ditch fills, about 2
percent of the dropped rocks
enter the roadway. If the
bench fills with rock debris,
then some 17 percent of the
dropped rocks enter the
roadway. When both the
bench and ditch become
filled with rock debris, then
about 19 percent of the
dropped rocks enter the
roadway. This case study
illustrates the need to keep
ditches and benches clean of
rock debris. Otherwise, the
accumulated debris acts as
launching pads for future
rockfall.

Figure 66. Cross sections used to illustrate the effects of ditches and benches filled with rock debris.

Figure 67. Cross sections used in the rockfall computer simulation analysis to illustrate the effects of rock debris-filled
ditches and benches.
Analysis of Typical Design Slopes

Rockfall computer simulation analyses were performed to evaluate the general effectiveness of the typical cut slope configurations shown in the section on guidelines, Figures 5 through 9. The analyses were not performed for the slope shown in Figure 4 because the class III non-durable will tend to degrade fairly rapidly. In this case, vegetation will usually become established on the 2 horizontal to 1 vertical slope, which lessens the potential for rockfall. In those analyses, some 400 rocks were dropped-- a very severe test. Surface roughness was assumed to be about 0.25-- a very severe test value and one that treats all surfaces as fairly smooth. Results of the analyses for the different slopes are shown in Figures 68 and 69. In those analyses, three different sizes of spherical rocks were assumed. Rock
diameters of 0.15 m (0.5 ft), 0.30 m (1.0 ft), and 0.61 m (2 ft) were used. The percentages of different sizes of rock reaching beyond the point of analysis in cases involving classes I and II and the durable shales ranged from zero to 11. For the massive limestone, or sandstone cut slopes, the percentages ranged from 2.6 to 6.1.

Cylindrical-shaped rocks are considered in Figures 70 and 71. In those analyses, the diameters of the falling rocks were assumed to be 0.3 and 0.46 m (1 and 1.5 ft), respectively. Lengths of the cylindrical-shaped rocks were assumed to be 0.30 and 0.6 m (1 and 2 ft), respectively. Generally, except for the typical shaley limestone, or sandstone, cut slope, the percentages of rockfall moving beyond the point of analyses ranged from zero to about 11. For the shaley limestone, or sandstone, cut slope, the percentage was about 27 for the larger rock. As these analyses indicate, the percentages of rockfall entering the roadway only begin to increase as the sizes of the rocks increase.

Figure 70. Results of cylindrical rockfall computer simulation analyses for typical cut slopes shown in Figures 9 and 10.

Figure 71. Results of cylindrical rockfall computer simulation analyses for typical cut slopes shown in Figures 8 and 9.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Based on extensive observations of rockfall and rockfall problems on Kentucky's highways, the following conclusions are made:

- Preliminary rockfall hazardous ratings of all rock cut slopes on the interstates, parkways, and most primary routes were performed. Some preliminary ratings were performed on some secondary routes. Some 5,270 slopes were observed. About 3.4 percent of these slopes were classified as “A” slopes and some 24 percent were classified as “B” slopes. Detailed rockfall hazardous ratings of all “A” slopes were obtained. Detailed ratings on some “B” slopes were obtained.

- The vast majority of rockfall and rockfall problems in Kentucky occur in counties located east of Interstate 75. Some ninety percent of highway rock cuts that were classified as “A” slopes and 88 percent that were classified as “B” slopes were found on roadways located east of Interstate 75.

- The average amount of a rockfall, or rockfall-related, claim filed with the Kentucky Board of Claims was about $157,000 dollars per year. This claim amount per year is believed to be exceptionally small because Kentucky is one of the few remaining states that retains sovereign immunity. Only about 22 of the rockfall claims are paid by Kentucky.

- Differential weathering and structural characteristics -- jointing and unfavorable orientations-- were the major causes of rockfall on Kentucky's highways. Rockfall occurs because rock slopes are subjected to freezing and thawing cycles, wetting and drying cycles, runoff over slopes, and differential erosion.

- The Rockfall Hazardous Rating System (RHRS) -- devised by Pierson and Vickle-- is a good system for rating the potential for rockfall at a given highway rock cut location. This system, when used statewide, can be very effective in identifying dangerous rockfall locations. Where repairs, or mitigation measures are needed, the rating system provides a very valuable means of developing a priority list. Moreover, the system provides uniformity in ranking the hazardous nature of rock slopes. During this study, two rock slopes that scored the top two highest scores-- over 660-- (out of some 5000 slopes) failed shortly after the slopes were rated using the RHRS system.
Few mitigation measures have been used on Kentucky's highways. During this study, two locations where fences had been used as a mitigation measure were identified. At six sites, the so-called Ritchie ditch had been used. Near the end of this study, a concrete retaining structure was used at one site as a barrier, or containment, wall.

For the sedimentary rock strata in Kentucky, benching of rock slopes is very effective in preventing, or mitigating, rockfall on Kentucky's highways. However, some consideration should be given to removing debris from slopes on occasions.

Detailed scores, based on the RHR system, of potentially, hazardous highway rock slopes on interstates and parkways ranged from about 280 to 520.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made:

- Preliminary ratings of all rock cut slopes on secondary routes under the jurisdiction of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet should be performed.

- The Rockfall Hazardous Rating System should be implemented statewide. Whenever a rockfall occurs on a roadway under the jurisdiction of the Cabinet, the rock slope should be rated using the RHR System. Detail ratings on all slopes that classified as “B” should be completed. Also, all “A” and “B” slopes identified on secondary routes should be detailed rated. All rated slope data should be maintained, including updates, in a central file.

- The computer rockfall simulation program devised by Colorado engineers is a very powerful analytical tool for assessing the safety of existing rock slopes and newly designed rock slopes. This program is extremely useful in devising remedial and mitigating plans at rockfall sites. It is recommended that this program be used when analyzing problem rock slopes.

- There is a need to devise remedial, or mitigation, solutions for the most hazardous rock cut slopes identified in this study (see APPENDIX B). After these measures have been identified for each site, cost estimates
should be determined. Ratios of estimated cost of the remedial, or mitigation, measures for each site to the RHRS score of the site need to be determined. Using those ratios, a priority list can be devised.

- A permanent, highway rock slope risk management program should be established by the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. To insure the success of this program, permanent funding should be established. Data in this program should be reviewed annually and updated when appropriate. All hazardous sites should be detail rated about every five years. (The establishment of a rockfall risk management system will provide the means to make good decisions on allocating funding for mitigating or repairing, rockfall problem sites. It will provide a proactive stance for the Cabinet and will provide some legal protection.)

- After cost estimates of remedial, or mitigation, measures of the most hazardous rock slopes and the establishment of a priority list has been made, the Cabinet should provide yearly funds for implementing rockfall mitigation and rock slope remedial measures. Money should be earmarked, or established, for the most hazardous sites. This may require making a request to the Kentucky Legislators for such funding. It should be noted that there are instances where several slopes that need repairs, or mitigation measures, could be grouped together under one contract. In these instances, savings in repair, or mitigation, costs could be realized.

- At all sites where remedial, or mitigating, measures have been used, the effectiveness of these measures should be monitored. Appropriate funding should be made available for this purpose.

- Appropriate measures should be established to monitor the effectiveness of Ritchie ditches.

- In using the Colorado rockfall computer simulation program, there is a need to check the coefficients -- used in the program -- of Kentucky rocks. Also, surface roughness for different situations should be evaluated. This would involve observing actual trajectories of rocks for different situations at selected sites.
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APPENDIX A

Rockfall Hazardous Rating System Coding Forms
## APPENDIX A–RHRS Numerical Coding Sheet

### RHRS Field Data Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway No.</th>
<th>Beginning Milepost</th>
<th>L / R</th>
<th>Ending Milepost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Rated By</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>Speed Limit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
<th>CATEGORY SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slope Height</td>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>Slope Height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditch Effectiveness</td>
<td>G M L N</td>
<td>Ditch Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Vehicle Risk</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>AVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sight Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Decision Site Distance</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Width</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway Width</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Geologic Character

**Case 1**
- Structural Condition: D C/F R A
- Rock Friction: R I U P C - S

**Case 2**
- Differential Erosional Features: F O N M
- Difference in Erosional Rates: S M L E

**Block Size/Volume**: ft / yd$^3$

**Climate**
- Precipitation: L M H
- Freezing Period: N S L
- Water on Slope: N I C

**Rockfall History**: F O M C

**Comments:**

**Total Score**
**APPENDIX A - RHRS Numerical Coding Sheet**

### Slope Height

- **H.I.** = Height of Surveying Instrument.
- **X** = distance between angle measurements.

**Slope Height**

\[ \text{Slope Height} = \frac{(\sin \alpha) (\sin \beta)}{\sin(\alpha - \beta)} (H.I.) \]

### AVR Score

\[ \text{AVR Score} = \frac{100}{\text{Speed Limit}} \times \frac{\text{ADT}/24 \times \text{Slope Length (miles)}}{12} \]

### Roadway Width

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ft</th>
<th>Roadway Width Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sight Dist. Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sight Dist. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Where:

- **ADT** = Average Daily Traffic

### Diagram

[Diagram showing slope height calculations]
APPENDIX B

Listing of Numerical Ratings of Rock Cut Slopes Identified as Class “A” on Selected Roadways under the Jurisdiction of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet
**Numerical Rating of Class A Slopes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County No.</th>
<th>Highway Route</th>
<th>Beginning Mile Point</th>
<th>Ending Mile Point</th>
<th>Center Line</th>
<th>Date of Rating</th>
<th>Class Rating</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Detail Rating Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/17/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>664*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>U119</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/21/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>665**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/15/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/01/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/15/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/30/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>U119</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>08/21/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>638*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/15/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/01/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>U127</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/13/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/16/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/16/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/20/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>605**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>U25W</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/20/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/12/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/25/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/01/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/01/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>U60</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/02/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/20/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>577**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.63</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/15/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>U119</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/21/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/12/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/30/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/15/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/15/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>U119</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>11/27/1995</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/16/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County No.</td>
<td>Highway Route</td>
<td>Beginning Mile Point</td>
<td>Ending Mile Point</td>
<td>Center Line</td>
<td>Date of Rating</td>
<td>Class Rating</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Detail Rating Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/15/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>U25W</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/14/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/29/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/01/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/01/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/30/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/09/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/29/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/01/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/29/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>MTPK</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/20/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>520**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>MTPK</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/08/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>08/08/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>05/19/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/20/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>517**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/20/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>515**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>MTPK</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/07/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/01/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/01/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/20/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>508**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>U119</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/21/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/12/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/28/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>U119</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/21/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/12/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/28/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/28/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>U421</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/21/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/21/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County No.</td>
<td>Highway Route</td>
<td>Beginning Mile Point</td>
<td>Ending Mile Point</td>
<td>Center Line</td>
<td>Date of Rating</td>
<td>Class Rating</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Detail Rating Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>U60</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/21/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/29/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/30/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/30/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/28/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>U127</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/13/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/20/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>477**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>CUPK</td>
<td>83.55</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/15/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/15/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>MTPK</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/08/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/12/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>CUPK</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/15/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>U119</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>08/10/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/28/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/20/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>467**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/30/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>MTPK</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>64.67</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/03/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/09/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>08/09/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>U60</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/02/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>MTPK</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/08/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/12/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/01/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.72</td>
<td>22.79</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/15/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>U75</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/14/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>08/17/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>U421</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/19/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/08/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>U119</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/21/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County No.</td>
<td>Highway Route</td>
<td>Beginning Mile Point</td>
<td>Ending Mile Point</td>
<td>Center Line</td>
<td>Date of Rating</td>
<td>Class Rating</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Detail Rating Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>I75</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/23/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>MTPK</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>47.45</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/03/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>23.17</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/03/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.17</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/29/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>U421</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>17.93</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/27/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>U421</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/02/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>U421</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/19/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/28/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I64</td>
<td>122.6</td>
<td>122.8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/03/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>I64</td>
<td>144.2</td>
<td>144.36</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/06/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/29/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/28/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/12/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/28/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>U431</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>08/09/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/20/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>424**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>CUPK</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/15/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/28/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>U421</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/13/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>I64</td>
<td>130.3</td>
<td>130.64</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/06/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>U25</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/17/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>U23X</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/28/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/02/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/30/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>U60</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/21/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>U25W</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/15/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/12/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/12/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>MTPK</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/09/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Listing and Scores of "A" Rock Cut Slopes—APPENDIX B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County No.</th>
<th>Highway Route</th>
<th>Beginning Mile Point</th>
<th>Ending Mile Point</th>
<th>Center Line</th>
<th>Date of Rating</th>
<th>Class Rating</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Detail Rating Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>U127</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/13/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>08/02/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/12/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>U68</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/01/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>119.5</td>
<td>119.3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/03/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>U421</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/13/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/21/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>401**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>U68</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/01/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>U119</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/14/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/09/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/21/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>399**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/29/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>U68</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/01/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>119.3</td>
<td>119.5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/03/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>08/09/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/03/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>167.8</td>
<td>165.9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/07/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/05/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>177.8</td>
<td>177.9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/04/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/15/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>U119</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/28/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/29/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>U421</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/02/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/02/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>08/09/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/09/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>MTPK</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/08/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>08/08/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Listing and Scores of "A" Rock Cut Slopes—APPENDIX B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County No.</th>
<th>Highway Route</th>
<th>Beginning Mile Point</th>
<th>Ending Mile Point</th>
<th>Center Line</th>
<th>Date of Rating</th>
<th>Class Rating</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Detail Rating Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>U25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/17/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>U119</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/17/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>MTPK</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/08/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>MTPK</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/08/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>MTPK</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/08/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>U119</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/21/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/01/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>MTPK</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/08/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/08/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>08/11/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/05/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>U60</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/02/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>MTPK</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/08/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>U23</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>08/10/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>CUPK</td>
<td>83.55</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/15/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>U60</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/02/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>CUPK</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>83.55</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/15/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/20/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/02/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>U421</td>
<td>19.92</td>
<td>19.97</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/19/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>MTPK</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/08/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>U68</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/01/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>U421</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/19/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>U421</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/19/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Listing and Scores of “A” Rock Cut Slopes--APPENDIX B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County No.</th>
<th>Highway Route</th>
<th>Beginning Mile Point</th>
<th>Ending Mile Point</th>
<th>Center Line</th>
<th>Date of Rating</th>
<th>Class Rating</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Detail Rating Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>08/09/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>06/03/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>U421</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/19/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>U421</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>07/19/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>08/08/1994</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>06/02/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>CUPK</td>
<td>83.35</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>07/15/1993</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Repairs were made after ratings due to slope failures.  ** Portions of Route 1274 in Menifee County (County No. 83) have been relocated, some slopes have been reconstructed and a rockfall impact fence has been constructed at one slope.
APPENDIX C

Rockfall Hazardous Rating System Sheets
Showing Detailed Numerical Rating Scores
of Slopes Identified as "A"
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 1098
DISTRICT #: 10
COUNTY #: 13
TOTAL SCORE: 664
DESIGN CODE:
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 1650

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 88
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 102
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 81
CATCHMENT: NONE
REMARKS: CONSIDERING POTENTIAL AND DAMAGED ROADWAY
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 1
PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 100
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 21
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 47
ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 24.0
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
FRACTURES:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0
DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 88
FEATURES: MAJOR
REMARKS: 20 OVERHANGS: OVER ROADWAY
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 82
RATE: EXTREME
REMARKS: SANDSTONE/SOFT SILTSTONE BEDDING
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100
BLOCK SIZE: 7
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27
PRECIPITATION:
FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 50
FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> VERY DANGEROUS SLOPE
>>> OVERHANGS ABOVE CENTER LINE
>>>
**ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM**

**Slope No. 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HWY #:</th>
<th>BMP: 0.00</th>
<th>R CF CENTERLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EMP: 0.24 SPEC. CASE. = &quot;LAKE DRIVE&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN CODE:</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0</td>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP:</td>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLD CENTERLINE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATER:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**
- DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 81
- ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 100
- SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
- AASHO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 62
- PERCENT OF TIME: 169
- WIDTH SCORE: 82
- ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 22.0
- GELOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
  - STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 99
  - FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
  - REMARKS: 40 JOINTS
  - ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 88
  - DESCRIPTION: CLAY-SLICK
  - REMARKS: 40 JOINTS WITH 2" CLAY INFILLING
- GELOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
  - STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 70
  - FEATURES: SOME
  - DIFFERECNE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0
  - RATE: LARGE
  - BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100
  - QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 10
  - CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: 27
    - PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS: PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
  - ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81
  - FALL OCCURRENCE: CONSTANT
  - ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
    - ENTIRE ROAD BLOCKED BY FALL LAST YEAR
    - ROAD MANGLED BY PAST FALLS
  - Remarks:

**Slope No. 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HWY #:</th>
<th>BMP: 12.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #:</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #:</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE:</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN CODE:</td>
<td>EMP:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLD CENTERLINE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATER:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**
- SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
- ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
- REMARKS: GREATER THAN 105 FEET
- DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 61
- ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 875
- PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 100
- WIDTH SCORE: 1
- ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 82.0
- GELOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
  - STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 99
  - FRACTURES: ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
  - REMARKS: 40 JOINTS
  - ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 88
  - DESCRIPTION: CLAY-SLICK
  - Remarks:
- GELOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
  - STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 70
  - FEATURES: SOME
  - DIFFERECNE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 68
  - RATE: LARGE
  - BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 63
  - QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 8
  - CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: 20
    - PRECIPITATION: MODERATE
  - Remarks:
  - PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: INTERMITTANT
  - ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 70
  - FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
  - ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
    - A LARGE NUMBER OF ROCKS WERE IN THE MEDIAN. THEY WERE NOT COAL BUT MATERIAL THAT MATCHED WHAT COULD BE FOUND ON THE SLOPE.

**APPENDIX C - RHRS Scores**
Slope No. 5

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 15  BMP: 14.60  L OF CENTERLINE = SOUTH
DISTRICT #: 10  EMP: 15.40  SPEC. CASE
COUNTY #: 13  TOTAL SCORE: 641  RATE DATE: 06/15/94  RATER: = SOUTH
DESIGN CODE:  EMP: 15.40  SPEC. CASE
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: (1000)  PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 93  CATCHMENT: REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100  PERCENT OF TIME:
REMQUKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 18  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 587
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 67
REMQUKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 47  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 24.0
REMQUKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FRACTURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMQUKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0  DESCRIPTION:
REMQUKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 71  FEATURES:
REMQUKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 51  RATE:
BLOCK SIZE QUANTITY SCORE: 100  BLOCK SIZE:
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 11
REMQUKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20  PRECIPITATION:
FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMQUKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMQUKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS >>>

Slope No. 6

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 10  BMP: 1.10  R OF CENTERLINE = EAST
DISTRICT #: 12  EMP: 1.50  SPEC. CASE
COUNTY #: 13  TOTAL SCORE: 641  RATE DATE: 06/15/94  RATER: = EAST
DESIGN CODE:  EMP: 1.50  SPEC. CASE
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 4150  PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 93  CATCHMENT: REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100  PERCENT OF TIME: 121
REMQUKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 47  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 440
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 50
REMQUKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 1  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 24.0
REMQUKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FRACTURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMQUKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0  DESCRIPTION:
REMQUKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 85  FEATURES:
REMQUKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 68  RATE:
BLOCK SIZE QUANTITY SCORE: 81  BLOCK SIZE:
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 8
REMQUKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20  PRECIPITATION:
FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMQUKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMQUKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS >>>

APPENDIX C - HURS Score
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Slope No. 7

HWY #: U119  BMP: 6.97  L OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 11  EMP: 7.00 SPEC. CASE. = NORTH
COUNTY #: 7
TOTAL SCORE: 638
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5460  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 120
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 81  CATCHMENT: NONE
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 2
PERCENT OF TIME:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 100  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 25
WIDTH SCORE: 5  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 40.0
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FRACTURES:
REMARKS:
ORIENATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0  DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81  FEATURES: MAJOR
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 61  RATE: LARGE
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100  BLOCK SIZE: 5.5
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27
PRECIPITATION:
FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  FALL OCCURRENCE: CONSTANT
REMARKS: ROAD AT GORILLA HILL
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>>
>>>
>>>

Slope No. 8

HWY #: 15  BMP: 20.70  R OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 10  EMP: 20.90  SPEC. CASE. = NORTH
COUNTY #: 13
TOTAL SCORE: 623
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5570  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 59  CATCHMENT: LIMITED
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 50
PERCENT OF TIME:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 96  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 37
WIDTH SCORE: 8  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 37.0
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FRACTURES:
REMARKS:
ORIENATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0  DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 89  FEATURES: MANY
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 66  RATE: LARGE
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 85  BLOCK SIZE: 4
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS: MUCH LARGER POTENTIAL
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27
PRECIPITATION:
FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 53  FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>>
>>>
>>>

APPENDIX C - HRS Scores
**ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM**

**HWY #:** 127  **BMP:** 1.25 **L OF CENTERLINE**

**DISTRICT #:** 8  **EMP:** 1.25 SPEC. CASE.  **= EAST**

**COUNTY #:** 104  **TOTAL SCORE:** 815  **RATE DATE:** 07/19/93  **RATER:** Farmer

**DESIGN CODE:**  **REPAIR CODE:** CUT  **CLASS:** A

**PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:** $  **REPAIR CODE:** CUT  **CLASS:** A

**AVG DAILY TRAFFIC:** 1350  **POSTED SPEED LIMIT:** 55

**SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:** 100  **ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):** 0

**REMARKS:** =105'

**DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE:** 38  **CATCHMENT:**

**REMARKS:**

**AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE:** 3  **PERCENT OF TIME:**

**REMARKS:**

**AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE:** 100  **ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):** 138  **PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:** 16

**REMARKS:**

**WIDTH SCORE:** 62  **ACTUAL WIDTH (FT):** 22.0

**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)**

(A) **STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:** 91  **FRACTURES:** MANY  **ORIENTATIONS:**

**REMARKS:**

(B) **ROCK FRICTION SCORE:** 81  **DESCRIPTION:**

**REMARKS:**

**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)**

(A) **DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE:** 0  **FEATURES:**

**REMARKS:**

(B) **BLOCK SIZE/IQNTITY SCORE:** 82  **BLOCK SIZE:** 4  **QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):**

**REMARKS:**

CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20  **PRECIPITATION:** MODERATE  **FREEZING PERIODS:** SOME

**REMARKS:**

ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  **FALL OCCURRENCE:** COMMON

**REMARKS:**

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

>>> SHOULD BE IN BAD CONDITION, LARGE SECTIONS LEANING

>>> TOWARDS ROAD.

>>>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slope No. 11</th>
<th>Slope No. 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HWY #: 15 BMP: 21.70</td>
<td>HWY #: 15 BMP: 21.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #: 10</td>
<td>DISTRICT #: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #: 26</td>
<td>COUNTY #: 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 612</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/16/93</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/16/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATER: FAREMARY/ANDELO</td>
<td>RATER:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN CODE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 2160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 9</td>
<td>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 51</td>
<td>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 20</td>
<td>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATCHMENT: MODERATE</td>
<td>CATCHMENT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS: ROCKS ON OTHER SIDE OF THE ROADWAY, FULL DITCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 4</td>
<td>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF TIME: 33</td>
<td>PERCENT OF TIME: 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 100</td>
<td>AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 321</td>
<td>ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 31</td>
<td>PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDTH SCORE: 81</td>
<td>WIDTH SCORE: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 20.0</td>
<td>ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81</td>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRACTURES:</td>
<td>FEATURES: CONT.IADVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIENTATIONS:</td>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 25</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81</td>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEATURES:</td>
<td>FEATURES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT.IADVER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 83</td>
<td>(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATE: LARGE</td>
<td>RATE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 27</td>
<td>BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE</td>
<td>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCORE: 20</td>
<td>SCORE: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRECIPITATION: MODERATE</td>
<td>PRECIPITATION:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREEZING PERIODS: SOME</td>
<td>FREEZING PERIODS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: INTERMITTNT</td>
<td>PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81</td>
<td>ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL OCCURRENCE: CONTINUOUS</td>
<td>FALL OCCURRENCE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope No. 13</td>
<td>Slope No. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWY #: 1274</td>
<td>HWY #: U25W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP: 5.60</td>
<td>BMP: 12.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L OF CENTERLINE</td>
<td>L OF CENTERLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #: 10</td>
<td>DISTRICT #: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #: 83</td>
<td>COUNTY #: 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 605</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/20/94</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 07/20/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN CODE:</td>
<td>DESIGN CODE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP: 5.79 SPEC. CASE.</td>
<td>EMP: 12.50 SPEC. CASE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATER:</td>
<td>RATER:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:</td>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:</td>
<td>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):</td>
<td>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE:</td>
<td>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATCHMENT: LIMITED</td>
<td>CATCHMENT: LIMITED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE VELOCITY RISK SCORE:</td>
<td>AVERAGE VELOCITY RISK SCORE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF TIME:</td>
<td>PERCENT OF TIME:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE:</td>
<td>AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):</td>
<td>ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:</td>
<td>PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDTH SCORE:</td>
<td>WIDTH SCORE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL WIDTH (FT):</td>
<td>ACTUAL WIDTH (FT):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0</td>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRACTURES:</td>
<td>FRACTURES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIENTATIONS:</td>
<td>ORIENTATIONS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0</td>
<td>(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 82</td>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEATURES: MAJOR</td>
<td>FEATURES: MAJOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS: SOFT SILTSTONE/DOLomite BEDDING</td>
<td>REMARKS: SHALE/MUDSTONE BEDDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 35</td>
<td>(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATE: LARGE</td>
<td>RATE: LARGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100</td>
<td>BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE: 8-10</td>
<td>BLOCK SIZE: 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):</td>
<td>QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 82</td>
<td>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRECIPITATION:</td>
<td>PRECIPITATION:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREEZING PERIODS:</td>
<td>FREEZING PERIODS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:</td>
<td>PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81</td>
<td>ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL OCCURRENCE: CONSTANT</td>
<td>FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR POTENTIAL FOR ROCKFALL</td>
<td>OVERHANG TO RIGHT WHEEL PATH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAD CHewed BY FALLS AND EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>DANGEROUS; HIGH TRAFFIC AREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR FALLS FILLING DITCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM**

**Slope No. 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HWY #: &amp; BMP:</th>
<th>R OF CENTERLINE</th>
<th>DISTRICT #:</th>
<th>EMP: 1.80 SPEC. CASE.</th>
<th>= EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #:</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE:</td>
<td>RATE DATE:</td>
<td>RATER: CAUDILL/FARMER</td>
<td>Design Code:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>07/12/93</td>
<td>CUT CLASS: A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:</td>
<td>REPAIR CODE:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:</td>
<td>4150</td>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slope Height Score: 100  
Actual Height (ft): 200  
Remarks:  
Ditch Effectiveness Score: 39  
Catchment: Moderate  
Remarks:  
Average Vehicle Risk Score: 11  
Percent of Time: 64  
Remarks:  
AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score: 21  
Actual Site Distance (ft): 572  
Percent of Low Design Value: 65  
Remarks:  
Width Score: 1  
Actual Width (ft): 82.0  
Remarks:  
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)  
(A) Structural Condition Score: 81  
Fractures: Continuous  
Orientations: Adverse  
Remarks:  
(B) Rock Friction Score: 78  
Description: Planer  
Remarks:  
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)  
(A) Structural Condition Score: 80  
Features:  
(B) Difference in Erosion Rates Score: 50  
Rate:  
Remarks: Case 1 Controls For This Slope  
Block Size/Quantity Score: 26  
Block Size: 2  
Remarks:  
Climate & Presence of Water on Slope Score: 20  
Precipitation: Moderate  
Freezing Periods: Some  
Remarks:  
Rockfall History Score: 61  
Fall Occurrence: Common  
Remarks:  
Additional Remarks and Comments:  
>>> Water Showing On The Rock Face. The Ditch Could Be Made Broader.  
>>>  
>>>  

**Slope No. 16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HWY #: &amp; BMP:</th>
<th>R OF CENTERLINE</th>
<th>DISTRICT #:</th>
<th>EMP: 1.90 SPEC. CASE.</th>
<th>= EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #:</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE:</td>
<td>RATE DATE:</td>
<td>RATER: CAUDILL/FARMER</td>
<td>Design Code:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>07/11/93</td>
<td>CUT CLASS: A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:</td>
<td>REPAIR CODE:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slope Height Score: 100  
Actual Height (ft): 0  
Remarks: Greater Than 105 Feet  
Ditch Effectiveness Score: 31  
Catchment: Low  
Remarks:  
Average Vehicle Risk Score: 37  
Percent of Time: 82  
Remarks:  
AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score: 1  
Actual Site Distance (ft): 1257  
Percent of Low Design Value: 130  
Remarks:  
Width Score: 1  
Actual Width (ft): 82.0  
Remarks:  
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)  
(A) Structural Condition Score: 80  
Fractures:  
Orientations:  
Remarks:  
(B) Rock Friction Score: 32  
Description:  
Remarks:  
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)  
(A) Structural Condition Score: 61  
Features: Some  
(B) Difference in Erosion Rates Score: 61  
Rate: Large  
Remarks:  
Block Size/Quantity Score: 81  
Block Size: 4  
Remarks:  
Climate & Presence of Water on Slope Score: 20  
Precipitation: Moderate  
Freezing Periods: Some  
Remarks:  
Presence of Water on Slope: Intermittent  
Remarks:  
Additional Remarks and Comments:  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  

APPENDIX C-RHRS Scores
### Slope No. 17

**Rockfall Hazard Rating System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HWY #: U23 BMP: 2.50</th>
<th>EMP: 2.70 SPEC. CASE: NORTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #: 12</td>
<td>TOTAL: 585 RATE DATE: 09/01/93 RATER:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #: 58</td>
<td>DESIGN CODE: REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 6000</td>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Slope Height Score:** 100  
**Actual Height (ft):** 0  
**Remarks:** Greater than 105 feet  
**Ditch Effectiveness Score:** 12  
**Catchment:**  
**Remarks:** 25' from rockface to roadway  
**Average Vehicle Risk Score:** 100  
**Percent of Time:** 105  
**Remarks:**  
**AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score:** 18  
**Actual Site Distance (ft):** 616  
**Percent of Low Design Value:** 70  
**Remarks:**  
**Width Score:** 12  
**Actual Width (ft):** 34.0  
**Remarks:**  
**Geologic Character – Case 1 (if applicable)**  
(A) **Structural Condition Score:** 94  
**FRACTURES:**  
**Orientations:**  
**Remarks:**  
(B) **Rock Friction Score:** 50  
**Description:**  
**Remarks:**  
**Geologic Character – Case 2 (if applicable)**  
(A) **Structural Condition Score:** 0  
**Features:**  
**Remarks:**  
(B) **Difference in Erosion Rates Score:** 0  
**Rate:**  
**Remarks:**  
**Block Size/Quantity Score:** 100  
**Block Size:**  
**Quantity of Material (cu yds):** 21  
**Remarks:**  
**Climate & Presence of Water on Slope Score:** 20  
**Precipitation:**  
**Freezing Periods:**  
**Remarks:**  
**Rockfall History Score:** 81  
**Fall Occurrence:**  
**Remarks:**  
**Additional Remarks and Comments:***


### Slope No. 18

**Rockfall Hazard Rating System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HWY #: 90 BMP: 7.70</th>
<th>EMP: 7.90 SPEC. CASE: EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #: 12</td>
<td>TOTAL: 584 RATE DATE: 09/01/93 RATER:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #: 36</td>
<td>DESIGN CODE: REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0</td>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Slope Height Score:** 100  
**Actual Height (ft):** 0  
**Remarks:** Greater than 105 feet  
**Ditch Effectiveness Score:** 19  
**Catchment:**  
**Remarks:** Good  
**Average Vehicle Risk Score:** 100  
**Percent of Time:** 146  
**Remarks:**  
**AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score:** 18  
**Actual Site Distance (ft):** 586  
**Percent of Low Design Value:** 67  
**Remarks:**  
**Width Score:** 1  
**Actual Width (ft):** 82.0  
**Remarks:**  
**Geologic Character – Case 1 (if applicable)**  
(A) **Structural Condition Score:** 93  
**FRACTURES:**  
**Orientations:** Adverse  
**Remarks:**  
(B) **Rock Friction Score:** 28  
**Description:** Planar  
**Remarks:**  
**Geologic Character – Case 2 (if applicable)**  
(A) **Structural Condition Score:** 40  
**Features:**  
**Remarks:**  
(B) **Difference in Erosion Rates Score:** 45  
**Rate:**  
**Remarks:** Case 1 controls for this slope  
**Block Size/Quantity Score:** 80  
**Block Size:** 3  
**Quantity of Material (cu yds):**  
**Remarks:**  
**Climate & Presence of Water on Slope Score:** 20  
**Precipitation:** Moderate  
**Freezing Periods:** Some  
**Remarks:** Presence of water on slope: intermittent  
**Rockfall History Score:** 70  
**Fall Occurrence:** Many  
**Remarks:**  
**Additional Remarks and Comments:***


---

**Appendix C: CHRIS Scores**

---

Slope No. 18
Slope No. 19

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 1274  BMP #: 4.60  L OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 10  EMP: 5.13 SPEC. CASE.  = EAST
COUNTY #: 83  TOTAL SCORE: 577  RATE DATE: 06/22/94  RATE:
DISTANCE: REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 390

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 107
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 10  CATCHMENT: MODERATE
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 2  PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 86  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
REMARKS:
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 39
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 62  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 22.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 39  FEATURES: LARGE
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 27  RATE: EXHAUSTIVE
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100  BLOCK SIZE: 10
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 28  PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

Slope No. 20

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 1274  BMP #: 4.60  L OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 10  EMP: 5.13 SPEC. CASE.  = EAST
COUNTY #: 83  TOTAL SCORE: 577  RATE DATE: 06/22/94  RATE:
DISTANCE: REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 390

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 112
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 60  CATCHMENT: LIMIT-NON
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 3  PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 81  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
REMARKS:
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 40
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 3  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 45.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81  FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0  DESCRIPTION: PLANAR
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FEATURES: LARGE
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0  RATE: EXHAUSTIVE
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100  BLOCK SIZE: 7-8
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 30  PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

APPENDIX C - RHRS Scores
### Slope No. 21

**Rockfall Hazard Rating System**

- **HWY No. 15**
- **BMP**: 17.63
- **Emp**: 17.70
- **Spec. Case.**: N
- **District**: 10
- **County**: 13
- **Total Score**: 571
- **Rate Date**: 06/15/94
- **Rater**: C
- **Repair Code**: 0
- **Cut Class**: A
- **Preliminary Cost Estimate**: $0
- **Average Daily Traffic**: 16000
- **Slope Height Score**: 100
  - **Actual Height (ft)**: 120
  - **Remarks**: Ditch Effectiveness Score: 50

**Geologic Character - Case 1** (If Applicable)

- **Structural Condition Score**: 94
- **Fractures**: Continuous
- **Orientations**: Adverse
- **Remarks**: Due to Extremely Adverse Orientation

**Remarks**:

- **Width Score**: 3
  - **Actual Width (ft)**: 44.0

**Geologic Character - Case 2** (If Applicable)

- **Structural Condition Score**: 73
- **Features**: Many
- **Remarks**: Many

**Remarks**:

- **Block Size/Quantity Score**: 100
  - **Block Size**: 5
  - **Quantity of Material**: (cu yds)

**Remarks**:

- **Climate and Presence of Water on Slope Score**: 27
  - **Precipitation**: Freezing Periods
  - **Presence of Water on Slope**

**Remarks**:

- **Rockfall History Score**: 81
  - **Fall Occurrence**: Constant

**Additional Remarks and Comments**

- **Weekly Cleaning is Needed**
- **Across from Mountain Motors in Jackson**

### Slope No. 22

**Rockfall Hazard Rating System**

- **HWY No. 110**
- **BMP**: 7.16
- **Emp**: 7.14
- **Spec. Case.**: S
- **District**: 11
- **County**: 7
- **Total Score**: 570
- **Rate Date**: 07/21/94
- **Rater**: C
- **Repair Code**: 0
- **Cut Class**: A
- **Preliminary Cost Estimate**: $0
- **Average Daily Traffic**: 5460
- **Slope Height Score**: 100
  - **Actual Height (ft)**: 135
  - **Remarks**: Ditch Effectiveness Score: 83

**Geologic Character - Case 1** (If Applicable)

- **Structural Condition Score**: 0
- **Fractures**: Continuous
- **Orientations**: Adverse
- **Remarks**: Due to Extremely Adverse Orientation

**Remarks**:

- **Width Score**: 1
  - **Actual Width (ft)**: 50.0

**Geologic Character - Case 2** (If Applicable)

- **Structural Condition Score**: 73
- **Features**: Many
- **Remarks**: Many

**Remarks**:

- **Block Size/Quantity Score**: 100
  - **Block Size**: 5
  - **Quantity of Material**: (cu yds)

**Remarks**:

- **Climate and Presence of Water on Slope Score**: 27
  - **Precipitation**: Freezing Periods
  - **Presence of Water on Slope**

**Remarks**:

- **Rockfall History Score**: 81
  - **Fall Occurrence**: Constant

**Additional Remarks and Comments**

- **Weekly Cleaning is Needed**
- **Across from Mountain Motors in Jackson**
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Slope No. 23

HWY #: 80  BMP: 6.10  DISTRICT #: 12  COUNTY #: 36  TOTAL SCORE: 569  PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 9560
EMP: 6.20  SPEC. CASE: = EAST  L OF CENTERLINE  RATE DATE: 07/12/93  RATER:  REPAIR CODE:  CUT CLASS: A
DESIGN CODE:  HAZARD  RATING SYSTEM  OF CENTERLINE  EMP: 6.20 SPEC. CASE.  RATE DATE: Q7/12/93  RATER:  REPAIR CODE:  CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 14300
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0  REMARKS: GREATER THAN 106 FEET
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 90  CATCHMENT: LARGE  REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100  PERCENT OF TIME: 126  REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 13  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 647  PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 74  REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 1  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 82.0  REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 56  FRACTURES: DISTRICT CONTINUOUS ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE  REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 48  DESCRIPTION: PLANAR  REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 36  FEATURES:  REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 53  RATE:  REMARKS: CASE ONE CONTROLS FOR THIS SLOPE.
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 10  BLOCK SIZE: 1  QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):  REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20  PRECIPITATION: MODERATE  FREEZING PERIODS: SOME  PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: INTERMITTANT  REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  FALL OCCURRENCE: COMMON  REMARKS: FALLEN ROCK ZONE
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS >>> HIGH LAUNCH POINTS ON THIS SLOPE. >>>

Slope No. 24

HWY #: 80  BMP: 12.40  DISTRICT #: 10  COUNTY #: 97  TOTAL SCORE: 568  PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 14300
EMP: 12.60  SPEC. CASE: = EAST  L OF CENTERLINE  RATE DATE: 07/12/93  RATER:  REPAIR CODE:  CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 14300
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0  REMARKS: > 105'
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 44  CATCHMENT:  REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100  PERCENT OF TIME: 199  REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 13  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 647  PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 74  REMARKS: > 675'
WIDTH SCORE: 1  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 82.0  REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FRACTURES:  ORIENTATIONS:  REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0  DESCRIPTION:  REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 36  FEATURES:  REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 79  RATE:  REMARKS: BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100  BLOCK SIZE: 6  QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):  REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20  PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS: SOME  PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:  REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 45  FALL OCCURRENCE:  REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS >>>

APPENDIX C - RHRS Scores
### Slope No. 27

**Rockfall Hazard Rating System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HWY #: 1119</th>
<th>BMP: 6.80 L of Centerline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #: 11</td>
<td>EMP: 7.00 Spec. Case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #: 7</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN CODE:</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 11/27/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0</td>
<td>RATE: BECKHAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 0</td>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Slope Height Score:** 71  
**Actual Height (ft):** 97  
**Remarks:**

**Ditch Effectiveness Score:** 81  
**Catchment:**  
**Remarks:**

**Average Vehicle Risk Score:** 2  
**Percent of Time:**

**AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score:** 100  
**Actual Site Distance (ft):** 0  
**Percent of Low Design Value:** 60  
**Remarks:**

**Width Score:** 3  
**Actual Width (ft):** 41.0  
**Remarks:**

**Geologic Character - Case 1 (if applicable)**

- **Structural Condition Score:** 0  
- **Fractures:**  
- **Orientations:**  
**Remarks:**

- **Rock Friction Score:** 0  
**Description:**
**Remarks:**

**Geologic Character - Case 2 (if applicable)**

- **Structural Condition Score:** 45  
- **Features:**  
**Remarks:**

- **Difference in Erosion Rates Score:** 60  
**Remarks:**

- **Block Size/Quantity Score:** 90  
**Remarks:**

- **Climate & Presence of Water on Slope Score:** 27  
**Remarks:**

**Rockfall History Score:** 81  
**Fall Occurrence:**  
**Remarks:**

**Additional Remarks and Comments:**  
- UPDATE RATING AFTER BENCHING IN SPRING 1995.
- COMBINATION OF 2 EXISTING SLOPES.

### Slope No. 28

**Rockfall Hazard Rating System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HWY #: 15</th>
<th>BMP: 5.50 L of Centerline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #: 10</td>
<td>EMP: 4.00 Spec. Case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #: 97</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN CODE:</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/19/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0</td>
<td>RATE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 6360</td>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Slope Height Score:** 100  
**Actual Height (ft):** 0  
**Remarks:**

**Ditch Effectiveness Score:** 53  
**Catchment:**  
**Remarks:**

**Average Vehicle Risk Score:** 100  
**Percent of Time:**

**AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score:** 14  
**Actual Site Distance (ft):** 529  
**Percent of Low Design Value:** 60  
**Remarks:**

**Width Score:** 3  
**Actual Width (ft):** 45.0  
**Remarks:**

**Geologic Character - Case 1 (if applicable)**

- **Structural Condition Score:** 81  
- **Fractures:**  
- **Orientations:**  
**Remarks:**

- **Rock Friction Score:** 27  
**Description:**  
**Remarks:**

**Geologic Character - Case 2 (if applicable)**

- **Structural Condition Score:** 0  
- **Features:**  
**Remarks:**

- **Difference in Erosion Rates Score:** 0  
**Remarks:**

- **Block Size/Quantity Score:** 81  
**Remarks:**

- **Climate & Presence of Water on Slope Score:** 20  
**Remarks:**

**Rockfall History Score:** 81  
**Fall Occurrence:**  
**Remarks:**

**Additional Remarks and Comments:**

> UPDATE RATING AFTER BENCHING IN SPRING 1995.

> COMBINATION OF 2 EXISTING SLOPES.

---

APPENDIX C - FHWS Score
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slope No. 29</th>
<th>Slope No. 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HWY #: 15</th>
<th>BMP: 12.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #: 10</td>
<td>EMP: 12.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #: 13</td>
<td>SPEC. CASE: L OF CENTERLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 555</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/15/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN CODE: 0</td>
<td>RATER: SOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 10600</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
<td>REPAIR CODE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP: 12.12</td>
<td>RATER: SOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 37</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 24</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 82</td>
<td>REPAIR CODE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF TIME:</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 66</td>
<td>REPAIR CODE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 340</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 39</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDTH SCORE: 47</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 24.0</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 30</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 35</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE: 3</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 17</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCKS HANGING @ 87</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL OCCURRENCE:</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EYEWITNESS HAS SEEN ROCKS ROLL INTO ROADWAY</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEYOND FOR 14 YEARS</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Slope No. 30**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HWY #: U59W</th>
<th>BMP: 2.80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #: 11</td>
<td>EMP: 2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #: 118</td>
<td>SPEC. CASE: R OF CENTERLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 551</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN CODE: 0</td>
<td>RATER: SOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 2730</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP: 2.70</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 97</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 63</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 104</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATCHMENT:</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 2</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF TIME: 12</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 66</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 292</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 33</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDTH SCORE: 54</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 23.0</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 30</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 17</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE: 2</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 15</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 87</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL OCCURRENCE:</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EYEWITNESS HAS SEEN ROCKS ROLL INTO ROADWAY</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEYOND FOR 14 YEARS</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/14/93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Slope No. 31

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 203 BMP: 1.90 R OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 12 EMP: 2.20 SPEC. CASE. = NORTH
COUNTY #: 58
TOTAL SCORE: 546
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 6050
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 19
CATCHMENT: GOOD DITCH. MATERIAL ACROSS ROAD
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100
PERCENT OF TIME: 132
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 67
FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS:

(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 27
DESCRIPTION: PLANAR W/UNDULATING
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
FEATURES: NONE
REMARKS:

(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0
REMARKS:

BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 0
REMARKS: 6 BOULDER IN DITCH
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS
REMARKS:

ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81
FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
REMARKS:

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>>
>>>

Slope No. 32

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 10 BMP: 6.00 R OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 12 EMP: 6.20 SPEC. CASE. = EAST
COUNTY #: 38
TOTAL SCORE: 547
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 9680
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 43
CATCHMENT: LOW
REMARKS:

AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100
PERCENT OF TIME: 146
REMARKS:

AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 17
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 581
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 65
REMARKS:

WIDTH SCORE: 1
ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 35.0
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 76
FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS:

(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 23
DESCRIPTION: PLANAR
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 52
FEATURES: NONE
REMARKS:

(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 43
REMARKS:

BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 13
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 1
REMARKS: C/ONE CONTROL FOR THIS SLOPE
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PRECIPITATION: MODERATE FREEZING PERIODS
REMARKS:

PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: INTERMITTANT
REMARKS:

ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 80
FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
REMARKS:

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>>
>>>
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: U23 BMP: 12.10
DISTRICT #: 12
COUNTY #: 64
TOTAL SCORE: 546
EMP: 12.30
SPEC, CASE. = NORTH
LOF CENTERLINE = EAST

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: U23 BMP: 12.10
DISTRICT #: 12
COUNTY #: 64
TOTAL SCORE: 546
EMP: 12.30
SPEC, CASE. = NORTH
LOF CENTERLINE = EAST

TOTAL SCORE: 546
EMP: 12.30
SPEC, CASE. = NORTH
LOF CENTERLINE = EAST

PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 7810
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
REMARKS: ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 105
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100
REMARKS: PERCENT OF TIME: 118
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 13
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 647
REMARKS: PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 74
WIDTH SCORE: 1
REMARKS: ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 50.0

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: U23 BMP: 10.80
DISTRICT #: 10
COUNTY #: 69
TOTAL SCORE: 560
EMP: 11.00
SPEC, CASE. = EAST
LOF CENTERLINE = NORTH

PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 14300
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
REMARKS: ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 6
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100
REMARKS: PERCENT OF TIME: 184
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 11
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 867
REMARKS: PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 76
WIDTH SCORE: 1
REMARKS: ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 82.0

GEOLeGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81
FRACTURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0
DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:

GEOLeGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 59
FEATURES: SOME
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 78
RATE: LARGE
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 81
BLOCK SIZE:
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 4
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PRECIPITATION: MODERATE
FREEZING PERIODS: SOME
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: SOME
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81
FALL OCCURRENCE: COMMON
REMARKS: FALLEN ROCK ZONE SIGN PRESENT.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> >>> >>>

Slope No. 33

Slope No. 34

APPENDIX C-MIRRORS Score
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Slope No. 35

HWY #: 62  BMP: 13.80  DISTRICT #: 10  EMP: 12.84  SPEC. CASE: = EAST
COUNTY #: 33  TOTAL SCORE: 538  RATE DATE: 06/09/94  RATER:  CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $    AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 700
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 9  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 51
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 1
PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81  FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 25  DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
REMARKS:

REMARKS:

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

---
---
---
---
Slope No. 37

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 80  BMP: 6.00  L OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 12  EMP: 6.20 SPEC. CASE.  = EAST
COUNTY #: 38  TOTAL SCORE: 524
TOTAL SCORE: RATE DATE:07/01/93  RATER: CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 9660

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
REMARKS: GREATER THAN 105 FEET
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
REMARKS: GREATER THAN 105 FEET
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100
REMARKS:
PERCENT OF TIME: 146
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 65
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 1
ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 82.0
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 76  FEATURES: MANY
FRACURES: CONTINUOUS ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 22
DESCRIPTION: PLANAR
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 45  FEATURES: MANY
DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 28  RATE: SOME
REMARKS: CASE ONE CONTROLS FOR THIS CASE
BLOCK SIZE: QuANTITY SCORE: 12  BLOCK SIZE: 6
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 1
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PRECIPITATION: MODERATE FREEZING PERIODS: SOME
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: INTERMITTENT
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 60  FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>>
>>>
>>>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>HWY #: MT PK</th>
<th>BMP:</th>
<th>EMP: Spec Case:</th>
<th>RATE:</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE:</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:</th>
<th>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:</th>
<th>POSTED SPEED LIMIT:</th>
<th>REMARKS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HWY #: 1274</td>
<td>MT PK</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>32.00 Spec Case.</td>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3900</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #: 83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP: 33.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP: 32.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEC. CASE.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATE: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 3900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Slope No. 39**

- **Geologic Character -- Case 1 (if applicable)**
  - (A) Structural Condition Score: 0
  - Fractures: Many
  - Orientation: Flat

- **Geologic Character -- Case 2 (if applicable)**
  - (A) Structural Condition Score: 75
  - Features: Many

- **Slope Height Score**: 100
  - *Actual Height (ft)*: 0
  - *Remarks*: 272

- **Ditch Effectiveness Score**: 75
  - Catchment: Limited
  - Remarks: Flat

- **Average Vehicle Risk Score**: 4
  - Percent of Time: 29

- **AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score**: 1
  - *Actual Site Distance (ft)*: 1300
  - Percent of Low Design Value: 100
  - Remarks: 78

- **Width Score**: 8
  - *Actual Width (ft)*: 20.0
  - Remarks: 8

**Notes:**
- Many launch points. Rocks constantly falling.
- Observable falls while rating.

---

**Slope No. 40**

- **Geologic Character -- Case 1 (if applicable)**
  - (A) Structural Condition Score: 0
  - Fractures: Many
  - Orientation: Flat

- **Geologic Character -- Case 2 (if applicable)**
  - (A) Structural Condition Score: 75
  - Features: Many

- **Slope Height Score**: 100
  - *Actual Height (ft)*: 0
  - Remarks: 0

- **Ditch Effectiveness Score**: 75
  - Catchment: Limited
  - Remarks: Flat

- **Average Vehicle Risk Score**: 4
  - Percent of Time: 29

- **AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score**: 1
  - *Actual Site Distance (ft)*: 1300
  - Percent of Low Design Value: 100
  - Remarks: 78

- **Width Score**: 8
  - *Actual Width (ft)*: 37.0
  - Remarks: 8

**Notes:**
- Many launch points. Rocks constantly falling.
- Observable falls while rating.
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 142B
DISTRICT #: 12
COUNTY #: 58
TOTAL SCORE: 519
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $6,030,000
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 9760
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 35
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 35
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 81
REMARKS: DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 27
CATCHMENT: LIMITED
REMARKS: WILL BE TOTALLY INEFFECTIVE IN LARGE FALLS
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100
PERCENT OF TIME: 47%
REMARKS: AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 34
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 295
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 56
REMARKS: WIDTH SCORE: 7
ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 38.0
REMARKS: GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81
FRAC TURES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS: (B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0
DESCRIPTION: PLANAR
REMARKS: GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 27
RATE: LARGE
REMARKS: BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100
BLOCK SIZE: 7-10
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 1
REMARKS: ROAD FREQUENTLY BLOCKED
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS: ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 27
FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS: ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>> RATED AT ROCKFALL CONFERENCE
>>>
>>>

Slope No. 41

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: U23 BMP: 22.60
DISTRICT #: 12
COUNTY #: 36
TOTAL SCORE: 519
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $100,000
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 15180
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 97
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 104
REMARKS: DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 30
CATCHMENT: LIMITED
REMARKS: CATCHES SMALL RAVEL: MANY LAUNCHING POINTS
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100
PERCENT OF TIME: 87%
REMARKS: AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 1
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 67%
REMARKS: WIDTH SCORE: 16
ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 32.0
REMARKS: GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81
FRAC TURES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS: (B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 40
DESCRIPTION: PLANAR
REMARKS: GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
FRAC TURES: 0
ORIENTATIONS: 0
REMARKS: (B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0
RATE: LARGE
REMARKS: BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100
BLOCK SIZE: 12
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 0
REMARKS: CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS: ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 27
FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
REMARKS: BASHED ROAD, ROCKFALL RECENT
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>> RATED AT ROCKFALL CONFERENCE
>>>
>>>

Slope No. 42
**ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HWY #: 1274</th>
<th>BMP: 7.10</th>
<th>L OF CENTERLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #: 10</td>
<td>EMP: 7.23 SPEC. CASE.</td>
<td>EAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #: 83</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 517</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 02/08/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN CODE:</td>
<td>BMP: 6.25</td>
<td>L OF CENTERLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP: 6.32 SPEC. CASE.</td>
<td>RATE: EAST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #: 10</td>
<td>COUNTY #: 83</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN CODE:</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0</td>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPAIR CODE:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>RATER:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATER:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CUT CLASS: A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDD: 390</td>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP: 6.32</td>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 9</td>
<td>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 50</td>
<td>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 50</td>
<td>CATCHMENT: LIMITED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 50</td>
<td>CATCHMENT: LIMITED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 1</td>
<td>PERCENT OF TIME:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 100</td>
<td>ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0</td>
<td>PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS: 186</td>
<td>REMARKS: 216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDTH SCORE: 54</td>
<td>WIDTH SCORE: 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 0.0</td>
<td>ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 22.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0</td>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRACTURES: ORIENTATIONS:</td>
<td>FRACTURES: ORIENTATIONS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS: REMARKS:</td>
<td>REMARKS: REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0</td>
<td>(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION: DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION: DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS: REMARKS:</td>
<td>REMARKS: REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 71</td>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEATURES: MANY FEATURES: MANY</td>
<td>FEATURES: MANY FEATURES: MANY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS: REMARKS:</td>
<td>REMARKS: REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 40</td>
<td>(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATE: LARGE RATE: LARGE</td>
<td>RATE: LARGE RATE: LARGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS: REMARKS:</td>
<td>REMARKS: REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100</td>
<td>BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE: 5</td>
<td>BLOCK SIZE: 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):</td>
<td>QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS: REMARKS:</td>
<td>REMARKS: REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27</td>
<td>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS: PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS: REMARKS:</td>
<td>REMARKS: REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 65</td>
<td>ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY</td>
<td>FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS: REMARKS:</td>
<td>REMARKS: REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Slope No. 43**

---

**Slope No. 44**
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Slope No. 45

HWY #: 1274
DISTRICT #: 10
COUNTY #: 83
TOTAL SCORE: 508
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $5,000
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 340
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 27
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 75
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 40
WIDTH SCORE: 62
ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 22.0

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 26

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> FALL RECENTLY PUSHED OFF ROAD (EARTH MOVER TRACKS)
>>> PRESENT

Slope No. 46

HWY #: 1108
DISTRICT #: 7
COUNTY #: 11
TOTAL SCORE: 508
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $5,000
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 170
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 4
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 30
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 24
WIDTH SCORE: 100
ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 17.0

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 27
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 81

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> FALL RECENTLY PUSHED OFF ROAD (EARTH MOVER TRACKS)
>>> PRESENT

ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 68
FALL OCCURRENCE: PRESENT

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

APPENDIX C - RHRS Scores
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Slope No. 47

- HWY #: MTPK
- BMP: 47.10
- R OF CENTERLINE
- DISTRICT #: 10
- EMP: 47.20
- SPEC. CASE: - WEST
- COUNTY #: 119
- RATE DATE: 06/07/03
- RATER: FARMER/ANDERSON
- TOTAL SCORE: 508
- PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
- AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 3460
- EMP: 7.10 SPEC. CASE. - NORTH
- HWY #: U23
- BMP: 6.90
- L OF CENTERLINE
- DISTRICT #: 12
- EMP: 7.10 SPEC. CASE. - NORTH
- COUNTY #: 64
- RATE DATE: 07/07/03
- RATER: FARMER/ANDERSON
- TOTAL SCORE: 508
- PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
- AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 7610

- SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 55
- ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 91
- REMARKS:
- DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 55
- CATCHMENT: LOW
- REMARKS:
- AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 3
- PERCENT OF TIME: 116
- REMARKS:
- AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 36
- ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 166
- PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 55
- REMARKS:
- WIDTH SCORE: 4
- ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 42.0
- REMARKS:

GEOLoGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 85
FRACTURES:
REMARKS:
ORIENTATIONS:

(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 70
DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:

GEOLoGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 61
FEATURES: MANY
REMARKS:

(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0
RATE: LARGE
REMARKS:

BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 140
BLOCK SIZE: 27
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 18-18
REMARKS:

CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS: 8
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: SOME
REMARKS: SOME VISIBLE WATER

ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 90
FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
REMARKS:

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>>}

Slope No. 48

- HWY #: MTPK
- BMP: 47.10
- R OF CENTERLINE
- DISTRICT #: 10
- EMP: 47.20
- SPEC. CASE: - WEST
- COUNTY #: 119
- RATE DATE: 06/07/03
- RATER: FARMER/ANDERSON
- TOTAL SCORE: 508
- PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
- AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 3460
- EMP: 7.10 SPEC. CASE. - NORTH
- HWY #: U23
- BMP: 6.90
- L OF CENTERLINE
- DISTRICT #: 12
- EMP: 7.10 SPEC. CASE. - NORTH
- COUNTY #: 64
- RATE DATE: 07/07/03
- RATER: FARMER/ANDERSON
- TOTAL SCORE: 508
- PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
- AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 7610

- SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
- ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 105
- REMARKS: GREATER THAN 105 FEET
- DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 100
- CATCHMENT: LOW
- REMARKS:
- AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100
- PERCENT OF TIME: 116
- REMARKS:
- THE SLOPE LENGTH IS 766 FEET
- AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 9
- ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 976
- PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 113
- REMARKS:
- WIDTH SCORE: 24
- ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 29.0
- REMARKS: LARGE SHOULDERS

GEOLoGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
FRACTURES:
REMARKS:
ORIENTATIONS:

(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0
DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:

GEOLoGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 61
FEATURES: MANY
REMARKS:

(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 60
RATE: LARGE
REMARKS:

BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 27
BLOCK SIZE: 2
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 18-18
REMARKS: MODERATE SIZE STONES

CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS: 8
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: SOME
REMARKS: SOME VISIBLE WATER

ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 78
FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
REMARKS: FAILED ROCK ZONE SIGN PRESENT

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> PHOTO TAKEN OF SLOPE NO. 16 ATTACHED TO RATING SHEET.
>>>
Slope No. 49

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: UT119  BMP: 7.62  L OF CENTERLINE DISTRICT #: 11  DOW: 7.07 SPEC. CASE. = NORTH
COUNTY #: 7  TOTAL SCORE: 505  RATE DATE: 07/21/94  RATER: REPAIR CODE:  CUT CLASS: A
DESIGN CODE: PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5460
TOTAL EMP: 7.07 SPEC. CASE. = NORTH

TOTAL SCORE: 503  RATE DATE: 07/12/93  RATER: ABSEHER REPAIR CODE:  CUT CLASS: A
DESIGN CODE: PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 4150
TOTAL EMP: 5.50 SPEC. CASE. = EAST

SLOT HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 170
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 2  PERCENT OF TIME: 34
AAHSO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 52  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  RATE: MODERATE
FRACUTURES: ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:

B) ROCKFRICTION SCORE: 0  DESCRIPTION: FRICTION:
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 25  RATE: MODERATE
FEATURES: MANY
REMARKS:

B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 25  RATE: SOME
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100  BLOCK SIZE: 0.5
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 100
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  FALL OCCURRENCE: CONSTANT
REMARKS: STATE POLICE VERBAL REPORT
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

---

Slope No. 50

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: UT60  BMP: 5.30  L OF CENTERLINE DISTRICT #: 12  DOW: 5.60 SPEC. CASE. = EAST
COUNTY #: 80  TOTAL SCORE: 503  RATE DATE: 07/12/93  RATER: ABSEHER REPAIR CODE:  CUT CLASS: A
DESIGN CODE: PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 4150
TOTAL EMP: 5.50 SPEC. CASE. = EAST

SLOT HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 2  PERCENT OF TIME: 34
AAHSO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 52  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 25  RATE: MODERATE
FRACUTURES: ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:

B) ROCKFRICTION SCORE: 26  DESCRIPTION: FREEZING PERIODS:
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 25  RATE: SOME
FEATURES: FEW
REMARKS:

B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 28  RATE: MODERATE
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 78  BLOCK SIZE: 0
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 78
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PRECIPITATION: MODERATE
FREEZING PERIODS:
SOME
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: INTERMITTANT
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  FALL OCCURRENCE: COMMON
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

---
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: U123
DISTRICT #: 12
COUNTY #: 98
TOTAL SCORE: 502
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5946

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
REMARKS: >100'
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 25  CATCHMENT: LIMITED
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 55
PERCENT OF TIME: 91
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 1
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 100
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 113
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 31  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 27.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 83
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 81
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 25
BLOCK SIZE: 2-3
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 9
REMARKS: LARGE SHALE BLOCKS NEAR ROAD
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: 27
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81
FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
REMARKS: ROCK FALL ZONE
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> SHALE-SANDSTONE ERODING AT DIFFERENT RATES.
>>>
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 80 BMP: 2.00
DISTRICT #: 12
COUNTY #: 56
TOTAL SCORE: 497
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 7320
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
Remarks: Greater than 105 feet.
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 44
CATCHMENT: LOW
Remarks:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 42
Remarks:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 62
Remarks:
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 396
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 45
Remarks:
WIDTH SCORE: 1
Remarks:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 38
Remarks: FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
Remarks:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 35
Remarks: DESCRIPTION: PLANAR
Remarks:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 33
Remarks: FEATURES: SOME
Remarks:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 65
Remarks: RATE: LARGE
Remarks:
BLOCK SIZE QUANTITY SCORE: 10
Remarks: BLOCK SIZE: 1
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
Remarks:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
Remarks: PRECIPITATION: MODERATE
FREEZING PERIODS: SOME
Remarks:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81
Remarks:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> Some launching points up high.

Slope No. 53

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: U23 BMP: 5.60
DISTRICT #: 12
COUNTY #: 98
TOTAL SCORE: 496
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 4450
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
Remarks: Greater than 105 feet.
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 44
CATCHMENT: LOW
Remarks:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 42
Remarks:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 62
Remarks:
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 488
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 56
Remarks:
WIDTH SCORE: 71
Remarks:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 38
Remarks: FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
Remarks:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 35
Remarks: DESCRIPTION: PLANAR
Remarks:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 33
Remarks: FEATURES: SOME
Remarks:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 65
Remarks: RATE: LARGE
Remarks:
BLOCK SIZE QUANTITY SCORE: 10
Remarks: BLOCK SIZE: 1
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
Remarks:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
Remarks: PRECIPITATION: MODERATE
FREEZING PERIODS: SOME
Remarks:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81
Remarks:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> Some launching points up high.

Slope No. 54
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: U221  BMP: 7.10  R OF CENTERLINE  = EAST
DISTRICT #: 7  SPEC. CASE. = EAST
COUNTY #: 34  RATE DATE: 06/20/93  RATER: FARMER
TOTAL SCORE: 491  REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5980
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 10  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 24
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 86  CATCHMENT: LOW
REMARKS: ALMOST NONE
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 4  PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 21  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 573
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 65
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 41  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 25.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81  FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 54  RATE: LARGE
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 6  BLOCK SIZE: 1
REMARKS: SHALE AND ROCK MASSES FALL
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20  PRECIPITATION: MODERATE
FREEZING PERIODS: SOME
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: INTERMITTANT
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  FALL OCCURRENCE: COMMON
REMARKS: FALLEN ROCK ZONE
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:
>>> LISTED AS TROUBLE SPOT BY MAINTENANCE
>>> {
>>> {
>>> {
>>> {

Slope No. 56

---

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: U221  BMP: 22.60  R OF CENTERLINE  = NORTH
DISTRICT #: 12  SPEC. CASE. = NORTH
COUNTY #: 99  RATE DATE: 06/20/93  RATER: CUT CLASS: A
TOTAL SCORE: 493  REPAIR CODE: 0
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $13400  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 13400
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 117
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 55  CATCHMENT: LIMITED
REMARKS: ROCKS FREQUENT THE ROAD
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 23  PERCENT OF TIME: 71
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 1  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 1200
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 16  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 32.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81  ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS: LIMESTONE CROSSBEDDING OVER BENCH
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0
REMARKS:
DESCRIPTION: UNPLANAR
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81  FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100  BLOCK SIZE:
REMARKS: SHALE AND ROCK MASSES FALL
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27  PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 70  FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:
>>> RATED AT ROCKFALL CONFERENCE
>>> {
>>> {

Slope No. 55
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 601 BMP: 1.55  I OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 9  BMP: 1.66 SPEC. CASE. = NORTH
COUNTY #: 103  RATE DATE: 06/21/94  RATER: EMP: 1.00
TOTAL SCORE: 456  REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A
DESIGN CODE: ROCKFALL  RATE DATE: 07/21/94  RATER: ABSHER
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 450  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 6600
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 106
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 43  CATCHMENT: LIMITED
REMARKS: MANY ROCKS FOUND ACROSS ROAD
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 1  PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 65  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 44
REMARKS: 681
WIDTH SCORE: 81  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 20.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 79  FRACTURES: DISTRICT CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 20  DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0  RATE:
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 27  BLOCK SIZE: 3
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS: PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 25 FALL OCCURRENCE: OCCASIONAL
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>>

APPENDIX C - RHRS Scores

Slope No. 57

Slope No. 58
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: U28 BMP: 22.60
DISTRICT #: 12
COUNTY #: 36
TOTAL SCORE: 484
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 7900

- SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
- DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 27
- AVERAGE VELOCITY RISK SCORE: 40
- SUDDEN DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 24
- WIDTH SCORE: 10
- BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 20
- CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
- ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81

- REMARKS:
  - DITCH EFFECTIVENESS: ROCKS ACROSS ROAD ON SHOULDER
  - AVERAGE VELOCITY RISK: OVERHANGS CREATE POTENTIAL FOR LARGER BLOCK
  - SUDDEN DECISION SITE DISTANCE: ROCKS ACROSS ROAD
  - WIDTH: ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 35.0

- REMARKS:
  - ROCKFALL HISTORY: ROCKS ACROSS ROAD

Slope No. 59

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 80 BMP: 6.00
DISTRICT #: 12
COUNTY #: 36
TOTAL SCORE: 483
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 9800

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
AVERAGE VELOCITY RISK SCORE: 100
WIDTH SCORE: 1
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 1
WIDTH (FT): 82.0
REMARKS:

- REMARKS:
  - ROCKFALL HISTORY: ROCKS ACROSS ROAD

Slope No. 60

APPENDIX C - R-BHS Scores
### Slope No. 63

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP:</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWY#:</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT#:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY#:</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP:</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEC. CASE:</td>
<td>EAST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE:</td>
<td>477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN CODE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATE DATE:</td>
<td>07/131999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPAIR CODE:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATER:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUT CLASS:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT:</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATCHMENT:</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF TIME:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE:</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDTH SCORE:</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL WIDTH (FT):</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRACTURES:</td>
<td>CONTINUOUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIENTATIONS:</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td>4-5 JOINTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td>UNDULATING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td>WICLAY INFILLING IN RANDOM PLACES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE / QUANTITY SCORE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRECIPITATION:</td>
<td>FREEZING PERIODS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL OCCURRENCE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Slope No. 64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP:</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWY#:</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT#:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY#:</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP:</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEC. CASE:</td>
<td>EAST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE:</td>
<td>477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN CODE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATE DATE:</td>
<td>07/131999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPAIR CODE:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATER:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUT CLASS:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT:</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATCHMENT:</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF TIME:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE:</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDTH SCORE:</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL WIDTH (FT):</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRACTURES:</td>
<td>CONTINUOUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIENTATIONS:</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td>4-5 JOINTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td>UNDULATING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td>WICLAY INFILLING IN RANDOM PLACES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE / QUANTITY SCORE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRECIPITATION:</td>
<td>FREEZING PERIODS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL OCCURRENCE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Slope No. 65

**ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM**

- **HWY #:** 15
- **BMP:** 16.10
- **DISTRICT #:** 10
- **EMP:** 16.21
- **COUNTY #:** 13
- **TOTAL SCORE:** 476
- **PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:** $0
- **RANGE CENTERLINE:** 0200
- **EMP:** 16.21
- **SPEC. CASE.** = NORTH
- **RIVER:**
- **DISTRICT#:** 10
- **COUNTY #:** 13
- **TOTAL SCORE:** 476
- **REPAIR CODE: CUT**

**ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM**

- **HWY #:** 15
- **BMP:** 16.10
- **DISTRICT #:** 10
- **EMP:** 16.21
- **COUNTY #:** 13
- **TOTAL SCORE:** 476
- **PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:** $0
- **RANGE CENTERLINE:** 0200
- **EMP:** 16.21
- **SPEC. CASE.** = NORTH
- **RIVER:**
- **DISTRICT#:** 10
- **COUNTY #:** 13
- **TOTAL SCORE:** 476
- **REPAIR CODE: CUT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slope No. 65</th>
<th>Slope No. 66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:</strong> 16</td>
<td><strong>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:</strong> 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):</strong> 60</td>
<td><strong>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):</strong> 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REMARKS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>REMARKS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE:</strong> 35</td>
<td><strong>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE:</strong> 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CATCHMENT: LIMITED</strong></td>
<td><strong>CATCHMENT: MODERATE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REMARKS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>REMARKS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE:</strong> 29</td>
<td><strong>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE:</strong> 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCENT OF TIME:</strong></td>
<td><strong>PERCENT OF TIME:</strong> 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REMARKS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>REMARKS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE:</strong> 1</td>
<td><strong>AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE:</strong> 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):</strong> 0</td>
<td><strong>ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):</strong> 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:</strong> 32</td>
<td><strong>PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REMARKS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>REMARKS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIDTH SCORE:</strong> 3</td>
<td><strong>WIDTH SCORE:</strong> 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTUAL WIDTH (FT):</strong> 43.0</td>
<td><strong>ACTUAL WIDTH (FT):</strong> 28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REMARKS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>REMARKS:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)**

- **(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:** 64
- **FRACTURES:**
- **ORIENTATIONS:**
- **REMARKS:**

**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)**

- **(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:** 80
- **FEATURES:** MANY
- **REMARKS:**

**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)**

- **(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:** 0
- **FRACTURES:**
- **ORIENTATIONS:**
- **REMARKS:**

**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)**

- **(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:** 0
- **FEATURES:** MANY
- **REMARKS:**

**CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE:** 27

- **PRECIPITATION:**
- **FREEZE PERIODS:**

**ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE:** 81

- **FALL OCCURRENCE:** CONSTANT
- **REMARKS:** CONSISTENT FALLS WHILE RATING

**ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE:** 32

- **FALL OCCURRENCE:** OCCASIONAL

**ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS**

---

**APPENDIX C - RHRS Score**
Slope No. 67

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: MTPK  BMP: 31.10  R OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 10  EMP: 33.90  SPEC. CASE.  = WEBT
COUNTY #: 99  TOTAL SCORE: 475
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 3675
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  REMARKS: >105' ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 58  CATCHMENT: MODERATE
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 6  PERCENT OF TIME:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 21  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 837
WIDTH SCORE: 8  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 37.0
GEOLLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 54  DESCRIPTION: PLANER
REMARKS:

GEOLLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 63  RATE:
REMARKS:
(B) BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 32  BLOCK SIZE: QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 12
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20  PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 78  FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

Slope No. 68

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: MTPK  BMP: 11.30  R OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 12  EMP: 11.30  SPEC. CASE.  = EAST
COUNTY #: 99  TOTAL SCORE: 474
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 4470
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 58  CATCHMENT: MODERATE
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 6  PERCENT OF TIME: 47
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 21  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 565
WIDTH SCORE: 1  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 82.0
GEOLLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 30  ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 54  DESCRIPTION: PLANER
REMARKS:

GEOLLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 58  RATE:
REMARKS: CASE ONE CONTROLS FOR THIS SLOPE
(B) BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 27  BLOCK SIZE: QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 9
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20  PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:
SOME
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 61  FALL OCCURRENCE: COMMON
REMARKS: FALLEN ROCK ZONE
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

APPENDIX C - R-RHS Scores
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slope No. 71</th>
<th>Slope No. 72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM**

**HWY #: U23 BMP: 22.10**
**DISTRICT #: 12**
**COUNTY #: 98**
**TOTAL SCORE: 468**
**PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0**
**AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:** 5100

---

**HWY #: 1274**
**DISTRICT #: 10**
**COUNTY #: 83**
**TOTAL SCORE: 457**
**PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0**
**AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:** 340

---

**SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100**
**ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0**
**REMARKS:**

**DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 27**
**CATCHMENT:** LIMITED
**REMARKS:**

**AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 28**
**PERCENT OF TIME:** 76
**REMARKS:**

**AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 1**
**ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 1000**
**PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:** 113
**REMARKS:**

**WIDTH SCORE: 62**
**ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 22.0**
**REMARKS:**

---

**ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81**
**FALL OCCURRENCE:**
**REMARKS:**

---

**ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---
Slope No. 73

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 114 BMP: 4.30 R OF CENTERLINE EMP: 4.40 SPEC. CASE: = EAST
DISTRICT #: 10 COUNTY #: 77 TOTAL SCORE: 466
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 7650

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 12 CATCHMENT:
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 15 PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 65 ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 382
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 44 REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 3 ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 43.0
REMARKS:
GELOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 75 FRACTURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 75 DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:
GELOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0 FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0 RATE:
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 20 BLOCK SIZE:
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PREcipitation:
FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81 FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> DITCH FULL IN PLACES, VEGETATION COVERED BENCHES
>>> 

Slope No. 74

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 80 BMP: 12.40 R OF CENTERLINE EMP: 12.58 SPEC. CASE: = EAST
DISTRICT #: 10 COUNTY #: 97 TOTAL SCORE: 466
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 6370

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 22 CATCHMENT: MODERATE
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 24 PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 24 ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 382
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 44 REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 1 ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 86.0
REMARKS:
GELOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0 FRACTURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0 DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:
GELOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 85 FEATURES: MAJOR
REMARKS: EXTREME OVERHANGS
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 81 RATE: EXTREME
REMARKS: SANDSTONE/SHALE BEDDING
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100 BLOCK SIZE: 10+
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 32
PREcipitation:
FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS: HYDROSTATIC HEAD PRESENT
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 20 FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> 

APPENDIX C - RHRS Scores
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: U23 BMP: 2.54 R OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 12 EMP: 2.72 SPEC. CASE. = NORTH
COUNTY #: 56 TOTAL SCORE: 465 RATE DATE: 08/09/94 RATE:
DESIGN CODE: RATER: CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0 POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 12100
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 134
REMARKS: DITCII EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 8 CATCHMENT: GOOD
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100 PERCENT OF TIME:
ASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 1 ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0 PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:
WIDTH SCORE: 14 ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 33.0
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 85 FRACRURES: CONTINUOUS
DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 22
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0 FEATURES: MAJOR
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0 RATE: LARGE
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100 BLOCK SIZE: 5
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27 PRECIPITATION:
FREEZING PERIODS: PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 8 FALL OCCURRENCE: FEW
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> FAIRLY INACTIVE BUT POTENTIALLY VERY DANGEROUS
>>> >>>

Slope No. 76

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: U23 BMP: 2.54 R OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 12 EMP: 2.72 SPEC. CASE. = NORTH
COUNTY #: 56 TOTAL SCORE: 465 RATE DATE: 08/09/94 RATE:
DESIGN CODE: RATER: CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0 POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 12100
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 134
REMARKS: DITCII EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 8 CATCHMENT: GOOD
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100 PERCENT OF TIME:
ASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 1 ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0 PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:
WIDTH SCORE: 14 ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 33.0
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 85 FRACRURES: CONTINUOUS
DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 22
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0 FEATURES: MAJOR
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0 RATE: LARGE
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100 BLOCK SIZE: 5
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27 PRECIPITATION:
FREEZING PERIODS: PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 8 FALL OCCURRENCE: FEW
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> FAIRLY INACTIVE BUT POTENTIALLY VERY DANGEROUS
>>> >>>

Slope No. 75
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Slope No. 77

HWY #: US 60
DISTRICT #: 22
COUNTY #: 22
TOTAL SCORE: 486
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 3670

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 27
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 61
WIDTH SCORE: 3

GEOLeGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

Slope No. 78

HWY #: US 60
DISTRICT #: 22
COUNTY #: 22
TOTAL SCORE: 483
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 4150

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 27
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 61
WIDTH SCORE: 1

GEOLeGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 45
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 27

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Hwy #: 79  BMP: 2.00  R.O.F CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 12  EMP: 2.00  SPEC. CASE. = EAST
COUNTY #: 36  TOTAL SCORE: 457  RATE DATE: 07/12/93  RATER: ABSHER
DESIGN CODE:  PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0
REPAIR CODE:  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 7320  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 6370
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 7320  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 6370
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 7320  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 6370

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
REMARKS: GREATER THAN 105 FEET.  REMARKS: EST. 140'  REMARKS: EST. 140'  REMARKS: EST. 140'
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 39  CATCHMENT: MODERATE  DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 27  CATCHMENT: LIMITED
CATCHMENT: MODERATE  CATCHMENT: MODERATE  CATCHMENT: MODERATE  CATCHMENT: MODERATE
REMARKS:  REMARKS:  REMARKS:  REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 38  PERCENT OF TIME: 83  AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 4  PERCENT OF TIME:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 38  PERCENT OF TIME: 83  AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 4  PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:  REMARKS:  REMARKS:  REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 38  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 484  AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 27  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 484  PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 55  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0  PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 41
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 55  REMARKS: läKJeI  REMARKS: REMARKS: läKJeI
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS  >>>  ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS  >>>  ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS  >>>  ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS  >>>

Slope No. 79

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Hwy #: 15  BMP: 22.72  R.O.F CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 10  EMP: 22.79  SPEC. CASE. = NORTH
COUNTY #: 13  TOTAL SCORE: 457  RATE DATE: 06/15/94  RATER: ABSHER
DESIGN CODE:  PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0
REPAIR CODE:  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5370  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5370
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5370  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5370
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5370  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5370

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
REMARKS:  REMARKS:  REMARKS:  REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 27  CATCHMENT: LIMITED  DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 27  CATCHMENT: LIMITED
CATCHMENT: LIMITED  CATCHMENT: LIMITED  CATCHMENT: LIMITED  CATCHMENT: LIMITED
REMARKS:  REMARKS:  REMARKS:  REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 4  PERCENT OF TIME:  52  AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 4  PERCENT OF TIME:  52
PERCENT OF TIME:  52  REMARKS:  REMARKS:  REMARKS:  REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 38  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 77  AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 38  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 77  PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 41  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0  PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 41
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 41  REMARKS:  REMARKS:  REMARKS:  REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS  >>>  ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS  >>>  ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS  >>>  ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS  >>>

Slope No. 80
Slope No. 81

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 80 BMP: 7.70
DISTRICT #: 12
COUNTY #: 38
TOTAL SCORE: 457
REPAIR CODE: 0
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 16800
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 17
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100
PERCENT OF TIME: 160
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 18
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 585
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 67
WIDTH SCORE: 1
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 83
FRAC TURES: CONTINUOUS ORIENTATIONS; ADVERSE
DESCRIPTION: PLANAR
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 42
DESCRIPTION: PLANAR
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 40
FEATURES:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 41
RATE:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 15
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PREPARATION: MODERATE
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 70
FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

Slope No. 82

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 175 BMP: 23.70
DISTRICT #: 11
COUNTY #: 118
TOTAL SCORE: 455
REPAIR CODE: 0
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 13250
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 65
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 17
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100
PERCENT OF TIME: 150
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 3
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 1086
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 100
WIDTH SCORE: 10
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 78
FRAC TURES:
DESCRIPTION: PLANAR
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 27
DESCRIPTION: PLANAR
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
FEATURES:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0
RATE:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 18
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PREPARATION: MODERATE
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81
FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

APPENDIX C: RHEBS Scores
Slope No. 83

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 52 BMP: 6.60 L OF CENTERLINE: EAST
DISTRICT #: 9 EMP: 6.76 SPEC. CASE: = NORTHEAST
COUNTY #: 103 TOTAL SCORE: 454 RATE DATE: 07/17/94 RATER: OUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0 AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 19300 POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 153
REMARKS: DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 17 CATCHMENT: MODERATE
REMARKS: CATCHING MOST: ROCKS FOUND ACROSS ROAD
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100 PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS: AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 19 ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
REMARKS: 582'
WIDTH SCORE: 27 ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 28.0
REMARKS: GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 95 FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS: (B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 8 DESCRIPTION: ROUGH IRREGULAR
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 45 FEATURES: MANY
REMARKS: SILSTONE/SHALE BEDDING
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 27 RATE: LARGE
REMARKS: OLD BENCH COVERED WITH TALUS MATERIAL
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 27 BLOCK SIZE: 3
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS: CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS: ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 65 FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
REMARKS: LISTED AS TROUBLE SPOT BY MAINTENANCE
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>> LAUNCH PITS, MANY BEDDED LAYERS
>> DESIGN PROPOSED
>>

Slope No. 84

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: LM21 BMP: 21.30 L OF CENTERLINE: NORTH
DISTRICT #: 11 EMP: 21.35 SPEC. CASE: = EAST
COUNTY #: 45 TOTAL SCORE: 453 RATE DATE: 07/17/94 RATER: OUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0 AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 2890 POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 30
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 60 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 94
REMARKS: DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 100 CATCHMENT: NONE
REMARKS: AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 2 PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS: AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 13 ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
REMARKS: 330'
WIDTH SCORE: 47 ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 24.0
REMARKS: GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 96 FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS: (B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 8 DESCRIPTION: ROUGH IRREGULAR
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0 FEATURES:
REMARKS: (B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0 RATE: LARGE
REMARKS: BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100 BLOCK SIZE: 20-30
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS: CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 25
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS: ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 3 FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>>
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 1119  BMP:  7.40  L OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 11  EMP:  7.43 SPEC. CASE. = NORTH
COUNTY #: 7  TOTAL SCORE: 445  RATE DATE:07/21/94
REPAIR CODE: 0  RATER:  
DESIGN CODE:  
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5400  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 115
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 27  CATCHMENT: LIMITED
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 2
PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 100
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 31
REMARKS: 275'
WIDTH SCORE: 1  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 52.0
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81  FRAC TURES: DISTRICTCONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS:
(8) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 18  DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FEATURES: 
REMARKS:
(8) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0  RATE:
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 10  BLOCK SIZE: 2  QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20  PRECIPITATION:  FRIEZED PERIODS:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS: FALLING ROCK ZONE
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> LISTED AS TROUBLE AREA BY REGIONAL FOREMEN
>>>  

Slope No. 85

Slope No. 86
### Slope No. 87

**Rockfall Hazard Rating System**

- **HWY #:** 175  
- **BMP:** 97.50  
- **DISTRICT #:** 7  
- **COUNTY #:** 7S  
- **TOTAL SCORE:** 443  
- **PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:** $0  
- **AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:** 2100  
- **POSTED SPEED LIMIT:** 65  
- **SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:** 55  
- **ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):** 91  
- **DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE:** 50  
- **CATCHMENT:** LIMITED  
- **AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE:** 100  
- **PERCENT OF TIME:** 217  
- **AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE:** 1  
- **ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):** 0  
- **PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:** 47  
- **WIDTH SCORE:** 18  
- **ACTUAL WIDTH (FT):** 37.0  
- **GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)**  
  - **STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:** 81  
  - **FRACTURES:** CONTINUOUS  
  - **ORIENTATIONS:** ADVERSE  
  - **DESCRIPTION:**  
  - **REMARKS:** SOME CLAY INFILLING  
- **GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)**  
  - **DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE:** 0  
  - **RATE:**  
  - **ZONE SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE:** 10  
  - **QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):**  
  - **CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE:** 20  
  - **PRECIPITATION:**  
  - **FREEZING PERIODS:**  
  - **PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:**  
  - **REMARKS:**  
  - **ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE:** 80  
  - **FALL OCCURRENCE:**  
  - **ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS**  

### Slope No. 88

**Rockfall Hazard Rating System**

- **HWY #:** MTPK  
- **BMP:** 47.40  
- **DISTRICT #:** 10  
- **COUNTY #:** 119  
- **TOTAL SCORE:** 442  
- **PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:** $0  
- **AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:** 3460  
- **POSTED SPEED LIMIT:** 55  
- **SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:** 29  
- **ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):** 77  
- **DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE:** 40  
- **CATCHMENT:** LIMITED  
- **AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE:** 2  
- **PERCENT OF TIME:**  
- **AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE:** 2  
- **ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):** 0  
- **PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:** 47  
- **WIDTH SCORE:** 4  
- **ACTUAL WIDTH (FT):** 43.0  
- **GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)**  
  - **STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:** 85  
  - **FRACTURES:** CONTINUOUS  
  - **ORIENTATIONS:** ADVERSE  
  - **DESCRIPTION:**  
  - **REMARKS:**  
- **GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)**  
  - **DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE:** 0  
  - **RATE:**  
  - **ZONE SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE:** 10  
  - **QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):**  
  - **CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE:** 20  
  - **PRECIPITATION:**  
  - **FREEZING PERIODS:**  
  - **PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:**  
  - **REMARKS:**  
  - **ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE:** 70  
  - **FALL OCCURRENCE:** MANY  
  - **ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS**  

---

**Appendix C: RHRS Scores**
**ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM**

| HWY #: 15 | BMP: 23.25 | LC OF CENTERLINE | EMP: 23.17 | SPEC. CASE: SOUTH |
| DISTRICT #: 10 | COUNTY #: 13 | TOTAL SCORE: 438 | RATE DATE: 06/28/94 | RATER: |
| DESIGN CODE: | PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: | 0 | POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55 |
| AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5570 |

**Slope Height Score:** 34  
**Remarks:**

**Ditch Effectiveness Score:** 10  
**Catchment:** MODERATE  
**Remarks:** 50-6 FEET: TOTAL VARIATION

**Average Vehicle Risk Score:** 4  
**Percent of Time:** 90  
**Remarks:**

**AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score:** 10  
**Actual Site Distance (ft):** 0  
**Remarks:** 105 FEET

**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER—CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)**

| STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: | 0 |
| Fractures: | |
| Orientations: | |
| Remarks: | |

| ROCK FRICTION SCORE: | 0 |
| Description: | |
| Remarks: | |

**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER—CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)**

| STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: | 50 |
| Features: | MANY |
| Remarks: | |

| Difference in Erosion Rates Score: | 81 |
| Rate: LARGE |
| Remarks: | |

**Block Size/Quantity Score:** 100  
**Block Size:** 12-17  
**Remarks:**

**Climate & Presence of Water on Slope Score:** 30  
**Precipitation:** FREEZING PERIODS  
**Presence of Water on Slope:**  
**Remarks:**

**Rockfall History Score:** 55  
**Fall Occurrence:** MANY  
**Remarks:**

**Additional, Remarks and Comments:**

---

**ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM**

| HWY #: 123 | BMP: 23.10 | RC OF CENTERLINE | EMP: 23.30 | SPEC. CASE: NORTH |
| DISTRICT #: 12 | COUNTY #: 36 | TOTAL SCORE: 438 | RATE DATE: 06/20/93 | RATER: FARMER |
| DESIGN CODE: | PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: | 0 | POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 65 |
| AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 7690 |

**Slope Height Score:** 100  
**Actual Height (ft):** 105  
**Remarks:** LARGE BLOCKS POSSIBLE

**Ditch Effectiveness Score:** 9  
**Catchment:** GOOD  
**Remarks:**

**Average Vehicle Risk Score:** 62  
**Percent of Time:** 90  
**Remarks:**

**AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score:** 10  
**Actual Site Distance (ft):** 681  
**Remarks:** 76 FEET

**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER—CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)**

| STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: | 0 |
| Fractures: | |
| Orientations: | |
| Remarks: | |

| ROCK FRICTION SCORE: | 0 |
| Description: | |
| Remarks: | |

**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER—CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)**

| STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: | 81 |
| Features: | SOME |
| Remarks: | |

| Difference in Erosion Rates Score: | 81 |
| Rate: EXTREME |
| Remarks: | |

**Block Size/Quantity Score:** 100  
**Block Size:** 1.5  
**Quantity of Material (cu yds):** |
| Remarks: | |

**Climate & Presence of Water on Slope Score:** 20  
**Precipitation:** MODERATE  
**Presence of Water on Slope:** SOME  
**Remarks:**

**Rockfall History Score:** 81  
**Fall Occurrence:** COMMON  
**Remarks:** FALLEN ROCK ZONE SIGN PRESENT

**Additional, Remarks and Comments:**

---

**Slope No. 90**
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Slope No. 93

HWY #: U42
BMP: 22.20
R OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 11
EMP: 22.25
SPEC. CASE. = NORTH
COUNTY #: 48
TOTAL SCORE: 435
RATE DATE: 07/07/94
RATER:
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 1850
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 40
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 12
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 57
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 77
CATCHMENT: LIMITED
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 2
PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 100
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 36
ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 20.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 29
FRACTURES: DISTRICT CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 25
DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0
RATE:
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100
BLOCK SIZE: 5
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 25
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 30
FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>>
>>>
>>>
**Slope No. 93**

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HWY #</th>
<th>BMP</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
<th>DESIGN CODE</th>
<th>REPAIR CODE</th>
<th>CUT CLASS</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE</th>
<th>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC</th>
<th>POSTED SPEED LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U23</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= NORTH</td>
<td></td>
<td>7830</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**
- SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
- ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 105
- DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 20
- CATCHMENT: MODERATE
- AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 0
- PERCENT OF TIME: 50
- AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 2
- ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 968
- PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 100
- WIDTH SCORE: 31
- ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 27.0
- GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
  (A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
  FRACTURES: BI-STRICT CONTINUOUS
  ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
  REMARKS:
  (B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0
  DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
- GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
  (A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 61
  FEATURES:
  REMARKS:
  (B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 81
  RATE:
  REMARKS:
  BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 10
  BLOCK SIZE: 1-2
  QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
  CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
  PRECIPITATION:
  FREEZING PERIODS:
  PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
  REMARKS:
  ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 61
  FALL OCCURRENCE:
  REMARKS:
- ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
  >>> SMALL ROCKS (1-3) FOUND ON MEDIAN.

**Slope No. 96**

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HWY #</th>
<th>BMP</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
<th>DESIGN CODE</th>
<th>REPAIR CODE</th>
<th>CUT CLASS</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE</th>
<th>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC</th>
<th>POSTED SPEED LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B34</td>
<td>144.20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= EAST</td>
<td></td>
<td>9980</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**
- SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
- ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 198
- DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 10
- CATCHMENT: MODERATE
- AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 88
- PERCENT OF TIME:
- AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 38
- ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
- PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 54
- WIDTH SCORE: 7
- ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 38.0
- GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
  (A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 27
  FRACTURES: DISTRICT CONTINUOUS
  ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
  REMARKS:
  (B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 22
  DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
- GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
  (A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
  FEATURES:
  REMARKS:
  (B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0
  RATE:
  REMARKS:
  BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100
  BLOCK SIZE: 8-10
  QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
  CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27
  PRECIPITATION:
  FREEZING PERIODS:
  PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
  REMARKS:
  ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 15
  FALL OCCURRENCE: OCCASIONAL
  REMARKS:
- ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
  >>>
  >>>
  >>>

**APPENDIX C - RHRSS Scores**
Slope No. 97

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: U23 BMP: 6.00
DISTRICT #: 12
COUNTY #: SB
TOTAL SCORE: 434
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 7215
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 12
SLOPE HEIGHT (FT): 0
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 17
PERCENT OF TIME: 64
REMARKS: >105'

GELOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
FRACTURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:

(G) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0
DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:

GELOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81
FEATURES:
REMARKS:

(G) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 80
RATE:

BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 10
BLOCK SIZE:
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 5-8
REMARKS: SMALL, TALUS MATERIAL
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PRECIPITATION:
FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:

ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81
FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>>

Slope No. 98

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: U23 BMP: 22.40
DISTRICT #: 12
COUNTY #: SB
TOTAL SCORE: 432
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 3645
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 4
PERCENT OF TIME: 46
REMARKS:

GELOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
FRACTURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:

(G) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0
DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:

GELOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81
FEATURES:
REMARKS:

(G) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 81
RATE:

BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 10
BLOCK SIZE:
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 5-8
REMARKS: MUCH LARGER POSSIBLE
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PRECIPITATION:
FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:

ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81
FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS: ROCK FALL ZONE

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>>

APPENDIX C - R-HRSc Score
Slope No. 99

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 80 BMP: 5.60 R OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 12 EMP: 5.30 SPEC. CASE: EAST
COUNTY #: 60 RATE DATE: 09/12/93 RATER: ABSHIER
TOTAL SCORE: 431 REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0 POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 4150

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 113
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 44 CATCHMENT: LOW
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 12 PERCENT OF TIME: 87
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 6 ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 763
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 87
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 1 ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 82.0
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 73 FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 36 DESCRIPTION: INTERMITTANT
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 36 FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 43 RATE:
REMARKS: CASE ONE CONTROLS FOR THIS SLOPE.
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 15 BLOCK SIZE: 2
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PREDICTION: MODERATE FREEZING PERIODS: SOME
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: COMMON
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 46 FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:
>>> WATER PRESENT ON SLOPE

Slope No. 100

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 100 BMP: 5.60 R OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 12 EMP: 5.65 SPEC. CASE: NORTH
COUNTY #: 58 RATE DATE: 09/12/93 RATER: ABSHIER
TOTAL SCORE: 429 REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0 POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 4450

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 10 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 9 CATCHMENT:
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 3 PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 100 ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 33
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 87
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 11 ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 25.0
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0 FRACTURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0 DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 76 FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 81 RATE:
REMARKS: BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 9 BLOCK SIZE: 5
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PREDICTION: MODERATE FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81 FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:
>>> MOSTLY SMALL, TALUS MATERIAL FALLING.
>>> DITCH CATCHING ALL

Slope No. 99

Slope No. 100
### Rockfall Hazard Rating System

**Slope No. 101**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway #</td>
<td>U481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L of Centerline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District #</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County #</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Cost Estimate $</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Traffic</td>
<td>4600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope Height Score</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditch Effectiveness Score</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Vehicle Risk Score</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Low Design Value</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width Score</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geologic Character – Case 1 (if applicable)**

- **Structural Condition Score**: 0
- **Fractures**: Continuous
- **Orientations**: Adverse

**Geologic Character – Case 2 (if applicable)**

- **Structural Condition Score**: 78
- **Features**: Undulating

**Remarks**

**Additional Remarks and Comments**

>>>

---

**Slope No. 102**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway #</td>
<td>1274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP</td>
<td>12.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L of Centerline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District #</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County #</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Cost Estimate $</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Traffic</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope Height Score</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditch Effectiveness Score</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Vehicle Risk Score</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Low Design Value</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width Score</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geologic Character – Case 1 (if applicable)**

- **Structural Condition Score**: 81
- **Fractures**: Continuous
- **Orientations**: Adverse

**Geologic Character – Case 2 (if applicable)**

- **Structural Condition Score**: 0
- **Features**: Undulating

**Remarks**

**Additional Remarks and Comments**

>>>
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Hwy #: U23  BMP: 22.70  Roy of Centerline
County #: 12  Rate Date: 06/28/93  Rater: Caudill
Design Code: Repair Code: Cut Class: A
Preliminary Cost Estimate: $ 0
Average Daily Traffic: 5645  Posted Speed Limit: 55

Slope Height Score: 10  Actual Height (ft): 93
Remarks:
Ditch Effectiveness Score: 25  Catchment: Minimum
Remarks:
Average Vehicle Risk Score: 9  Percent of Time: 54
Remarks:
AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score: 1  Actual Site Distance (ft): 0
Remarks: Short distance = 0 ft.
Width Score: 27  Actual Width (ft): 28.0
Remarks:
Geologic Character - Case 1 (if applicable)
(A) Structural Condition Score: 72  Fractures:
Orientation:
Remarks:
(B) Rock Friction Score: 81  Description:
Remarks:

Geologic Character - Case 2 (if applicable)
(A) Structural Condition Score: 73  Features: Many
Remarks:
(B) Difference in Erosion Rates Score: 0  Rate: Extreme
Remarks:
Block Size/Quantity Score: 20  Block Size: 2.80
Remarks:
Climate & Presence of Water on Slope Score: 20
Remarks:
Rockfall History Score: 29  Fall Occurrence: Moderate
Remarks:
Additional Remarks and Comments
>>>

Slope No. 103

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Hwy #: U23  BMP: 22.30  Roy of Centerline
County #: 12  Rate Date: 07/15/93  Rater: Caudill
Design Code: Repair Code: Cut Class: A
Preliminary Cost Estimate: $ 0
Average Daily Traffic: 293  Posted Speed Limit: 55

Slope Height Score: 100  Actual Height (ft): 0
Remarks: >105'
Ditch Effectiveness Score: 12  Catchment: Minimum
Remarks:
Average Vehicle Risk Score: 7  Percent of Time: 43
Remarks:
AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score: 1  Actual Site Distance (ft): 1000
Remarks: Percent of Low Design Value: 113
Width Score: 31  Actual Width (ft): 27.0
Remarks:
Geologic Character - Case 1 (if applicable)
(A) Structural Condition Score: 81  Fractures:
Orientation:
Remarks:
(B) Rock Friction Score: 81  Description:
Remarks:

Geologic Character - Case 2 (if applicable)
(A) Structural Condition Score: 0  Features:
Remarks:
(B) Difference in Erosion Rates Score: 0  Rate: Extreme
Remarks:
Block Size/Quantity Score: 9  Block Size: 1-2
Remarks:
Climate & Presence of Water on Slope Score: 20
Remarks:
Rockfall History Score: 29  Fall Occurrence: Moderate
Remarks: Rock Fall Zone
Additional Remarks and Comments
>>>

Slope No. 104

Appendix C: RHRS Score
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Slope No. 105

HWY #: U25  BMP: 13.10  R OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 8  EMP: 13.40  = EAST
COUNTY #: 107  RATE DATE: 06/17/94  RATER: SURVEYED SLOPE
TOTAL SCORE: 422  DESIGN CODE: REPAIR CODE: 0
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 8650
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 11  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 54
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 25  CATCHMENT: GOOD
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100  PERCENT OF TIME: 155
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 15  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 625
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 71
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 14  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 38.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 9  FRACTURES: DISTRICT CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: RANDOM
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 25  DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 27  FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

---

Slope No. 106

HWY #: U25  BMP: 13.10  L OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 8  EMP: 13.40  = EAST
COUNTY #: 107  RATE DATE: 06/17/94  RATER: SURVEYED SLOPE
TOTAL SCORE: 422  DESIGN CODE: REPAIR CODE: 0
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 8650
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 11  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 54
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 25  CATCHMENT: GOOD
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100  PERCENT OF TIME: 155
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 15  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 625
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 71
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 14  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 33.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0  RATE:
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100  BLOCK SIZE: 6
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27
PRECIPITATION:
FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 27  FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

---
**ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM**

**Slope No. 107**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HWY #: U21</th>
<th>BMP: 0.57</th>
<th>L OF CENTERLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #: 7</td>
<td>EMP: 0.68 SPEC. CASE: = NORTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #: 76</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN CODE:</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP: SPEC. CASE. = NORTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCOR</td>
<td>ENLARGED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM**

**Slope No. 108**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HWY #: U23X</th>
<th>BMP: 3.60</th>
<th>R OF CENTERLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #: 12</td>
<td>EMP: 3.70 SPEC. CASE: = NORTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #: 67</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN CODE:</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP: SPEC. CASE. = NORTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCOR</td>
<td>ENLARGED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Remarks:**

- **SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:** 12
- **ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):** 57
- **REMARKS:** DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 75 CATCHMENT: LIMITED
- **REMARKS:** LARGE AMOUNT OF MATERIAL ACROSS ROAD

- **AVERAGE VELOCITY RISK SCORE:** 3
- **PERCENT OF TIME:** 60
- **REMARKS:** MSHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 13
- **ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):** 0
- **REMARKS:** ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 21.0

---

**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)**

| STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81 |
| FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS |
| ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE |
| DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING |
| REMARKS: PLANAR PRESENT |

- **DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE:** 0
- **RATE:**
- **REMARKS:** BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY: 100 BLOCK SIZE: 9-10 |
- **QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):**
- **CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:**
- **PRECIPITATION:** MODERATE |
- **FREEZING PERIODS:** SOME |
- **PRESENCE OF WATER:** INTERMITTENT |
- **REMARKS:** ROCKFALL HISTORY: 15 FALL OCCURRENCE: CONTINUOUS |
- **REMARKS:** ROCKS ACROSS ROAD |

---

**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)**

| STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0 |
| FEATURES: |
| DESCRIPTION: |
| REMARKS: |

---

**ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:**

- **DITCH NEEDS ENLARGING**
- **SLOPE OVERHANGS THE ROAD.**
- **CLOSENESS OF SLOPE TO ROAD IS REAL DANGER.**
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 52 BMP: 21.00 L OF CENTERLINE = EAST
DISTRICT #: 7 EMP: 22.00 SPEC. CASE.
COUNTY #: 70 SPEC. CASE.
TOTAL SCORE: 415 RATE DATE: 06/20/93 RATER: BECKHAM
DESIGN CODE: REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0 POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 25
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 1180

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 5 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 20
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 40 CATCHMENT: M-I
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 5
PERCENT OF TIME: 36
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 77
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 555
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 41
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 5 ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 41.0
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 82 FEATURES: M
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 29 DESCRIPTION: PLANAR
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81 FEATURES: M
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 81 RATE: E
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 81 BLOCK SIZE: 6+ QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20 PRECIPITATION: M-H FREEZING PERIODS: S-L PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: I
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 20 FALL OCCURRENCE: O
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

Slope No. 109

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 80 BMP: 10.80 R OF CENTERLINE = EAST
DISTRICT #: 10 EMP: 10.98 SPEC. CASE.
COUNTY #: 97 SPEC. CASE.
TOTAL SCORE: 413 RATE DATE: 08/20/93 RATER: EAST
DESIGN CODE: REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0 POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 2370

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 8 CATCHMENT: GOOD
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 20
PERCENT OF TIME: 36
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 29
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 1 ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 82.0
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 82 FEATURES: M
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 29 DESCRIPTION: PLANAR
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0 FEATURES: M
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0 RATE: E
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100 BLOCK SIZE: 10+
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27 PRECIPITATION: M-H FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 9 FALL OCCURRENCE: OCCASIONAL
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

Slope No. 110
### Slope No. 111

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HWY #: U2SW</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRICT #: 11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNTY #: 118</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMP: 12.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPEC. CASE:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 11300</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIDTH SCORE: 41</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Slope No. 112

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HWY #: U60</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRICT #: 9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNTY #: 103</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMP: 6.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPEC. CASE:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 1680</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 67</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 65</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIDTH SCORE: 36</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 80 BMP: 0.10
DISTRICT #: 12  EMP: 0.15 SPEC. CASE. = EAST
COUNTY #: 30 TOTAL SCORE: 409
DESIGN CODE:  REPAIR CODE:  CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 4980

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 36  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 83
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 55  CATCHMENT: LOW
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 8  PERCENT OF TIME: 39
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 1  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 484
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 55
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 1  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 82.0
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 65  FRACTURES: DISTRICT CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 48  DESCRIPTION: PLANAR
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 35  FEATURES: OCCASIONAL
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 23  RATE: LARGE
REMARKS: CASE ONE CONTROLS FOR THIS SLOPE.
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 20  BLOCK SIZE: 3
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20  FREEZING PERIODS: SOME
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: INTERMITTANT
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 61  FALL OCCURRENCE: COMMON
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> DITCH COULD BE MADE LARGER. AREAS OF FRACTURE THAT
>>> COULD BE POSSIBLE FUTURE SLIDE HAZARDS.
>>>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slope No. 115</th>
<th>Slope No. 116</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM</strong></td>
<td><strong>ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HWY #: U127</strong></td>
<td><strong>HWY #: U127</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BMP: 1.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>BMP: 1.25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R OF CENTERLINE</strong></td>
<td><strong>R OF CENTERLINE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRICT #: 8</strong></td>
<td><strong>DISTRICT #: 8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNTY #: 104</strong></td>
<td><strong>COUNTY #: 104</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SCORE: 408</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL SCORE: 408</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0</strong></td>
<td><strong>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 1350</strong></td>
<td><strong>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 1350</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 65</strong></td>
<td><strong>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 127</strong></td>
<td><strong>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 150</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 20</strong></td>
<td><strong>CATCHMENT: MODERATE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>PERCENT OF TIME:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 53</strong></td>
<td><strong>REMARKS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIDTH SCORE: 21</strong></td>
<td><strong>REMARKS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 30.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>FALL OCCURRENCE:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE</strong></td>
<td><strong>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0</strong></td>
<td><strong>LARGER POSSIBLE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):</strong></td>
<td><strong>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLOC K SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 37</strong></td>
<td><strong>P R E C I P I T A T I O N:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLOCK SIZE: 2.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>FREEZING PERIODS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):</strong></td>
<td><strong>PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:</strong></td>
<td><strong>REMARKS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FREEZING PERIODS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:</strong></td>
<td><strong>FALL OCCURRENCE:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REMARKS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DITCH NEEDS CLEANING, LARGE SANDSTONE OVERHANGS</strong></td>
<td>&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10' - 127' ABOVE ROADWAY</strong></td>
<td>&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:</strong></td>
<td>&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:</strong></td>
<td>&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:</strong></td>
<td>&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM**

**Slope No. 117**

- HWY #: 184  BMP: 53.90  L OF CENTERLINE  SPEC. CASE:  = WEST
- DISTRICT #: 5  EMP: 54.50  LOF CENTERLINE  = SPEC. CASE.
- COUNTY #: 37  TOTAL SCORE: 406  RATE DATE: 03/29/23  RATER: ABSCALIFAR
- DESIGN CODE:  REPAIR CODE:  CUT CLASS: A
- PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 11550
- POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 65

**SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:** 20  **ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):** 68

- **DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE:** 36  **CATCHMENT: M TO L**
- **REMARKS:** DITCH NEEDS CLEANING

- **AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE:** 100  **PERCENT OF TIME:** 42%
- **AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE:** 18  **ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):** 68

- **WIDTH SCORE:** 9  **ACTUAL WIDTH (FT):** 36.0

- **GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1** (IF APPLICABLE)
  - **STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:** 45  **FRACTURES:** CONTINUOUS
  - **ORIENTATIONS:** ADVERSE

- **(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE:** 33  **DESCRIPTION:** PLANAR

- **DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE:** 0  **RATE:**

- **BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE:** 10  **QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):**

- **CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCOR:** 20  **PRECIPITATION:** FREEZING PERIODS

- **ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE:** 8  **FALL OCCURRENCE:**

- **ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS**


**Slope No. 118**

- HWY #: 80  BMP: 11.30  L OF CENTERLINE  SPEC. CASE:  = EAST
- DISTRICT #: 12  EMP: 11.50  LOF CENTERLINE  = SPEC. CASE.
- COUNTY #: 69  TOTAL SCORE: 405  RATE DATE: 07/27/93  RATER: ABSHER
- DESIGN CODE:  REPAIR CODE:  CUT CLASS: A
- PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 4470
- POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55

**SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:** 100  **ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):** 0

- **DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE:** 30  **CATCHMENT: MODERATE**

- **AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE:** 8  **PERCENT OF TIME:** 47%

- **AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE:** 18  **ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):** 68

- **WIDTH SCORE:** 1  **ACTUAL WIDTH (FT):** 82.0

- **GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1** (IF APPLICABLE)
  - **STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:** 33  **FEATURES:**

- **ROCK FRICTION SCORE:** 27  **DESCRIPTION:** PLANAR

- **DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE:** 34  **RATE:**

- **BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE:** 18  **QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):**

- **CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCOR:** 20  **FREEZING PERIODS:**

- **ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE:** 62  **FALL OCCURRENCE:** COMMON

- **ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS**


APPENDIX C - RHBRS Score
### Slope No. 119

- **HWY #: US 5**
- **BMP: 119.50**
- **DISTRICT #: 7**
- **COUNTY #: 57**
- **TOTAL SCORE: 405**
- **PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Slope Height Score: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Actual Height (FT): 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ditch Effectiveness Score: 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Actual Height (FT): 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Ditch Effectiveness Score: 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Percent of Low Design Value: 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Width Score: 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>Actual Width (FT): 38.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)

- **STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0**
- **Rocks: MANY**
- **Orientations: ADVERSE**

#### GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)

- **STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 70**
- **Features: MANY**
- **Rocks: LARGE OVERHANGS FORMED**

#### CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE

- **Precipitation:** FREEZING PERIODS
- **Presence of Water on Slope:** LARGE OVERHANGS

#### ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

- **SOFT SHALE & DOLOMITE EROSIONAL DIFS. FORMING LARGE OVERHANGS.**

---

### Slope No. 120

- **HWY #: US 6**
- **BMP: 0.89**
- **DISTRICT #: 7**
- **COUNTY #: 57**
- **TOTAL SCORE: 405**
- **PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Slope Height Score: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Actual Height (FT): 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Ditch Effectiveness Score: 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Percent of Low Design Value: 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Width Score: 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>Actual Width (FT): 25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)

- **STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 1**
- **Rocks: CONTINUOUS**
- **Orientations: ADVERSE**

#### GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)

- **STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0**
- **Features: MANY**
- **Rocks: LARGE OVERHANGS FORMED**

#### CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE

- **Precipitation:** FREEZING PERIODS
- **Presence of Water on Slope:** LARGE OVERHANGS

#### ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

- **SOFT SHALE & DOLOMITE EROSIONAL DIFS. FORMING LARGE OVERHANGS.**

---
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: U421
DISTRICT #: 7
COUNTY #: 76
TOTAL SCORE: 402
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0

BMP: 0.52
L OF CENTERLINE: 2700
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 2700
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 31
ACTUAL HEIGHT (F1): 78
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 1
PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 6
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FD): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 87
REMARKS: 504'
WIDTH SCORE: 54
ACTUAL WIDTH (FD): 23.0
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81
FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 40
DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
REMARKS: W/CLAY INFILLING

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 21
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100
BLOCK SIZE: 5-7
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS: BIGGER BLOCKS FOUND
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 25
PRECESSION OF WATER ON SLOPE: INTERMITTANT
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 27
FALL OCCURRENCE: OCCASIONAL
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> SURVEYED WITH CLINOMETER FOR SIMULATION
>>> ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

Slope No. 121

Slope No. 122
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 114  BMP: 2.60  R OF CENTERLINE = EAST
DISTRICT #: 12  EMP: 2.70 SPEC. CASE.
COUNTY #: 36  RATE DATE:06/09/95  RATER:
TOTAL SCORE: 400  REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS:A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 7560
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 52  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 30
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 35  CATCHMENT:
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 6  PERCENT OF TIME: 36
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 1  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 1000
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 113
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 14  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 33.0
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81
REMARKS:

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 114  BMP: 2.60  R OF CENTERLINE = EAST
DISTRICT #: 7  EMP: 0.98 SPEC. CASE.
COUNTY #: 37  RATE DATE:06/09/95  RATER:
TOTAL SCORE: 401  REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS:A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: 0  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 35
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 2940
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 3  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 28
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 73  CATCHMENT:
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 2  PERCENT OF TIME: 19
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 100  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 8
REMARKS: 64'
WIDTH SCORE: 41  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 26.0
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81  FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS:

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Slope No. 123

Slope No. 124

Slope No. 123

Slope No. 124
Slope No. 125

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: U19  BMP: 6.30  L OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 11  EMP: 6.40 SPEC. CASE. = NORTH
COUNTY #: 7
TOTAL SCORE: 400
RATE DATE: 08/14/93  RATER: CAUDILLO/BISHER
DESIGN CODE:  REPAIR CODE:  CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 4520
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 22  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 70
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 0  CATCHMENT: NONE
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 25
PERCENT OF TIME: 73
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 16
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 634
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 69
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 18  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 31.0
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FRACTURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0  DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 76  FEATURES: LARGE
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 46  RATE: LARGE
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 20  BLOCK SIZE:
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 4
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20  PRECIPITATION: MODERATE
FREEZING PERIODS: SOME
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: OCCASIONAL
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  FALL OCCURRENCE: COMMON
REMARKS: FALLEN ROCK ZONE
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> ROCKS FOUND ON OPPOSITE SIDE OF THE ROAD.
>>>

Slope No. 126

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 1274  BMP: 13.30  L OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 10  EMP: 13.38 SPEC. CASE. = EAST
COUNTY #: 83
TOTAL SCORE: 399  RATE DATE: 08/14/94  RATER: CAUDILLO/BISHER
DESIGN CODE:  REPAIR CODE:  CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 340
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 122
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 20  CATCHMENT: MODERATE
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 1
PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 1
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:
REMARKS: >1300
WIDTH SCORE: 71  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 21.0
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 27  FRACTURES: DISTRICT CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 12  DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0  RATE:
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100  BLOCK SIZE: 4.5
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27  PRECIPITATION:
FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 35  FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>>
### Slope No. 127

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HWY #: U23 BMP:</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #:</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #:</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE:</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:</td>
<td>6050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT:</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE:</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATCHMENT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE:</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF TIME:</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE:</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDTH SCORE:</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL WIDTH (FT):</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRACTURES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIENTATIONS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE:</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEATURES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE:</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRECIPITATION:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREEZING PERIODS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE:</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL OCCURREANCE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Slope No. 128

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HWY #: U18 BMP:</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #:</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #:</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE:</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:</td>
<td>2940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT:</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE:</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATCHMENT:</td>
<td>LM-NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF TIME:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE:</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDTH SCORE:</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL WIDTH (FT):</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRACTURES:</td>
<td>CONTINUOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIENTATIONS:</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td>TREES GROWING IN JOINTS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSSIBLE JACKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE:</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td>UNDULATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEATURES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE:</td>
<td>1.5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRECIPITATION:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREEZING PERIODS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE:</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL OCCURRENCE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
<td>FALLING ROCK ZONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Remarks and Comments:**

- slope
- and
- ditch
Slope No. 129

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 154  BMP: 118.30
DISTRICT #: 9  EMP: 118.50
COUNTY #: 6
TOTAL SCORE: 397

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 160  BMP: 1.74
DISTRICT #: 12  EMP: 1.90
COUNTY #: 6
TOTAL SCORE: 395

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 9  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 50
REMARKS: DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 9  CATCHMENT: MODERATE
REMARKS: DITCH DOES WELL, NEEDS TO BE CLEANED
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 29  PERCENT OF TIME: 76
REMARKS:
AASHO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 1
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 71
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 9  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 39.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: RANDOM
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0  DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81  FEATURES: M
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 81  RATE: E
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 81  BLOCK SIZE: 6
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 12
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS: PROBABLE FALLING ROCK ZONE
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>>> FOUR PEOPLE ANALYZED THE SLOPE - THE RESULTS
>>>> ABOVE ARE FROM THE PERSON CLOSEST TO THE AVG.

Slope No. 130

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 160  BMP: 1.74
DISTRICT #: 12  EMP: 1.90
COUNTY #: 6
TOTAL SCORE: 395

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 205
REMARKS: DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 29  CATCHMENT: MODERATE
REMARKS: BENCHES CATCHING MANY FALLS
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 9  PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:
AASHO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 15
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 71
REMARKS: 620'
WIDTH SCORE: 9  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 38.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 71  FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: RANDOM
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 26  DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0  RATE:
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100  BLOCK SIZE: 6
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 12
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 18  FALL OCCURRENCE: OCCASIONAL
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 52  BMP: 22.30  R OF CENTERLINE  EMP: 22.40  SPEC. CASE.  = EAST
DISTRICT #: 7  COUNTY #: 76  TOTAL SCORE: 393  RATE DATE: 0/0/0394  RATER: CUT CLASS: A
REPAIR CODE:  PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5180  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 35  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 81
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 9  CATCHMENT:
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 12
PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 62
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 45
REMARKS: 390
WIDTH SCORE: 12  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 34.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81  FRACtURES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENrATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 81  DESCRIPTION: CLAY-SLICK
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0
RATE:
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 9  BLOCK SIZE: 2
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 65  FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

Slope No. 131

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 184  BMP: 167.80  R OF CENTERLINE  EMP: 165.90  SPEC. CASE.  = EAST
DISTRICT #: 9  COUNTY #: 22  TOTAL SCORE: 392  RATE DATE: 06/07/93  RATER: FARMER
REPAIR CODE:  PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 8200  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 65
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 42  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 85
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 13  CATCHMENT:
REMARKS: STREAM IN DITCH HAS DEEPENED & WIDENED DITCH
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 97
PERCENT OF TIME: 104
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 1
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 113
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 8  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 37.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 75  FRACtURES: C
ORIENrATIONS: A
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 47  DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0
RATE:
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 8  BLOCK SIZE: 1.2
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS: LARGER BLOCKS POSSIBLe
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS: POSSIBLE FALLING ROCK ZONE
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

Slope No. 132
Slope No. 133

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Hwy #: L421 BMP: 16.20 L of Centerline
District #: 11 Emp: 16.24 Spec. Case: = North
County #: 66

Total Score: 390 Date: 07/15/94 Rater:

BMP: 16.20 Level of Centerline
HWY#: IJ421
District#: 11
County#: 66

Emp: 16.2 - 4 Spec. Case. = North

Total Score: 390 Design Code: Rate:

Rate Date: 07/15/94 Repair Code: Cut Class: A

Preliminary Cost Estimate: $ 3580 Average Daily Traffic: 3580

Posted Speed Limit: 55 Slope Height Score: 11

Actual Height (ft): 53 Ditch Effectiveness Score: 20

Remarks: Catchment: Moderate

Average Vehicle Risk Score: 1 Percent of Time:

Remarks: AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score: 100

Actual Site Distance (ft): 0 Percent of Low Design Value: 26

Remarks: 229'

Width Score: 54 Actual Width (ft): 23.0

Remarks: Ditch Effectiveness Score: 10

Catchment: Moderate

Remarks: Average Vehicle Risk Score: 2 Percent of Time:

Remarks: Rockfall History Score: 25 Fall Occurrence: Occasional

Remarks: Additional Remarks and Comments

Slope No. 134

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Hwy #: 30 BMP: 5.10 R of Centerline
District #: 9 Emp: 5.15 Spec. Case. = EAST
County #: 13

Total Score: 387 Date: 07/05/94 Rater:

BMP: 5.15 Level of Centerline
HWY#: 30
District#: 9
County#: 13

Emp: 5.15 Spec. Case. = EAST

Total Score: 387 Design Code: Rate:

Rate Date: 07/05/94 Repair Code: Cut Class: A

Preliminary Cost Estimate: $ 850 Average Daily Traffic: 850

Posted Speed Limit: 55 Slope Height Score: 11

Actual Height (ft): 55 Ditch Effectiveness Score: 25

Remarks: Catchment: Moderate

Average Vehicle Risk Score: 1 Percent of Time:

Remarks: AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score: 30

Actual Site Distance (ft): 0 Percent of Low Design Value: 55

Remarks: 373'

Width Score: 100 Actual Width (ft): 18.0

Remarks: Climate & Presence of Water on Slope Score: 25

Precipitation: Freezing Periods:

Remarks: Presence of Water on Slope:

Remarks: Rockfall History Score: 35 Fall Occurrence: Many

Remarks: Additional Remarks and Comments

Additional Remarks and Comments
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 164  BMP: 177.90  R OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 9  EMP: 177.90  SPEC. CASE. = EAST
COUNTY #: 22  TOTAL SCORE: 387  RATE DATE: 06/04/93  RATER:
DEVIATION CODE: 0  PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 6200
TOTAL SCORE: 387  RATE DATE: 06/15/94  RATER:
DESIGN CODE: 0  TOTAL SCORE: 388  RATE DATE: 06/15/94  RATER:
REPAIR CODE: 0  TOTAL SCORE: 388  RATE DATE: 06/15/94  RATER:
CUT CLASS: A  DESIGN CODE: REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  TOTAl SCORE:
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 65  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 62  SloPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100
REMARKS:
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 95  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 105
SLOPE EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 50  CATCHMENT: DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 37
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 9  AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 5
PERCENT OF TIME: 81  PERCENT OF TIME:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 3  AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 10
REMARKS:
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 1000  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 99  PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 26
WIDTH SCORE: 5  WIDTH SCORE: 3
REMARKS:
ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 40.0  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 45.0
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FRACTURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0  DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 27  FEATURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 50  RATE:
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 27  BLOCK SIZE: 3
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20  PRECIPITATION:
FREEZING PERIODS:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

Slope No. 135

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 15  BMP: 2.06  R OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 10  EMP: 2.18  SPEC. CASE. = NORTH
COUNTY #: 13  TOTAL SCORE: 390  RATE DATE: 06/04/93  RATER:
DEVIATION CODE: 0  PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 4000
TOTAL SCORE: 390  RATE DATE: 06/15/94  RATER:
DESIGN CODE: 0  TOTAL SCORE: 388  RATE DATE: 06/15/94  RATER:
REPAIR CODE: 0  TOTAL SCORE: 388  RATE DATE: 06/15/94  RATER:
CUT CLASS: A  DESIGN CODE: REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0  TOTAl SCORE:
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 106
REMARKS:
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 105  CATCHMENT: DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 37
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 5  AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 5
PERCENT OF TIME:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 100  AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 100
REMARKS:
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0  ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 26  PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 26
WIDTH SCORE: 3  WIDTH SCORE: 3
REMARKS:
ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 45.0  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 45.0
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FRACTURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0  DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 27  FEATURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 50  RATE:
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 27  BLOCK SIZE: 3
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20  PRECIPITATION:
FREEZING PERIODS:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

Slope No. 136
### Table 1: Rockfall Hazard Rating System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slope No.</th>
<th>HWY #: U119</th>
<th>BMP: 23.00</th>
<th>L of Centerline</th>
<th>HWY #: U23</th>
<th>BMP: 23.30</th>
<th>R of Centerline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISTRICT #: 12</td>
<td>EMP: 23.10</td>
<td>SPEC. CASE. = NORTH</td>
<td>DISTRICT #: 12</td>
<td>EMP: 23.50</td>
<td>SPEC. CASE. = NORTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COUNTY #: 36</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 386</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/28/83</td>
<td>COUNTY #: 36</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 382</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/28/83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DESIGN CODE:</td>
<td>REPAIR CODE:</td>
<td>OUT CLASS: A</td>
<td>DESIGN CODE:</td>
<td>REPAIR CODE:</td>
<td>OUT CLASS: A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0</td>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5695</td>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0</td>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 7590</td>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100</td>
<td>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0</td>
<td>Remarks: GREATER THAN 105'</td>
<td>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100</td>
<td>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 105</td>
<td>Remarks:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 24</td>
<td>CATCHMENT: MODERATE</td>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 7</td>
<td>PERCENT OF TIME: 43</td>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 8</td>
<td>ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 729</td>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81</td>
<td>ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE</td>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRACURES: CONTINUOUS</td>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING</td>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0</td>
<td>RATE:</td>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 81</td>
<td>BLOCK SIZE: 41</td>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRECIPITATION: MODERATE</td>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20</td>
<td>FREEZING PERIODS: SOME PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: INTERMITTENT</td>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 49</td>
<td>FALL OCCURRENCE: OCCASIONAL</td>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS =&gt; LOW A SCORE.</td>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Slope No. 137

- **Slope No. 137**

### Slope No. 138

- **Slope No. 138**
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: U421
DISTRICT #: 7
COUNTY #: 78
TOTAL SCORE: 382
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 2700
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 4
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 32
REMARKS:

DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 75
CATCHMENT:
REMARKS:

AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 1
PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:

AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 100
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 12
REMARKS: 109
WIDTH SCORE: 82
ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 22.0
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 27
FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: RANDOM
REMARKS:

(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 9
DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
FEATURES:
REMARKS:

(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0
RATE:
REMARKS:

BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 27
BLOCK SIZE: 3
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:

CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27
PRECIPITATION:
FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:

ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 50
FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

Slope No. 139
### Slope No. 141

| HWY #: 66 | BMP: 2.00 | L OF CENTERLINE EMP: 2.20 SPEC. CASE. = EAST |
| DISTRICT #: 12 | | |
| COUNTY #: 36 | | |
| TOTAL SCORE: 378 | RATE DATE: 06/09/94 | RATER: |
| DESIGN CODE: | REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A | |
| PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0 | POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55 |
| AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 7320 |

**Remarks:**
- Slope Height Score: 100
- Actual Height (ft): 198
- Average Vehicle Risk Score: 100
- Percent of Time:
- AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score: 24
- Actual Site Distance (ft): 62
- Percent of Low Design Value: 62
- Width Score: 1
- Actual Width (ft): 82.0

**Geologic Character - Case 1 (If Applicable)**

- (A) Structural Condition Score: 27
- Fractures: District Continuous
- Orientations: Random

**Remarks:**
- Block Size/Quantity Score: 27
- Block Size: 3
- Quantity of Material (cu yds):
- Climate & Presence of Water on Slope Score: 29
- Precipitation: Freezing Periods
- Presence of Water on Slope:

**Geologic Character - Case 2 (If Applicable)**

- (A) Structural Condition Score: 0
- Features:

**Remarks:**
- Difference in Erosion Rates Score: 0
- Rate:
- Block Size/Quantity Score: 27
- Block Size: 3
- Quantity of Material (cu yds):
- Climate & Presence of Water on Slope Score: 29
- Precipitation: Freezing Periods
- Presence of Water on Slope:

**Additional Remarks and Comments**

### Slope No. 142

| HWY #: 114 | BMP: 7.10 | R OF CENTERLINE EMP: 7.20 SPEC. CASE. = EAST |
| DISTRICT #: 12 | | |
| COUNTY #: 36 | | |
| TOTAL SCORE: 377 | RATE DATE: 06/09/93 | RATER: |
| DESIGN CODE: | REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A | |
| PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0 | POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55 |
| AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 4590 |

**Remarks:**
- Slope Height Score: 40
- Actual Height (ft): 54
- Average Vehicle Risk Score: 10
- Percent of Time:
- AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score: 28
- Actual Site Distance (ft): 45
- Percent of Low Design Value: 74
- Width Score: 3
- Actual Width (ft): 45.0

**Geologic Character - Case 1 (If Applicable)**

- (A) Structural Condition Score: 27
- Fractures:
- Orientations:

**Remarks:**
- Block Size/Quantity Score: 27
- Description: Undulating

**Additional Remarks and Comments**

---

**ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM**
### Slope No. 143

**Rockfall Hazard Rating System**

| HWY #: 114 | BMP: 4.90 | R of Centerline: | DISTRICT #: 12 | EMP: 4.78 | SPEC. CASE: | WEST |
| COUNTY #: 38 | TOTAL SCORE: 368 | RATE DATE: 08/03/94 | RATER: | REPAIR CODE: | 4.78 | SPEC. CASE: | WEST |
| PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0 | POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 65 |

**Average Daily Traffic:** 7180

**Slope Height Score:** 100

**Actual Height (ft):** 154

**Remarks:**

**Ditch Effectiveness Score:** 19

**Catchment:** Moderate

**Remarks:**

**Average Vehicle Risk Score:** 18

**Percent of Time:** 66

**Remarks:**

**AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score:** 27

**Actual Site Distance (ft):** 0

**Percent of Low Design Value:** 135

**Remarks:**

**Width Score:** 2

**Actual Width (ft):** 46.0

**Remarks:**

**Geologic Character – Case 1 (if applicable):**

(A) Structural Condition Score: 25

(Fractures: Distinct Continous)

**Orientations:** Random

**Remarks:** Siliciclastic Shale Bedding

(B) Rock Friction Score: 26

**Description:** Undulating

**Remarks:**

**Geologic Character – Case 2 (if applicable):**

(A) Structural Condition Score: 0

**Features:**

**Remarks:**

(B) Difference in Erosion Rates Score: 0

**Rate:**

**Remarks:**

**Block Size/Quantity Score:** 100

**Block Size:** 5

**Quantity of Material (cu yds):**

**Remarks:**

**Climate & Presence of Water on Slope Score:** 27

**Precipitation:** Freezing Periods

**Presence of Water on Slope:**

**Remarks:**

**Rockfall History Score:** 24

**Fall Occurrence:** Occasional

**Remarks:** Fallen Rock Zone

**Additional Remarks and Comments:**

>>>

>>>>

>>>>

---

### Slope No. 144

**Rockfall Hazard Rating System**

| HWY #: MTPK | BMP: 4.90 | R of Centerline: | DISTRICT #: 10 | EMP: 4.70 | SPEC. CASE: | WEST |
| COUNTY #: 119 | TOTAL SCORE: 368 | RATE DATE: 08/03/93 | RATER: | REPAIR CODE: | 4.78 | SPEC. CASE: | WEST |
| PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0 | POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 65 |

**Average Daily Traffic:** 3680

**Slope Height Score:** 11

**Actual Height (ft):** 54

**Remarks:**

**Ditch Effectiveness Score:** 25

**Catchment:**

**Remarks:**

**Average Vehicle Risk Score:** 3

**Percent of Time:**

**Remarks:**

**AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score:** 1

**Actual Site Distance (ft):** 1184

**Percent of Low Design Value:** 135

**Remarks:**

**Width Score:** 18

**Actual Width (ft):** 51.0

**Remarks:**

**Geologic Character – Case 1 (if applicable):**

(A) Structural Condition Score: 81

**Fractures:**

**Orientations:**

**Remarks:**

(B) Rock Friction Score: 55

**Description:**

**Remarks:**

**Geologic Character – Case 2 (if applicable):**

(A) Structural Condition Score: 0

**Features:**

**Remarks:**

(B) Difference in Erosion Rates Score: 0

**Rate:**

**Remarks:**

**Block Size/Quantity Score:** 73

**Block Size:** 4

**Quantity of Material (cu yds):**

**Remarks:**

**Climate & Presence of Water on Slope Score:** 20

**Precipitation:** Freezing Periods

**Presence of Water on Slope:**

**Remarks:**

**Rockfall History Score:** 81

**Fall Occurrence:**

**Remarks:**

**Additional Remarks and Comments:**

>>>
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Slope No. 145

HWY #: 15  BMP: 23.00  DISTRICT #: 10  COUNTY #: 10
COUNTY #: 10
TOTAL SCORE: 364  RATE DATE: 08/15/94  RATER: = NORTH
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:$ 0  REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5370  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 128
REMARKS: DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 20  CATCHMENT: MODERATE
REMARKS: AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 6  PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS: AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 10
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0  PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 79
REMARKS: 634
WIDTH SCORE: 39  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 28.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 87  FRACROES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 27  DESCRIPTION: PLANAR
REMARKS: MASSIVE POTENTIAL FOR FAILURE
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(5) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0  RATE:
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 16  BLOCK SIZE: 2.5
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS: LARGE POSSIBLE
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENT OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 35  FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>>
>>>
>>>

Slope No. 146

HWY #: 15  BMP: 23.00  DISTRICT #: 10  COUNTY #: 10
COUNTY #: 10
TOTAL SCORE: 364  RATE DATE: 09/17/93  RATER: = EAST
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:$ 0  REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 3250  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 19  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 87
REMARKS: DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 12  CATCHMENT:
REMARKS: DITCH FULL
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 9  PERCENT OF TIME: 49
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 81
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 350  PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 40
REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 27  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 28.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81  FRACROES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 24  DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(5) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0  RATE:
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 12  BLOCK SIZE: 1.5
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS: LARGER POSSIBLE
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20
PRECIPITATION:
PRESENT OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>>
>>>
>>>
**Slope No. 147**

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: USB BMP: 0.67  
DISTRICT #: 7  
COUNTY #: 57  
TOTAL SCORE: 363  
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $  
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 2340  
PROMPTED SPEED LIMIT: 35  
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 2  
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 75  
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 1  
PERCENT OF TIME: 4  
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 100  
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 1300  
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 128  
WIDTH SCORE: 81  
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27  
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 25  
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

**Slope No. 148**

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: MT PK  
DISTRICT #: 10  
COUNTY #: 99  
TOTAL SCORE: 357  
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $  
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 3650  
PROMPTED SPEED LIMIT: 65  
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 25  
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 76  
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 4  
PERCENT OF TIME:  
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 100  
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 1300  
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 128  
WIDTH SCORE: 0  
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20  
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 25  
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
### Slope No. 149

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HWY #: 164 BMP: 137.40 EMP: 137.10 R OF CENTERLINE SPEC. CASE. = EAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #: 9 COUNTY #: 103 TOTAL SCORE: 354 RATE DATE: 06/10/93 RATER: CUT CLASS: A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0 PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5570 POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 26 CATCHMENT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 5 PERCENT OF TIME: 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 1 ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0 PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GELOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 78 FRACTURES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 68 DESCRIPTION:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GELOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0 FEATURES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0 RATE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20 PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 44 FALL OCCURRENCE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS &gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Slope No. 150

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HWY #: 164 BMP: 137.40 EMP: 137.10 R OF CENTERLINE SPEC. CASE. = EAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #: 9 COUNTY #: 103 TOTAL SCORE: 354 RATE DATE: 06/10/93 RATER: CUT CLASS: A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0 PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5570 POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 26 CATCHMENT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 5 PERCENT OF TIME: 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 1 ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0 PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GELOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0 FEATURES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0 DESCRIPTION:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GELOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 70 FEATURES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 81 RATE: EXTREME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 16 BLOCK SIZE: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20 PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 44 FALL OCCURRENCE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS &gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**APPENDIX C - RHRS Scores**
### Slope No. 153

**Rockfall Hazard Rating System**

- **HWY #:** U127
- **BMP:** 20.93 R OF CENTERLINE
- **DISTRICT #:** 5
- **EMP:** 20.88 SPEC. CASE. = NORTH
- **COUNTY #:** 37
- **TOTAL SCORE:** 351
- **DESIGN CODE:**
- **PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:** $0
- **AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:** 1900
- **SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:** 3 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 23
- **GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1** (IF APPLICABLE)
  - **(A)** STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 27
  - **FRACURS:** DISTRICT CONTINUOUS ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
  - **Remarks:**
  - **(B)** ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 9 DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
  - **Remarks:**
- **GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2** (IF APPLICABLE)
  - **(A)** STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
  - **Features:**
  - **(B)** DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0 RATE:
    - **Remarks:**
- **BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE:** 27 BLOCK SIZE: 3
- **CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE:** 27 PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS: PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
- **Remarks:**
- **ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE:** 68 FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
- **ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS**

### Slope No. 154

**Rockfall Hazard Rating System**

- **HWY #:** 15
- **BMP:** 5.60 L OF CENTERLINE
- **DISTRICT #:** 10
- **EMP:** 5.50 SPEC. CASE. = SOUTH
- **COUNTY #:** 119
- **TOTAL SCORE:** 349
- **DESIGN CODE:**
- **PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:** $0
- **AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:** 3010
- **SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:** 48 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 88
- **GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1** (IF APPLICABLE)
  - **(A)** STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 81
  - **FRACURS:** DISTRICT CONTINUOUS ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
  - **Remarks:**
  - **(B)** ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 30 DESCRIPTION:
  - **Remarks:**
- **GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2** (IF APPLICABLE)
  - **(A)** STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
  - **Features:**
  - **(B)** DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0 RATE:
    - **Remarks:**
- **BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE:** 7 BLOCK SIZE: 1
- **CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE:** 27 PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS: PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
- **Remarks:**
- **ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE:** 30 FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
- **ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS**

**APPENDIX C: RHRS Scores**
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Slope No. 155

Slope No. 156

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Slope No. 155

Slope No. 156

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Slope No. 155

Slope No. 156
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Slope No. 157

HWY #: U23 BMP: 4.10
DISTRICT #: 9
COUNTY #: 10
TOTAL Score: 345
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 4525
SLOPE HEIGHT Score: 100
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK Score: 4
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS Score: 7
TOTAL SCORE: 345
REM: 4.01 SPEC. CASE.
SLOPE HEIGHT: 0
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 0
PERCENT OF TIME: 32
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE Score: 1
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION Score: 0
FRATURES:
ORIENTATIONS:

(B) ROCK FRICTION Score: 0
DESCRIPTION:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION Score: 35
FEATURES: MANY
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES Score: 40
RATE: LARGE
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY Score: 58
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 0-11
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE Score: 29
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS;
WATER PRESENT AFTER SUMMER DROUGHT
ROCKFALL HISTORY Score: 48
FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>> SURVEYED FOR ROCKFALL SIMULATION
>>

Slope No. 158

HWY #: U23 BMP: 6.87
DISTRICT #: 12
COUNTY #: 67
TOTAL Score: 345
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 4525
SLOPE HEIGHT Score: 85
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK Score: 1
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS Score: 9
TOTAL Score: 345
REM: 6.90 SPEC. CASE.
SLOPE HEIGHT: 101
ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 101
PERCENT OF TIME: 32
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE Score: 4
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 96

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION Score: 0
FRATURES:
ORIENTATIONS:

(B) ROCK FRICTION Score: 0
DESCRIPTION:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION Score: 30
FEATURES: MANY

(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES Score: 31
RATE: LARGE

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>> SURVEYED FOR ROCKFALL SIMULATION
>>

ROCKFALL HISTORY Score: 22
FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY

ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>

PRELIMINARY HAZARD RATING SYSTEM
### Slope No. 159

**ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HWY #:</th>
<th>U60 BMP: 5.20</th>
<th>R OF CENTERLINE</th>
<th>EMP: 5.25 SPEC. CASE.</th>
<th>EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 344</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/02/94</td>
<td>RATER:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>REPAIR CODE:</td>
<td>CUT CLASS: A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE:</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:** 6  
**ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):** 20  
**REMARKS:**  
**AVG. DAILY TRAFFIC:** 950  
**POSTED SPEED LIMIT:** 55  
**REMARKS:**  
**AVG. DAILY TRAFFIC:** 950  
**PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:** 21  
**REMARKS:**  
**AVG. DAILY TRAFFIC:** 950  
**WIDTH SCORE:** 62  
**ACTUAL WIDTH (FT):** 22.0  
**REMARKS:**  
**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)**  
**A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:** 0  
**FRACTURES:** DISTRICT CONTINUOUS  
**ORIENTATIONS:** ADVERSE  
**REMARKS:**  
**B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE:** 0  
**DESCRIPTION:** UNDETERMINED  
**REMARKS:**  
**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)**  
**A) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE:** 27  
**RATES:** LARGE  
**REMARKS:**  
**B) BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE:** 27  
**BLOCK SIZE:** 3  
**QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):**  
**REMARKS:**  
**C) CLIMATE & PRECIPITATION ON SLOPE SCORE:** 37  
**PRECIPITATION:** FREEZING PERIODS  
**PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:**  
**REMARKS:**  
**ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE:** 27  
**FALL OCCURRENCE:** MANY  
**REMARKS:**  
**ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:**  

---

### Slope No. 160

**ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HWY #:</th>
<th>U89 BMP: 7.60</th>
<th>L OF CENTERLINE</th>
<th>EMP: 8.00 SPEC. CASE.</th>
<th>EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE: 334</td>
<td>RATE DATE: 06/02/94</td>
<td>RATER:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>REPAIR CODE:</td>
<td>CUT CLASS: A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE:</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:</td>
<td>3870</td>
<td>POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:** 16  
**ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):** 63  
**REMARKS:**  
**AVG. DAILY TRAFFIC:** 3870  
**PRECEPITATION:** FREEZING PERIODS  
**PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:**  
**REMARKS:**  
**AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE:** 16  
**ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):** 0  
**PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:** 63  
**REMARKS:**  
**AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE:** 16  
**ACTUAL WIDTH (FT):** 22.0  
**REMARKS:**  
**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)**  
**A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:** 0  
**FRACTURES:** DISTRICT CONTINUOUS  
**ORIENTATIONS:** ADVERSE  
**REMARKS:**  
**B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE:** 0  
**DESCRIPTION:** UNDETERMINED  
**REMARKS:**  
**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)**  
**A) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE:** 0  
**RATES:** LARGE  
**REMARKS:**  
**B) BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE:** 100  
**BLOCK SIZE:** 5  
**QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):**  
**REMARKS:**  
**CLIMATE & PRECIPITATION ON SLOPE SCORE:** 45  
**PRECIPITATION:** FREEZING PERIODS  
**PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:**  
**REMARKS:**  
**ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE:** 27  
**FALL OCCURRENCE:** MANY  
**REMARKS:**  
**ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:**  

---
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Slope No. 161

HWY #: MTPK  BMP: 47.50  LOC. OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 10  EMP: 47.50  SPEC. CASE:  = WEST
COUNTY #: 119  TOTAL SCORE: 333  RATE DATE: 06/09/93
DESIGN CODE:  REPAIR CODE:  RATER:  CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 3460
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 65
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 15  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 61
REMARKS:  DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 17  CATCHMENT:  REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 2  PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:  AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 30
WIDTH SCORE: 18  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 31.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 1  (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FRACTURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0  DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 2  (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 27  FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 75  RATE:
REMARKS:  BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 5  BLOCK SIZE:
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS): 5-6
REMARKS:  CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
PRECIPITATION:  FREEZING PERIODS:
REMARKS:  ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 81  FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

Slope No. 162

HWY #: U23  BMP: 22.10  LOC. OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 12  EMP: 22.30  SPEC. CASE:  = NORTH
COUNTY #: 98  TOTAL SCORE: 333  RATE DATE: 06/09/93
DESIGN CODE:  REPAIR CODE:  RATER:  CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $  AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 7930
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 65
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 92  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 103
REMARKS:  DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 9  CATCHMENT: MODERATE
REMARKS:  ROCK ON EDGE OF PAVEMENT
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 100
REMARKS:  PERCENT OF TIME:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 1
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:
REMARKS:  WIDTH SCORE: 12  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 34.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 1  (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  FRACTURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0  DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 2  (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 27  FEATURES: MANY
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 25  RATE: MODERATE
REMARKS:  BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 5  BLOCK SIZE: 1.5
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:  CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
PRECIPITATION:  FREEZING PERIODS:
REMARKS:  ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 35  FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

APPENDIX C--RHS Scores
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: UGO  BMP: 6.80  L OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 9  EMP: 6.88 SPEC. CASE.  = EAST
COUNTY #: 103
TOTAL SCORE: 328  RATE DATE:06/02/94  RATER:
REPAIR CODE: 0
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 6660  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 55
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 5  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 36
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 60  CATCHMENT: LIM-NON
REMARKS: ROCKS ACROSS ROAD
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 4
PERCENT OF TIME: REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 82
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 45
REMARKS: 3027
WIDTH SCORE: 31  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 27.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(FRACTURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0  DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 27  FEATURES: MANY
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 45  RATE: LARGE
REMARKS: SHALE/DOLOMITE BEDDING
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 27  BLOCK SIZE: 3
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 40  FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS >>>
>>> >>>
Slope No. 164

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: CUPK  BMP: 83.55  L OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 8  EMP: 83.70 SPEC. CASE.  = EAST
COUNTY #: 130
TOTAL SCORE: 332  RATE DATE:07/15/93  RATER:
REPAIR CODE: 0
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 3210  POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 65
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 22  ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 20
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 9  CATCHMENT: MODERATE
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 4
PERCENT OF TIME: REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 1
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:
REMARKS: >1200
WIDTH SCORE: 27  ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 28.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0  ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(FRACTURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0  DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 27  FEATURES: MANY
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 55  RATE: LARGE
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100  BLOCK SIZE: 7
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 27  FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS >>>
>>> >>>
Slope No. 163

APPENDIX C-DHRS Score
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Hwy #: 1664
BMP: 15.30
L OF CENTERLINE
District #: 7
Emp #: 1539
Spec. Case: NORTH
County #: 120
Total Score: 322
Slope Height Score: 12
Actual Height (ft): 56
Remarks:

Average Daily Traffic: 700
POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 35
Slope Height Score: 12
Actual Height (ft): 56
Remarks:

Ditch Effectiveness Score: 20
Catchment:
Remarks:

AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 1
PERCENT OF TIME:
Remarks:

AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 100
Actual Site Distance (ft): 0
Remarks: 141'

Width Score: 36
Actual Width (ft): 26.0
Remarks:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(a) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 9
FRACTURES: CONTINUOUS
ORIENATIONS: RANDOM
Remarks:
(b) Rock Friction Score: 81
DESCRIPTION: CLAY-SLICK
Remarks:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(a) STRUCTURAL CONDITION Score: 0
FEATURES:
Remarks:
(b) Difference in Erosion Rates Score: 0
Rate:
Remarks:

Block Size/Quantity Score: 16
Block Size: 2.5
Remarks:

CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE Score: 27
PRECIPITATION:
FREEZING PERIODS:
Remarks:

Rockfall History Score: 20
Fall Occurrence:
Remarks:

Additional Remarks and Comments
>>>
>>>
>>>
### Slope No. 167

**HWY #:** 75  
**BMP:** 20.12  
**DISTRICT #:** 11  
**COUNTY #:** 118  
**TOTAL SCORE:** 319  
**PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:** $20.12  
**EMP:** 20.00  
**R OF CENTERLINE:** = SOUTH  
**TOTAL TRAFFIC:** 1259  
**REPAIR CODE:** OUT CLASS: A  
**RATER:** SOUTH  
**RATE DATE:** 07/20/94  
**TOTAL SCORE:** 318  
**PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:** $20.12  
**RATER:** SOUTH  
**DATE:** 07/20/94  
**TOTAL TRAFFIC:** 1259  
**REPAIR CODE:** OUT CLASS: A  

**SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:** 8  
**ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):** 48  
**REMARKS:**  

**DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE:** 15  
**CATCHMENT:** MODERATE  
**REMARKS:**  

**AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE:** 0  
**PERCENT OF TIME:** 104  
**REMARKS:**  

**AASHO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE:** 1  
**ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):** 0  
**PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:** 18  
**REMARKS:**  

**WIDTH SCORE:** 7  
**ACTUAL WIDTH (FT):** 36.0  
**REMARKS:**  

**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)**  
(A) **STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:** 0  
**FRACURES:** CONTINUOUS  
**ORIENTATIONS:** RANDOM  
**REMARKS:**  

(B) **ROCK FRICTION SCORE:** 0  
**DESCRIPTION:** Planar W/ Clay infilling  
**REMARKS:**  

**DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE:** 37  
**RATE:** LARGE  
**REMARKS:**  

**BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE:** 27  
**BLOCK SIZE:** 3  
**QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):**  
**REMARKS:**  

**CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE:** 28  
**PRECIPITATION:** FREEZING PERIODS  
**PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:**  
**REMARKS:**  

**ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE:** 27  
**FALL OCCURRENCE:** MANY  
**REMARKS:**  

**ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS**  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  

---

### Slope No. 168

**HWY #:** 1264  
**BMP:** 15.40  
**DISTRICT #:** 7  
**COUNTY #:** 120  
**TOTAL SCORE:** 316  
**PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:** $15.45  
**EMP:** 15.45  
**R OF CENTERLINE:** = NORTH  
**TOTAL TRAFFIC:** 780  
**REPAIR CODE:** OUT CLASS: A  
**RATER:** NORTH  
**DATE:** 08/20/94  
**TOTAL TRAFFIC:** 780  
**REPAIR CODE:** OUT CLASS: A  

**SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE:** 10  
**ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT):** 53  
**REMARKS:**  

**DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE:** 27  
**CATCHMENT:** LIMITED  
**REMARKS:**  

**AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE:** 1  
**PERCENT OF TIME:** 104  
**REMARKS:**  

**AASHO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE:** 100  
**ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT):** 96  
**PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE:** 18  
**REMARKS:**  

**WIDTH SCORE:** 27  
**ACTUAL WIDTH (FT):** 20.0  
**REMARKS:**  

**GEOLOGIC CHARACTER – CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)**  
(A) **STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE:** 0  
**FEATURES:** MANY  
**REMARKS:**  

(B) **DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE:** 0  
**RATE:** LARGE  
**REMARKS:**  

**BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE:** 18  
**BLOCK SIZE:** 2.5  
**QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):**  
**REMARKS:**  

**CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE:** 27  
**PRECIPITATION:** FREEZING PERIODS  
**PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:**  
**REMARKS:**  

**ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE:** 20  
**FALL OCCURRENCE:** MANY  
**REMARKS:**  

**ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS**  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  

---

APPENDIX C–FHRS Scores
## Slope No. 169

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Characteristics</th>
<th>Slope Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geologic Character - Case 1 (If Applicable)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>REMARKS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Structural Condition Score</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>FRACTURES: DISTRICT CONTINUOUS ORIENTATIONS: RANDOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Rock Friction Score</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geologic Character - Case 2 (If Applicable)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Structural Condition Score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FEATURES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Difference in Erosion Rates Score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>RATE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Size/Quantity Score</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>BLOCK SIZE: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate &amp; Presence of Water on Slope Score</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockfall History Score</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>FALL OCCURRENCE:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS**

>>>

---

## Slope No. 170

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Characteristics</th>
<th>Slope Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geologic Character - Case 1 (If Applicable)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Structural Condition Score</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>FRACTURES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Rock Friction Score</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geologic Character - Case 2 (If Applicable)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Structural Condition Score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FEATURES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Difference in Erosion Rates Score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>RATE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Size/Quantity Score</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>BLOCK SIZE: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate &amp; Presence of Water on Slope Score</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockfall History Score</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>FALL OCCURRENCE:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS**

>>>

>>>

>>>

---
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: US8 BMP: 0.72 L OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 7 DISTRICT =
COUNTY #: 57 EMP: 0.67 SPEC. CASE.
TOTAL SCORE: 301 RATE DATE: 08/01/94 RATE:
DESIGN CODE: REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0 POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 35
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 2840

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 6 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 46
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 60 CATCHMENT:
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 2 PERCENT OF TIME: 17
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 100 ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 23
REMARKS: 122
WIDTH SCORE: 62 ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 22.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 15 FRACTURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 9 DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0 FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0 RATE:
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 9 BLOCK SIZE: 1-2'
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27 PRECIPITATION:
PRECESSION OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 9 FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

Slope No. 171

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: I-421 BMP: 20.80 L OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 11 DISTRICT = NORTH
COUNTY #: 48 EMP: 20.83 SPEC. CASE.
TOTAL SCORE: 294 RATE DATE: 07/19/94 RATE:
DESIGN CODE: REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0 POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 65
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 2840

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 7 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 45
REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 50 CATCHMENT: LIMITED
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 1 PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 14 ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 60
REMARKS: 82
WIDTH SCORE: 47 ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 24.0
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 32 FRACTURES: DISTRICT CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: ADVERSE
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 30 DESCRIPTION: PLANAR
REMARKS:
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0 FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0 RATE:
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 100 BLOCK SIZE: 6
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27 PRECIPITATION:
PRECESSION OF WATER ON SLOPE:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 9 FALL OCCURRENCE:
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

Slope No. 172
Slope No. 173

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 90 BMP: 2.00 R OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 12 EMP: 2.20 SPEC. CASE: = EAST
COUNTY #: 38 TOTAL SCORE: 289 RATE DATE: 08/09/94 RATER:
DESIGN CODE: REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0 POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 85
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 7320

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 100 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 205
REMARKS:
DIETE EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 25 CATCHMENT: MODERATE
REMARKS: ROCKS IN MEDIAN
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 10 PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 24 ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 62
REMARKS: 540
WIDTH SCORE: 1 ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 82.0
REMARKS:
GELOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 27 FRACCURES: DISTRICT CONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: RANDOM
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0 DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
REMARKS:
GELOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0 FEATURES:
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0 RATE:
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 27 BLOCK SIZE: 3
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 25
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 20 FALL OCCURRENCE: OCCASIONAL
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:
>>> BENCHES PROVIDE MANY LAUNCH POINTS
>>> >>>

Slope No. 174

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 1421 BMP: 2.70 R OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 11 EMP: 2.78 SPEC. CASE: = NORTH
COUNTY #: 26 TOTAL SCORE: 289 RATE DATE: 07/19/94 RATER: FARMER
DESIGN CODE: REPAIR CODE: CUT CLASS: A
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $ 0 POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 85
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 1360

SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 13 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 58
REMARKS:
DIETE EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 25 CATCHMENT: MODERATE
REMARKS:
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 1 PERCENT OF TIME:
REMARKS:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 44 ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 51
REMARKS: 456
WIDTH SCORE: 47 ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 24.0
REMARKS:
GELOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0 FRACCURES:
ORIENTATIONS:
REMARKS:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0 DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:
GELOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 55 FEATURES: MANY
REMARKS:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 25 RATE: MODERATE
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 27 BLOCK SIZE: 3
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
REMARKS:
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 25
PRECIPITATION: FREEZING PERIODS:
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 27 FALL OCCURRENCE: MANY
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS:
>>> ROCKS EVIDENT ACROSS ROAD
>>> >>>

APPENDIX C—HERS Scores
### Slope No. 175

**Rockfall Hazard Rating System**

- **HWY #:** 52  **BMP:** 21.80  **R of Centerline:** EAST
- **District #:** 7  **County #:** 76
- **Total Score:** 288  **Rate Date:** 08/03/94  **Rater:** EMP: 22.00  **Spec. Case:**

**Design Code:** Cut Class: A  **Repair Code:** 0  **Preliminary Cost Estimate:** $

**Average Daily Traffic:** 5180  **Posted Speed Limit:** 55

**Slope Height Score:** 5  **Actual Height (ft):** 38  **Remarks:**

**Ditch Effectiveness Score:** 6  **Catchment:**

**Average Vehicle Risk Score:** 4  **Percent of Time:**

**AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score:** 62  **Actual Site Distance (ft):** 0  **Percent of Low Design Value:** 45  **Remarks:**

**Width Score:** 6  **Actual Width (ft):** 39.9  **Remarks:**

**Geologic Character — Case 1 (if applicable)**

(A) **Structural Condition Score:** 60  **Fractures:** Continuous  **Orientations:** Random  **Remarks:**

(B) **Rock Friction Score:** 18  **Description:** Undulating  **Remarks:**

**Geologic Character — Case 2 (if applicable)**

(A) **Structural Condition Score:** 0  **Features:** Occasional  **Remarks:**

(B) **Difference in Erosion Rates Score:** 40  **Rate:** Large  **Remarks:**

**Block Size/Quantity Score:** 100  **Block Size:** 5  **Remarks:**

**Climate & Presence of Water on Slope Score:** 27  **Precipitation:**  **Presence of Water on Slope:**  **Remarks:**

**Rockfall History Score:** 9  **Fall Occurrence:**  **Remarks:**

**Additional Remarks and Comments:**

---

### Slope No. 176

**Rockfall Hazard Rating System**

- **HWY #:** 421  **BMP:** 1.20  **R of Centerline:** NORTH
- **District #:** 11  **County #:** 26
- **Total Score:** 287  **Rate Date:** 08/03/94  **Rater:** Anderson  **Emp:** 1.25  **Spec. Case:**

**Design Code:** Cut Class: A  **Repair Code:** 0  **Preliminary Cost Estimate:** $

**Average Daily Traffic:** 2160  **Posted Speed Limit:** 35

**Slope Height Score:** 17  **Actual Height (ft):** 65  **Remarks:**

**Ditch Effectiveness Score:** 27  **Catchment:** Limited  **Remarks:**

**Average Vehicle Risk Score:** 2  **Percent of Time:**

**AASHTO Decision Site Distance Score:** 3  **Actual Site Distance (ft):** 0  **Percent of Low Design Value:** 99  **Remarks:**

**Width Score:** 41  **Actual Width (ft):** 25.0  **Remarks:**

**Geologic Character — Case 1 (if applicable)**

(A) **Structural Condition Score:** 60  **Fractures:** Continuous  **Orientations:** Random  **Remarks:**

(B) **Rock Friction Score:** 18  **Description:** Undulating  **Remarks:**

**Geologic Character — Case 2 (if applicable)**

(A) **Structural Condition Score:** 0  **Features:**  **Remarks:**

(B) **Difference in Erosion Rates Score:** 0  **Rate:**  **Remarks:**

**Block Size/Quantity Score:** 47  **Block Size:** 3.5  **Remarks:**

**Climate & Presence of Water on Slope Score:** 25  **Precipitation:**  **Presence of Water on Slope:**  **Remarks:**

**Rockfall History Score:** 27  **Fall Occurrence:** Many  **Remarks:**

**Additional Remarks and Comments:**

---
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: U421
COUNTY #: 48
TOTAL SCORE: 256
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 1980
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 9
REMARKS: ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 50
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 15
REMARKS: CATCHMENT: MODERATE
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 2
REMARKS: PERCENT OF TIME:
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 100
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 85
REMARKS: PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 21
WIDTH SCORE: 36
REMARKS: ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 28.0
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 12
REMARKS: FRACTURES: DISTRICTCONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: RANDOM
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 23
REMARKS: DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
REMARKS: FEATURES:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0
REMARKS: RATE:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 27
REMARKS: BLOCK SIZE: 3
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 25
REMARKS: PRECIPITATION:
FREEZING PERIODS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 7
REMARKS: FALL OCCURRENCE: FEW
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

Slope No. 177

ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

HWY #: 114
COUNTY #: 36
TOTAL SCORE: 244
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 7560
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 85
REMARKS: ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 101
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 28
REMARKS: CATCHMENT: LIMITED
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 4
REMARKS: PERCENT OF TIME: 32
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 26
ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 0
REMARKS: PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 61
WIDTH SCORE: 3
REMARKS: ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 45.0
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 25
REMARKS: FRACTURES: DISTRICTCONTINUOUS
ORIENTATIONS: RANDOM
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 22
REMARKS: DESCRIPTION: UNDULATING
GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0
REMARKS: FEATURES:
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0
REMARKS: RATE:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 9
REMARKS: BLOCK SIZE: 2
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 27
REMARKS: PRECIPITATION:
FREEZING PERIODS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 15
REMARKS: FALL OCCURRENCE: OCCASIONAL
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS

Slope No. 178
ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM

Hwy # 52 BMP: 22.40 L OF CENTERLINE
DISTRICT #: 7 EMP: 22.60 SPEC. CASE. = EAST
COUNTY #: 76 TOTAL SCORE: 244
DESIGN CODE: EMP: 22.60 SPEC. CASE.
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $0 POSTED SPEED LIMIT: 65
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC: 5180

SLOPE HEIGHT: 7 ACTUAL HEIGHT (FT): 45
SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 7 REMARKS:
DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 50 CATCHMENT: L-N
AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 16 REMARKS:
PERCENT OF TIME: 69
AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 52 ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 421
PERCENT OF LOW DESIGN VALUE: 49 REMARKS:
WIDTH SCORE: 27 ACTUAL WIDTH (FT): 28.0
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0 REMARKS:
FRATURES: ORIENTATIONS:
Rocks:
(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 0 DESCRIPTION:
REMARKS:

GEOLOGIC CHARACTER - CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)
(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 18 REMARKS:
FEATURES: O-N
(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 18
RATE: M-L
REMARKS:
BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 0 BLOCK SIZE: 2
QUANTITY OF MATERIAL (CU YDS):
CLIMATE & PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 18
PRECIPITATION: M FREEZING PERIODS: S
PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE: I
REMARKS:
ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 27 FALL OCCURRENCE: O-M
REMARKS:
ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS
>>> DITCH APPEARS TO FILL WITH ROCK REGULARLY. ABOUT
>>> EVERY 3 MONTHS IT IS CLEANED.
>>>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROCKFALL HAZARD RATING SYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HWY #: CUPK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT #: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY #: 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN CODE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOPE HEIGHT SCORE: 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DITCH EFFECTIVENESS SCORE: 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE VEHICLE RISK SCORE: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO DECISION SITE DISTANCE SCORE: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL SITE DISTANCE (FT): 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDTH SCORE: 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLeGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 1 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) ROCK FRICTION SCORE: 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLeGIC CHARACTER -- CASE 2 (IF APPLICABLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) STRUCTURAL CONDITION SCORE: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) DIFFERENCE IN EROSION RATES SCORE: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK SIZE/QUANTITY SCORE: 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIMATE &amp; PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE SCORE: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRECIPITATION:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENCE OF WATER ON SLOPE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKFALL HISTORY SCORE: 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND COMMENTS &gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slope No. 181