Network Outcomes Contract Governance & Management Group Clarification	
Reference Number:	NOCC No.4
Subject Title:	OPM 34 Edgebreak
Issue Date:	12 October 2015
Clarification Purpose	Clarification is provided to ensure the NOC is being interpreted consistently. The clarification does not remove or supersede the Network Outcomes Contract documentation.

SUBJECT

OPM 34 is deemed a defect when any occurrence of edgebreak encroaches into the edgeline within an audit length. The OPM is measured every 2 months. If triggered it applies to All Roads.

A paper was submitted to the NOC GMG seeking;

1. Clarification from NZTA on the definition of a defect in respect of OPM 34,
2. Endorsement of a proposal to relocate the edgeline by narrowing the lane widths,
3. Agree to an audit exemption on selected SH's in respect of OPM 34,
4. Feedback on a minor improvement funding request strategy.

SUMMARY OF ISSUE

Measurement of 'edgebreak encroaching into the edgeline' is a new measure applied to a networks previously managed under a traditional measure and value contract. In these Contracts repair of edgebreak was traditionally managed as a measure and value item constrained by available funds and was not subject to performance measures.

If it is considered that OPM 34 was included for safety reasons why it is not a Safety Related OPM as defined in the Maintenance Specification?

One reason for the continued OPM 34 non-compliance on some networks is the edgeline being located on the edge of seal, especially on state highways with narrow carriageways.

During the tender period the Transport Agency conducted an OPM audit and Tenderers were supplied with the outputs.

It should be noted that Section 2.3.3 of the Maintenance specification states that "the contractor shall rectify all defects identified in any compliance report within 12 months, regardless of whether or not compliance with the contract standard is being achieved. The

standard of rectification shall be a permanent repair at a minimum, in accordance with best practice or the applicable Principals specification". Appendix 2.4, process map 3.6.1 provides a the process flow chart for Defect Intervention Options.

RESPONSE

The Transport Agency does not have link width criteria for different highway classification to be achieved although the draft SHGDM and SHCM both have guideline widths per classification.

Seal widening may be carried out:

- If the proposed widening is supported by a robust business case demonstrating the benefits of reducing maintenance/ safety risk and improving network availability/ efficiency.
- In conjunction with an AWPT on roads with the following One Network road classifications (National (High Volume), National, Regional) where it can be shown that the DSI's saved/10 years/ $100m invested will support the widening.
- As a standalone safety project at sites where there are clear safety issues and seal widening has been identified as an appropriate treatment to reduce the risk'.

The NOC GMG agreed that;

- Some networks will have an issue with edgebreak encroaching into the edgeline. Potential issues had been clearly identified through the Agency OPM audit during the tendering period and that the network condition is assessed by competent contractors at the time of putting together their tendered price,
- There is difficulty in some locations to apply a suitable long term treatment to address encroachments into the edgeline, particularly where the edgeline was hard up against the unsealed shoulder. The issue of painted edgelines at the edge of seal is not unique and treatments have been undertaken to address the non-compliance on other performance based contracts.
- True extent of the issue and cost of addressing OPM 34 non-compliance needs to be clearly demonstrated to develop a robust and justified business case.
- Review of the network video will aid in identifying the extent of the edgebreak issue, for example on inside of corners or around edgemarker posts, and could the edgebreak be a compounding factor associated with other maintenance activities such as spraying around edgemarker posts or managing the ingress of water into the pavement structure.
- To develop a justified business the strategy would need to provide detail on;
  - Actual seal widths to fully understand the extent,
  - Crash history,
  - Comparison to other networks with similar seal width dimensions, and
  - The proposed solutions, be it high cost or whether there were other lower cost options, such as improved pavement drainage which could be considered as a precursor to the on-going edgebreak issue.

CONCLUSION

Clarification from NZTA on the definition of a defect

The NOC GMG confirms that any occurrence of edgebreak encroaching into any part of the edgeline is classified a defect. We do not see a need for the OPM 34 description in the Visual Audit Guideline to be amended.

Endorsement of a proposal to relocate the edgeline by narrowing the lane widths

The NOC GMG does not support the relocation of the edgeline to address the management of OPM 34 as research indicates there would be a negative safety benefit from this strategy. A Contractor could present a proposal to the Agency to correct incorrectly marked areas of the network whilst still maintaining SHGDM or SHCM guideline lane widths.

Agree to an audit exemption on selected SH's

The NOC GMG does not propose to allow a Contractor an OPM 34 exemption on selected sections of the SH at this point in time.

The NOC GMG proposes that where networks have an edgebreak issue;

- An independent audit (with the cost shared equally) could be undertaken by an external auditor to focus on sealed edge and shoulder maintenance only. The size of the audit and any highways which may be excluded should be agreed. Sites should still be selected randomly to assess the extent of the problem but the sample size should be greater than 10%.
- As an output of the audit the Contractor should provide a detailed assessment to the Agency of a proposed, costed, timetabled treatment solution for consideration and a further case for OPM exemption or relief.