



## Highway Bridge Program Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda Division of Local Assistance

**Date:** Thursday June 18, 2020

**Time:** 9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

**Location:**

**Contact:**

Start Time	Topic	Speaker	Desired Outcome
9:30 a.m.	1. Welcome and Introductions	Dee Lam	Meeting Kickoff
9:45 a.m.	2. Agenda Review	Linda Newton	Review and modify agenda as needed
9:50 a.m.	3. Review of 04/16/20 Draft Action Summary	Linda Newton	Review and finalize summary
10:15 a.m.	4. Local Bridge Assessment Update	Max Katt	Information sharing
10:45 a.m.	5. Financial Status	Eileen Crawford	Information sharing
11:15 p.m.	6. HBP funding	José Luis Cáceres	Information sharing
11:45 p.m.	Lunch		
12:30 p.m.	7. 2020 Prioritization / BPMP Priority	Jeremy Wright	Discussion and Recommendation
1:00 p.m.	8. HBP Guideline Changes	All	Discussion and Recommendation
3:00 p.m.	9. Review New Action Items	Susan Herman	Confirm New Action Items
3:15 p.m.	10. Round Table	All	
3:30 p.m.	Adjourn		

### Future Meeting Dates

1. August 20
2. December 10

Local Assistance  
 Highway Bridge Program Advisory Committee Meeting  
 April 16, 2020—Decisions Made and Action Items

**Attendees**

Dee Lam, Acting Division Chief, DLA	Debbie O’Leary, City of Oxnard
Mark Samuelson, DLA	Robert Newman, City of Santa Clarita
Robert Peterson, DLA	Jesse Gothan, City of Sacramento
Linda Newton, DLA	Ross McKeown, MTC
Eileen Crawford, DLA	José Luis Cáceres, SACOG
Robert Zezoff, DLA H	Jon Pray, CTC
Jim Perrault, DLAE D6	Greg Kolle, FHWA
Sudhakar Vatti, Caltrans SLA	Adam Fisher, FHWA
Michael Chung, San Joaquin County	Rebecca Neves, City of Placerville
Jason Vivian, Tulare County	Susan Herman, CSUS
Matt Randall, Placer County	Kirk Anderson, D6
Chris Sneddon, Santa Barbara County	

**Decisions**

No decisions were made at the meeting.

**Action Items**

Item Number	Status	Who	Action	Date Created	Target Date
A95	Open	DLA	Bridge Capacity System (BCS) hosting: consider costs and risks, with input from County of LA, Caltrans IT, and LTAP Center	02/19/2015	2020
A106	Open	All/Ross	Review proposed HBP policy improvements regarding: ADT/Future ADT, approach roadway length, bridge project item eligibility for Federal-aid reimbursement, width of bridge project lanes and shoulders	8/23/2018	4/16/2020 Agenda Item #6
A110	Open	CSAC reps	Contact county agencies whose unprogrammed bridge projects appear on the scour critical list coded 1 or 2, to promote awareness of HEC 23 chapter 2 (Scour Plan of Action and	2/21/2019	2020

			Countermeasures), available mitigation funding, and HBP prioritization criteria.		
A112	Open	DLA	Invite a specialist from Caltrans Division of Environmental Analysis to provide input on NEPA process, for discussion on how to streamline	4/18/2019	2020
A114	Open	All	Discuss possible changes to 6-A scoping document to help estimate project cost more precisely	4/18/2019	4/16/2020 Agenda #6
A115	Open	All	Discuss future of BIC program to balance flexibility and fairness—e.g., whether to simplify the program to encourage better utilization, discontinue program, or other action.	4/18/2019	2020
A120	Open	DLA	DLA to circulate letter for comment to 6 county agencies whose yet-to-be programmed bridge projects appear on the scour critical list coded 2, seeking response on Scour Plan of Action and Countermeasures	8/22/2019	2020
A121	Complete	DLA	Invite selected consultant to report on bridge portion of 2020 CA Statewide Local Streets & Roads Needs Assessment	8/22/2019	02/20/2020
A122	Open	DLA	Draft guidelines for CSAC and LCC to use in implementing SB 137 Federal-State Highway Funds exchange	12/12/2019	2020
A123	Open	DLA	How many projects are we delivering versus in the past with rising costs?	02/20/2020	2020
A124	Open	DLA	Report on Bridge Projects with Inactive Obligation and possible actions by the HBP Managers	02/20/2020	2020

## **Discussions**

### **1. Welcome**

- The meeting was held by Webex in the morning session, by phone for the afternoon session
- Dee Lam introduced herself as the Acting Division Chief, now that Ray Zhang has retired

## 2. Agenda Review

- No items were added to the agenda

## 3. Review of 2/20/20 Draft action summary

- A106 was discussed as Agenda #7 in February
- A113 is now complete; will be removed next time
- A114 was discussed as Agenda #7 in February
- A118 is now complete; will be removed next time
- Some target dates read 2019; Eileen will update these
- Still working on A122 draft guidelines for SB-137
- 2 items added last time—A123, A124
- Re: A121, Matt noted that comments for the Streets and Roads Needs Assessment were originally due 4/17/20 but the deadline has been extended to 5/1/20 due to low response rate. Multiple channels—Local Assistance blog, messages out via SACOG region newsletters, etc.—are needed to remind survey respondents to weigh in
- Re: A124, agencies typically work directly with DLA when invoicing. If the agency is not invoicing (and there are many possible reasons for this), then DLA is more likely to have up-to-date information about why. Action is for DLA to update its processes with Implementation and how they share inactive obligation statuses with the RTPAs and MPOs

## 4. Financial Status/Financial Constraint

- HBP has obligated \$168M of its FY apportionment as of April 2020
- Current apportionment delivery is an all-time high for the HBP
- In mid-March obligational authority (OA) was maxed out; no additional E-76s will be submitted to FHWA until May 1
- HBP projects are queueing up, so the remainder of this FY's apportionment (about \$78M) will go very quickly

### Comments

Of the \$168M that has been obligated, Linda estimated a small portion is accounted for by two or three AC conversions for high-cost bridges. 6<sup>th</sup> Street in LA has not submitted for authorization yet.

The \$25.8M carry-over balance from FY18-19 is advanced HBP apportionment from a future year. This was done because of rescission that was written into FAST Act. HBP apportionments were subject to rescission, but this was later repealed.

More bridge projects are being added to the queue every day and will surely exceed the \$78M projected balance. Options include:

- Stop sending E-76s when we hit our apportionment value
- Ask agencies if they are to use AC as a tool

- Dip into 2021 apportionment

Re: demand backlog

- The financial status and financial constraint reports contain a lot of data that can be used to advocate for more funds— the \$289M apportionment isn't enough
- There are 441 projects programmed in the current FTIP; 17-18 years' demand
- Of the \$75M programmed for Off-system in FFY19/20, construction costs accounted for \$58.1M (15.5M of which was for cost increases). Of 24 Off-system projects programmed, half of them have cost increases. This hurts the probability of projects getting construction programmed when they want it
- How can PE contract documentation stay current with NEPA and design standards when there is an 18-year backlog?
- In April 2019 the HBP had 16.93 years of demand (combined On- and Off-system categories) and was trending towards the goal of having only a 15-year backlog. This was due to LAPM Chapter 6 updates that prioritized and metered projects into the program. Since SB-1 has resulted in higher demand for construction the backlog is lengthening again
- José Luís said he could provide info from a project in District 3 that had bids come in around 2x the engineer's estimate

FHWA in FFY 18-19 awarded \$225 million in grant funding under a Competitive Highway Bridge Program for highway bridge replacement or rehabilitation projects on public roads that demonstrated cost savings by bundling at least two highway bridge projects into a single contract. California did not meet the criteria to be invited for this competitive funding, but one of Ray Zhang's goals was to be ready if a similar opportunity arose again. Greg will research the grant and coordinate with CTC staff on bringing a presentation on this and other HBP funding issues to the CTC.

Some HBP projects could be used as part of economic stimulus to make up for lost revenue during coronavirus stay-at-home orders—this is in progress in CA State legislature.

## 5. 2020 Prioritization

Under the current prioritization scheme, 2020 shows a demand of \$267M in On-system projects (61 of them), and \$155.5M for 76 Off-system projects. Suggestions to further manage this include:

- Allowing only projects ranked 1 and 2
- Re-ranking preventive maintenance projects from rank 6 to rank 4
- Resolve the bridges with Scour 113 = U code (unknown foundation); load posting may be based on very conservative assumptions. Can Caltrans visit local agencies to re-emphasize the importance of their as-built plans?

Re: preservation. HBP managers asked for input on the idea of carving out a BPMP amount separate from bridge replacements/rehabs.

- Mike noted that for State-owned bridges, about 25% of available funds goes to preventive maintenance and 75% to rehabilitation and replacement
- Chris suggested prioritizing maintenance projects under \$500K
- Greg suggested emphasizing BIC for preventive work

Re: policy that currently includes some State bridge owners in Local HBP:

- Future agreements through CTC should include funds to the Local HBP for State CalFire and/or State Parks-owned bridges; no CalFire bridges are currently programmed
- Future policy should not include CalFire—agency can get hazard mitigation funds; State parks can use ATP grants

No call for a vote/decision this meeting but any changes to prioritization must be made by August. Additional comments:

- A “no additional projects” approach might spur more usage of BIC
- Let’s consider a 25%/75% formula for BPMP/rehab and replace
- Rebecca commented that it’s difficult for most small agencies to carry construction funds until more OA is available. Her agency had a conditioned local match from developer—so didn’t have to carry substantial costs for a long time. Such tools aren’t always available
- Chris noted that local agency revenues will be down 20% or more due to COVID-19 (Rebecca’s agency estimates a 36% loss in Q2), so the idea of using BIC won’t be practical
- Frequent re-prioritization makes it hard for local agencies to plan and execute
- Caltrans is still developing guidance to bring back to the committee on SB-137 funds. If the federal-state exchange results in State only funds for local bridges this could result in faster and less expensive projects than locals using BIC or prioritization through federal HBP. This topic and the idea of getting a better scope for Scour 113 Unknown projects can be covered in a future meeting

## **6. HBP Guidelines Changes**

HBP managers thanked everyone for submitting comments earlier. All rankings and comments were put into an Excel spreadsheet.

Nine items rose to the top and were discussed as HBP reform proposals. Purpose of discussion was to add clarification and build consensus. All changes to LAPM Chapter 6 must be done by end of August for January 2021 publication, so the committee should plan to vote on these changes at the June meeting.

## 1. Accountable Project Cost and Schedule

### c. All projects must have a Field Review, Type Selection, Hydraulic Report, 65% and 95% plans reviewed by HQ and/or SLA.

The purpose of this proposal is to ensure all projects are being reviewed at the same level and that all have eligible scope. Projects that come in late in the cycle sometimes have to re-validate information because of ineligible scope. Reviews by HQ or SLA would be advisory, rather than mandatory.

#### Comments

- The 65% PS&E review would mainly be for code issues but this feeds into eligibility too; the idea is to ensure projects are staying on scope and there aren't other alternatives that might help the local agency more than their current plan. And 95% review is just to make sure code, bridge rail, etc. is updated—last minute checks.
- Context: An example of a low water crossing project with 6-A for \$2.5M. Eight years later agency submitted a 6-D for \$12.5M—scope creep, agency going own direction with elements that weren't HBP eligible. Frustrating for HBP and agency to have gone 8 years on a project that wasn't eligible.
- District 10 is already very proactive about requesting DLA approval of the type selection and design, so adding extra reviews might cause time lag. However, Districts differ in their practice of reviewing PS&E packages; some do only a cursory review; an additional SLA review would not add much extra time.
- The proposal seems to contrast with other initiatives to speed up projects and get more done. Also, after Field Review, Type Selection, and Hydraulic Report reviews, is a 95% PS&E review too late to be finding scope and code problems?
- Agencies don't want to get caught in differences of opinion regarding engineering judgment; checks should be limited to scope creep.
- How to account for situations where an agency might want to do a replacement when the project is determined to meet scope requirements for rehabilitation only? Re-frame reviews as "HBP will pay for these elements...agency will use other funding sources for non-HBP eligible elements."
- Should a "tiered" approach be taken, where more reviews are required for larger, more complicated projects than for smaller, less-complicated ones?
- Will Caltrans add more staff to avoid causing timeline delays? HQ will streamline their interactions with SLA to reduce redundant reviews and work more closely, with status meetings about projects.
- 6-A and 6-D don't often tell the full story; not seeing any plans after type selection seems risky. However, the onus should (ideally) be on local agency to request reviews. Can there be language that gives agencies incentives to ask for SLA review at 65% and 95%?
- Most committee members approve the proposal if reviews can be guaranteed within a certain timeframe.

- HBP managers noted that another way to look at this proposal is to achieve better documentation of what is/isn't HBP eligible—helps down the line with agencies talking to decision makers about how much money they really have to spend from federal and other sources.

## **2. Limit HBP Funding to Basic Bridge Costs**

**a. All bridges are only funded at the cost of basic structural solution. No aesthetics treatment (except historic bridge projects). HBP will not pay for signature structures.**

### Comments

- The purpose of this proposal is to clarify that HBP is not for funding “statement” bridges but to span a gap. HBP will pay for baseline bridge, the most cost-effective way to get across the gap.
- Jesse agreed with proposal, as long as there is sensitivity to NEPA requirements and functional elements. HBP should fund items that are identified as environmental mitigations.
- For bridges that are in highly visible locations—as demonstrated in the outreach process—consider imposing a cap on the total construction costs for special visual elements (currently it's 2% of construction costs). When community provides input about more extravagant structures, this gives boundary language for local engineers to discuss with elected officials.
- Definition of base structural costs comes from SLA review of plans. Ideally the consultant would come up with costs, then SLA directs what an appropriate structure type would be. Data also comes from Type Selection report; the “most appropriate structure” would already be documented.
- Need people & policies to referee all exceptions. If possible, to calculate extra aesthetics costs, this should be documented for each project so it can be aggregated.
- Some permitting agencies require aesthetic elements, e.g., CA Coastal Commission has “scenic and visual quality policies” for colors, rail types, etc. Boundaries need to be clear about permitting agency requirements.
- Permitting agency requirements and some aesthetic requirements may not NEPA requirements. To provide HBP funding statewide in a fair and equitable manner, these items may not be HBP eligible.

## **2. Limit HBP Funding to Basic Bridge Costs**

**c. No approach roadwork beyond what is necessary to build abutments. Approach roadway costs capped at x% bridge construction cost unless otherwise approved by HBP managers.**

### Comments



- Currently there are 200 feet and 400 feet approach limits for On- or Off-system respectively. Many agencies seem to view this as a given, regardless of whether their proposed bridge can achieve touchdown with shorter approach roadway. Consider having approach roadway capped at 10% of bridge construction cost OR 200/400-ft approach, whichever is less expensive.
- Good to encourage agencies to have creative solutions. Emphasize bridge safety, not roadway rehabilitation.
- Sometimes an approach roadway longer than 200 or 400 feet is needed. Should there be a hard cap, regardless of regulatory agency requirements?

### **3. Project Delivery Accountability and Monitoring**

- a. Required regular project status report that provide project updates. This will replace the current annual surveys.**
- b. All changes to programmed project costs must be submitted to the HBP Managers using LAGP 6-D.**

#### Comments

- The purpose of this proposal is to clarify that the required documentation and a full review of agencies' projected cost increases must happen before any such increases are programmed. Cost increases shown in the survey will no longer be added without the documentation. It also requires agencies to submit information on what's been accomplished in the past year, to allow HBP managers to monitor progress.
- HBP managers may present updated annual survey form at next meeting.

### **4. Programming Changes**

- b. Include cost escalation factors with project programming.**

#### Comments

- HBP managers are reluctant to endorse this proposal. Local agencies should calculate cost escalation and include it in the LAGP 6-A or 6-D.
- LAPM should highlight that agencies must estimate the cost of projects in year-of-expenditure dollars.
- Recommend all agencies use the industry standard for escalation, such as provide by Engineering News Record.

### **5. High-cost Bridges**

- a. Cap HBP funding on High Cost Bridge Projects to \$80 mil.**

#### Comments

- This proposal would allow agencies to get conversions for high-cost projects within one FTIP cycle.
- \$80M seems too low—what about \$250M?
- Change the conversion amount of \$20M per FTIP year.
- Five current projects would no longer receive over \$80M HBP if cap changes to \$80M.
- Consider cap as a percentage of the whole program vs. a defined number. What if the program does get more funding?
- Using percentages would mean looking separately at On- vs. Off-system. \$250M cap means one bridge takes up one year's worth of FTIP programming. Lower limit would avoid over-committing the program to one project; would also encourage the use of multi-funding streams for large projects.
- HBP drafted a new definition of high-cost bridge project. This was emailed to the committee on 4/17/20, for discussion in June.

## 6. Other considerations

**a. All bridge projects start as rehabilitation or BPMP, proposed replacements must be justified and approved by HBP managers.**

### Comments

- The reason for this proposal is to clean up guidelines for inspection report and eligibility, following the change in January 2018 to poor-fair-good rating rather than “structurally deficient.” It also emphasizes the principle that just because a local agency wants a certain project scope doesn’t mean this is the best choice
- The idea is to prevent agencies from committing to bridge replacements too early. Have more consideration of “what’s wrong with the bridge and determining appropriate scope up front.
- To encourage a more thoughtful approach to scoping, consider language such as “engineering review to determine structural needs” rather than automatically starting with rehabilitation or BPMP.
- In the example of a timber bridge with SR rating less than 50, would this still have to start out as rehabilitation, then agency would need to provide justification for replacement? In such a case the justification process should be a simple conversation rather than numerous reports.
- Consider adding a metric such as “bridges that are under 100 years old” or another number, rather than have a blanket expectation—so agencies can develop their project scopes more independently.

## 6. Other considerations

**c. Only minimum AASHTO standards is eligible.**

Comments

- The idea behind this proposal is to be fair and equitable statewide. If local agencies have standards such as “must be 14 feet wide with trees” this isn’t fair for others.
- Consider adding “and/or NACTO standards” and “width needed to accommodate ADA compliance.” Ross noted that feedback from his agencies is that AASHTO standards do not encourage the bike transit sufficiently. He will provide more information about how much NACTO standards differ from AASHTO standards.

**7. Review New Action Items**

No new action items

**8. Roundtable**

- Jason Vivian will not attend next meeting.
- HBP managers indicated there are no updates yet on any HBP impacts expected due to revised revenue estimates
- Matt noted that CSAC is working on advocating for more bridge funding for the whole HBP; he will follow up with League of Cities about coordinating efforts. He sent data and talking points to Ross and José Luis.
- Matt will also send a link out for his new blog to communicate about HBP committee activities. It’s an idea for another way to engage 58 counties and hundreds of city transportation agencies
- Ross mentioned the potential for stimulus money from Congress to backfill lost revenues such as sales taxes and tolls normally for transportation. Hopefully this will be followed up with a stimulus for getting new projects out for job creation. With these, there may be an opportunity for more money for the bridge program.
- José Luis said regions may opt to forgo adopting a new FTIP this year. So, 2023 will be considered a “beyond” year and EPSP won’t work
- Greg said he and Matt have been working on presentation for CEAC meeting (was to be in Monterey—was cancelled). It compares 2019 to 2010 data on downward trend of bridge work completed with available funding. He will ask to be on the June agenda to talk about a needs-based approach to bridge projects.
- HBP managers said that as of today, the project delivery agreements for seismic projects are still due May 31—HBP managers will update when all is finalized with CTC.

**Local Assistance HBP FFY 19/20 Fund Status  
As of 06/03/2020**

Fund Type	FFY 2019-20									Balances (Includes pending obligatons only)
	Carry-over Balance FFY 18/19	New FFY 19/20 HBP Funds (\$303M minus 2% SPR)	Transfers (The NHPP exchange is for tracking purposes only. No actual exchange has taken place.)	FFY 19/20 Deobligations (+)	FFY 19/20 Obligations (-)	Projects in Districts (-)	FFY 19/20 Projects in HQ, not ready for reserve (-)	FFY 19/20 Pending Obligations (-)	Projected Balance	
<b>On/Off Federal Aid Highway Flex Funds</b> (Pre MAP-21 and Map-21 STP funds and Pre-Map-21 HBP Funds)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,889,932	(\$2,564,269)	\$0	\$1,518,218	(\$242,235)	\$1,601,646	\$83,428
<b>Off Federal Aid Highway Set Aside Funds</b> (MAP-21 STP and Pre-MAP-21 HBP Funds)	\$0	\$74,908,951	\$0	\$3,991,459	(\$66,884,526)	\$0	(\$20,482,633)	(\$7,273,192)	(\$15,739,940)	\$4,742,692
<b>National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) Funds</b> (Projects on the National Highway System)	(\$25,856,087)	\$214,000,000	\$0	\$3,377,726	(\$161,302,680)	\$0	(\$30,069,419)	(\$15,364,022)	(\$15,214,483)	\$14,854,936
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>(\$25,856,087)</b>	<b>\$288,908,951</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$10,259,117</b>	<b>(\$230,751,475)</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$49,033,834)</b>	<b>(\$22,879,449)</b>	<b>(\$29,352,777)</b>	<b>\$19,681,056</b>

Federal Fiscal Year	Bond		SHA	
	CTC Allocation	Initial Current Encumbrances	CTC Allocation	Initial Project Encumbrances
13/14 and prior	\$50,440,741	\$44,648,818	\$24,300,000	\$21,035,687
14/15	\$7,028,096	\$1,309,500		\$138,787
15/16	\$10,239,205	\$9,020,624		
16/17	\$9,790,000	\$9,057,675		
17/18	\$2,187,216	\$2,032,981		
18/19		\$3,231,440		
19/20	\$5,442,720			
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$85,127,978</b>	<b>\$69,301,038</b>	<b>\$24,300,000</b>	<b>\$21,174,474</b>

Past Apportionment Delivery	
Federal Fiscal Year	Obligations
Jun-15	\$182,665,199
Jun-16	\$168,037,250
Jun-17	\$182,479,877
Jun-18	\$244,638,429
Jun-19	\$227,625,432

On/Off, Off, and STP Flavored HBP funds obligated on Off Federal Aid Highway Bridges (FFY):	Obligations Off FA Highways	% of State+Local HBP Funds	State+Local HBP Funds
14/15	\$106,244,063	141.8%	\$74,908,951
15/16	\$97,826,162	130.6%	\$74,908,951
16/17	\$76,559,851	102.2%	\$74,908,951
17/18	\$74,478,754	99.4%	\$74,908,951
18/19	\$72,573,513	96.9%	\$74,908,951
19/20	\$62,287,592	83.2%	\$74,908,951

(Note: Only Local HBP funds under MAP-21)

Toll Credit Status (FFY)	Obligations
14/15	\$9,983,561
15/16	\$7,297,316
16/17	\$9,353,469
17/18	\$14,601,956
18/19	\$7,540,196
19/20	\$4,912,331

(Note: Toll Credits were used on some On Federal Aid Highway projects to supplant Seismic Prop 1B funds used for R/W.)

OA Delivery	Federal Fiscal Year	OA Allocation	Obligations	%OA Delivery
	13/14	\$193,328,473	\$308,943,306	159.8%
	14/15	\$176,811,980	\$233,964,053	132.3%
	15/16	\$220,469,180	\$333,194,580	151.1%
	16/17	\$181,913,046	\$277,789,936	152.7%
	17/18	\$197,241,101	\$291,007,658	147.5%
	18/19	\$192,715,787	\$328,860,651	170.6%
	19/20 (Projected)	\$173,509,225	\$230,751,475	117.0%

March 2020 HBP Project Prioritization - ON SYSTEM

	Priority Rank	Dist	Local Agency	Bridge No.	Project Description	SR	Status	Scour 113	Posted? Y/N	Posting K, D, P, or R NBI 41	Detour Length (miles) NBI 19	Future ADT NBI 114	Year Built	Year Recon.	Total Federal Funds	Running Federal Funds total	Date of Application
1	1	2	Trinity County	05C0039	Replace	28.5	SD	2	N		123.6	426	1955		\$ 2,613,111	\$ 2,613,111	2/28/2018
2	1	3	Butte County	12C0009L	Replace	7.0	SD	2	N		18.0	12,054	1949	-	\$ 5,920,886	\$ 8,533,997	8/21/2018
3	1	7	City of Pasadena	53C0757	Voluntary Seismic Retrofit (HBP)	75.9	FO	8	N		1.9	1,140	1922	-	\$ 9,291,230	\$ 17,825,227	10/16/2018
4	1	7	City of Ventura (San Bu	52C0061	Replace	31.1	SD	2	N		1.2	6,853	1932	1995	\$ 36,700,112	\$ 54,525,339	5/6/2019
5	2	1	Willits	10C0198	Replace	31.6	SD	8	Y	P	1.2	2137	1993		\$ 5,985,062	\$ 60,510,401	11/22/2019
6	3	3	Butte County	12C0022	Scour	40.0	SD	3	N		24.8	5,200	1965	-	\$ 1,250,044	\$ 61,760,445	11/22/2019
7	4	1	Humboldt County	04C0189	Replace	30.1	SD	8	N		123.6	205	1935	-	\$ 9,274,226	\$ 71,034,671	11/27/2019
8	4	8	San Bernardino County	54C0239	Replace	37.3	SD	5	N		39.7	275	1930	-	\$ 5,173,693	\$ 76,208,364	11/21/2019
9	4	5	San Luis Obispo County	49C0346	Replace	20.7	SD	U	N		8.1	569	1965		\$ 4,546,016	\$ 80,754,380	10/9/2019
10	4	4	Town of San Anselmo	27C0094	Replace	29.3	SD	8	N		1.2	2,708	1935	-	\$ 4,320,795	\$ 85,075,175	3/6/2019
11	5	1	Humboldt County	04C0061	Rehab	51.5	SD	8	N		67.1	38	1955	1993	\$ 1,473,316	\$ 86,548,491	11/27/2019
12	5	7	Long Beach	53C0208	Remove Bridge	67.5	SD	N	N	-	1.2	19,769	1932		\$ 12,721,761	\$ 99,270,252	5/30/2019
13	6	2	Shasta County	06C0192	BPMP (HBP) stand alone	35.6	SD	8	N		21.1	2,769	1987		\$ 121,641	\$ 99,391,893	11/6/2019
14	6	3	Sacramento County	24c0005	BPMP (HBP)	39.4		U	N		14.9	6,626	1952		\$ 7,303,725	\$ 106,695,618	10/30/2019
15	6	8	City of Rialto	54C0063	BPMP (HBP) stand alone	78.2	SD	N	N		3.1	49000	1959	1972	\$ 500,000	\$ 107,195,618	11/21/2019
16	6	2	Tehama County	PM00200	BPMP (HBP)										\$ 1,006,510	\$ 108,202,128	9/19/2018
17	6	8	City of La Quinta	PM00201	BPMP (HBP)										\$ 4,862,972	\$ 113,065,100	7/15/2018
18	6	7	City of Ventura	PM00202	BPMP (HBP)										\$ 1,893,657	\$ 114,958,757	10/17/2018
19	6	4	City of Novato	PM00205	BPMP (HBP)										\$ 198,307	\$ 115,157,064	10/1/2018
20	6	4	City of Sunnyvale	PM00204	BPMP (HBP)										\$ 2,764,526	\$ 117,921,590	7/18/2018
21	6	4	City of Santa Clara	PM00199	BPMP (HBP)										\$ 1,645,871	\$ 119,567,461	3/1/2019
22	6	7	City of Long Beach	PM00206	BPMP (HBP)										\$ 948,455	\$ 120,515,916	8/17/2018
23	6	6	Shasta County	PM00213	BPMP (HBP)										\$ 434,394	\$ 120,950,310	10/10/2019
24	6	6	Fresno County	PM00214	BPMP (HBP)										\$ 281,106	\$ 121,231,416	10/4/2019
25	6	11	City of Escondido	PM00216	BPMP (HBP)										\$ 350,243	\$ 121,581,659	10/11/2019
26	6	10	San Joaquin County	PM00215	BPMP (HBP)										\$ 7,393,694	\$ 128,975,353	10/4/2019
27	6	3	Shasta County	PM00213	BPMP (HBP)										\$ 434,394	\$ 129,409,747	10/10/2019
28	7	12	Laguna Niguel	55C0037	Rehabilitation (HBP)	45.1	FO	8	N	-	123.6	7324	1938	-	\$ 2,895,196	\$ 132,304,943	9/23/2016
29	7	10	San Joaquin County	29C0349	Replace (HBP)	48.2	FO	-	N	-	123.6	3,000	1950	-	\$ 5,488,861	\$ 137,793,804	9/9/2016
30	7	5	San Luis Obispo	49C0398	Replace (HBP)	39.2	FO	-	N	-	123.6	2,061	1922	-	\$ 2,334,802	\$ 140,128,606	9/16/2016
31	7	10	Stanislaus County	38C0199	Replace (HBP)	77.8	FO	-	N	-	34.2	909	1918	1968	\$ 1,760,862	\$ 141,889,468	9/26/2016
32	7	10	Stanislaus County	38C0268	Replace (HBP)	71.0	FO	8	N	-	19.9	1,527	1927	-	\$ 3,802,409	\$ 145,691,877	9/26/2016
33	7	10	San Joaquin County	29C0035	Rehabilitation (HBP)	76.1	FO	-	N	-	11.8	3,207	1955	-	\$ 3,619,549	\$ 149,311,426	9/9/2016
34	7	3	El Dorado County	25C0063	Rehabilitation (HBP)	64.7	FO	U	N	-	11.2	1462	1930	-	\$ 2,875,013	\$ 152,186,439	9/29/2016
35	7	6	Fresno County	42C0118	Rehabilitation (HBP)	76.6	FO	-	N	-	9.9	1,048	1946	-	\$ 1,304,932	\$ 153,491,371	6/28/2016
36	7	6	Tulare County	46C0182	Rehabilitation (HBP)	51.5	FO	-	N	-	6.8	3,679	1949	-	\$ 2,202,627	\$ 155,693,998	7/25/2016
37	7	3	Placer County	19C0079	Replace (HBP)	52.9	FO	8	N	-	6.8	1562	1935		\$ 2,118,966	\$ 157,812,964	9/30/2016
38	7	3	Placer County	19C0051	Rehabilitation (HBP)	59.5	FO	5	N	-	6.2	18000	1930	1981	\$ 2,133,573	\$ 159,946,537	9/30/2016
39	7	12	Orange County	55C0008	Replace (HBP)	72.1	FO	-	N	-	6.2	8,437	1980	-	\$ 6,374,160	\$ 166,320,697	3/16/2016
40	7	10	San Joaquin County	29C0225	Rehabilitation (HBP)	60.1	FO	8	N	-	6.2	2144	1928		\$ 1,849,923	\$ 168,170,620	9/23/2016
41	7	10	Stanislaus County	38C0080	Rehabilitation (HBP)	52.4	FO	-	N	-	6.2	1,886	1934	-	\$ 2,048,850	\$ 170,219,470	9/26/2016
42	7	6	Fresno County	42C0253	Rehabilitation (HBP)	72.3	FO	-	N	-	6.2	1,587	1924	-	\$ 1,573,178	\$ 171,792,648	6/28/2016
43	7	3	Chico	12C0106	Replace (HBP)	59.8	FO	5	N	-	5.0	14,330	1969	-	\$ 6,325,469	\$ 178,118,117	8/3/2016
44	7	5	San Luis Obispo	49C0372	Replace (HBP)	54.1	FO	-	N	-	3.1	30,912	1958	1974	\$ 2,820,123	\$ 180,938,240	9/16/2016
45	7	3	Placer County	19C0076	Replace (HBP)	65.6	FO	8	N	-	3.1	7910	1973	1983	\$ 4,894,381	\$ 185,832,621	9/30/2016

### March 2020 HBP Project Prioritization - ON SYSTEM

	Priority Rank	Dist	Local Agency	Bridge No.	Project Description	SR	Status	Scour 113	Posted? Y/N	Posting K, D, P, or R NBI 41	Detour Length (miles) NBI 19	Future ADT NBI 114	Year Built	Year Recon.	Total Federal Funds	Running Federal Funds total	Date of Application
46	7	5	San Luis Obispo	49C0380	Replace (HBP)	48.2	FO	-	N	-	3.1	3,606	1920	-	\$ 4,077,692	\$ 189,910,313	9/16/2016
47	7	7	Los Angeles County	53C0440	Rehabilitation (HBP)	73.4	FO	-	N	-	1.9	30,451	1952	-	\$ 1,548,390	\$ 191,458,703	9/8/2016
48	7	7	Long Beach	53C0729	Rehabilitation (HBP)	75.4	FO	-	N	-	1.9	17,200	1958	-	\$ 1,680,742	\$ 193,139,445	9/8/2016
49	7	11	Imperial County	58C0028	Replace	56.7	FO	5	N	-	1.9	8579	1925	1947	\$ 2,330,110	\$ 195,469,555	7/26/2016
50	7	3	Placer County	19C0074	Replace (HBP)	52.4	FO	8	N	-	1.9	7000	1930	-	\$ 3,053,843	\$ 198,523,398	9/30/2016
51	7	6	Tulare County	46C0056	Replace (HBP)	77.5	FO	-	N	-	1.9	4,731	1937	-	\$ 2,160,132	\$ 200,683,530	7/25/2016
52	7	6	Tulare County	46C0148	Rehabilitation (HBP)	58.4	FO	-	N	-	1.9	4,204	1949	-	\$ 1,971,564	\$ 202,655,094	7/25/2016
53	7	10	San Joaquin County	29C0317	Rehabilitation	53.1	FO	-	N	-	1.9	1599	1945	-	\$ 889,727	\$ 203,544,821	9/9/2016
54	7	8	San Bernardino County	54C0127	Replace (HBP)	76.2	FO	-	N	-	1.2	11,221	1939	-	\$ 11,774,490	\$ 215,319,311	6/23/2016
55	7	5	San Luis Obispo	49C0370	Replace (HBP)	51.3	FO	-	N	-	1.2	10,304	1935	1954	\$ 2,174,120	\$ 217,493,431	9/16/2016
56	7	3	Chico	12C0279	Rehabilitation (HBP)	77.5	FO	-	N	-	1.2	2,490	1958	-	\$ 2,175,166	\$ 219,668,597	9/13/2016
57	8	3	Butte County	00L0092	Low Water Xing (HBP)										\$ 14,441,899	\$ 234,110,496	7/19/2016
58	8	5	San Luis Obispo County	00L0095	Low Water Xing (HBP)										\$ 8,760,897	\$ 242,871,393	8/4/2016
59	8	11	San Diego County	00L0105	Low Water Xing (HBP)								-	-	\$ 8,159,509	\$ 251,030,902	9/15/2016
60	Not Ranked	8	Barstow	54C0090	Replace	32.8	SD		N	-	0.8	5291	1939	-	\$ 14,189,822	\$ 265,220,724	12/19/2016

March 2020 HBP Project Prioritization - OFF SYSTEM

	Priority Rank	Dist.	Local Agency	Bridge No.	Project Description	SR	Status	Scour 113	Posted? Y/N	Posting K, D, P, or R NBI 41	Detour Length (miles) NBI 19	Future ADT NBI 114	Year Built	Year Recon.	Total Federal Funds	Running Federal Funds total	Date of Application
1	1	2	Trinity County	05C0144	BPMP (HBP) stand alone scour/f	28.7	SD	2	N		123.6	21	1950	1990	\$ 2,640,000	\$ 2,640,000	8/21/2019
2	2	3	Nevada County	17C0028	Replace	22.8	SD	5	Y	P	11.2	27	1952	-	\$ 2,086,000	\$ 4,726,000	11/29/2019
3	2	3	El Dorado County	25C0078	Replace	18.2	SD	8	Y	P	6.8	350	1940	1994	\$ 2,558,000	\$ 7,284,000	10/31/2019
4	2	2	Lassen County	07C0040	Replace	39.9	SD	U	Y	P	5.0	267	1978	-	\$ 2,293,000	\$ 9,577,000	11/27/2019
5	2	1	CalFire	10F0056	Replace	26.3	SD	8	Y	P	0.6	31	2005	-	\$ 455,000	\$ 10,032,000	1/1/2019
6	3	3	Butte County	12C0301	Scour	49.7	SD	3	N		123.6	210	1921	-	\$ 759,500	\$ 10,791,500	11/21/2019
7	3	6	Tulare County	46C0313	BPMP (HBP) stand alone scour	30.8	SD	3	N		123.6	200	1932	1952	\$ 620,000	\$ 11,411,500	2/12/2020
8	3	1	CalFire	04F0001	Scour	68.5	-	3	N		123.6	160	1965	-	\$ 393,000	\$ 11,804,500	3/12/2019
9	3	2	Trinity County	05C0147	Scour & Painting	79.8	-	3	N		123.6	15	1950	1990	\$ 2,640,000	\$ 14,444,500	11/19/2019
10	3	1	County of Lake	14C0114	Scour	59.7	SD	3	N		24.2	308	1930	1993	\$ 111,020	\$ 14,555,520	11/27/2019
11	3	1	CalFire	10F0011	Replace	41.8	SD	3	N		11.2	115	1948	-	\$ 502,000	\$ 15,057,520	1/1/2019
12	3	1	CalFire	10F0051	Scour	89.0	-	3	N		9.9	31	1981	-	\$ 187,000	\$ 15,244,520	1/1/2019
13	3	1	CalFire	10F0022	Scour	89.0	-	3	N		6.2	31	1980	-	\$ 187,000	\$ 15,431,520	1/1/2019
14	4	2	Shasta County	06C0297	Replace	44.0	SD	5	N		123.6	240	1925	-	\$ 1,249,000	\$ 16,680,520	10/22/2019
15	4	6	Tulare County	46C0118	Replace	48.8	SD	U	N		123.6	100	1936	-	\$ 2,720,000	\$ 19,400,520	11/27/2019
16	4	1	CalFire	10F0037	Replace	43.9	SD	5	N		123.6	12	1992	-	\$ 380,000	\$ 19,780,520	1/1/2019
17	4	3	Nevada County	17C0057	Replace	33.5	SD	U	N		9.9	80	1920	-	\$ 2,622,000	\$ 22,402,520	5/6/2019
18	4	3	El Dorado County	25C0090	Replace (HBP)	31.0	SD	8	N		8.1	2305	1936	-	\$ 4,318,750	\$ 26,721,270	9/29/2016
19	2	2	Lassen County	07C0041	Replace	32.0	SD	U	Y	P	5.0	191	1978	-	\$ 2,265,000	\$ 28,986,270	11/27/2019
20	4	3	El Dorado County	25C0085	Rehabilitation (HBP)	31.6	SD	U	N		3.1	3059	1928	-	\$ 3,387,500	\$ 32,373,770	9/29/2016
21	4	4	Town of San Anselmo	27C0101	Replace (HBP)	20.0	SD	8	N		1.2	12,000	1935	-	\$ 5,595,400	\$ 37,969,170	7/18/2018
22	4	4	Contra Costa County	28C0383	Replace	44.6	SD	5	N		1.2	6,800	1954	-	\$ 7,506,200	\$ 45,475,370	9/20/2019
23	4	6	Madera County	41C0155	Replace	49.9	SD	5	N	-	1.2	295	1955	-	\$ 653,000	\$ 46,128,370	12/19/2016
24	5	6	Tulare County	46C0370	Rehabilitation (HBP)	62.8	SD	-	N	-	123.6	77	1949	-	\$ 1,777,000	\$ 47,905,370	7/25/2016
25	5	1	CalFire	10F0019	Replace	51.0	SD	U	N		123.6	3	1965	2009	\$ 436,000	\$ 48,341,370	1/1/2019
26	5	5	San Luis Obispo County	49C0093	Replace	62.0	SD	U	N		26.1	294	1940	-	\$ 4,110,000	\$ 52,451,370	10/15/2019
27	5	1	CalFire	10F0057	Replace	51.0	SD	5	N		21.1	12	1997	-	\$ 524,000	\$ 52,975,370	1/1/2019
28	5	1	County of Lake	14C0089	Rehab	69.6	SD	8	N		19.9	169	1979	-	\$ 100,720	\$ 53,076,090	11/27/2019
29	5	6	Tulare County	46C0216	Replace (HBP)	51.5	SD	-	N	-	9.9	536	1942	-	\$ 1,516,000	\$ 54,592,090	7/25/2016
30	5	6	Tulare County	46C0215	Replace (HBP)	50.6	SD	-	N	-	8.7	536	1942	-	\$ 1,305,000	\$ 55,897,090	7/25/2016
31	5	6	Tulare County	46C0325	Rehabilitation (HBP)	66.4	SD	-	N	-	3.7	268	1949	-	\$ 1,777,000	\$ 57,674,090	7/25/2016
32	5	2	CalFire	06F0030	Replace	60.2	SD	8	N		3.1	35	1994	-	\$ 867,200	\$ 58,541,290	11/6/2019
33	5	6	Tulare County	46C0225	Rehab	41.9	SD	5	N		1.9	1920	1949	-	\$ 100,000	\$ 58,641,290	11/27/2019
34	5	7	Long Beach	53C0024	Replace (HBP)	54.2	SD	-	N	-	1.2	1,346	1953	-	\$ 4,423,000	\$ 63,064,290	7/15/2016
35	6	2	Trinity County	05C0122	Painting	76.7	SD	8	N		123.6	160	1960	-	\$ 825,000	\$ 63,889,290	12/5/2019
36	6	4	Contra Costa County	28C0495	Painting	45.2	SD	5	N		123.6	150	2001	-	\$ 184,200	\$ 64,073,490	1/21/2020
37	6	4	Contra Costa County	28C0207	BPMP (HBP) stand alone deck/p	47.8	SD	N	N		3.1	5,063	1965	-	\$ 1,051,200	\$ 65,124,690	11/25/2019
38	6	4	Contra Costa County	28C0389	Painting	68.7	-	5	N		1.9	747	1946	2003	\$ 630,000	\$ 65,754,690	1/22/2020
39	6	6	Tulare County	46C0229	BPMP (HBP) stand alone	47.0	SD	8	N		1.9	54	1949	-	\$ 100,000	\$ 65,854,690	11/27/2019
40	7	10	Sonora	32C0075	Rehabilitation (HBP)	48.8	FO	-	N	-	123.6	8,666	1940	-	\$ 1,165,000	\$ 67,019,690	9/29/2016
41	7	3	El Dorado County	25C0082	Rehabilitation (HBP)	68.3	FO	5	N		123.6	6286	1966	-	\$ 3,897,750	\$ 70,917,440	9/29/2016
42	7	10	San Joaquin County	29C0348	Replace (HBP)	44.0	FO	-	N	-	123.6	3,000	1950	-	\$ 6,200,000	\$ 77,117,440	9/9/2016
43	7	10	Tuolumne County	32C0023	Replace (HBP)	46.6	FO	-	N	-	123.6	586	1925	-	\$ 678,500	\$ 77,795,940	5/20/2016
44	7	6	Fresno County	42C0495	Replace (HBP)	70.6	FO	-	N	-	123.6	180	1934	1978	\$ 1,076,000	\$ 78,871,940	6/28/2016
45	7	1	Humboldt County	04C0057	Replace (HBP)	44.4	FO	-	N	-	123.6	170	1923	-	\$ 2,203,600	\$ 81,075,540	9/2/2016

March 2020 HBP Project Prioritization - OFF SYSTEM

	Priority Rank	Dist.	Local Agency	Bridge No.	Project Description	SR	Status	Scour 113	Posted? Y/N	Posting K, D, P, or R NBI 41	Detour Length (miles) NBI 19	Future ADT NBI 114	Year Built	Year Recon.	Total Federal Funds	Running Federal Funds total	Date of Application
46	7	2	Trinity County	05C0025	Replace (HBP)	48.2	FO	-	N	-	123.6	159	1970	-	\$ 2,814,781	\$ 83,890,321	9/26/2016
47	7	10	Tuolumne County	32C0038	Rehabilitation (HBP)	50.9	FO	-	N	-	41.0	533	1925	-	\$ 997,500	\$ 84,887,821	5/10/2016
48	7	6	Tulare County	46C0183	Rehabilitation (HBP)	68.6	FO	-	N	-	31.7	156	1956	-	\$ 629,000	\$ 85,516,821	7/25/2016
49	7	6	Tulare County	46C0189	Rehabilitation (HBP)	79.3	FO	-	N	-	29.2	102	1938	-	\$ 835,000	\$ 86,351,821	7/25/2016
50	7	3	El Dorado County	25C0083	Rehabilitation (HBP)	56.0	FO	8	N	-	13.0	1567	1930	-	\$ 3,187,500	\$ 89,539,321	9/29/2016
51	7	10	San Joaquin County	29C0368	Replace (HBP)	70.2	FO	-	N	-	11.8	350	1961	-	\$ 1,711,800	\$ 91,251,121	9/9/2016
52	7	6	Tulare County	46C0010	Rehabilitation (HBP)	69.0	FO	-	N	-	8.7	1,069	1917	-	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 93,651,121	7/25/2016
53	7	2	Plumas County	09C0037	Rehabilitation (HBP)	68.5	FO	-	N	-	8.7	734	1953	-	\$ 818,000	\$ 94,469,121	9/22/2016
54	7	6	Fresno County	42C0512	Replace (HBP)	79.6	FO	-	N	-	8.7	400	1940	1982	\$ 1,776,000	\$ 96,245,121	6/28/2016
55	7	3	El Dorado County	25C0089	Rehabilitation (HBP)	69.1	FO	8	N	-	8.1	2088	1931	-	\$ 3,272,500	\$ 99,517,621	9/29/2016
56	7	10	San Joaquin County	29C0352	Rehabilitation (HBP)	60.7	FO	-	N	-	8.1	600	1950	-	\$ 1,644,390	\$ 101,162,011	9/1/2016
57	7	10	San Joaquin County	29C0272	Replace (HBP)	71.7	FO	-	N	-	8.1	97	1956	-	\$ 1,622,200	\$ 102,784,211	9/9/2016
58	7	3	El Dorado County	25C0097	Rehabilitation (HBP)	66.0	FO	8	N	-	6.8	1467	1930	-	\$ 3,330,000	\$ 106,114,211	9/29/2016
59	7	6	Tulare County	46C0012	Rehabilitation (HBP)	69.8	FO	-	N	-	5.0	1,069	1916	-	\$ 1,780,000	\$ 107,894,211	7/25/2016
60	7	6	Fresno County	42C0419	Replace (HBP)	73.6	FO	-	N	-	3.7	1,059	1948	1970	\$ 1,157,000	\$ 109,051,211	6/28/2016
61	7	3	Placer County	19C0132	Replace (HBP)	53.4	FO	8	N	-	3.7	1048	1935	-	\$ 4,918,000	\$ 113,969,211	9/30/2016
62	7	3	Placer County	19C0122	Replace (HBP)	65.4	FO	5	N	-	3.7	1048	1928	-	\$ 4,109,500	\$ 118,078,711	9/30/2016
63	7	2	Trinity County	05C0049	Bridge Rehabilitation/Painting	66.1	FO	U	N	-	3.7	53	1935	1993	\$ 1,072,500	\$ 119,151,211	9/30/2016
64	7	5	Santa Cruz County	36C0041	Replace (HBP)	72.2	FO	-	N	-	3.1	7,500	1948	-	\$ 3,959,000	\$ 123,110,211	8/29/2016
65	7	6	Fresno County	42C0407	Rehabilitation (HBP)	54.6	FO	-	N	-	3.1	6,856	1940	1950	\$ 3,149,000	\$ 126,259,211	9/13/2016
66	7	3	Placer County	19C0146	Rehabilitation (HBP)	52.2	FO	-	N	-	3.1	3,291	1930	1940	\$ 1,717,000	\$ 127,976,211	9/30/2016
67	7	6	Fresno County	42C0405	Rehabilitation (HBP)	57.7	FO	-	N	-	3.1	214	1936	-	\$ 1,149,000	\$ 129,125,211	6/28/2016
68	7	4	Oakley	28C0206	Replace (HBP)	48.3	FO	-	N	-	1.9	14,619	1938	-	\$ 2,817,523	\$ 131,942,734	9/29/2016
69	7	6	Tulare County	46C0101	Rehabilitation (HBP)	68.6	FO	-	N	-	1.9	4,333	1949	-	\$ 6,065,000	\$ 138,007,734	7/25/2016
70	7	10	Tuolumne County	32C0039	Replace (HBP)	60.7	FO	-	N	-	1.9	533	1912	-	\$ 910,800	\$ 138,918,534	5/10/2016
71	7	10	Tuolumne County	32C0002	Replace (HBP)	49.2	FO	-	N	-	1.9	380	1910	-	\$ 1,455,000	\$ 140,373,534	5/10/2016
72	7	6	Tulare County	46C0224	Rehabilitation (HBP)	49.7	FO	-	N	-	1.9	80	1949	-	\$ 2,912,000	\$ 143,285,534	7/25/2016
73	7	3	Placer County	19C0101	Replace (HBP)	57.6	FO	U	N	-	1.2	1631	1950	-	\$ 3,317,500	\$ 146,603,034	9/30/2016
74	7	3	Placer County	19C0102	Replace (HBP)	61.5	FO	U	N	-	1.2	1437	1950	-	\$ 3,317,500	\$ 149,920,534	9/30/2016
75	7	5	Santa Cruz County	36C0136	Replace (HBP)	48.8	FO	-	N	-	1.2	600	1948	-	\$ 2,746,000	\$ 152,666,534	9/27/2016
76	7	6	Tulare County	46C0221	Rehabilitation (HBP)	67.1	FO	-	N	-	1.2	158	1915	-	\$ 948,000	\$ 153,614,534	7/25/2016
77	7	6	Fresno County	42C0355	Rehabilitation (HBP)	55.9	FO	-	N	-	0.6	100	1940	-	\$ 1,929,000	\$ 155,543,534	6/28/2016



Move BPMP Priority from 6 to 3.

Per the LAPG Chapter 6 HBP Guidelines, on page 23, new projects are prioritized to determine how many projects will be allowed into the Highway Bridge Program. The priority goes from 1 (highest) seismic retrofit project and scour critical bridges with NBI 113 $\leq$ 2 to the lowest priority 8 low water crossings dated prior to 10/1/16. Currently, BPMP projects are in priority 6. HBP managers propose to move BPMP projects from priority 6 to 3. The current priority 3 would become priority 4 and the rest to follow to priority 8. The purpose of the change of priority is to place an emphasis on local agencies keeping their bridges in good condition through preventative maintenance.

Existing HBP Guidelines read:

**Project Prioritization Policy**

*The National Bridge Inventory (NBI) coding from the Bridge Inspection Reports will be used in the prioritization process. The prioritization below will be used to determine programming priorities for developing financially constrained HBP lists. The priority established will determine when the Preliminary Engineering (PE) phase will be programmed. New projects will only be available for programming into the two additional years of a new FTIP/FSTIP cycle.*

*The lowest priority number is the highest priority.*

**PRIORITY 1:**

*Seismic retrofit projects and Scour countermeasure projects or rehabilitation and/or replacement of scour critical bridges (NBI Item 113 $\leq$ 2).*

**PRIORITY 2:**

*Bridges that have major structural deficiencies causing the bridge to be posted or closed. The NBI Item 41 Structure Open, Posted, or Closed to Traffic will be utilized to determine the sort order. The sort will be:*

- 1. K = bridge closed to traffic*
- 2. D = bridge open, would be posted or closed except for temporary shoring*
- 3. P = bridge posted for load*
- 4. R = bridge posted with restrictions not load.*

**PRIORITY 3:**

*Scour countermeasure projects or rehabilitation of scour critical bridges (NBI Item 113=3).*

**PRIORITY 4:**

*Projects that are eligible for replacement. Structurally Deficient with a sufficiency rating less than 50.*

**PRIORITY 5:**

*Projects that are eligible for rehabilitation. Structurally Deficient with a sufficiency rating 80 or less.*

**PRIORITY 6:**

*Bridge Preventive Maintenance Plan Projects.*

**PRIORITY 7:**

*Projects that are Functionally Obsolete with application dated prior to October 1, 2016.*

**PRIORITY 8:**

*Low water crossing projects with application dated prior to October 1, 2016.*

## 1. Accountable Project Cost and Schedule

### c. All projects must have a Field Review, Type Selection, Hydraulic Report, 65% and 95% plans reviewed by HQ and/or SLA

The below red text shows the changes that would occur in the LAPG Chapter 6, the black text is the original Chapter 6 language, and the “...” shows where text was left out for this purpose.

## 6.8 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Once the project is programmed in an approved FTIP, local agencies may request PE authorization for preparation of environmental documentation for NEPA clearance. The DLAE shall ensure that funds authorized do not exceed what is programmed as shown in the HBP program lists.

### Mandatory Field Reviews

An in-person, on site formal field review is mandatory for all HBP rehabilitation and replacement projects. The objectives of field reviews for HBP projects are different in several ways from typical local agency projects. The objectives of an HBP field review include:

- Introductions between all relevant parties involved in the project development.
- Review the most recent Exhibit 6-A to ensure no revisions are necessary.
- Begin to scope the project and discuss HBP eligibility. The project will not be fully scoped until after type selection concurrence.
- Identify project constraints.
- Verify that the as-built plans accurately represent the existing conditions.
- Discuss environmental considerations and review the draft PES form, if available.

Important items to keep in mind for HBP field reviews include access, clearance, coordination, detours, environmental, falsework, obstructions, utilities, modifications, hydraulics and permits.

The field reviews must be attended by:

- Consultants, if any.
- Local agency staff knowledgeable of utilities, R/W, environmental, traffic, etc.
- Caltrans SLA, DLAE staff and District Environmental.

The field review results:

- The preliminary scope of the project is outlined.
- The existing conditions are verified and any modifications documented.
- Construction controls are identified.
- Responsibilities are reviewed.

All projects that have PE authorization after 12/31/18 must comply with the mandatory field review requirement.

### Mandatory Field Reviews for Local Seismic Safety Retrofit Projects

...

### **Mandatory Type Selection Report Review**

Type Selection Reports must be submitted to SLA and HQ-DLA for review and concurrence. Preliminary hydraulic and geotechnical reports should accompany the Type Selection Report to substantiate the alternatives studied and proposed, if applicable. This review is to ensure that the chosen structure type and associated details are the most cost-effective solution that meets the structural needs for the project. SLA's review will focus on the technical structural issues (i.e.: structure type, foundation type, hydraulics, bridge length, span configuration, etc.) and HQ-DLA's review will cover eligibility (i.e.: bridge width, approach road work, vertical and horizontal alignments, etc.). The objective of this review is to ensure that the most cost effective solution is being considered and that the preferred alternative has justification for HBP eligibility. All projects with a NEPA clear date after 12/31/20 must comply with this mandatory Type Selection Report review requirement.

### **Mandatory Strategy Meetings for Local Seismic Safety Retrofit Projects**

...

### **Cost/Scope/Schedule Changes**

...

### **Mandatory 65% PS&E Review**

Local agencies are required to submit their 65% PS&E package for SLA review and concurrence. This mandatory review will be limited to verifying the provided plans match the agreed upon type selection report, and the appropriate design specifications and standards have been used. The estimate will also be reviewed and the associated costs shall be used to submit an Exhibit 6-D to update the programmed amounts. This review must be updated prior to construction authorization if the original PS&E approval is more than 24 months old. The objective of this review is to ensure the proposed work is HBP eligible, and the appropriate standards and specifications are being used. All projects with a NEPA clear date after 12/31/20 must comply with this mandatory 65% PS&E review requirement.

## 2. Limit HBP Funding to Basic Bridge Costs

a. All bridges are only funded at the cost of basic structural solution. No aesthetics treatment (except historic bridge projects). HBP will not pay for signature structures.

The below red text shows the changes that would occur in the LAPG Chapter 6, the black text is the original Chapter 6 language.

### Definition of Terms

**Baseline bridge** – The least cost structure necessary to span the obstructing gap. The baseline bridge must be designed to all current codes per LAPM Chapter 11 and meet the structural needs of the project.

...

### Architectural Treatments

Architectural treatments (decorative fascia, tile work, architectural lighting, exotic bridge railing, belvederes etc.) generally are not participating. Location, public input, availability of funds, and cost-effectiveness play a role in the determination of HBP participation. Architectural treatments **shall** not exceed 2% of the total construction contract item cost. Local agencies are required to justify architectural treatments in their project files for future audits.

Local agencies shall notify the DLAE to request HBP participation of architectural treatments.

The HBP participation in signature, or gateway structures will be limited to the cost of the baseline bridge. Costly structure types and structural elements will also be limited to the cost of the baseline bridge. Special historic bridge work is the only exception to this architectural treatment participation limit.

## 2. Limit HBP Funding to Basic Bridge Costs

### c. No approach roadwork beyond what is necessary to build abutments. Approach roadway costs capped at x% bridge construction cast unless otherwise approved by HBP managers

The below red text shows the changes that would occur in the LAPG Chapter 6, the black text is the original Chapter 6 language.

## 6.5 DESIGN STANDARDS

### Approach Roadway Work

Federal participation for approach roadway shall be limited to 10% of the HBP participating “Construct Bridge” as shown on page 6 of LAPG 6-A or 6-D or 200-feet for on federal-aid system projects and 400-feet for off federal-aid system, whichever is less. The approach roadway length is measured from the bridge abutment to the touchdown on the existing roadway alignment. The approach length from each abutment in excess of **this limit** requires advance approval by the HBP Managers. The HBP eligible approach roadway width will match the HBP eligible bridge width. Approach roadway costs **determine to be non-participating and documented correctly on the LAPG 6-A or 6D.**

High cost bridge projects are limited to **200-feet for on federal-aid system projects and 400-feet for off federal-aid system.**

### Detour-Stage Construction Costs

**The determination of the estimate for detour-stage construction and approach roadway on the LAPG 6-A or 6-D shall not be intertwined to circumvent the 10% rule. Detour-stage construction costs include all elements of the project such as temporary work (primarily for maintaining traffic), detours, etc., includes all labor materials and incidental costs for the installation and removal of all items necessary to maintain reasonable flow of traffic and safety during construction of the proposed work, railroad work, temporary or detour structures (and their removal), signage, traffic control, signals, temporary pavement, barriers, striping, traffic management plan, supplemental work, and mobilization that are required for detour-stage construction activities. Any preparation or work that is the final approach roadway will not be included in detour-stage construction costs.**

### 3. Project Delivery Accountability and Monitoring

- a. Require regular project status report that provide project updates. This will replace the current annual survey.
- b. All changes to programmed project costs must be submitted to the HBP managers using LAPG 6-D

The below red text shows the changes that would occur in the LAPG Chapter 6, the black text is the original Chapter 6 language, and the “...” shows where text was left out for this purpose.

## 6.7 Project Programming Policy and Procedure

### Policy

...

### Procedure

...

7. Starting in July of each year, the DLAEs will survey their local agencies for next year's needs. The survey will be provided by the HBP Managers to the DLAEs. **Project cost updates shall be submitted on LAPG -6D, and approved prior to updates in the database.** The HBP FileMaker database must be updated by DLAEs by the end of September. The HBP Managers will release new statewide program lists to the MPOs for inclusion into the FTIP by the end of October of each year.

...

### Annual Project Survey

Prior to the development of program lists in October, the DLAE will request that status of currently programmed projects from local agencies. Cost and schedule information provided from the survey **shall be submitted on a LAPG -6D, and approved prior to being** incorporated into the program lists. Failure to provide status may result in project cancellation. The programming as provided in the financially constrained lists provided to the MPOs may have different funding in a different federal fiscal year than requested by the local agency in the survey **or 6D**. The financially constrained program lists are based upon the Rank Policy.

#### 4. Programming Changes

##### b. Include cost escalation factors with project programming.

The below red text shows the changes that would occur in the LAPG Chapter 6 – for cost escalation. Black text is existing Chapter 6 text.

### 6.4 Eligible Costs

#### Escalation on Project Cost Estimates

To assure that HBP projects have a good cost estimate for programming purposes, local agencies must take project schedule into account. The costs must have escalation taken into consideration for future phase programming. DLA suggests local agencies use industry standards for escalation in project costs when an application or cost/scope/schedule change is submitted.

#### Participating Cost Limits

To ensure the purpose of the HBP is being fulfilled by local agency projects, certain costs and types of work have participation limits. These limits apply to all projects funded under this chapter. See [Exhibit 6-B: HBP Special Cost Approval Checklist](#) for a summary of participating costs that require specific HBP Managers approval.

## 5. High-cost Bridges

### a. Cap HBP funding on High Cost Bridge Projects to \$80 mil.

The below red text shows the changes that would occur in the LAPG Chapter 6 – for cost escalation. Black text is existing Chapter 6 text.

#### High Cost **Bridge** Projects Programming Policy

To ensure that HBP funds are made available throughout the state on a fair and equitable basis, in compliance with federal regulations, high cost projects have additional programming policy. It has been demonstrated that high cost project commits large sums of federal funds but cannot spend the funds in one year due to local agency contract processes, time to mobilize the contractors and the time it takes to construct large project. These idle federal funds could be used to advance other projects. Cash management of high cost projects is critical to effective stewardship of the local HBP. The HBP Managers will identify the high cost projects and through the DLAE, contact the project sponsors to explain the policy.

High cost bridge projects will have a federal funding cap of \$80 million for the high cost phases. If a project has two high costs phases, the federal funding limit for both phases is \$80 million. The local project sponsor will need to provide any additional funding necessary to fully fund the project.

When a high cost project phase is ready to be programmed in the 4-year element of the FTIP, the local agency will notify the DLAE and discussions on programming the phase will begin.



## 6. Other Considerations

### a. All bridge projects start as rehabilitation or BPMP, proposed replacements must be justified and approved by HBP managers

The below red text shows the changes that would occur in the LAPG Chapter 6, the black text is the original Chapter 6 language, and the “...” shows where text was left out for this purpose.

## 6.3 REIMBURSABLE PROJECT SCOPES

### *Bridge Rehabilitation **and or Replacement***

1. All projects requesting inclusion into the HBP program as a rehabilitation or replacement project will complete a LAPG 6-A with the scope of work as rehabilitation. Bridges must be rated SD with a SR  $\leq$  80 and rated “poor” condition to be eligible candidates for inclusion into the HBP program. All deficiencies of the bridge shall be reviewed to determine the project scope. See Section 6.9 regarding how the ratings are derived from the bridge inspection report data. The local agency should indicate if the preferred scope of work is replacement even though all projects initially are scoped as rehabilitation. The DLAE managers will determine the appropriate scope of work and may use SLA, District, and local agency input to help with that determination. The level of detail will vary on a case-by-case basis. In cases where rehabilitation is not constructible or where the cost-effectiveness is self-evident, the detailed cost analysis may not be required. The cost comparison between rehabilitation and replacement shall not be the sole factor in deciding the best alternative. HBP managers may approve special cases where the best alternative is not the most cost-effective.

...

- 4 Bridge replacement may be an appropriate “rehabilitation” option if a detailed cost analysis shows that replacement is the most cost-effective solution. HBP Managers’ prior approval is required to ensure the cost analysis is HBP eligible
- 5 The HBP managers will notify the DLAE after a determination has been made whether rehabilitant or replacement scope of work is HBP eligible. If the determination that replacement is the appropriate scope of work, the HBP managers will request that a new LAPG 6-A be submitted. Concurrence must be obtained prior to approving the environmental documents and proceeding with final design and R/W.

~~Bridge Replacement~~ (This section will be removed)

## 6. Other Considerations

### c. Only minimum AASHTO standards are eligible

The below red text shows the changes that would occur in the LAPG Chapter 6, the black text is the original Chapter 6 language.

## 6.5 DESIGN STANDARDS

### Exceeding Minimum AASHTO Standards

HBP project eligibility begins at the minimum AASHTO standards **and/or NACTO standards**, exceeding these **are not HBP eligible**. Where proposed design solutions exceed AASHTO's "[A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets](#)" guidelines, the associated extra costs are not HBP participating. Minimum standards may be exceeded based on intermodal transportation considerations, serviceability issues, and good geometric design practice, **at the discretion of the local agency** and are not HBP eligible.

### Establishing Bridge Geometrics

Many areas of California are experiencing population growth and are demanding more diverse modes of transportation than in recent years. Major capital projects such as bridge rehabilitation and replacement projects can involve difficult environmental problems and expensive construction. For this reason, it is important that local agencies properly plan their bridge projects from a transportation facility point of view rather than just a "replace in kind" approach or simply rehabilitate a bridge using current ADTs.

Local agencies need to work closely with their RTPA and consult AASHTO's "A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets" or "Geometric Design of Very Low Volume Roads" to ensure that their bridge rehabilitation and replacement projects will **meet these standards**.

Bridge geometrics should be established based on future ADTs, but may also be based on other appropriate transportation planning studies involving Design Hourly Volume analysis or other rational analysis.

## High Cost Bridge Projects Talking Points

### **Talking Point 1**

The following is a recommendation to redefine high cost bridge projects. There are a few reasons for this recommendation. The definition from 2011 doesn't take into consideration inflation in project phase costs, the current spike in construction costs is making projects that really are not high cost become high cost and it is getting more difficult to provide programming capacity for the bridge projects that are not high cost.

**Existing definition:** High cost bridge projects are projects with Right of Way or Construction total costs in excess of \$20 million.

**Proposed definition:** High cost bridge project are projects with Right of Way total costs in excess of \$20 million or with Construction total costs in excess of \$35 million.

#### **Discussion:**

By adjusting the definition of a high cost bridge project, more projects on the lower end of the spectrum can advance without delay. Changing the definition would reduce the high cost agreements needed as well.

On the Federal-aid System category: Under the existing definition there are 41 high cost bridge projects. Under the new definition there would be 22 high cost projects.

Off the Federal-aid System category: Under the existing definition there are 8 high cost bridge projects. Under the new definition there would be 4 high cost projects.

### **Talking Point 2**

A second proposal is the addition of a definition for mid-level or semi-high cost projects. This mid-level definition would be for Construction total costs between \$15 million and \$35 million.

#### **Discussion:**

Create a new definition for mid-level cost for Construction. The mid-level total construction cost between \$15 million and \$35 million would have programming split between two federal fiscal years. Funding would be programmed with approximately half the total cost in the year of construction authorization along with Advance Construction (AC) for the remainder. At the same time, program the AC conversion the following year. These mid-level projects would not be bound by the 50% expenditure requirements for the AC conversion the following year. This allows more ready to advertise projects to begin in the year needed.

Typically, the year a project receives an authorization to proceed, the out of pocket expenditures are lower due to advertising, bid opening, awarding and in stream construction schedules.

Adding a new definition of project between high cost and not high cost is an idea for consideration that has pros and cons. While it provides the opportunity for more construction projects at the time needed, programming construction this way adds another new layer of actions for projects that currently doesn't exist. There would be a minimum of two requests for construction authorization from the local agency. Looking at the current subset of programmed projects:

On the Federal-aid System category: Under the new definition there would be 38 mid-level projects and 370 regular projects.

Off the Federal-aid System category: Under the new definition there would be 5 mid-level projects and 363 regular projects.