

Federal Highway Administration, DOT

§ 650.707

and current inventories together with recommendations for further improvements.

Subparts E-F [Reserved]

Subpart G—Discretionary Bridge Candidate Rating Factor

SOURCE: 48 FR 52296, Nov. 17, 1983, unless otherwise noted.

§ 650.701 Purpose.

The purpose of this regulation is to describe a rating factor used as part of a selection process of allocation of discretionary bridge funds made available to the Secretary of Transportation under 23 U.S.C. 144.

§ 650.703 Eligible projects.

(a) Deficient highway bridges on Federal-aid highway system roads may be eligible for allocation of discretionary bridge funds to the same extent as they are for bridge funds apportioned under 23 U.S.C. 144, provided that the total project cost for a discretionary bridge candidate is at least \$10 million or twice the amount of 23 U.S.C. 144 funds apportioned to the State during the fiscal year for which funding for the candidate bridge is requested.

(b) After November 14, 2002 only candidate bridges not previously selected with a computed rating factor of 100 or

less and ready to begin construction in the fiscal year in which funds are available for obligation will be eligible for consideration.

(c) Projects from States that have transferred Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation funds to other funding categories will not be eligible for funding the following fiscal year.

[48 FR 52296, Nov. 17, 1983, as amended at 67 FR 63542, Oct. 15, 2002]

§ 650.705 Application for discretionary bridge funds.

Each year through its field offices, the FHWA will issue an annual call for discretionary bridge candidate submittals including updates of previously submitted but not selected projects. Each State is responsible for submitting such data as required for candidate bridges. Data requested will include structure number, funds needed by fiscal year, total project cost, current average daily truck traffic and a narrative describing the existing bridge, the proposed new or rehabilitated bridge and other relevant factors which the State believes may warrant special consideration.

§ 650.707 Rating factor.

(a) The following formula is to be used in the selection process for ranking discretionary bridge candidates.

$$\text{Rating Factor (RF)} = \frac{\text{SR}}{\text{N}} \times \frac{\text{TPC}}{\text{ADT}} \times \left[1 + \frac{\text{Unobligated HBRRP Balance}}{\text{Total HBRRP Funds Received}} \right]$$

The lower the rating factor, the higher the priority for selection and funding.

(b) The terms in the rating factor are defined as follows:

(1) SR is Sufficiency Rating computed as illustrated in appendix A of the Recording and Coding Guide for the Structure Inventory and Appraisal of the Nation's Bridges, USDOT/FHWA (latest edition); (If SR is less than 1.0, use SR=1.0);

(2) ADT is Average Daily Traffic in thousands taking the most current value from the national bridge inventory data;

(3) ADTT is Average Daily Truck Traffic in thousands (Pick up trucks and light delivery trucks not included). For load posted bridges, the ADTT furnished should be that which would use the bridge if traffic were not restricted. The ADTT should be the annual average volume, not peak or seasonal;

(4) N is National Highway System Status. N=1 if not on the National Highway System. N=1.5 if bridge carries a National Highway System road;

(5) The last term of the rating factor expression includes the State's unobligated balance of funds received under

§ 650.709

23 U.S.C. 144 as of June 30 preceding the date of calculation, and the total funds received under 23 U.S.C. 144 for the last four fiscal years ending with the most recent fiscal year of the FHWA's annual call for discretionary bridge candidate submittals; (if unobligated HBRRP balance is less than \$10 million, use zero balance);

(6) TPC is Total Project Cost in millions of dollars;

(7) HBRRP is Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program;

(8) ADT' is ADT plus ADTT.

(c) In order to balance the relative importance of candidate bridges with very low (less than one) sufficiency ratings and very low ADT's against candidate bridges with high ADT's, the minimum sufficiency rating used will be 1.0. If the computed sufficiency rating for a candidate bridge is less than 1.0, use 1.0 in the rating factor formula.

(d) If the unobligated balance of HBRRP funds for the State is less than \$10 million, the HBRRP modifier is 1.0. This will limit the effect of the modifier on those States with small apportionments or those who may be accumulating funds to finance a major bridge.

[48 FR 52296, Nov. 17, 1983; 48 FR 53407, Nov. 28, 1983, as amended at 67 FR 63542, Oct. 15, 2002]

§ 650.709 Special considerations.

(a) The selection process for new discretionary bridge projects will be based upon the rating factor priority ranking. However, although not specifically included in the rating factor formula, special consideration will be given to bridges that are closed to all traffic or that have a load restriction of less than 10 tons. Consideration will also be given to bridges with other unique situations, and to bridge candidates in States that have not previously been allocated discretionary bridge funds. In addition, consideration will be given to candidates that receive additional funds or contributions from local, State, county, or private sources, but not from Federal sources which reduce the total Federal cost or Federal share of the project. These funds or contributions may be used to reduce the total

23 CFR Ch. I (4-1-10 Edition)

project cost for use in the rating factor formula.

(b) The need to administer the program from a balanced national perspective requires that the special cases set forth in paragraph (a) of this section and other unique situations be considered in the discretionary bridge candidate evaluation process.

(c) Priority consideration will be given to the continuation and completion of projects previously begun with discretionary bridge funds which will be ready to begin construction in the fiscal year in which funds are available for obligation.

[48 FR 52296, Nov. 17, 1983, as amended at 67 FR 63543, Oct. 15, 2002]

Subpart H—Navigational Clearances for Bridges

SOURCE: 52 FR 28139, July 28, 1987, unless otherwise noted.

§ 650.801 Purpose.

The purpose of this regulation is to establish policy and to set forth coordination procedures for Federal-aid highway bridges which require navigational clearances.

§ 650.803 Policy.

It is the policy of FHWA:

(a) To provide clearances which meet the reasonable needs of navigation and provide for cost-effective highway operations,

(b) To provide fixed bridges wherever practicable, and

(c) To consider appropriate pier protection and vehicular protective and warning systems on bridges subject to ship collisions.

§ 650.805 Bridges not requiring a USCG permit.

(a) The FHWA has the responsibility under 23 U.S.C. 144(h) to determine that a USCG permit is not required for bridge construction. This determination shall be made at an early stage of project development so that any necessary coordination can be accomplished during environmental processing.

(b) A USCG permit shall not be required if the FHWA determines that