EXHIBIT 6-A   HBRRP APPLICATION/SCOPE DEFINITION FORM

See Section 6.6, Chapter 6 of the LAPG for information about this form.

This form shall replace Exhibit 7-D, “Major Structure Data”, from Chapter 7, “Field Review,” of the LAPM. Wherever the LAPM requires Exhibit 7-D for other programs, Exhibit 6-A may be substituted. Bridge projects funded entirely through other programs should continue to use Exhibit 7-D.

(One bridge per application, separate applications are required for multiple bridges at same location. Multiple bridges may be combined into one federal aid project later.)

State Bridge No. ___________________________ Local Bridge No. ___________________________

Project Number ___________________________ (Caltrans to provide project number for new projects)

Responsible Agency
Caltrans District ___________________________
County _________________________________

Project Manager ________________________________________________________________
Title ________________________________________________________________
Phone ___________________________ Fax ___________________________
E Mail ___________________________

Project Location

Project Limits

Type of Work

Work Description

HBRRP Category:
☐ Rehabilitation  ☐ Scour Countermeasure
☐ Replacement  ☐ Replacement Due to Flood Control Project
☐ Painting  ☐ New Bridge to Replace Ferry Service
☐ Bridge Railing/Approach Barrier Replacement  ☐ Historic Bridge
☐ Low Water Crossing Replacement  ☐ High Cost Bridge

☐ Minimal Application: Only questions 1, 2, 3, 4, cost data and signoff will be completed. Other information will be submitted at a later time after PE has been federally authorized to scope the project. See Section 6.6.2 “Minimum Application Requirements” for additional information.
The field review process enables the proper scoping of projects. Some field reviews are mandatory, most are optional. Field reviews are critically important to identify difficult environmental, Right of Way, and bridge type selection issues early in the project development phase. Please see Chapter 7 of the LAPM further discussion.

1. Do you request that Caltrans initiate a field review?  
   Yes  No

2. Do you need help with consultant selection/oversight?  
   Yes  No

3. Do you need help with the federal process?  
   Yes  No

4. Caltrans engineers are available to provide an optional cursory review of the PS&E. The review looks at constructability, standard details and specifications, foundation/hydraulic design, and HBRRP funding eligibility. Do you request Caltrans perform a cursory PS&E review for this project? (If yes, please also request a field review.)  
   Yes  No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Congressional District(s)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Senate District(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly District(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preliminary Engineering by:  
Local Agency Staff  Consultant  Other...

Design by:  
Local Agency Staff  Consultant  Other...

Foundation Investigation by:  
Local Agency Staff  Consultant  Other...

Hydrology Study by:  
Local Agency Staff  Consultant  Other...

Detour, stage construction, or close road?  
Length of detour:  

Resident Engineer for Bridge Work:  
Local Agency Staff  Consultant  Other...
For painting & scour scopes of work, skip this page.

**NBI data is from the Bridge Inspection Report (SI&A sheet)**

**Contact the DLAE/SLA for assistance, if needed.**

Date Constructed (NBI Item 27): ___________ Historical Bridge Category (NBI Item 37) ___________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure Data</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Minimum AASHTO Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure length (specify units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spans (No. and length)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Curb to Curb width  
(See NBI Item 51 definition) |          |          |                          |
| Number of lanes |          |          |                          |
| Lane widths |          |          |                          |
| Shoulder widths | Lt _____ Rt _____ | Lt _____ Rt _____ |                          |
| Bike lanes  
(identify only if not included in the shoulder dimensions) | Lt _____ Rt _____ | Lt _____ Rt _____ |                          |
| Sidewalks/separated bikeways | Lt _____ Rt _____ | Lt _____ Rt _____ |                          |
| Approach roadway width  
(traveled way + paved shoulders, tapered approaches should be measured at the touchdown points not the abutments) | abt1 _____ abt2 _____ | abt1 _____ abt2 _____ |                          |
| Total bridge deck width |          |          |                          |
## Summary of Major Deficiencies of Existing Bridge (See Section 6.12 for information) (Contact the DLAE/SLA for assistance, if needed)

Data is from SI&A Sheet (Last page of Bridge Inspection Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Data Item</th>
<th>NBI Data Item</th>
<th>Deficient Criteria</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>What are the Deficiencies?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deck</td>
<td>Item 58=</td>
<td>$\leq 4$ is problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superstructure</td>
<td>Item 59=</td>
<td>$\leq 4$ is problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substructures</td>
<td>Item 60=</td>
<td>$\leq 4$ is problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culvert and Retaining Walls</td>
<td>Item 62=</td>
<td>$\leq 4$ is problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Item 67=</td>
<td>$\leq 3$ is problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterway Adequacy</td>
<td>Item 71=</td>
<td>$\leq 3$ is problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deck Geometry</td>
<td>Item 68=</td>
<td>$\leq 3$ is problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD = Structurally Deficient
FO = Functionally Obsolete
Blank = Not SD or FO
NG = Not Good (Deficiency)

[Item 62 applies only if the last digits of Item 43 are coded 19.]

[Item 71 applies only if the last digit of Item 42 is coded 0, 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9.]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Data Item</th>
<th>NBI Data Item</th>
<th>Deficient Criteria</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>What are the Deficiencies?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under-clearances</td>
<td>Item 69=</td>
<td>≤ 3 is problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OK NG-FO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Roadway</td>
<td>Item 72=</td>
<td>≤ 3 is problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK NG-FO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scour Criticality</td>
<td>Item 113=</td>
<td>≤ 3 is problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OK NG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Railing</td>
<td>Item 36A=</td>
<td>= 0 Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OK NG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardrail Transition,</td>
<td>Item 36B=</td>
<td>= 0 Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches, Guardrail</td>
<td>Item 36C=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ends</td>
<td>Item 36D=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other deficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not identified in Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Item 69 applies only if the last digit of Item 42 is coded 0, 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 or 8.]

Discuss in detail, attach additional pages and photographs as needed to justify HBRRP funds to correct problem:
5. If this application is for rehabilitation or replacement scope, will all deficiencies be resolved by the project? If no, please discuss below or attach discussion on separate pages to application.

   □ Yes  □ No  □ Not Applicable

6. Discuss any special conditions or proposed design exceptions:


7. Identify and justify “betterments” that are HBRRP participating but are not related to the major deficiencies. Attach additional pages as needed.


8. Refer to Exhibit 6-B. Identify and justify specific items requiring Caltrans funding approval. Attach additional pages as needed.
9. Other comments: (identify non-HBRRP participating work)

Estimated Construction Costs:

| Exclude Contingencies, Supplementary Work, and Construction Engineering |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
|                                                        | HBRRP Participating | NOT HBRRP Participating* |
| Construct Bridge                           |                  |                      |
| Bridge Removal                                |                  |                      |
| Slope Protection                             |                  |                      |
| Channel Work                                  |                  |                      |
| Detour - Stage Construction                   |                  |                      |
| Approach Roadway                              |                  |                      |
| Utility Relocation                            |                  |                      |
| Mobilization                                  |                  |                      |
| **Total**                                    |                  |                      |

| **Total Cost** |                  |                      |

*Items that are not HBRRP participating could be participating through other federal programs. See the LAPG for other eligibility requirements of other programs. Local agencies that are unsure which project costs are HBRRP participating should contact the DLAE/SLA for resolution.

Note that the total of the HBRRP participating costs should carry over into the construction line (direct costs) on the next page.
Summary of HBRRP Participating Costs

Please indicate the HBRRP total participating (eligible for reimbursement) costs for this project. Based on the amounts below and the federal reimbursement rate, Caltrans will program (reserve) the HBRRP funds needed for this project. Other federal funds (RSTP, TEA, etc.) needed for this project should be shown in the Field Review form Exhibit 7-B from Chapter 7 of the LAPM.

Target dates represent a commitment by the local agency when the project will need HBRRP funding. Failure to meet target dates may cause funds to be reprogrammed to other projects by other local agencies. The reprogramming of HBRRP funds is at the discretion of Caltrans.

PE = Preliminary Engineering (Total not to exceed the greater of $75 K or 25% of CON and consultant contract management and quality assurance not to exceed 15% of consultant costs).
R/W = Right of Way.
CE = Construction Engineering (Not to exceed 15% of CON)
CON = Construction
Cont = Contingency (including supplemental work) not to exceed 25% (preliminary estimate) nor 10% of CON for final design. $5 K min.

Enter CE Rate: [
Enter Contingency Rate: [ ]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PE</th>
<th>Direct Costs</th>
<th>Indirect Costs*</th>
<th>HBRRP Participating $**</th>
<th>Target Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enter Fed. Match Rate: [
HBRRP Requested: [

*See Chapter 5, “Accounting/Invoices,” of the LAPM for approval of indirect costs.

**Participating costs exclude ineligible work items. Please review the HBRR Program Guidelines for reimbursable scopes of work and program cost limits. Other federal funds will be shown in the Field Review form, Exhibit 7-B, Chapter 7, “Field Review,” of the LAPM.
Caltrans, please notify this agency to confirm this project has been programmed in the HBRRP Multi-Year Plan. I understand that reimbursable work shall not commence until a request for authorization (E76) has been processed by Caltrans and a notice to proceed has been received by this agency.

I certify that this project is in compliance with Chapter 6 (HBRRP) of the *Local Assistance Program Guidelines*. I understand that changes to the project scope/cost/schedule impacting the information in Exhibit 6-A and Exhibit 6-B require the processing of Exhibit 6-D (HBRRP Scope/Cost/Schedule Change Request).

Two (2) copies plus one original of this application (with attachments) will be included in the transmittal package to the DLAE.

---

**Attachments:**

1. Exhibit 6-B, LAPG, HBRRP Special Cost Approval Checklist
2. Bridge Inspection Report with SI&A Sheet
3. Sketch of General Plan or marked up as-built
4. Sketch of typical section
5. Photographs: 4 corners looking at the bridge & 2 elevation views, & views of each approach, for a total of 8 photographs (minimum).
6. Exhibit 7-B, Field Review Form, Chapter 7, LAPM
7. Exhibit 7-C, Roadway Data Sheet, Chapter 7, LAPM
8. ☐ Exhibit 6-C, PIN for Barrier Rail Replacement Projects (include only if applying for Bridge Railing Replacement funds.)
9. ☐ Other:
10. Request for Authorization is included in this application package for expedited processing? ☐ Yes ☐ No

**Thank you for assembling the application package. Please send this package to your District Local Assistance Engineer to start the programming process.** Please email your suggestions to improve this form to eric.bost@dot.ca.gov or shannon.mlcoch@dot.ca.gov.

---

**For Caltrans use only:**

I have reviewed this application for completeness and have forwarded copies to the Office of Program Management and SLA.

☐ I recommend approval. (Attach comments as needed.)

☐ I do not recommend approval for the following reasons: See attached memo/email to the Office of Program Management.

☐ I request SLA review of this application for the following reasons: (Attach memo/email justifying increased Caltrans oversight.)

---

DLAE or authorized staff __________________________ Date __________
EXHIBIT 6-B  HBRRP SPECIAL COST APPROVAL CHECKLIST

The purpose of this form is to help local agencies identify project costs that require Caltrans funding approval. Local agencies are responsible for contacting the DLAE to resolve any items requiring Caltrans review. This form is not a substitute for reading Chapter 6, of the LAPG or the LAPM. Local agencies are still financially accountable for meeting all the requirements of the LAPG and the LAPM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>State Bridge No. (One bridge per application)</th>
<th>Local Bridge No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 6 LAPG Section #’s</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1 - Rehab 6.2.2 - Replace</td>
<td>Adding Additional Lanes (including turn lanes)</td>
<td>Requires Caltrans/MPO Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1 - Rehab</td>
<td>Scope is Bridge Replacement, but SR&gt;50</td>
<td>Requires Caltrans Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.4 - Rail</td>
<td>No bridge railing work to be done, but other safety work related to bridge is needed.</td>
<td>Requires Caltrans Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.4 - Rail (applies to all scopes of work)</td>
<td>New sidewalks to be installed where none existed before. Please identify as &quot;betterment&quot; in Exhibit 6-A.</td>
<td>Requires Caltrans Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.4 - Rail (applies to all scopes of work)</td>
<td>New electroliers to be installed where none existed before. Please identify as &quot;betterment&quot; in Exhibit 6-A.</td>
<td>Requires Caltrans Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1 - Rehab 6.2.2 - Replace 6.2.10- Historic 6.3 - Standards</td>
<td>Rehabilitation/Replacement will not address all major bridge deficiencies</td>
<td>Requires Caltrans Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.11 - Replace</td>
<td>&quot;Replaced&quot; bridges to remain in place. Applies to work beyond specified examples in Section 6.5.12</td>
<td>Requires Caltrans Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Chapter 6 LAPG Section #’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 6 LAPG Section #’s</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.4.2                      | Approach roadwork exceeding guidelines | ☐ Requires Caltrans Approval  
☐ Caltrans has Approved Costs  
☐ Not Applicable |
| 6.4.3                      | PE costs exceeding guidelines | ☐ Requires Caltrans Approval  
☐ Caltrans has Approved Costs  
☐ Not Applicable |
| 6.4.4                      | Contingency exceeding guidelines | ☐ Requires Caltrans Approval  
☐ Caltrans has Approved Costs  
☐ Not Applicable |
| 6.4.5                      | CE costs exceeding guidelines | ☐ Requires Caltrans Approval  
☐ Caltrans has Approved Costs  
☐ Not Applicable |
| 6.5.3                      | 10 Year Rule - Major (Re)Construction | ☐ Requires Caltrans Approval  
☐ Caltrans has Approved Costs  
☐ Not Applicable |
| 6.5.4                      | 10 Year Rule - PE Authorization | ☐ Requires Caltrans Approval  
☐ Caltrans has Approved Costs  
☐ Not Applicable |
| 6.5.7                      | Unusual Architectural Treatments | ☐ Requires Caltrans Approval  
☐ Caltrans has Approved Costs  
☐ Not Applicable |
| 6.7.1                      | Scope/Cost/Schedule Changes | ☐ Requires Caltrans Approval  
☐ Caltrans has Approved Costs  
☐ Not Applicable |
| 6.7.4                      | Construction Change Orders (CCOs) that Exceed Contingency | ☐ Requires Caltrans Approval  
☐ Caltrans has Approved Costs  
☐ Not Applicable |

I certify that I have reviewed this project against the requirements of Chapter 6 of the LAPG and have filled out this checklist accordingly.

Local Agency Project Manager

Date
EXHIBIT 6-C  PIN FOR BARRIER RAIL REPLACEMENT PROJECTS

Following is the formula to be used to calculate the priority index number for HBRR Barrier Rail Replacement projects:

**Description and Evaluation of Priority Factors**

**Total Bridge Rail Priority Points = F1 + F2 + F3 + F4 + F5 + F6 + F7**

**F1: Bridge Rail Type** - Among the types of rails where NBI item 36A is coded 0 in the Bridge Inspection Report, some are considered to be less effective than others. Listed below are the assigned points (ten points maximum per project - if one side is good, project applies to bad side only - if project is for two sides with different points, use average):

- F1 = 10 points: no bridge rail, or lightweight timber rails;
- F1 = 6 points: lightweight concrete post or metal baluster, Tuthill, or equal;
- F1 = 3 points: lightweight concrete window (Todd rail), unreinforced masonry; metal beam or lattice, or equal;
- F1 = 0 points: all other rail types

**F2: Consequence of Penetration**

- F2 = 6 points: bridges over an area of moderate or heavy public use (i.e., main road, street or railroad, playgrounds, parking lots, etc.);
- F2 = 0 points: otherwise.

**F3: Inadequate Approach Rail System** - Points are given for inadequate approach guardrails, inadequate approach guardrail to bridge rail connections, and inadequate approach guardrail terminals (five points maximum per project - if it varies, use average of rails to be replaced):

- F3 = 1 point: inadequate approach guardrail transitions;
- F3 = 3 points: inadequate approach guardrail;
- F3 = 1 point: inadequate approach guardrail terminal;

(Two-way bridges less than 18.3 meters wide should have an adequate approach guardrail system at all four corners).

**F4: Accidents** - All accidents involving the bridge rail, bridge ends and approach guardrails in the last 5 years are counted. One point is given for each Property...
Damage Only (PDO) accident while 5 points are given for each fatal or injury accident.

F4 = 5 points: x (# of fatal or injury accidents) + 1 point: x (# of PDO accidents)

If replacing rail on only one side, use accidents involving the rail to be replaced.

**F5:** ADT/Lane - This is a measure of the number of conflicts on the bridge. The most critical case is at a volume/capacity ratio of 0.50, This is equivalent to 4,000 ADT/Lane, (Average Daily Traffic/Lane) on 2-lane, 2-way roads and 8,000 ADT/Lane on multi-lane roads. Points are given as follows (Use the “ADT” information from the Bridge Inspection Report.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F5 Points</th>
<th>On 2-Lane, 2-Way Roads</th>
<th>On Multi-Lane Roads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>L&lt;800</td>
<td>L&lt;1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>800 ≤ L ≤ 1,600</td>
<td>1,600 ≤ L ≤ 3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,600 ≤ L ≤ 2,400</td>
<td>3,200 ≤ L ≤ 4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,400 ≤ L ≤ 3,200</td>
<td>4,800 ≤ L ≤ 6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,200 ≤ L ≤ 4,000</td>
<td>6,400 ≤ L ≤ 8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>L ≥ 4,000</td>
<td>L ≥ 8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F6:** Site Conditions - This rating factor is affected by many variables such as vertical alignment, horizontal alignment, bridge width, or access roads being close to the bridge. For each variable that is slightly worse than the design standard, add 1/2 point. For each variable that is significantly worse than the design standard, add 1-1/2 points. The points for F6 shall be as follows:

F6 = 0 points: site conditions are excellent
F6 = 1 point: site conditions are good
F6 = 2 points: site conditions are fair
F6 = 3 points: site conditions are average
F6 = 4 points: site conditions are poor
F6 = 5 points: site conditions are critical
The maximum number of points for F6 on any bridge shall be 5.

**F7: Potential for future bridge replacement** - Top priority is to replace obsolete barrier rails on bridges with long life expectancy.

- F7 = 10 points if Sufficiency Rating (SR) > 80
- F7 = 6 points if 70 < SR ≤ 80
- F7 = 5 points if 60 < SR ≤ 70
- F7 = 4 points if 50 < SR ≤ 60
- F7 = 0 points if SR ≤ 50.

For each candidate project provide each of the factors above with explanation for why each factor was selected. THIS INFORMATION MUST BE PROVIDED FOR THE APPLICATION TO BE ACCEPTED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Justification (Attach additional pages if required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{PIN} = \sum \text{Values above} = \underline{\phantom{0}} \]
# EXHIBIT 6-D HBRRP SCOPE/COST/SCHEDULE CHANGE REQUEST

See Section 6.7.1, Chapter 6 of the LAPG for information about this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Bridge No.</th>
<th>Local Bridge No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>(Caltrans to provide project number for new projects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Describe reason for Scope/Cost/Schedule Change (or attach separate pages):
2. If this is a request for scope change (not cost or schedule) please prepare a new or revised Exhibit 6-A “HBRRP Application/Scope Definition Form.” Will a revised Exhibit 6-A be submitted?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable

3. If the answer to the above question is “Yes,” please skip to the signoff on this form and submit this form with the Exhibit 6-A package.

4. Identify and justify “betterments” that are HBRRP participating but are not related to the major deficiencies of this bridge. Attach additional pages as needed.

5. Refer to Exhibit 6-B. Identify and justify specific items requiring Caltrans funding approval. Attach additional pages as needed.

6. Other comments: (identify non-HBRRP participating work)
## Estimated Construction Costs:

### Exclude Contingencies, Supplementary Work, and Construction Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>HBRRP Participating</th>
<th>NOT HBRRP Participating*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Removal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detour - Stage Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Roadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total Cost ________________________________

*Items that are not HBRRP participating could be participating through other federal programs. See the LAPG for other eligibility requirements of other programs. Local agencies that are unsure which project costs are HBRRP participating should contact the DLAE/SLA for resolution.

Note that the total of the HBRRP participating costs should carry over into the construction line (direct costs) on the next page.
Summary of HBRRP Participating Costs

Please indicate the HBRRP total participating (eligible for reimbursement) costs for this project. Based on the amounts below and the federal reimbursement rate, Caltrans will program (reserve) the HBRRP funds needed for this project. Other federal funds (RSTP, TEA, etc.) needed for this project should be shown in the Field Review form Exhibit 7-B from Chapter 7 of the LAPM.

Target dates represent a commitment by the local agency when the project will need HBRRP funding. Failure to meet target dates may cause funds to be reprogrammed to other projects by other local agencies. The reprogramming of HBRRP funds is at the discretion of Caltrans.

PE = Preliminary Engineering (Total not to exceed the greater of $75 K or 25% of CON and consultant contract management and quality assurance not to exceed 15% of consultant costs).
R/W = Right of Way.
CE = Construction Engineering (Not to exceed 15% of CON)
CON = Construction
Cont = Contingency (including supplemental work) not to exceed 25% (preliminary estimate) nor 10% of CON for final design. $5 K min.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enter CE Rate:</th>
<th>Enter Contingency Rate:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Costs</th>
<th>Indirect Costs*</th>
<th>HBRRP Participating $**</th>
<th>Target Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Participating Cost

Enter Fed. Match Rate: HBRRP Reserved

*See Chapter 5, “Accounting/Invoices,” of the LAPM for approval of indirect costs.

**Participating costs exclude ineligible work items. Please review the HBRR Program Guidelines for reimbursable scopes of work and program cost limits. Other federal funds will be shown in the Field Review form, Exhibit 7-B, Chapter 7, “Field Review,” of the LAPM.
Caltrans, please notify this agency to confirm the requested scope/cost/schedule changes for this project have been incorporated in the HBRRP Multi-Year Plan. I understand that reimbursable work shall not commence until a request for authorization (E76) has been processed by Caltrans and a notice to proceed has been received by this agency.

I certify that this project is in compliance with Chapter 6 (HBRRP) of the Local Assistance Program Guidelines.

Two (2) copies plus one original of this form (with attachments) will be included in the transmittal package to the DLAE.

_________________________  _______________________
Local Agency Project Manager  Date

Attachments (only if Question 2 is answered “No”):
1) Exhibit 6-B, LAPG, HBRRP Special Cost Approval Checklist
2) ☐ Other: _____________________________________________
3) Request for Authorization is included in this application package for expedited processing? ☐ Yes  ☐ No

Thank you for assembling the form. Please send this package to your District Local Assistance Engineer to process your request for scope/cost/schedule changes. Please email your suggestions to improve this form to eric.bost@dot.ca.gov or shannon.mlcoch@dot.ca.gov.

For Caltrans use only:

☐ I recommend approval. (Attach comments as needed.)
☐ I do not recommend approval for the following reasons: See attached memo/email to the Office of Program Management.
☐ I request SLA review of this form for the following reasons: (Attach memo/email justifying increased Caltrans oversight.)

_________________________  _______________________
DLAE or authorized staff  Date
This page intentionally left blank
EXHIBIT 6-E  ROAD CLOSURE STUDY

(EXAMPLE)

See Section Error! Reference source not found., “24 Hour Construction Day,” on page 6-
Error! Bookmark not defined. of Chapter 6 of the LAPG, for information on this study.

This report was prepared to address the impacts of temporarily closing road _______. The
closure is necessitated by the proposed project which requires the widening of
_________________ in the vicinity of ________________.

It is not feasible to stage the work allowing the road to remain in operation while the project
is being constructed. The project will be constructed on the ___________ side north of
_____________ Street, at the site of the ________________.

The existing road provides direct access to and from ______, and _______ Streets. Access to
and from ___________ Street is provided via _______________. The road will
be closed for a period of 10 months.

A brief description of the project area is as follows: The immediate project vicinity is the
commercial area along __________ Street to the east and west of __________, roughly
between __________ Avenue and __________ Street. __________ Avenue
and __________ Boulevard are north-south arterials paralleling ________________ to
the east and west, respectively. The portions of these arterials between ______________
Streets are also considered part of the immediate project vicinity.

Typical businesses along ___________ Street include ________________

______________________________________________________________.

Land use along ____________ Avenue ranges from a ______________ and a
__________________ to ____________________ and ________________, and is zoned ____________________.

The most sensitive land use in the project area is the _______ at the
___________ quadrant of ___________ Street and _____ Blvd.

The _______________ is a major provider of _______________ in the area. It also
provides ______________ services. Potential impacts on emergency vehicle access to the
_____________ was one of our communities’ major concerns.

All of the businesses and non-profit organizations in the project area, including the
__________________, have a portion of their respective patrons that arrive and exit by
_____________ Street.
___________ Road also serves the nearby residential areas, as previously noted. Patrons seeking access to the business establishments in the project area will be impacted while __________ Street is closed from __________ to ____________.

Because there are no viable alternative routes to and from the commercial area along __________ Street and, potential business patrons would not have adequate access to the project area during the road closure period, businesses would be adversely impacted.

The City of ________ met with ______________ staff to discuss the closure and identify any of their concerns. The staff indicated that with advance notification and coordination the emergency drivers will be able to cope with the construction schedules. Project resident engineers will work closely with the medical staff.

On __________ (date), the City of __________ provided an opportunity for business owners and local residents to identify any concerns that they may have regarding access impacts due to temporarily closing the __________ Street.

As mitigation for the long-term closure of __________ Street, particularly with regards to emergency vehicle access, the County of __________ will require the contractor to complete the project in less than half the time as possible to insure that __________ Road will be in service as soon as possible. The road would be closed for the duration of the contract.

Because there are no viable alternative routes to the project area it is concluded that the various businesses and non-profit organizations would suffer adverse patronage losses during closure of ____________ Street. This conclusion is further reinforced by the results of the meeting with the business owners and local residents as previously discussed.

Because the __________ Street closure would pose an adverse impact on the businesses in the project area, and surrounding residential communities, the following measures are suggested:

• Construct project is less than half the time (5months vs. 10 months).

• Notify the local business and commercial concerns of the temporary closure of ____________ Road and alternative routes.

• Notify emergency public services, fire departments, and local ambulance services.

• Inform the California Highway Patrol and other appropriate law enforcement agencies of the proposed action.

• Notify the County Supervisor’s Office and the City in which the road is located to discuss the proposal with them.

• If the Supervisor’s Office and/or the City deems it worthy, conduct an open house to discuss the proposed closing with the public.

• Keep the County and affected City Traffic Engineer appraised.
• Before closing _______________ Street mail out informational notices, issue press releases, and make public service radio announcements to inform the public in advance of the closure.
EXHIBIT 6-F  MODIFICATIONS TO CRASH TESTED BRIDGE RAILING

Memorandum

U.S. Department
of Transportation
Federal Highway
Administration

Subject: INFORMATION: Bridge Rail Analysis  
Date: May 16, 2000

From: Frederick G. Wright, Jr.  
Program Manager, Safety

To: Resource Center Directors  
Division Administrators

Since 1986, the Federal Highway Administration has required all new bridge railings installed on the National Highway System to be crash tested or to be essentially the same as a railing that was tested. Since many States and municipalities in particular often desire not only architectural or aesthetic enhancements to existing acceptable bridge rails but often request acceptance of untested designs, strict compliance with this requirement could result in full scale testing of scores of essentially similar designs, increased project costs, and significant delays in construction. The AASHTO LRFD Bridge Specifications contain a procedure for analyzing certain types of bridge railings for structural adequacy and provide guidelines for desirable post and beam geometry based on the dimensions of railings that have been successfully crash tested in the past. However, a static analysis of untested designs has not been acceptable as an alternative to crash test verification of railing performance.

The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) essentially combined both approaches by analyzing the capacity of a fully crash-tested railing and comparing the results to a similar Colorado design. The original Colorado design was then modified and re-analyzed to show that it equaled or exceeded the capacity of the tested rail. The FHWA accepted the modified Colorado design for use on the National Highway System based on the State’s analysis, a copy of which has been added, along with this memorandum, to FHWA’s Report 350 Hardware web site under “Bridge Railings.” Specific questions on the Colorado analysis procedure may be addressed to Mr. Michael McMullen, CDOT, at (303) 757-9587 or via e-mail at michael.mcnelly@dot.state.co.us.

The FHWA bridge engineers may use this type of analysis as a basis for acceptance of bridge railings that are similar to a design that has been tested under the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 350 guidelines. It is critical to note that this is not a “cookbook” approach, but rather one that requires careful analysis of all possible failure modes and assumed behavior of all rail elements and connection details. The failure modes may differ from those identified in the Colorado analysis if the bridge railing designs are significantly different. In addition to the structural analysis, bridge railings must also meet the height...
requirements, size of openings between rails for combination traffic/pedestrian rails, and the recommended rail height-to-traffic face ratio and rail-to-post offsets noted in the LRFD Bridge Specifications.

Our goal is to give highway agencies a greater choice of railing designs without requiring unnecessary testing and without compromising motorist safety. As more rails are tested to comply with NCHRP Report 350, the choice of tested designs will increase and there should be less need to seek acceptance for any design that has not been tested. Please call Mr. Richard Powers of my staff at (202) 366-1320 if you have any questions.
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