APPENDIX A

Study Questionnaire

National Cooperative Highway Research Project 20-5, Topic 28-08

Historic Highway Bridge Preservation Practices

The National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) has convened a panel of experts from around the country to prepare a synthesis of information on the policies and practices of state and other agencies for dealing with historic bridges when they become candidates for rehabilitation or replacement. Historic bridges are understood to be those that are listed, or determined to be eligible for listing, in the National Register of Historic Places. The synthesis will focus on policies and decision-making procedures that have been employed by the agencies to determine which bridges to preserve and which not to preserve. The synthesis will compliment a current study of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) focused on the technical aspects of preserving historic bridges, and will supplement NCHRP Synthesis 101, "Historic Bridges - Criteria for Decision Making", published in 1983.

If ample space has not been provided for responding to specific questions, please feel free to write on the back side of any page or to add pages. A supplemental sheet has already been included for responses to Questions 3-5. Also, please feel free to add any additional comments that you believe would be helpful. Your responses will be carefully evaluated and incorporated into the synthesis report, copies of which will be furnished to your agency as a participant in this important program.

Schedule: We ask that you complete and return the survey form by April 1, 1997.

Returns: Please return the completed survey forms to:

William P. Chamberlin 1046 Shave Court

Schenectady, N.Y. 12303

Questions: In the event that you have any questions about the survey, please call Mr.

Chamberlin at (518) 356-1090.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE IN COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE / INTERVIEW DOCUMENT

Name of Agency:		
Name of Respondent:		
Title of Respondent:		
Telephone Number:	; FX Number	
Date of Response:	,	
-		
Definition of Preservation:	For the purpose of this questionnaire,	you should consider the term
"preservation" to mean conti	inued use of a bridge for a vehicular or	non-vehicular transportation
function, at either its present	t location or at an alternate location, even	en when structurally or
geometrically modified. Its	use as a display or monument, or for ar	y other non-vehicular
function at any location, sho	uld also be considered a form of preser	vation even though it may no
longer serve a transportation	function. Similarly, match-marking, d	lismantling and storage for
future use should be conside	red a form of preservation. For the pur	pose of this questionnaire.
neither salvage of specific st	ructural or decorative elements for disp	olay, research or reuse nor
recordation/documentation for	followed by destruction should be consi	dered forms of preservation.
	* * * * * *	
jurisdiction that either clarifi	Requirements Please identify any legines, interprets or adds to the requirement redecessors) regarding the treatment of the ease enclose a copy.	ts of existing Federal
Status of Historic Bridge In	nventories:	
	historic bridges that have been invento	ried in your jurisdiction
Metal truss	Timber truss (incl. covered),	Concrete arch ,
Stone or brick arch	, Non-arched concrete,	Metal beam/girder,
Moveable,	Rigid frame,	Trestle ,
Long span (suspension	n, cantilevered truss, metal arch),	Other (please identify)
0.1 0		
2. If any of these inventories	s have been published, either as an inter	rnal agency document or for
broader distribution, pleas	se give the appropriate citation(s).	

Historic Bridge Preservation Patterns: The purpose of the four questions that follow is to identify patterns of preservation within specific historic bridge types in your jurisdiction, and to identify those factors that have been the principle determinants of whether or not preservation was successful. While the questions are posed in sequence, you may wish to record your responses in the table on the following page. Please review carefully the definition of "preservation" given above.

- 3. For each of the bridge types inventoried, how many of the total number inventoried were determined to be National Register eligible?
- 4. Among those NO eligible bridges that have been included in bridge rehabilitation or replacement projects since the inventory was completed, how many of each type have been preserved, according to the above definition; how many have not been preserved?
- 5. For each bridge type, can you identify the factors that have contributed most strongly to the decision to preserve or to not preserve (e.g., historic importance, safety, cost, tort liability, local support, etc.)?
- 6. Based on your experience, how would you describe the usefulness of the historic bridge inventory as a planning tool in your jurisdiction?

Extremely Useful	Moderately Useful	 Not at all Useful
Please give the reason(s) fo	or your response.	

Historic Bridge Preservation Plans: The purpose of the next two questions is to determine whether or not your agency has developed a preservation plan for historic bridges and, if so, the nature of that plan. For this purpose, a "preservation plan" is defined as a document that identifies preservation warrants, preservation constraints and feasible preservation alternatives for each NO eligible bridge. Preservation warrants are typically judgments of NO eligibility. Whether eligibility is based on national, state or local significance may also be a consideration, as may be the relative historic importance among the eligible bridges. Preservation constraints are technical, legal and financial considerations that may mitigate against one or more preservation alternative. Feasible preservation alternatives are those for which the constraints do not impose unacceptable conditions. Where no feasible alternatives exist, the plan would identify acceptable mitigations such as document/destroy or dismantle/store. Some agencies have developed preservation plans in conjunction with their historic bridge inventory; others under a separate project; still others not at all.

Tabulation of Responses to Questions 3-5

		umber Number ventoried NO Eligible	From those Considered for Rehabilitation or Replacement			
Inventoried	Inventoried		Preserved	Number Not Preserved	Principal Contributing Factors	

	(most)			
11.	Whether your agency has written policies for making preservation decisions? Pleas important. If it is not possible to put thes important" and "least important". Insert	se list them in or se criteria in rank	der from most import out the	ortant to least
10.	What offices of your agency and what our written policies and/or practices?	tside agencies pa	articipated in devel	oping these
	Does your agency have <u>written</u> policies an regarding historic bridges? Yes (please enclose a copy) No		or making preservat	
to ic pres to d reha amo	dentify and describe policies and practices serve or not to preserve historic bridges. The letermine the disposition of an historic bridge abilitation/replacement interest and, ideally ong feasible preservation alternatives alreatelect an acceptable mitigations where no practices may be written or unwritten.	used by your ag Typically, such p dge at the time the y, would be used dy identified (e.	ency in making decolories and practice hat the bridge becard to select a course of g., in your preserva	eisions to s would be used ne the object of of action from tion plan); or
	Please give the reason(s) for your respon	ıse		
	•	Moderately Useful		Not at all Useful
	If your agency has a written preservation plusefulness of that document as a planning t			you describe the
	Yes (please enclose a copy) No (please skip to question 9)	No, but on	e is being develope	d.
	dentified in you jurisdiction?			

12.	What in-house offices of your agency participate in preservation decisions regarding individual historic bridges? Examples of in-house offices might include cultural affairs, environmental affairs, legal services, bridge engineering, planning, etc.				
13.	What agencies other than y might include the SHPO, s protection, water quality),	yours participate in these decisions tate historical services, state envirolocal jurisdictions, etc.	s? Examples of other agencies conmental conservation (stream		
14.		nes does your agency use to decide historical integrity is unacceptibil			
15.	Does your agency have a verection at some future dat No viable plan If yes, plese describe	viable plan for dismantling and sto	ring historic bridges for re-		
16.	How successful has your a systems within your state?	ngency been in moving historic bri	dges to alternative transportation		
	Extremely Successful	Modereately Successful	Not at all Successful		
	Please give reason(s) for	r your response.			
17.		agency been in finding recipients flity of the bridges for donation has			
	Extremely Successful	Moderately Successful	Not at all Successful		

Que	estion 17 continued)
	Please give reason(s) for your response.
	Based on your experience, how would you assess the adequacy of the decision process of your agency with regard to the disposition of historic bridges?
	Extremely Moderately Not at all Successful Successful Successful
	Please give the reason(s) for your response.
9.	Do you have any recommendations on how the decision process with regard to the disposition of historic bridges in your jurisdiction could be improved? If so, please elaborate.
	cellaneous: In your experience, what are the three most important issues with regard to managing
	historic bridges? 1)
21.	Please identify any local jurisdictions within your state (counties or towns) that, in your opinion, have been <u>unusually</u> successful in managing decisions regarding disposition of historic bridges and that could contribute to this synthesis.
22.	Can you recommend any literature that might be helpful in preparing this synthesis?