

**STATEMENT OF  
KING W. GEE  
ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR FOR INFRASTRUCTURE  
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**BEFORE THE**

**COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HIGHWAYS AND TRANSIT  
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

JULY 21, 2010

Chairman DeFazio, Ranking Member Duncan, and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss oversight of the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Highway Bridge Program (HBP) and the National Bridge Inspection Program (NBIP).

It has been nearly three years since we lost 13 lives in the tragic collapse of the I-35W bridge in Minneapolis. This tragedy sparked a necessary national conversation concerning the state of the Nation's bridges and highways. While we do not have a broad transportation infrastructure safety crisis, the condition of our infrastructure continues to receive our on-going attention. The FHWA has a robust HBP that reinforces safety as the Department of Transportation's (DOT) highest priority, and we have worked expeditiously to address the recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and the DOT Office of Inspector General (OIG) to ensure the continued safety of our Nation's bridges.

**OVERVIEW OF FHWA'S HIGHWAY BRIDGE AND NATIONAL BRIDGE INSPECTION PROGRAMS**

The HBP has expanded since its inception more than 30 years ago. The purpose of the program was initially limited to the replacement of deficient bridges on Federal-aid highways, but Congress has expanded the scope of the program to include rehabilitation, seismic retrofit, scour countermeasures, and systematic preventive maintenance on virtually any highway bridge. This expansion demonstrates Congress' recognition of the importance of addressing bridge vulnerabilities and preserving existing bridges.

FHWA recognizes that the bridge population is aging, with the average age of Interstate bridges approaching 40 years. Owing in part to the HBP, the condition of bridges has been improving, even as the total number of bridges in the Nation's inventory rises. Through the leadership of FHWA, advances in methodologies and technologies in the areas of design, inspection, construction, asset management, and preservation have been integrated into common practice.

Bridge Condition. The HBP has been successful in reducing bridge deficiencies. Since 1994, the percentage of the Nation's bridges that are classified as "structurally deficient" has declined from 19.4 percent to 12.0 percent. The term "structurally deficient" is one of the technical terms used to classify bridges according to condition, serviceability and essentiality for public use. Bridges are considered "structurally deficient" if significant load-carrying elements are found to be experiencing advanced deterioration or are in a damaged condition, or the adequacy of the waterway opening provided by the bridge is determined to be extremely insufficient to the point of causing intolerable traffic interruptions due to overtopping flow caused by a flood. The fact that a bridge is classified as "structurally deficient" does not mean that it is unsafe for use by the public. Classification as "structurally deficient" may mean that the bridge is not capable of safely carrying its originally designed load, but is safe to remain in public use with a lower load capacity restriction. If a bridge is unsafe, it is closed to public use.

As of December 2009, bridges on the National Highway System (NHS) totaled 117,419, or about one-fifth of the 603,000 bridges inventoried nationwide. Of those NHS bridges, 6,151, or 5.2 percent, were considered structurally deficient. That represents a reduction of 1.3 percent from 1999, when 8,473 out of 130,199, or 6.5 percent, of NHS bridges inventoried were structurally deficient.

While bridge conditions are improving, it is important to monitor current activities aimed at maintaining a safe inventory of structures. We have quality control systems that provide surveillance over the design and construction of bridges. We have quality control systems that oversee the operations and use of our bridges. And, we have quality control over inspections of bridges to keep track of the attention that a bridge will require to stay in safe operation. These systems have been developed over the course of many decades and are the products of the best professional judgment of many experts.

Bridge Inspections. With an aging infrastructure and limited resources, it is vitally important to monitor continuously the condition of the Nation's bridges and frequently assess the load-carrying capacity of those bridges that are showing signs of deterioration. FHWA strives to ensure that the quality of the NBIP is maintained at the highest level. We rely on thousands of well-trained bridge inspectors at the State and local levels who work every day to monitor bridge conditions and ensure that critical safety issues are identified and remedied to protect the traveling public.

The NBIP was created in response to the 1967 collapse of the Silver Bridge over the Ohio River between West Virginia and Ohio, which killed 46 people. At the time of that collapse, the exact number of highway bridges in the United States was unknown, and there was no systematic bridge inspection program to monitor the condition of existing bridges. In the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1968, Congress directed the Secretary of Transportation, in cooperation with State highway officials, to establish: (1) National Bridge Inspection Standards (NBIS) for the proper safety inspection of bridges, and (2) a program to train employees involved in bridge inspection to carry out the program. As a result, FHWA published the NBIS regulation (23 CFR Part 650, Subpart C), prepared a

bridge inspector's training manual, and developed a comprehensive training course, based on the manual, to provide specialized training.

The NBIS require routine safety inspections at least once every 24 months for highway bridges that exceed 20 feet in total length located on public roads. Many bridges are inspected more frequently. However, with the express approval by FHWA of State-specific policies and criteria, some bridges can be inspected at intervals greater than 24 months, but no longer than 48 months. New or newly reconstructed bridges, for example, may qualify for less frequent routine inspections. Approximately 85 percent of bridges are inspected once every 24 months, 10 percent are inspected annually, and 5 percent are inspected on a 48-month cycle.

The flexibility of inspecting bridges on differing cycles is important to ensure optimal use of inspection resources. New bridges built to modern standards with better materials and improved construction practices generally need less frequent inspections, while older deficient bridges might require more frequent inspections. Age is not the only consideration in adjusting inspection frequency. Other factors such as the type and performance of a structure and environmental setting also need to be considered. Quite often, after some natural event such as an earthquake, hurricane, or flood, structures that may have been affected are re-inspected to make sure there is not damage. Flexibility in managing resources and setting an appropriate inspection frequency for a bridge is an important part the program.

State departments of transportation (State DOTs) must inspect or cause to be inspected all highway bridges on public roads that are fully or partially located within the States' boundaries, except for bridges owned by Federal agencies. States may use their HBP funds for bridge inspection activities. Federal agencies perform inspections of the bridges they own through other processes beyond those performed by the State DOTs. The NBIS do not apply to privately-owned bridges, including commercial railroad bridges and some international crossings; however, many private bridges on public roads are inspected in accordance with the NBIS.

Bridge inspection techniques and technologies have been evolving continuously since the NBIS were established over 30 years ago. Bridge owners have been taking advantage of the latest and proven inspection techniques and technologies to improve the detection of potential defects in the bridges. The NBIS regulation has been updated several times to reflect lessons learned. FHWA substantially revised the NBIS in January 2005. Most recently, FHWA revised the NBIS in December 2009 to incorporate by reference the new AASHTO Manual for Bridge Evaluation, First Edition 2008.

With the help of the NBIS and the National Bridge Inventory (NBI), America has experienced few catastrophic bridge failures from undetected structural flaws or defects. Most failures today occur because of natural events such as flooding or earthquakes or from vehicles that exceed the load capacity of the bridge. The international bridge community looks to the United States as leaders in the bridge inspection field and seeks our assistance and guidance. Nonetheless, we have scanned the state-of-the-practice in

bridge inspections by other countries and are evaluating concepts that may lead to further improvements in our current domestic practices.

Training/Qualification Requirements for Bridge Inspectors. The NBIS establish minimum qualifications for bridge inspection Program Managers, Team Leaders, individuals responsible for load ratings, and underwater inspectors. These qualification requirements are based on a combination of education, training and experience. As part of the 2005 NBIS update, training requirements were enhanced for all Team Leaders and Program Managers. Through our National Highway Institute (NHI), FHWA has developed an array of bridge inspection training courses, and States may use Federal-aid Highway Program funds to pay for NHI course fees.

Stewardship and Oversight of the National Bridge Inspection Program. FHWA Division Offices conduct comprehensive annual reviews of all areas of the NBIS, which are supplemented with periodic in-depth reviews of specific parts of a State's program, including fracture critical, underwater, and scour inspections; inspection documentation; quality assurance and quality control; follow-up on critical findings and recommendations; and special feature inspections, such as steel fatigue cracking or post-tensioning corrosion. The annual reviews typically consist of the following:

- A field review of bridges to compare inspection reports for quality and accuracy;
- Interviews with inspectors and managers to document NBIS procedures;
- An office review of various reports of inventory data to assess compliance with frequencies, posting, and data accuracy; and
- Preparation of a summary report.

The FHWA Resource Center (RC) provides expert technical assistance to FHWA Division Offices and their partners; assists Headquarters program offices in the development and deployment of new policies, technologies, and techniques; and takes the lead in deploying leading edge market ready technologies. The RC also assists in coordinating and conducting bridge inspection peer reviews and program exchanges, as well as in delivering and updating training.

At Headquarters, FHWA issues bridge inspection policies and guidance; maintains the NBI; monitors and updates bridge inspection training courses; collects, reviews, and summarizes the Division Office annual reports; and monitors overall NBIS compliance.

Bridge Research and Technology (R&T). The current FHWA bridge research program is focused on three areas: (1) developing the "Bridge of the Future," a bridge that can last for 100 years or more and require minimal maintenance and repair, while being adaptable to changing conditions such as increasing loads or traffic volumes; (2) ensuring effective stewardship and management of the existing bridge infrastructure in the United States; and (3) assuring a high level of safety, security, and reliability for both new and existing highway bridges and other highway structures and protecting them from all man-made and natural extreme events. We also work with our stakeholders and partners, including State DOTs, industry, other Federal agencies, and academia, to coordinate a national

research program for agenda-setting, to carry out research, and to deploy new innovations to improve the safety, performance, and durability of highway bridges.

A key measure of success of any highway technology depends on its acceptance by stakeholders on a national scale. FHWA's responsibilities for research and technology include not only managing and conducting research, but also sharing the results of completed research projects, and supporting and facilitating technology and innovation deployment. A number of barriers, including a lack of information about new technologies and long-standing familiarity with existing technologies, may explain the relatively slow adoption of cost-effective highway technologies by State and local highway agencies and their contractors. Through NHI, FHWA provides education and training programs to transcend these types of barriers. Stakeholders also may have difficulty envisioning the long-term benefits of a new technology relative to initial investment costs.

As we continue to build upon these research and technology efforts with our partners, we need to strive for the greatest gains in return for our investments. Key to achieving that goal is granting the maximum flexibility to make the most effective use of our research and technology resources and address the highest priority needs of our stakeholders and partners.

Bridge Investments and Needs. The FHWA maintains the NBI, which contains an assessment of bridge conditions. For bridges subject to NBIS requirements, information is collected on bridge composition and conditions and reported to FHWA, where the data is maintained in the NBI database. The information in the NBI database is "frozen" at a given point in time. This information forms the basis of, and provides the mechanism for, the determination of the formula factor used to apportion Highway Bridge Program funds to the States. A sufficiency rating (SR) is calculated based on the NBI data items on structural condition, functional obsolescence, and essentiality for public use. The SR is then used programmatically to determine eligibility for rehabilitation or replacement of the structure using HBP funds. Ratings of bridge components such as the deck, superstructure, and substructure assist States in prioritizing their bridge investments.

FHWA uses the NBI data to prepare the biennial report to Congress, "Status of the Nation's Highways, Bridges and Transit: Conditions and Performance" (C&P Report). The C&P Report assesses trends in bridge conditions over time and investment requirements to either maintain or improve future conditions and performance. The last C&P Report estimated that that \$11.1 billion (in 2006 dollars) would need to be spent annually by all levels of government combined to maintain the overall condition of the Nation's bridges at current levels. All levels of government combined spent \$10.1 billion on bridge rehabilitation and replacement in 2006. The report identified a backlog of potential cost-beneficial bridge repair and replacement investments of \$98.9 billion in 2006. Addressing this backlog and keeping bridges in a state of good repair over the next 20 years would cost an estimated \$17.9 billion (in 2006 dollars) per year.

Bridge Management Systems (BMSs). As an increasing number of States have implemented an asset management approach to managing transportation infrastructure, the use of BMSs is playing a key role in collecting and managing bridge data and managing bridge assets. Forty-one States and five municipalities are now using the Pontis<sup>®</sup> Bridge Management System, a comprehensive software tool initially developed by FHWA and now available from the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) as an AASHTOWare<sup>®</sup> product. Pontis<sup>®</sup> can be used to store bridge inventory and inspection data; formulate network-wide preservation and improvement policies; and make recommendations for projects to be included in an agency's capital improvement program, so as to achieve the maximum benefit from limited funds. Most notably, it provides a systematic procedure for the allocation of resources to the preservation and improvement of the bridges in a network by considering both the costs and benefits of maintenance policies versus investments in improvements or replacement. Many States do not yet use all of the asset management features in Pontis<sup>®</sup> and, as noted, not all States use Pontis<sup>®</sup>. All States, however, have some form of bridge management software, at least for keeping inventories of bridges and bridge conditions.

Looking toward the future, Congress authorized the Long-Term Bridge Performance (LTBP) program in SAFETEA-LU. The LTBP program is intended to be at least a 20-year research effort to achieve a deeper understanding of bridge performance through quality data collection and analysis. The program will develop methods to measure bridge reliability and is likely to lead to the development of “next generation” bridge and highway asset management systems.

## **RECOVERY ACT INVESTMENT**

In addition to the funds regularly provided for bridges under the HBP, States received a large infusion of transportation infrastructure funds last year with the passage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act). The Recovery Act provided \$48.1 billion for transportation programs to be used for improvements to our Nation's highways and bridges, transit systems, airports, railways, and shipyards. The single largest investment of Transportation Recovery Act dollars—\$27.5 billion—was targeted at improving highways and bridges. FHWA has committed more than \$26 billion from the Recovery Act to over 12,700 highway projects. Approximately 12 percent of the FHWA Recovery Act funds—and 10 percent of these highway projects—are being invested in bridge improvement, bridge replacement, or new bridge construction.

We have six times more Recovery projects underway this summer than we did last. We are going to improve more than 30,000 miles of highway this summer—three times as many miles as we improved last summer and enough to make 10 trips across the country.

We are going to make travel safer and easier for millions of people, and we are going to create jobs. Overall, the Recovery Act is already responsible for an estimated 2.5 million jobs, with tens of thousands of those in the transportation sector.

Across the Nation—from Hawaii to Maine—States are using Recovery Act dollars for important bridge projects. For example, in Hawaii, the \$15.3 million South Punaluu Stream Bridge project is providing a new structure to carry the Kamehameha Highway to Oahu's northwest shore. By replacing a structure that has been in service for 85 years, the new concrete bridge will meet current vehicle load, safety, and seismic standards. The new bridge will include eight-foot shoulders and a separated pedestrian path.

Work continues in Pittsburgh on one of Pennsylvania's largest Recovery Act projects. At \$26.2 million, the I-279 Fort Duquesne Bridge project is entirely funded by the Recovery Act and is a vital transportation link for the region. The Recovery dollars will pay for preservation that will ensure the bridge stays in good condition for the 80,000 drivers that use it each day. The project includes improvements on 16 bridge and ramp structures and steel, concrete and deck repairs.

In May, FHWA Administrator Victor Mendez helped break ground on a \$22 million bridge replacement project on Baltimore's beltway, I-695. This bridge replacement project will provide a bridge that is 38 feet wider than the 1961 original it replaces, adding 34 percent to its current capacity. The contract for the bridge replacement came in a full 40 percent lower than anticipated, freeing up funds for additional projects that will create additional jobs and improve additional infrastructure.

Drivers in downtown Atlanta are much closer to having a newer and safer bridge thanks to Recovery Act funds being used to replace an outdated bridge currently closed to traffic. The Georgia Department of Transportation is using \$8.8 million in Recovery Act dollars to build a completely new bridge, replacing the current Mitchell Street Bridge that was closed to traffic in March 2008. The bridge, which crosses over the Norfolk Southern Railroad, served as a vital link to downtown Atlanta and was used by heavy trucks, transit buses, and daily commuters. The Mitchell Street Bridge, originally built in 1924 and reconstructed in 1940, carries over 6,800 vehicles daily and is in need of replacement because of its deteriorating condition. The new bridge will re-connect portions of downtown Atlanta and improve traffic options in the vicinity of the Atlanta Federal Center, Georgia Dome, CNN Center, and other downtown attractions.

With \$35.5 million in Recovery Act dollars, Maine rehabilitated almost 24 miles of Interstate highway between Gardiner and Topsham, rehabilitated six bridges, and replaced 60,000 feet of guardrail. The I-295 northbound project was the State's top highway priority and the largest single project proposed by the Maine Department of Transportation for Recovery Act funds. With an estimated 60 to 70 percent of Maine's gross domestic product traveling on I-295, the Interstate serves as a major thoroughfare for moving goods in and out of Maine and is a significant route for the State's important tourism industry.

These are just a few examples of how Recovery Act dollars are providing needed investments for our people and infrastructure throughout the United States. The Recovery Act projects will save lives on our Nation's highways, while strengthening the economy by helping our highway and bridge system move people and goods more efficiently and effectively.

## **OVERSIGHT OF HIGHWAY BRIDGE PROGRAM**

A GAO report in 2008 and OIG reports in 2006, 2009, and 2010 provided a number of recommendations for improving the HBP and the NBIP, and FHWA has made significant efforts to address these recommendations. Over the last four years, we have also communicated regularly with the OIG to ensure that we are responding appropriately to their recommendations.

GAO Report 2008. The GAO report entitled "Highway Bridge Program: Clearer Goals and Performance Measures Needed for a More Focused and Sustainable Program" indicated that bridge conditions improved from 1998 through 2007 but noted that the impact of the HBP on that improvement is difficult to determine because (1) the program provides only a share of what States spend on bridges (no comprehensive data for State and local spending), and (2) HBP funds can be used for a variety of bridge projects without regard to a bridge's deficiency status or sufficiency rating. The GAO determined that the HBP program lacks focus, performance measures, and sustainability. Further, GAO reported that statutory goals are not focused on a clearly identified federal or national interest, but rather have expanded from improving deficient bridges to supporting seismic retrofitting, preventive maintenance, and many other projects, thus expanding the Federal interest to include potentially any bridge in the country. According to GAO, the program lacks measures linking funding to performance and is not sustainable, given the anticipated deterioration of the Nation's bridges and the declining purchasing power of available funding. Once the Federal interest in bridges is clearly defined, GAO reported that policymakers can clarify the goals for Federal involvement and align the program to achieve those goals. GAO indicated that sustainability may also be improved by identifying and developing performance measures and re-examining funding mechanisms.

GAO recommended that DOT work with Congress to identify specific program goals in the national interest, develop and implement performance measures, incorporate best tools and practices, and review the program's funding mechanisms. In December 2008, DOT agreed to work with Congress to incorporate the ideas into future legislation but disagreed with the need for a stand-alone program for bridges. In November 2009, FHWA advised GAO that there are no near-term plans to conduct any further action to address the recommendations and asked GAO to close the audit. Throughout the process of the next authorization, FHWA will be pleased to work with this Committee and others to craft legislation that addresses bridge needs going forward.

OIG Report 2006. In March 2006, the OIG issued a report on "Oversight of Load Ratings and Postings on Structurally Deficient Bridges on the National Highway

System.” The OIG recommended that FHWA revise its annual compliance reviews of State bridge programs to address the most serious deficiencies found during bridge inspections and develop a risk-based, data-driven approach and metrics. The OIG additionally recommended that FHWA evaluate greater use of computerized BMSs to improve States’ bridge inspection programs and enhance the accuracy of bridge load ratings.

FHWA concurred with these recommendations and responded with several actions, including developing a new NHI course on Load and Resistance Factor Rating methodology; developing several new standard NBI data reports aimed at identifying load rating issues of concern or data quality problems; initiating a three-year program of risk assessments and in-depth reviews of load rating and posting practices, an assessment of which will be prepared in 2011; and continuing BMS assistance activities (e.g., training, case studies, exchanges).

OIG Report 2009. In January 2009, OIG issued a report on the “National Bridge Inspection Program: Assessment of FHWA’s Implementation of Data-Driven, Risk-Based Oversight.” The OIG recommended that FHWA develop and implement minimum requirements for data-driven, risk-based bridge oversight during bridge engineers’ annual NBIS compliance reviews; develop a comprehensive plan to routinely conduct systematic, data-driven analysis to identify nationwide bridge safety risks, prioritize them, and target those higher priority risks for remediation in coordination with States; develop a requirement for States to correct promptly data inaccuracies found by FHWA’s NBI data validation program; increase FHWA’s use of element-level data; and initiate a program to collect data regularly on States’ use of BMS, evaluate the data to identify those States most in need of assistance in implementing effective BMS, and target them for technical assistance and training resources.

FHWA concurred with these recommendations and took several actions in response. For example, FHWA initiated the development of a data-driven, risk-based approach to the oversight of the NBIP as well as a pilot evaluation of the process. We are currently reviewing the results of this pilot, which ended in May, and plan to implement this approach in 2011. FHWA also implemented new data error-check procedures and developed standard data reports to address inconsistent coding items and errors. In addition, FHWA worked with AASHTO to update the standards for element level data. A new AASHTO guide was approved by the bridge subcommittee in May, and FHWA will work with AASHTO on an implementation plan. FHWA collected information on state-of-the-practice in BMS implementation and is now evaluating the results in order to develop a focused plan of targeted assistance.

OIG Report 2010. In January of this year, OIG issued a report entitled, “Assessment of FHWA Oversight of the Highway Bridge Program and the National Bridge Inspection Program.” The report highlighted several recommendations, including that the FHWA regularly collect and analyze HBP expenditure data to identify State activities to improve the condition of the Nation’s deficient bridges; collaborate with States in setting quantifiable performance targets; report regularly to stakeholders on States’ efforts to

improve the condition of the Nation's deficient bridges; develop detailed criteria to help bridge engineers determine with greater consistency whether States demonstrate overall compliance with the NBIS; develop a policy providing risk-based guidance that defines Division Office procedures to enforce compliance with the NBIS; and conduct a workforce assessment to identify strategic needs and target limited funding to higher priority staffing and training needs.

FHWA concurred with the OIG's recommendations. Our work in response to the OIG's January 2009 recommendations will address several of the 2010 recommendations. In addition, FHWA is working on an enhancement to the Financial Management Information System (FMIS) to allow improved tracking of bridge projects and obligations. We anticipate implementation in fiscal year 2011. We also are evaluating possible performance measures and targets for not only bridges but for the entire Federal-aid Highway Program. In addition, FHWA is evaluating the use of the C&P Report to enhance reporting on the effectiveness of States' efforts to improve the condition of the Nation's bridges.

## **EVERY DAY COUNTS INITIATIVE**

Administrator Mendez recently launched a major innovation initiative at FHWA called Every Day Counts (EDC). EDC has two primary goals—to speed up the delivery of major bridge and highway projects; and to deploy proven, effective, market-ready technologies as quickly as possible. FHWA solicited ideas related to these goals. Through this initiative, FHWA sought input from stakeholders including AASHTO, the Associated General Contractors of America, and the American Road & Transportation Builders Association to develop a set of clearly-defined strategies that will advance FHWA's mission. We wanted to get ideas that cover the whole spectrum, from planning through actual construction.

In order to shorten project delivery, on the pre-construction side, we have proposals for preparing environmental and other planning documents without duplicating a lot of work that has already been done. We are also looking at areas where Federal laws and regulations allow some flexibility that can be used to speed up the process. The underlying goal is to take these ideas and help State and local governments apply them time after time, project after project. We also examined the construction part of project delivery, looking for new forms of innovative contracting, including bringing the contractor to the table sooner. The ongoing engagement of designers and contractors offers a better handle on costs, risks, possible problems and potential solutions.

The other pillar of EDC is getting new technologies deployed in the field faster. There are a lot of proven, effective, market-ready technologies that could be saving lives or relieving congestion or protecting our environment. After reviewing hundreds of technologies, we currently are focusing on five, including two that apply to bridges. One of the technologies pertaining to bridges is geo-synthetic reinforced soil (GRS). FHWA is advancing GRS technology for its application on bridge abutments. We are recommending this technology for small, single span bridges. Because this technology is

so easy to use, it cuts labor time and costs. Another technology we are considering in EDC is pre-fabricated bridge elements. This technology allows many parts of the bridge to be built concurrently off-site, then shipped in for assembly. This approach results in a major time and cost saver over the traditional approach, where everything is completed sequentially in the work zone.

We believe this initiative can make a real difference in how we build our infrastructure in the future. Taken together, the technologies we are focusing on with EDC will help us meet some of the basic goals of the DOT—enhancing safety, sustaining the environment, promoting livable communities. These principles—along with keeping assets in a state of good repair and keeping our economy competitive—are also the principles that are guiding us as we work with Congress to write the next surface transportation bill.

## **CONCLUSION**

As we consider reauthorization of our surface transportation programs, we will continue to maintain the safety and integrity of bridges while improving system performance and reliability. We look forward to continued work with this Committee, the States, the OIG and GAO, and our partners in the transportation community to improve the condition and performance of our Nation’s bridges and the effectiveness of the Federal Highway Bridge and National Bridge Inspection Program.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. I would be happy to answer questions.

#