

share, the allowable amount of credits will be limited by the lower share.

(f) The test is based on the following principles:

(1) Since the standard non-Federal cost-share is substantially less than full costs in every case, the ability to pay test should be structured so that reductions in the level of cost-sharing will be granted in only a limited number of cases of severe economic hardship.

(2) The test should depend not only on the economic circumstances within a project area, but also on the conditions of the state(s) in which the project area is located. Although states' policies with respect to supporting local interests on flood control projects are not uniform, the state represents a potential source of financial assistance which should be considered in the analysis.

(3) The alternative level of cost-sharing determined under the ability to pay principle should be governed in part by project benefits. If, as a result of the project, local beneficiaries receive more income, or are required to use fewer resources on flood damage repair or replacement, or on flood insurance, a portion of these resources should be available to pay for the non-Federal share, even in those cases where an analysis of current economic conditions indicates that there are relatively limited resources in the project area and its state.

(4) Since project benefits represent availability of resources in the future, but not the present, project sponsors should be permitted to defer a certain percentage of the non-Federal share whenever current economic circumstances suggest that non-Federal resources may be limited.

(g) The Non-Federal interest may, at its discretion, waive the application of the ability to pay test. In this case, the Non-Federal interest shall be considered to have the ability to pay the standard cost-share and no further economic inquiry will be required.

**§ 241.5 Procedures for estimating the alternative cost-share.**

(a) *Step one, the benefits test.* Determine the maximum possible reduction in the level of non-Federal cost-sharing for any project.

(1) Calculate the ratio of flood control benefits (developed using the Water Resources Council's *Principles and Guidelines*—ref. § 241.3(b)) to flood control costs for the project based on the discount rate which the Corps is currently using to evaluate projects. Costs include operations and maintenance as well as first costs. Divide the result by four. For example, if the project's (or separable element's) benefit-cost ratio is 1.2:1, the factor for this project equals 0.3. If a project has been authorized for construction without a benefit-cost ratio calculated in accordance with the Principles and Guidelines, determination of the ratio is a prerequisite for consideration under the ability to pay provision.

(2) If the factor determined in § 241.5(a)(1), when expressed as a percentage, is greater than the standard level of cost-sharing, the standard level will apply.

(3) If the factor determined in § 241.5(a)(1), when expressed as a percentage, is less than the standard level of cost-sharing, projects may be eligible for either a reduction in the non-Federal share to this "benefits based floor" (BBF), or for a partial reduction to a share between the standard level and the BBF, as determined by the procedures in step two, § 243.5. In no case however, will the non-Federal cost-share be less than five percent.

(b) *Step two, the income test.* Projects may qualify for the full amount of the reduction in cost-sharing calculated in Step one, or for some fraction of the reduction in cost-sharing, depending on a measure of the current economic resources of the project area and of the state or states in which the project is located.

(1) To assure consistency, the calculations in § 241.5(b) (2) and (3) will be performed by HQUSACE and distributed to all FOA's via Engineering Circulars. The information will be updated and distributed to HQUSACE and to the field as soon as new data are available. The procedures may be verified for any single county or state using the sources cited.

(2) For each of the three latest calendar years for which information is available, determine the level of per capita personal income in the state in

## §241.5

## 33 CFR Ch. II (7-1-06 Edition)

which the project beneficiaries are located, and compare this to the national average of per capita personal income. Source: Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, as published yearly in the *April Survey of Current Business*. (If the project beneficiaries are located in Alaska or Hawaii, divide the per capita personal income figure by one plus the percentage used in the Federal Government's cost of living pay differential for Federal workers who purchase local retail and who use private housing, employed in Anchorage, AK or Oahu, HI as contained in References §241.3(c) and (d).) Determine the state's per capita personal income as an index number in comparison to the national average (U.S.=100), and calculate the three year average of the state's index number.

(3) For each of the three latest calendar years for which information is available, determine the level of per capita personal income in the county where the project beneficiaries are located (the "project area"), and compare this to the national average of per capita personal income. Source: Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, as published yearly in the *April Survey of Current Business*. (If the project beneficiaries are located in Alaska or Hawaii, divide the county's per capita personal income figure by one plus the percentage used in the Federal Government's cost of living pay differential for Federal workers who purchase local retail and who use private housing, employed in Anchorage, AK or Oahu, HI.) Calculate the index for the county's per capita personal income to the national average (U.S.=100), and calculate the three year average of the county's index number.

(4) When the project area, as determined by the location of the project's beneficiaries, includes more than one county, calculate a composite project area index by taking a weighted average of the county index numbers, the weights being equal to the relative levels of benefits received in each county. When the project area includes more than one state, the state index for the project should be calculated using the same weighting technique.

(5) Calculate an "Eligibility Factor" for the project according to the following formula:

$$EF = a - b_1 \times (\text{state factor}) - b_2 \times (\text{area factor}).$$

If EF is one or more, the project is eligible for the full reduction in cost-share to the benefits based floor. If EF is zero or less, the project is not eligible for a reduction. If EF is between zero and one, the non-Federal cost-share will be reduced proportionately to an amount which is greater than the BBF but less than the standard non-Federal cost-share in accordance with the procedures described in paragraph §241.5(c) of this part. The values of  $a$ ,  $b_1$  and  $b_2$  will be determined by HQUSACE. The parameter values will be based on the latest available data and set so that 20 percent of counties have an EF of 1.0 or more, while 66.7 percent have an EF of 0 or less. These values will be adjusted periodically as new information becomes available. Changes will be published in Engineering Circulars. The values will be set so that  $b_2=2 \times b_1$ , giving local income twice the weight of state income.

(6) Since estimates (available from the Bureau of Economic Analysis) of per capita personal income for Puerto Rico, Guam and other U.S. territories are well below the national average, the eligibility factor for projects in these areas is administratively established to be equal to 1.

(7) For flood control projects sponsored by Native American tribes or villages, the EF shall be calculated using information on tribe or village income as a replacement factor for both the area and state factor (that is multiply the replacement income factor by both  $b_1$  and  $b_2$  and subtract each from  $a$  in the equation in §241.5(b)(5)). The replacement factor will be tribe or village income as a percentage of the national average for the equivalent definition of income (for example a Tribe's median family income as a percentage of the median family income for all U.S. families). The data should be the latest available information. It is acceptable, but not required that the data be obtained from the Bureau of the Census, *American Indians, Eskimos and Aleuts on Identified Reservations and*

in *Historic Areas of Oklahoma (Excluding Urbanized Areas)*, part 1, Table 10, or *General Social and Economic Characteristics—United States Summary (1980)*, Table 252. Since both sources contain information for Native Americans living on reservations, rather than all Tribe or Village members, the sources should be used only when appropriate, or when no better information is available.

(c) *Application of the Ability to Pay Formula to the Basic Cost-sharing Provisions of Section 103.* If a flood control project has a BBF which is less than the standard cost-share and an EF which is greater than zero, the non-Federal cost-share will be reduced. The alternative non-Federal share will be calculated and reported to the nearest one tenth of one percent. The actual reduction is determined by applying the ability to pay formula to the basic flood control cost-sharing provisions of section 103 of Pub. L. 99-662, 33 U.S.C. 2213, as follows:

(1) When  $EF \geq 1$ , non-Federal cost-share = BBF

(2) For structural projects covered by section 103(a), when  $0 < EF < 1$ :

(i) If LERRD equals or exceeds 45 percent:

$$\text{non-Federal cost-share} = 50 - EF \times (50 - \text{BBF})$$

(ii) If LERRD exceeds 20 percent but is less than 45 percent:

$$\text{non-Federal cost-share} = (\text{LERRD} + 5) - ER \times [(\text{LERRD} + 5) - \text{BBF}]$$

(iii) If LERRD is less than 20 percent:

$$\text{non-Federal cost-share} = 25 - EF \times (25 - \text{BBF})$$

(3) For non-structural projects covered by section 103(b), when  $0 < EF < 1$ :

$$\text{non-Federal cost-share} = 25 - EF \times (25 - \text{BBF})$$

(4) In no case however, can the non-Federal share be less than five percent, even if the calculation made in §241.5(c) (1), (2), or (3) results in a smaller number.

(5) NOTE: LERRD equals the costs of lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and dredged material disposal areas expressed as a percentage of total project costs. The BBF and numerical

terms in the equations above are also expressed as percentages.

(d) Additional consideration for high cost projects. For any project where the normal non-Federal share exceeds 35 percent, and the per capita non-Federal cost (*i.e.*, normal non-Federal share of total construction costs divided by the population in the sponsor's geographic jurisdiction) exceeds \$300, the non-Federal share under the ability to pay provision will be either LERRD's (*i.e.*, no cash requirement) or 35 percent, whichever is greater. If LERRD's exceed 50 percent, the non-Federal share remains at 50 percent. Projects which qualify under the benefits and income tests will receive the reduction under the high cost criteria only if the high cost criteria results in a greater reduction in the non-Federal cost share.

[54 FR 40581, Oct. 2, 1989, as amended at 60 FR 5134, Jan. 26, 1995]

#### §241.6 Deferred payments for certain qualifying projects.

(a) Whenever a project's Eligibility Factor exceeds zero, the project sponsor will be permitted to defer a portion of its share of flood control costs. The maximum allowable amount deferred equals the total non-Federal share less (for structural projects) five percent of total project costs and less (for all projects) any amounts for LERRD paid for or acquired by the sponsor prior to the time the PCA is signed. If for example, the non-Federal share of a structural project = 35.0 percent (after the ability to pay adjustment, if any) of which 10 percent is LERRD already paid for by the local sponsor, the maximum allowable amount to be deferred = 20 percent of project flood control costs (35 less the 5 percent cash requirements, less the 10 percent LERRD already acquired). Deferred payments at the option of the sponsor will be allowed regardless of the outcome of the benefits test described in §241.5(a) whenever the Eligibility Factor exceeds zero.

(b) When  $EF \geq 1$ , the project sponsor may defer as much as the maximum allowable amount as described in §241.6(a).