

# **APPENDIX I – Preparation Guidelines for Permit Engineering Evaluation Report**

## **Table of Contents**

APPENDIX I – Preparation Guidelines for Permit Engineering Evaluation Report..	I-3
ARTICLE 1 Overview .....	I-3
The Encroachment Permit Application Review Form.....	I-3
The Permit Engineering Evaluation Report.....	I-4
Projects-Funded-by-Others if Cost is Over \$1,000,000.....	I-4
Projects not Requiring a Permit Engineering Evaluation Report .....	I-4
Purpose of a Permit Engineering Evaluation Report .....	I-4
Report Format .....	I-4
ARTICLE 2 Guidelines for Completing the	
Permit Engineering Evaluation Report .....	I-5



# APPENDIX I – Preparation Guidelines for Permit Engineering Evaluation Report

---

## ARTICLE 1 Overview

### The Encroachment Permit Application Review Form

Refer to [Chapter 9](#) – Project Initiation for information about the encroachment permit process. The Encroachment Permit Application Review form (TR-0110) is used by the district permits unit for transmitting encroachment permit proposals that cost up to \$1,000,000 within State right-of-way to other Caltrans units for review. The reviewing units must fully detail their comments about the proposal and their number of review hours. The responsible unit as determined by the district permit engineer is designated on this form. The responsible unit must determine whether a permit engineering evaluation report (PEER) is required for encroachment permit projects, and if so, attach it or indicate the estimated completion date. If the unit determines that there will be no adverse impact on highway operations, maintenance, and tort liability, it will indicate so in the appropriate box shown on the Encroachment Permit Application Review form with the signature by at least a senior level person. The unit will then do its usual permit review, fill out the rest of the form, and return it to the district permit engineer. If there will be impacts, a PEER is required and the unit will be responsible for the preparation and review and securing the approval of the PEER. If the project does not meet the eligibility requirements for processing via a combined project study report-project report (PSR-PR), it is not eligible for processing as a PEER. Refer to [Chapter 9](#) – Project Initiation for more information about the PSR-PR.

The PEER process is intended to streamline the processing of projects-funded-by-others by reducing the steps in the project development process. It is not intended to relieve the project sponsor from meeting all Caltrans' other policies, standards and practices. Caltrans may increase the level of documentation and processing for those projects that are deemed complex.

## **The Permit Engineering Evaluation Report**

A project report (PR) or a PEER is required for every action that has a permanent traffic impact and for work that affects the operating capability of a State highway facility. These reports, and their preparation, are the responsibility of either project development or traffic operations. However, the district permit unit must verify that responsible and reviewing units have considered the need for the appropriate report and have correctly completed the Encroachment Permit Application Review form.

### **Projects-Funded-by-Others if Cost is Over \$1,000,000**

The district permit engineer determines the magnitude of the work. An encroachment or public transit project that costs more than \$1,000,000 and is located within State right-of-way is considered a project-funded-by-others and will require PEER if it costs less than \$3 million, a PSR-PR if it qualifies, or a project study report (PSR) and a PR if it does not. The PSR-PR process is described in [Chapter 9](#) – Project Initiation and in [Appendix A](#) – Preparation Guidelines for Project Study Report-Project Report.

### **Projects not Requiring a Permit Engineering Evaluation Report**

Projects not requiring a PEER usually are for commercial filming, miscellaneous activities, special events, surveys, and utilities.

### **Purpose of a Permit Engineering Evaluation Report**

A PEER is prepared to document the engineering analysis of proposed work. The analysis includes review of the proposed improvements to determine drainage, maintenance, operation, and environmental impact on the State Highway System. Proposed improvements must conform to Caltrans' current design standards and practices or be justified by an approved design decision document. Additional information may be requested from the applicant if it is needed to perform the reviews. A permit may be denied based upon conclusions of the reviews.

### **Report Format**

The PEER should be prepared and submitted using the Permit Engineering Evaluation Report form (TR-0112). Article 2 provides guidelines for specific items on the form.

## **ARTICLE 2      Guidelines for Completing the Permit Engineering Evaluation Report**

### Hours for Preparing

For permit projects: Give the total hours used in investigating and preparing the PEER by all parties. PEER preparation is considered part of the permit review process. The time needed to evaluate and finalize the PEER will depend on the scope and complexity of the work. When it can be done within the review deadline, the PEER should be attached to the review form and returned to the district permit engineer. When more time is needed, the review form should be returned immediately to the district permit engineer, notifying of the estimated date of PEER completion and whether or not additional information is needed.

For projects-funded-by-others: These projects require a work plan for the independent quality assurance efforts. Project sponsors are required to prepare the PEER and the hours required to prepare the PEER are not required.

### Permit Number

Permit number assigned to permit application by district permit office (if appropriate).

### Date

Date of completion of the PEER.

### District / County / Route/ Post Mile (Dist-Co-Rte-PM)

The post mile should be given to the nearest 0.1 mile; if the project is 0.2 mile or more in length, give both the beginning and ending post mile.

### EA Used

The expenditure authorization (EA) used to charge costs for the permit review process as spelled-out in Chapter 2 of the [\*Encroachment Permits Manual\*](#) or the project EA for projects-funded-by-others.

### Applicant

Name of individual, agency or organization submitting permit proposal.

1. Describe Proposal, What It Serves, Approximate Cost

Provide a brief narrative containing statements that are concise but include the information needed to describe the proposed work.

2. Describe Existing Highway - Brief Analysis of Impact on Highway Operation and Maintenance

Evaluate the impacts of the proposal upon the State highway.

3. Analysis of Proposal for Geometric and Functional Adequacy

Summarize the findings of the determination of the geometric and functional adequacy of the proposal. All statements should be concise and contain the information needed to justify (or reject) the proposed work.

3a. Nonstandard Design Features

Check “Yes” or “No” indicating whether nonstandard design features are involved and if they are, provide the rationale for approval of a design standard decision document. If yes, give name of approval authority and date of approval. If Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) approval of a design standard decision document is needed, obtain this on a separate sheet and attach it.

4. Revision in Access Control or Transfer of Right-of-Way to Permittee Involved

Check “Yes” or “No.”

4a. If Yes, Date of District Director Approval

If the proposal involves a reduction in access control or the transfer of Caltrans right-of-way to the permittee, a request must first be made to the District Director for authorization to decertify and dispose of the property rights involved. See [Chapter 26](#) – Disposal of Rights-of-Way for Public or Private Road Connections for processing instructions. Indicate the date the District Director approved the revision.

4b. If Interstate, Date of FHWA Approval

If FHWA concurrence is needed for a change in access on the Interstate System, give the date of approval.

5. Signalization Involved

Check “Yes” or “No.” If the answer is yes, answer the next four questions by checking yes, no, or not applicable.

If the answer to any of the four questions is no, provide an explanation and any comments on an attached sheet.

Proposal Recommended

Check either “Yes, as submitted,” “Yes, with conditions described above,” or “No, as described above.” List conditions in Item 3. Indicate reasons for “No, as described above” in Item 3.

Prepared by Title

- Name of individual who prepared this report and who should be contacted regarding the proposal
- Title of individual preparing the PEER
- For projects-funded-by-others enter the name and title of the individual responsible for reviewing the PEER

Registered Engineer Stamp

The PEER must be prepared by a California registered civil engineer. The stamp or seal and signature and date must be placed on the report, in the space provided for the engineer in responsible charge of the evaluation.

Unit

The unit source code of the registered engineer in responsible charge of the evaluation of the proposal.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_ Date Approved \_\_\_\_\_

- Signature of the District Director or the Deputy District Director to whom approval authority has been delegated
- Title of individual approving the PEER
- Date approved