

Category	Task ID	CEAC Feedback	Workout <i>This is something that DLA can take care of quickly.</i>	Doable <i>But requires a lot of planning and action</i>	Not Doable <i>Not to be done, out of our control</i>	Note <i>Who would be the group.</i>
Funding	F-1	Project Limit struggles, (rehab). Make limits adjustments at award-additive Bidding				Solution additive bidding?
	F-2	Small project options should be considered to streamline the process and get more projects completed.				Lean 6 Sigma
	F-3	Instant On-Line status with an overall status, reimbursements, reports due, submittal deadlines, etc. Accurate instant on-line status reports would be great. All located in one spot would be good.				IT Project
	F-4	HBP Bridge List moving project funding out of the 4 year FTIP. Makes things difficult when juggling local budgets, staffing, and looming fund revision dates.				
	F-5	Coordinating HBP survey with FTIP incusion is challenging				Bridge Team
	F-6	Lots of comments about too many updates to form and changes in policy				Annual Publication Process
	F-7	Find changing the reimbursement ratio a challenge				Regulation
	F-8	Closeout package not getting processed in time which cause funds to lapse				Final Voucher
	F-9	Lump Sum RSTP funding for Rehab Projects				Exchange?
	F-10	The Funding authorization process is lengthy and inconsistent between sources.				
	F-11	"Shut-down" of submitting RFA's the last quarter of the federal fiscal year is a challenge.				
	F-12	Hurdles/hoops to jump through just to obtain an FPN#				
	F-13	Getting projects funded in the appropriate year is challenging: RTPA and CT coordination.				Advance Construction
Right of Way	RW-1	Exhibit 13-A is helpful, however we understand separate and additional approval remains for reimbursement for manhole cover adjustments				
	RW-2	We continue to have our utility relocation work unfunded without extensive paperwork. This is especially true for small projects with simple manhole or meter relocations				
	RW-3	The LAPM is not updated to allow liability determination to occur prior to NEPA				

Category	Task ID	CEAC Feedback	<i>This is something that DLA can take care of quickly.</i>	<i>But requires a lot of planning and action</i>	<i>Not to be done, out of our control</i>	<i>Who would be the group.</i>
Design	D-1	Caltrans Design Oversight for on-system projects within same District should be consistent				Different by District
	D-2	25% PE cap should be more flexible. There should be certain projects, such as small projects below a certain dollar amount, where no justification is required to exceed the cap.				non-issue, CAP removed
	D-3	15% CE cap should also be more flexible. Environmental monitoring requirements should be considered as well as distance from the office to the site, and the size of the project				non-issue, CAP removed, approach Bridge Committee
	D-9	Where does it say you cannot use 2006 Specifications. If an Agency does will they loose funding?				
	D-10	Once Project Initiated with specific Standards can the standards stay throughout the project cycle. If the standards need to change is federal funding provided.				
	D-4	A&I requirements, consultant invoicing requirements are too stringent and inflexible. Audits and Investigations requirements conflict with our Agency's standard contracting practices.				
	D-5	A&I Indirect Cost Rate accounting requirements are too difficult for consultants, especially small firms and DBEs.				
	D-6	Safe Harbor application is even harder to fill out than the full blown Form 10k. Safe Harbor is not helping small firms and DBEs.				
	D-7	PIF document were not upheld (Develop)				Caltrans item
	D-8	Long bridge approach justification process is not clearly defined as to when that process needs to happen.				HBP
	D-11	Percent Complete Invoicing Process. Negotiate upfront "Not to Exceed Price" and Bill/Invoice at a percentage base.				Needs a committee
Construction	C-1	Too easy to lock in rates with pro-rata. Under old rules appeared much easier to change ratios and true up at close out				
	C-2	Still confusing not sure what method is best usually leave up to DLAE to make recommendation.				

Category	Task ID	CEAC Feedback	<i>This is something that DLA can take care of quickly.</i>	<i>But requires a lot of planning and action</i>	<i>Not to be done, out of our control</i>	<i>Who would be the group.</i>
Environmental	E-1	New requirements over time				Publish an annual summary of new environmental requirements and NEPA court case decisions.
	E-2	Flood Studies for sign post installation				This is a broader policy that needs to be coordinated with Design to develop Instructions for Completing the Summary of Floodplain Encroachment Form
	E-3	Programmatic District wide (simple projects ie flood plain, archeology). For example No effect memo, Standard specs overlay, Programmatic B.O.				Doable but will require considerable coordination to see if we can define a scope or possible project.
	E-4	Excessive analysis required for non impacts (such as sign placement or overlays)				Ask DEA what level of environmental analysis they perform on projects within disturbed CT R/W
	E-5	Staff turnover & Staff change Don't always accept each other's clearances Conflicting responses between different reviewers, and between Local Assistance and HQ				Establish Standards, Thresholds and/ or Expectations to minimize the subjectiveness on the part of CT District and HQ reviewers and define conflicts between resource and regulatory agency requirements
	E-6	Caltrans should adopt USFWS's BA format				Work with DEA on creating a NEPA-Only BA Template
	E-7	Agency engineers consistently underestimate the schedule and budget required for environmental work. They should be working with environmental staff during initial project development and have them prepare realistic schedule and budget				Expand ATP Guidance and other Program Guidelines to include the average turnaround time for a NEPA CE is 6-12 months. Schedule accordingly.

Category	Task ID	CEAC Feedback	<i>This is something that DLA can take care of quickly.</i>	<i>But requires a lot of planning and action</i>	<i>Not to be done, out of our control</i>	<i>Who would be the group.</i>
	E-8	Revised and Re-issued PES forms after an original Caltrans signature and approval				The PES Form is a dynamic or living document. Significant Scope Changes, TBD responses and/or Reviving an old PES Form would necessitate revisions to a PES Form
	E-9	It is difficult to determine Right of Way requirements during PE for mitigation areas, required by permitting. Arch and RWQCB continue to be challenging to project delivery				
	E-10	Lack of reciprocity for NEPA clearance on multimodal projects combined at construction means a large effort to segregate all future costs on the project will be required				
	E-11	Complete Street on State Highway System - Why required on our projects, agreement for Landscape maintenance.				This is a CT Design consideration; not a NEPA requirement