

# Webinar Summary & Poll Results

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies 6/3 & 6/4/2020

Webinar Signup	Total	County		MPO/ RTPA		State		Consultant / Other	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Session 1 - 6/3	390	118	128	16	37	91			
Session 2 - 6/4	266	76	64	18	32	76			
Total:	656	194	192	34	69	167	30%	29%	5%
							11%	25%	

## Webinar Poll Results

Max votes in red Min votes in blue

### Question #1

About how much SB1 funding do you think gets allocated by California into the HBP annually?

Answer	Session 1 - 6/3		Session 2 - 6/4		Combined	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
None	96	44%	51	39%	147	42%
\$2m to \$19m	24	11%	27	21%	51	15%
\$20m to \$199m	62	28%	35	27%	97	28%
\$200m or more	37	17%	17	13%	54	15%
Total Respondents:	219		130		349	

### Question #2 - No Aesthetic Treatments / No Signature Structures

Policy #2 - Rate the effect this policy would have on your local agency (or your clients' agency):

Answer	Session 1 - 6/3		Session 2 - 6/4		Combined	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Not sure without more explanation	22	12%	6	6%	28	10%
No effect	44	24%	27	27%	71	25%
Positive Effect	14	8%	21	21%	35	12%
Some negative effect	98	54%	37	37%	135	48%
Major detrimental effect	5	3%	8	8%	13	5%
Total Respondents:	183		99		282	

### Question #4 - High Cost Bridge Project Cap @ \$80 Million

Policy #7 - Rate the effect this policy would have on your local agency (or your clients' agency):

Answer	Session 1 - 6/3		Session 2 - 6/4		Combined	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Not sure without more explanation	13	8%	2	2%	15	6%
No effect	71	41%	38	38%	109	40%
Positive Effect	50	29%	28	28%	78	29%
Some negative effect	28	16%	22	22%	50	18%
Major detrimental effect	10	6%	9	9%	19	7%
Total Respondents:	172		99		271	

### Question #6

Would you attend future webinars that would provide updates on the latest HBP committee activities and policies?

Answer	Session 1 - 6/3		Session 2 - 6/4		Combined	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	223	50%	118	100%	341	50%
No	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%
Total Respondents:	224		118		342	

## Webinar Q&A General Statistics

Questions & Comments During Webinar: 275

Webinar Attendance	Unique Viewers	Total Users
Session 1 - 6/3	297	433
Session 2 - 6/4	192	261
Total	489	694

### Question #2 - Caltrans SLA and/or HQ Reviews

Policy #1 - Rate the effect this policy would have on your local agency (or your clients' agency):

Answer	Session 1 - 6/3		Session 2 - 6/4		Combined	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Not sure without more explanation	48	24%	19	20%	67	23%
No effect	18	9%	16	17%	34	12%
Positive Effect	38	19%	18	19%	56	19%
Some negative effect	84	42%	37	39%	121	41%
Major detrimental effect	11	6%	6	6%	17	6%
Total Respondents:	199		96		295	

### Question #3 - Roadway Approach Work Limits

Policy #3 - Rate the effect this policy would have on your local agency (or your clients' agency):

Answer	Session 1 - 6/3		Session 2 - 6/4		Combined	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Not sure without more explanation	22	12%	8	8%	30	11%
No effect	21	11%	13	14%	34	12%
Positive Effect	5	3%	9	9%	14	5%
Some negative effect	116	62%	51	53%	167	59%
Major detrimental effect	23	12%	15	16%	38	13%
Total Respondents:	187		96		283	

### Question #5 - Start as Rehabilitation & Minimum AASHTO Standards

Policy #8 & #9 - Rate the effect this policy would have on your local agency (or your clients' agency):

Answer	Session 1 - 6/3		Session 2 - 6/4		Combined	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Not sure without more explanation	18	10%	4	5%	22	8%
No effect	41	23%	24	28%	65	24%
Positive Effect	32	18%	13	15%	45	17%
Some negative effect	79	44%	42	48%	121	45%
Major detrimental effect	10	6%	4	5%	14	5%
Total Respondents:	180		87		267	

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsivness
1	Are the webinars recorded for future reference?	yes	X			X	X				
2	can you please provide the powerpoint presentation	yes, it will be provided on our website. The powerpoint slide is available at californialocalhbp.com very bottom of the policy page.	X			X	X				
3	thank you very much	<i>You're welcome</i>		X		X	X				
4	In regards to the Hydraulic report, how does that work when we have a local bridge that doesn't cross a waterway?	It would apply to studies that are needed for the project. If a study is not needed, it would not be included in this process	X			X			x		
5	when is HQ review triggered and when is Structures LA enough?	<i>Unknown at this time. Details to be determined</i>		X		X			x		
6	How much % funds were from HBP for the Sixth Street Viaduct Bridge Los Angeles?	<i>Contact the City for funding information.</i>		X		X			x		
7	Is this Policy #1 rescinding the delegation of authority?	<i>Not sure what delegation you are referring to. Please send us a clarifying follow up question.</i>		X		X			x		
8	Does CT have the resources to perform these reviews?	Yes.		X		X				x	
9	Whata type of review will SLA be performing. Most bridges are not that complicated or big. Most of my expeirnce with SLA is that they are more subjective then objective on how a bridge should be constructed.	<i>The details of what SLA will review vs what HQ will review are still being determined.</i>		X		X				x	
10	Is there a specific unit or contact to submit the package in Headquarter or go through Aea Engineer?	The process is still in early discussions/development, more to come later.	X			X				x	

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsiveness
11	We share concerns on scope cost and schedule. Need to establish purpose of review, review timelines, and CT resources. (Earl Seaberg)	Good comment/suggestion, we're discussing this at a committee level as well.	X			X				x	
12	Do you predict Policy #1 will increase the amount of paperwork required to maintain project compliance?	Our intent is not to create or generate more paperwork that Local Agencies are responsible for. This is something that will need to be discussed more as the policy is developed.	X			X				x	
13	Understand the review of Field Review by Caltrans and Type Selection and initial review to determine rehab versus replacement, but why does HQ want to get involved in PSE review? Seems like unless art oversight.	<i>Review to ensure the project scope is consistent with what was approved.</i>		X		X				x	
14	Some projects have been stuck due to the requirements being constantly changed. Is there any way to lock in requirements at a specific time?	The intent is that projects will be looked at a case by case basis.	X			X				x	
15	The review by Caltrans was supposed to be cursory as long as the agency certifies everything was done in accordance with Caltrans Standards	<i>Agreed</i>		X		X				x	
16	It would be helpful if HBP reviews could be more streamlined (faster) with easier communication with reviewers because at the local agency level we see a lot of delay during these periods of time (especially during type selection). Unfortunately, this is why HBP projects have such long design lifespans.	Good comment/suggestion and we intend to discuss further at the committee level.	X			X				x	
17	To streamline process why not delegate plan review to District LA	Good comment/suggestion, we're discussing this at a committee level as well.	X			X				x	
18	Policy 1: Potential commercial issue if Caltrans reviews trigger extra work requiring additional PE funds and creating a potential dispute between the designer and local agency client.	Good comment/suggestion, we're discussing this at a committee level as well	X			X			x	x	
19	Are there also lobbying efforts taking place at the federal level to increase funding to the program?	We'll discuss this further into today's webinar.	X			X			x		
20	The vast majority of our bridges are in residential areas and the design review boards don't typically approve typical thri-beam crash barriers and want to see something more decorative, which would be non-participating under Policy 2	<i>Correct. Aesthetic enhancements required by local standards would not be participating.</i>		X		X			x		

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category						
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsivness		
21	Policy #2 should have been implemented years ago! It makes total sense.	<i>Thanks for the feedback.</i>		X		X	x						
22	Jason's points on thorough scoping, establishing project's limits, Type Selection concurrence at the beginning is the highest priority. Any plan review by CT Local Assistance on 65% (or after that) should only be at a cursory level to verify no significant scope change has occurred. Important to keep responsibility on project PS&E delivery firmly on Local Agency.	Good comment/suggestion, we're discussing this at a committee level as well	X			X					x	x	
23	Cost saving for local-rural bridges can be acheived by using a modified standard plans, specifications, considering much lower ADT and service life exepcted of a rural bridges than typical State highway bridges with much higher ADT.	Good comment/suggestion, thank you.	X			X		x					
24	There are several different Federal Agencies that implment policies and regulations that need to be addressed such as the 4F designation to continue trails and pathways. Recently we were tod by Caltrans that this was not participating,but is a requirement of the Federal Government. how do we intend to solve these issues?	<i>Good question. All local agencies struggle with unfunded requirements. We are trying to focus bridge program funding on the bridges on our local roadways. Suggest contacting your legislative advocacy representativies.</i>		X		X					x		
25	Would this policy limit the use off alternative barrier options?	The baseline for standards is still under discussion at the committee level.	X			X		x					
26	Policy 2: This makes sense to ensure HBP dollars can be spread as far as possible. Please ensure the definition of what is considered "an aesthetic treatment" is very clear. It would not be advisable having to convince HBP that an element is not an aesthetic treatment (for example, is a haunched box girder considered aesthetic?), we want this as black and white as possible.	Good comment/suggestion, thank you.	X			X					x		
27	Re: Policy 2 -- What is the process for determining "the cost of the basic structural solution"? Who makes the cost estimate?	<i>More details will be provided in the LAPG. In general the local agency will perform the analysis and Caltrans will approve.</i>		X		X		x			x		
28	Policy #2 what happens if the NEPA document require features that are part of a historic bridge project.	Historic structure requirements would be considered differently.	X			X		x			x		
29	Remember NEPA requirements are federal requirements.	They are, however, NEPA only defines work items and parameters in the project, but it does not state how it is funded. We are discussing this topic at the committee level as well.	X			X					x		
30	If we're required to comply with NEPA as a condition of recieving funding through HBP then why shouldn't the requirements of NEPA be funded by the program? This seems like a double standard.	NEPA only defines work items and parameters in the project, but it does not state how it is funded. We are discussing this topic at the committee level as well	X			X				x	x		

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category						
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsiveness		
31	Could we please also get copies of the Q&A dialog?	It will be posted to the blog at a later date. We will be grouping them and answering after this and then will make available	X			X	x						
32	We need a lot more federal funding to address rehabilitation/retrofit/widening/replacement of our bridges currently considered for BPMP. The maintenance activities often applied to much older bridges with inherent deficiencies will not address the structural issues or substandard hydraulic issues. We need to re-scope our maintenance and add to HBP eligible bridges and elevate to FHWA.	Agreed! Great comment.	X			X		x	x				
33	Major issue I see with the changes are there doesn't appear to be a way to capture eligible, but unfunded costs. This is important to demonstrate need during reauthorization efforts..	Good comment, we'll bring this back to the committee for discussion	X			X			x				
34	The scope of real needs of the inventory are currently underestimated.	There are varying methods of calculating the need. They all demonstrate that the need is much greater than what is available.	X			X			x				
35	This could be a problem if the bridge gets significantly higher, the approach work can rival the cost of the bridge. Why should the HBP program not pay for the approach roadway work? It's part of the construction activity. For Bridge Replacement projects nominal approach roadway work necessary to conform to existing roadway geometry in accordance with sound engineering design principals has always been eligible for inclusion. This puts significant onus on LPA's and may compromise design standards.	Good comment, we'll bring this back to the committee for discussion	X			X		x		x			
36	This affects smaller bridges that have difficult approach solutions. %s cheat smaller complicated projects.	Good comment, we'll bring this back to the committee for discussion.	X			X		x	x	x			
37	Will the LAPM better address inundation of the approaches and what will be qualifying work?	<i>Good comment. Unknown at this time. Will provide comment to Caltrans.</i>		x		X		x					
38	Will policy #3 address the fact that, in some cases, the total project cost can be significantly reduced by increasing the approach lengths (e.g. increased offset of new alignment to avoid 2-staged bridge construction).	Projects will be looked at on a case by case basis.	X			X		x	x	x			
39	Policy 3: HBP should fund any approach work that is necessary to accomplish the completion of the bridge.	Thank you for your good comment. The intent of the bridge program is a bridge safety program delivered in a fair and equitable basis, and we are discussing this at the committee level as well.	X			X			x	x			
40	Is there any specific limitation on the allowed approach roadway reconstruction length? Previously, it was 200' or 300'	<del>Thank you for your good comment. The intent of the bridge program is a bridge safety program delivered in a fair and equitable basis, and we are discussing this at the committee level as well. Beyond that, exceptions would likely be case-by-case. But look for future clarification as we consolidate and answer all the questions. The committee has discussed capping the percentage of roadway/structure costs, so this likely would not be limited to a certain runout length.</del>	X			X		x					

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsivness
41	Is there exceptional approval for those bridges the design standard required longer approach roadway reconstruction is to get the appropriate sight distance. Most of local bridges are functionally obsolete and need some geometric adjustment including the the width. Is there exceptional approval for those bridges the design standard required longer approach roadway?	Projects are reviewed on a case by case basis.	X			X		x		x	
42	Must be carefull with defining roadway costs as a percentage of structure costs. Sometimes the most cost effective solution of project type, size, and location results in a relatively shorter bridge but longer roadway transitions. Seems like the emphasis should be on cost effective solutions with minimal impacts in defining project scope/limits.	Great comment, we'll bring this back to the committee for discussion.	X			X		x	x	x	
43	The current policy regarding bridge approaches is very clear and does not allow for additional work to be funded just because we're out there!	Good comment, we'll bring this back to the committee for discussion.	X			X		x	x	x	
44	I heard mention of sidewalks, can you clarify how you interpret complete street requirements and Caltrans directive to accomodate context correct bike and ped travel fitting in the program	<i>Good comment. Committee will request more guidance to be provided in LAPG.</i>		x		X		x		x	
45	It's never easy on the local agency side to obtain other forms of grant funding for approaches. Perhaps HBP can partner with other grant programs to make this an easier process for local agencies.	Great comment! We'll bring this back to the committee for discussion.interesting concept.	X			X			x		
46	What happens when a bridge is already programmed above \$80 million in the FTIP? Is this going to be retroactive?	Projects are being looked at on a case by case basis.	X			X				x	
47	Policy 7: This will likely result in larger, more expensive bridges not being reconstructed/rehabilitated and left in a dangerous state. This is not recommended.	Good comment, we'll bring this back to the committee for discussion	X			X		x			
48	Seems the critical elements of the need and alternate funding sources should be considered.	Good comment, we'll bring this back to the committee for discussion	X			X			x		
49	Is this \$80 million going to be adjusted annually?	Good question and we can bring this back to the committee for discussion.	X			X			x	x	



# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsivness
60	Policy #3: What about bridge replacement projects with new roadway realignments that could result in greater approach roadway costs? The local jurisdiction will have to fund majority of that?	Potentially. Agencies may need to be prepared to fund those increased costs.	X			X			x	x	
61	Since minimum AASHTO, can another state's MASH approved barrier be used? Or does it need to be MASH approved by Caltrans?	Great question! We can bring this back to the committee for discussion.	X			X		x			
62	Again, a resource and response time issue for CT.	<i>Thank you for the feedback</i>		x		X				x	
63	Couldn't the bike and ped facilities be covered by ATP funding instead of bridge funding?	Yes!	X			X		x			
64	Unfortunately, it's always an expensive and time consuming process. I wish it wasn't :)	<i>Thank you for the feedback</i>		x		X		x	x		
65	used to be if the rehab cost was 75% or more of the cost to replace, then you replace it.	<i>Thank you for the feedback</i>		x		X		x	x	x	
66	#8 - The Bridge Inspection Reports already set a starting threshold for rehabilitation vs. replacement. Many bridges eligible for rehabilitation are in need of replacement (e.g. ASR). Additional justification could add to the time and cost it takes to get through the PE phase.	Good comment, we'll bring this back to the committee for discussion.	X			X			x	x	
67	Policy #9: So if a local single lane bridge that would have to be replaced with another single lane bridge that would normally be completed with exemptions, would not be funded since it does not meet all AASHTO requirements?	For the specificity of this question, it's important to note that projects are looked at on a case by case basis.	X			X		x	x		
68	Doesn't the current guidelines already address the threshold for which the replacement project is more feasible?	<i>Currently bridges that are SD with an SR&lt;50 qualify for replacement categorically. The new policy revises this approach to potentially more stringent standards - fewer bridges will qualify for replacement in an effort to reduce present day costs to mitigate the program backlog.</i>		x		X		x	x		
69	A lot of the required exhibits and documentation are redundant and time-consuming. Wouldn't it be more beneficial to combine and streamline these forms as the project goes along? This would result in less time for the Local Agency to prepare and for Caltrans to review.	Great comment, we're discussing this at the committee level as well.	X			X			x		





# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category							
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsiveness			
80	Can the HBP Advisory committee publish meeting notes/minutes?	live answered Hi Mark,  Yes we're happy to do that.	X		X		x							
81	Thanks! That would be great!	<i>Thank you back!</i>		x	X		x							
82	what is meant by "On System"?	On System refers to bridges that are on Federal Aid Routes. Generally, collector roads and higher road designation is on CRS maps: <a href="https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=026e830c914c495797c969a3e5668538">https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=026e830c914c495797c969a3e5668538</a>	X		X		x							
83	Can we get a copy of this PowerPoint and presentation video?	Yes, we'll make it available on our website and the video is also being recorded for later viewing.	X		X		x							
84	Is that including seismic?	Sorry what is this question in reference to?	X		X		x							
85	do you have a list of the acronyms so that it is easier to follow along?	many of them can be found here (starting page 1 of main document): <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/local-assistance/documents/lapg06.pdf">https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/local-assistance/documents/lapg06.pdf</a>	X		X		x							
86	Do you have data on the design and environmental cost increases since 2009? Do the rule of thumb percentages still hold?	it varies widely by location, scope, size, etc. you can contact me offline and I will see if there is some info that answer more specifically. csneddo@cosbpw.net	X		X						x			
87	Chris,	<i>Thank you for your participation!</i>		x	X		x							
88	Chris, Thanks!	<i>Thank you for your participation!</i>		x	X		x							

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsivness
89	When was the last needs assessment?	2018 <a href="https://www.cacities.org/Member-Engagement/Professional-Departments/Public-Works-Officers-Department/California-Statewide-Local-Streets-and-Roads-Needs.aspx">https://www.cacities.org/Member-Engagement/Professional-Departments/Public-Works-Officers-Department/California-Statewide-Local-Streets-and-Roads-Needs.aspx</a> It just completed through the recent local needs and roads assessment sent out to all local agencies.	X		X		x				
90	Does caltrans have the staff to implement Policy 1 without significant schedule delays?	live answered	X		X					x	
91	Does Field Review means submitting the Field Review Form and conducting a formal filed review?	Yes	X		X				x		
92	Does Caltrans have the staffing to complete a timely review of 65% and 95% plans? How will turn around performance be measured?	that is a good question and something that would need to be addressed if implemented.	X		X					x	
93	Will these requirements hold up the projects? It would be helpful if the agencies were allowed to continue with the project so the reviews do not hold them up.	That is a concern we have as local agencies and would want to see addressed if this goes into effect.	X		X					x	
94	Topic 1, Policy 1:	<i>Thank you for your participation!</i>		x	X		x				
95	Does Topic #1/Policy #1 applies to new request?	live answered	X		X		x		x		
96	What timelines can Caltrans commit to in these reviews, experience is that time delays are significant when Caltrans engages.	would need to be worked out.	X		X					x	
97	Is this current policy or proposed policy?	Proposed.	X		X		x				
98	This is how it was done in the 1980s and 1990s when I was a Structures Local Assistance Engineer. Great idea-just need to dedicate sufficient Caltrans OSLA staffing. Can't have only 5 people for the whole state...	good point. thanks for the feedback	X		X					x	

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsivness
99	Policy #1: Do all of these documents apply to all HBP projects? i.e. is a TSR required for a non-replacement project?	The intent is not to add studies that were previously not needed, just to review the documents that are needed for the project.	X		X					x	
100	How much review time is anticipated for the 65% and 95% submittal?	That is a good question that would need to be addressed.	X		X					x	
101	At what stage is a "field Review" required?	<i>Early in the project. Good question. Details will be addressed in policy documents. Will take comment to the committee.</i>		x	X					x	
102	Will geotech/foundation report be an explicit review milestone, or will that occur through the TSR?	<i>Good question. Not determined at this point. Probably not explicit. Probably would occur with the TSR. Details will be addressed in policy documents. Will take comment to he committee.</i>		x	X					x	
103	won't hydraulic reports add significant cost to bridge maintenance projects	I think the idea was to just review the documents that would be created as part of the project development process normally. So if the project did not require this, it would not need to be done.	X		X			x	x	x	
104	Or Does Policy #1 also applie to existing HBP funded projects that are planning to request additional funding due to the current cost climate that was discussed earlier? Thanks!	Exactly how it is phased in would need to be addressed, but most likely would be implemented starting at whatever stage you are at.	X		X					x	
105	is the field review, type selection, 65% 90%plans, etc. just to apply for an HBP application? or are these to be submitted to caltrans after HBP funding is approved?	the latter	X		X					x	
106	Does Policy #1 apply to projects that are currently in th design phase?	yes in general, but not intended to go back and redo work that is already done.	X		X					x	
107	This review policy may increase design costs and increase delivery time, ignoring programming issues.	agreed, would need to be addressed	X		X					x	
108	Aren't field review and type selection already reviewed by Caltrans?	yes, this process would formalize what is already being done on some elements/regions.	X		X					x	

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsivness
109	How long will take Caltrans to revive the 65% and 95% plans?	good question- would need to be addressed	X		X					x	
110	These requirements used to be mandatory and "re-engineering" change the policy to what it is today. With the past policy you had to keep re-submitting the PS&E until you received a formal approval letter. Would a formal approval letter be required at each stage?	<i>That has not been determined yet. Good comment. Approval clarity is needed. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X					x	
111	Will Caltrans provide training / procedures manual to consultant engineers, so that they will take the concerns into account prior to Caltrans review, thus speeding the review.	<i>That has not been determined yet. Good comment. Guidelines are needed. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X					x	
112	What is the definition of 65% and 90% milestones? For example, does 65% refer to environmental approval?	<i>That has not been determined yet. Good comment. Guidelines are needed. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X					x	
113	Are the requirement on Policy #1 during the HBP application. If not, what pahse of the project?	<i>That has not been determined yet. Good comment. Probably not with the initial application. Rather this data &amp; information would be needed early in the project Will bring to the committee and request clarification.</i>		x	X					x	
114	With Limited Projects, would it be possible to Post Projects moving forward per the Project Development Phases?	<i>Need clarification on this question. The committee discussed broader program management reforms that would be similar to Caltrans process &amp; SHOPP program management in the future. Will bring this comment to the committee.</i>		x	X					x	
115	How much are agencies expected to pay up front to have 65% to 95% plans? Small agencies and agencies who do not have bridge engineers will need to pay a consultant and will cost them 100 of thousands of dollars with no guarentee that the project will be funded.	<i>That has not been determined yet. Good comment. Conceptually we are trying to develop policies that will accomoate smaller local agencies with less funding &amp; resources. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X				x	x	
116	CT Environmental staff should attend field reviews as the definition of required studies is imperative to schedule success.	<i>Agreed. Will bring this comment to the committee.</i>		x	X					x	
117	One issue that tends to extend the timeline are code changes. Is it possible to stick to an implementation date related code updates	<i>Agreed. Will bring this comment to the committee.</i>		x	X			x		x	
118	is policy#1 requirements be done before bridge is programmed on HBP list?	<i>Good question. Will bring this to the committee and ask for clarifications on timing in the policy.</i>		x	X					x	

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsivness
119	Policy #1 would work better for both local agency and HBP program to efficiently manage the projects as long as the details of this policy are available and if HQ have adequate staff to review promptly.	<i>Agreed. Good comment. Will bring this comment to the committee.</i>		x	X					x	
120	Does this eliminate the 5% allowed for aesthetic treatments?	live answered	X		X				x	x	
121	Is there any discussion at the at the Policy Maker level to supplement HBP Funding with additional funds from the State?	There is discussions related to supplementing funding and exploring the use of SB 137 for the PSR as well.	X		X				x		
122	Please clarify how policy #2 varies from the current policy.	<i>The current policy does not specifically prohibit signature structures.</i>		x	X		x				
123	what type of aesthetics will qualify for HBP if the bridge is historical but it has to be replaced because the deficiency rate.	<i>Has not been determined. Historic structures will need to be addressed on a case by case basis - Good question. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X				x		
124	What about "aesthetics" that are required by permitting agencies... for example, Coastal Commission? This can be tinting, specific guardrails, bridges needing blend in with background, concrete patterns, etc.	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this comment to the committee.</i>		x	X				x		
125	What do you consider aesthetic treatments? please give some examples.	<i>Good question. Will bring this comment to the committee. Formliners, stained concrete are a couple of examples.</i>		x	X				x		
126	Could you clarify if the environmental document requires mitigation that includes bridge aesthetics, would this qualify?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this comment to the committee. Aesthetics required by the CEQA document may not qualify for reimbursement. Will likely need a case by case review &amp; approval by Caltrans.</i>		x	X				x		
127	Does SLA have the resources to review statewide bridge 65% & 95% Plans?	<i>Ancipated to be yes.</i>		x	X					x	
128	Suggest review guidance for Caltrans reviewers be clear that comments be "essential needs" and not include "preferences" (to reduce costs/time)	<i>Thank you for the comment. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X				x		

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category					
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsiveness	
129	What if Caltrans NEPA VIA review requires aesthetics to be implemented, will the program pay for those betterments?	live answered	X		X			x	x			
130	Would FHWA and HQ participate in the field review?	<i>Has not been determined but probably not.</i>		x	X						x	
131	Does it include complete street improvements?	<i>Not sure which policy this question is referring to. Need clarification on this question.</i>		x	X		x	x				
132	Topic 2, Policy 2: Isn't there already a 5% cap on aesthetic treatments?	The cap is currently set at 2% but this policy would eliminate that cap	X		X						x	
133	many of our bridges have stains, and surface texture molding.	<i>Thank you for the comment.</i>		x	X				x			
134	Bike and Ped improvements	<i>Thank you for the comment. Need clarification.</i>		x	X		x					
135	Can Ped and Bike co-exist within the same Bridge Right of Way as wider bridges by Area to accommodate Pedestrian and Bike are High Cost?	<i>Thank you for the comment. Need clarification on this question. Will ask for ped &amp; bike width eligibility clarifications in the policy.</i>		x	X				x			
136	would an outlook viewing spot on a new bridge would be considered aesthtic?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee.</i>		x	X				x		x	
137	If aesthetic treatments are required to address Visual Impacts I would assume that this would be funded. Is that correct?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee.</i>		x	X				x		x	
138	Policy #2 Would aesthetic treatments prescribed as a NEPA mitigation be eligible?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee.</i>		x	X				x			

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsivness
139	Policy #2. This makes a lot of sense if you are talking about big signature type aesthetic treatments. But what about very common treatments like barrier treatments, form liners on columns, etc.	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee.</i>		x	X			x		x	
140	Topic 2, Policy 2: What about projects that require Coastal Commission approval?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee.</i>		x	X			x		x	
141	Do bridge maintenance projects even require an H&H? since you would not raise the bridge height with maintenance projects?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee.</i>		x	X			x			
142	Can aesthetic treatments be part of the non-participating costs and still be part of the project?	Yes		x	X					x	
143	This is understandable, but a good compromise would be at least to pay for minimal easthetic treatments (i.e. bridge railing treatments) since most users see the bridge from this vanatge point. It is cost-effective treatment that will help agencies with public outreach and the community who typically wants to see something nice.	<i>Thank you for the comment. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X					x	
144	Comment: Functional elements for non-vehicular users should not be excluded , especially in an urban or redeveloping environment. -Vin Cay, West Sacramento	<i>Thank you for the comment. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X			x		x	
145	Bat houses?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee.</i>		x	X			x			
146	TSR would be especially important for a rehab project although we call it a rehab study usually but it includes selection for a widening for example..	<i>Thank you for the comment. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X					x	
147	Aesthetic treatment within the Coastal Zone is often necessary in order to get through NEPA and in order to obtain at CDP as "mitigation" for the visual impacts	<i>Thank you for the comment. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X					x	
148	What has to be done is a lot of work educating our various legislative leaders about this and work on solutions for coming up with those funds.	<i>Thank you for the comment. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X					x	



# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsivness
149	Need clear defination and parameter for Basic Structure Solution.	<i>Thank you for the comment. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X					x	
150	In Trinity, there are requirements for decrotive rails and rock faced abutments. If it is required by local code, it should be allowed to continue.	<i>Thank you for the comment. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X			x		x	
151	How would HBP quantify the "base" cost of a lighting system vs. the "aesthetic" betterment?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee.</i>		x	X			x	x	x	
152	Also, what happen to the 5% cap.	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee.</i>		x	X				x	x	
153	what is the current allowance? 1%?	<i>See LAPG 6.3. 2%</i>		x	X					x	
154	so for example, the difference in cost between regular lighting and enhanced lighting, will be eligible?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee.</i>		x	X			x	x		
155	FHWA Section 4(f) requirements should be eligible, as well.	<i>Thank you for the comment. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X				x	x	
156	Caltrans regularly uses more expensive open barriers on their own projects in certain areas, such as rivers and coastal.	<i>Thank you for the comment. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X			x		x	
157	The biggest equestion here is what agencies do when the bridge needs to be raised for hydraulic capacity?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee.</i>		x	X				x		
158	Does this only applies to new bridges that are not already nominated?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee.</i>		x	X					x	

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsivness
159	Would it be within the Design Standards?	<i>Need clarification on this question.</i>		x	X		x	x			
160	Policy 3: How does this policy affect funding of approach roadways for bridges that need to be raised due to hydraulic requirements?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee. The roadway costs will likely be limited by a cap regardless of the hydraulic requirements - bridges with long approaches may need to be funded with another funding source.</i>		x	X			x	x		
161	what about creation of a joint seal at the join with between the bridge deck and roadway...	<i>Thank you for the comment. Not sure what this is referring to. Need clarification.</i>		x	X		x	x			
162	If the CEQA document requires form liners or a see through bridge rail would they be eligible?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee.</i>		x	X				x	x	
163	How does Policy 3 relate to logical termini?	<i>The draft policy describes a cap on the roadway costs. If roadway construction costs associated with logical termini exceed the cap, agencies would need to find other funding sources to pay for the difference.</i>		x	X			x	x		
164	FHWA wording is that approaches should be funded to the "attainable touchdown point", whether that be due to geometry, hydraulics, etc. Many older bridges do not meet today's design standards.	<i>Agree. In the new policies that roadway work may not be eligible for reimbursement if the costs exceed the funding cap proposed in policy #3.</i>		x	X			x	x		
165	We did Policy 3 in the old days also. I think we capped approach work at 10% of CON. Will be challenging for hydraulically-lengthened bridges or those on new alignments. Can we use vertiacl touchdown requirements at least since non-negotiable code-wise generally.	<i>Thank you for the comment. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X			x	x		
166	If approach roadway is required for independent utility, as required by NEPA, would this be participating?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee. In the proposed policy independent utility would not mean that the work is eligible for HBP funding. Agencies would need to find other sources to fund the work needed to complete the project.</i>		x	X			x	x		
167	Policy 3 Would this effect exisitng projects in design that have already been approved for approach roadway work that is more than the standard 50 ft.	<i>Has not been determined. Probably not if the roadway work was previously approved.</i>		x	X				x	x	
168	When will the City know what's eligible and what's not? Is it during the 65% review that will be submitted to Caltrans?	<i>Has not been determined, but the intent would be to determine eligibility early in the project (like at type selection or 30% design).</i>		x	X				x	x	

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsivness
169	Would this be in conflict with Regional Vision Zero Safety policy?	<i>Good comment. Will bring to the committee for discussion. Probably not because these policies only determine what is eligible for funding.</i>		x	X					x	
170	How about channel improvements to improve hydraulics	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee.</i>		x	X			x		x	
171	What consideration is given to shifted alignments to allow for stage construction? Especially in cases where the additional approach road work would be less than a temporary structure.	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee.</i>		x	X			x		x	
172	How does this policy affect staged construction and detours?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee. The cap would likely be applied to all roadway costs including stage construction &amp; detour costs.</i>		x	X			x	x		
173	How would this policy #3 affect projects currently being designed.	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee.</i>		x	X					x	
174	Safety-related reprofiling due to inadequate stopping sight distance comes to mind for the approach roadway. How is this policy #3 applied to that ?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee. The policy will likely limit roadway costs regardless of the approach length needed for safe sight distance; local agencies will need to pay for the roadway costs over the limit with other funds.</i>		x	X			x	x		
175	Policy #3 - will there be a variance process for certain contexts?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee.</i>		x	X					x	
176	Do policies 2 and 3 apply to projects that are well along in the planning and design phase, nearing construction? Unanticipated ineligible costs may increase local match needs beyond what was budgeted and can be afforded.	<i>Has not been determined. Great comment. Will bring this to the committee. Caltrans has indicated that they will be sensitive to this; at the same time, the HBP backlog needs to be reduced otherwise agencies may be waiting for many years for HBP funding to become available. Rhetorically... which is worse?</i>		x	X				x	x	
177	This is getting into Join Funding scenario with RTPA with STP and others.	<i>Yes. Good comment.</i>		x	X				x		
178	Topic 3: The majority of bridge failures are caused by scour, the main safety concerns are traffic collisions--these are the constraints that can result in additional road work. This policy will result in reduced safety and increased failure?	<i>No. Local agencies are still required to construct project features that are required for safety. These policies are simply intended to limit HBP participating costs. Local agencies will need to find funding for costs over what HBP will pay for.</i>		x	X				x	x	

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsiveness
179	The goal posts have already moved	<i>The Caltrans HBP program managers are doing what they feel is necessary to sustain the program for the overall benefit of Local Agencies.</i>		x	X			x			
180	What if the encroachment permit requires additional work beyond the originally planned "touchdown" location?	<i>Local agencies will need to find funding for costs over what HBP will pay for.</i>		x	X				x		
181	Caltrans regularly cites CVFPB criteria being above the Federal or Caltrans minimum criteria for hydraulics, so they say it is betterment, what is the local agency to do in those cases where permits would be denied?	<i>Local agencies will need to find funding for costs over what HBP will pay for.</i>		x	X				x	x	
182	Regarding Policy 3, if a project did not require raised abutments, but does require a wider deck, would funding for roadway w/ shoulder, sidewalk or trail still be typically funded on the approach?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring this to the committee. Will clarify bike &amp; ped participation requirements.</i>		x	X			x			
183	Would PE 10 rule be modified with Program Policy to assure project selection and programming?	<i>Good question. At this point there are no plans to modify the PE&gt;10 rule. You make a good point though - it doesn't seem right to impose penalties on agencies who are ready to go but waiting for funding to be available. Will take this to the committee.</i>		x	X					x	
184	Why is the HBP still at 2009 fund levels?	Good question. Long answer. Basically, federal funding didn't increase. Then the bridge program for on-system bridges was effectively ended at the federal level. State stakeholders agreed to continue the program, but it is not indexed and is a fixed amount. The new federally highway bill that came out today, if approved, could enhance funding, especially for off-system bridges. But it has a ways to go before getting approved.	X		X				x		
185	Policy #1 Question-The 65% and 95% implies that environmental document is approved and design is underway. Most projects need HBP funding for PA/ED & PS&E phases. How will this be addressed?	These reviews would happen as part of the bridge development process and would be covered during these funded phases.	X		X				x	x	
186	There are projects now in design in which crossing over waterway or canals that have to be clear spanned so logical termini carries beyond 200 ft for on-system bridge, maybe even to 400 ft. However decision out of HQ has been to not approve. So seems like this is being implemented now.	<i>Good comment. The Caltrans HBP managers are doing what they feel is necessary to sustain the program for the greater good of local agencies statewide. Local agencies will need to find funding for project costs in excess of what HBP will pay for.</i>		x	X				x	x	
187	Perhaps a higher approach roadway participating ratio for very short bridges where approach costs would be necessarily a higher percentage of bridge costs.	<i>Good comment. Will bring to the committee for discussion.</i>		x	X				x	x	

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsivness
188	Topic 3 - This has the potential for many local agencies to simply not be able afford to construct bridges that are nearly ready to advertise.	I don't think it would change your funding if the project is already approved.	X		X				x		
189	Is that total cost or CON?	<i>Good question. Needs clarification in the final policy. Will bring to the committee for discussion.</i>		x	X					x	
190	With regard to approaches, please consider improving design speed (even if modestly) of the approach as another justification for approach expense in addition to approach needs to meet hydraulics or freeboard. The approach established on many bridges 100 years ago have extremely low design speeds.	Thanks for the feedback- we'll add that to the list of things to consider on this topic.	X		X			x			
191	P7 Good idea. don't think it will go with current program.	<i>Thank you for your comment.</i>		x	X				x		
192	Need a cut off time line.	<i>Thank you for your comment. Will consider this.</i>		x	X					x	
193	How was the 80 million cap in High Cost bridge projects derived?	By looking at how big of an impact they would have on the program. But there is still a lot of discussion about what that cap should be.	X		X				x		
194	For Topic #4/ Policy #7 is the \$80 Million the total cost of the project or the maximum amount the program will pay out? For exmple, can the total cost of the project be \$100 Million with \$80 Million being funded by HBP, and \$20 Million being paid with other none state or federal funding?	good question. I believe so, but that would be a good thing to address if/when implemented.	X		X				x		
195	how are the bridges being prioritized?	Bridges are prioritized based on guidelines that were adopted last year or the year before. Contact me if you need the guideline. csneddo@cosbpw.net	X		X					x	
196	How do you weigh the cap against a significant safety concern?	<i>Local agencies are still required to construct project features that are required for safety. These policies are simply intended to limit HBP participating costs. Local agencies will need to find funding for costs over what HBP will pay for.</i>		x	X			x	x		
197	Can we lobby to Congress for the next Infrastructure Program ?	please do. CEAC, League of Cities, and NACE are all active in this. Now is a great time as a proposed bill was just released today that could be helpful.	X		X			x			

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsiveness
198	This is getting too confusing.	<i>Thank you for the feedback. Will try to simplify the message for future webinars. We hope you come back!</i>		x	X		x				
199	For policy 7, it seems like there should be a different criteria than a cap. How about benefit to cost, risk, traffic volume, length of detour, etc.?	That is an interesting concept. A lot of discussion on how to implement a cap	X		X				x		
200	Is the \$80M intended for CON Hard Cost or inclusive of PE and CE soft costs?	<i>Good question. Details have not been determined but conceptually it's intended to be a cap on the CON phase which includes both CON &amp; CE costs. Will ask for clarity on this in the final policy.</i>		x	X				x		
201	Caltrans will not accept long approach justifications until the designs are nearly complete.	<i>Thank you for the feedback. Will share this comment with Caltrans. Agree that it would be helpful to have these kinds of decisions nailed down early in the project.</i>		x	X				x	x	
202	What is the current dollar amount triggering a High Cost Agreement?	<i>See the LAPG. Construction phases over \$20 million.</i>		x	X				x		
203	Does the Cap of \$80M represent just construction cost or costs including design, con admin and construction costs?	<i>Good question. Details have not been determined but conceptually it's intended to be a cap on the CON phase which includes both CON &amp; CE costs. Will ask for clarity on this in the final policy.</i>		x	X				x		
204	How about \$20M for AC consideration?	<i>AC is almost always a local agency option but AC has to be reimbursed at some point. Need clarification on this question.</i>		x	X				x		
205	The upper limit should account for inflation.	Good comment, we'll include this in discussions to develop the policy.	X		X				x		
206	Policy#8 Question-Requiring all bridge projects to start with rehab is not appropriate in all cases. I'm working on a bridge that is 70 years old, is structurally deficient, scour critical, and has a sufficiency rating of 16.6. Why waste the time and money for the engineering analysis, it fairly obvious that it needs replacement?	<i>Good comment. We anticipate that funding availability will be a factor in making future scoping decisions. Statewide analysis indicates at the current funding level local bridges may need to last 150 years. Some bridges will be obvious replacements and will not require sophisticated analysis. However, since funding is limited some bridges that used to be an "obvious" replacement will need to be scoped as a rehab to extend the life of the bridge until funding is available.</i>		x	X			x	x		

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsiveness
207	Isn't \$80 million about a year's worth of off system bridge funding?	Yes. \$75M is for off system	X		X		X				
208	\$80M is a good benchmark. this allows the greater number of workhorse structures to be funded. Large signature projects can attract funding due to their inherent visibility.	Good comment, we'll include this in policy development discussion.	X		X		X				
209	Local agencies/rural counties are being hurt by high cost bridges in other jurisdictions that seem to be draining the HBP pot of money. Should there be a limit on the number of high cost bridges per agency/county?	<i>Good comment. See the LAPG on high cost project limitations already in place. Will bring your comment to the committee for discussion.</i>		X	X				X		
210	Where can the new federal highway bill be found?	<i>Will post link on website.</i>		X	X		X				
211	Why the arbitrary limit? Equity vs. equality should not be confused. -Vin	<i>Good comment. The limit is based on the maximum amount that can be programmed in the FTIP under current policies (\$20 million x 4 years = \$80 million). Will bring your comment to the committee for discussion.</i>		X	X				X	X	
212	When will these Policies be implemented, and how will it be implemented to projects already programmed and/or authorized?	We are still working through them at the the committee and HBP Manager level and will clarify in future on how and when it will be rolled out.	X		X				X		
213	The concept is a good and due to limited funds. The limit could be slightly higher, \$90 or \$100M.	<i>Thank you for your comment. Will consider this.</i>		X	X				X		
214	How would local planning requires effect policy #9? For instance, local bike route plans	<i>Specifics have not been determined but local agencies will need to find funding for local requirements over and above AASHTO standards.</i>		X	X				X		
215	Could Policy 8 establish a 15% set aside for the Bridge Preventive Maintenance Program?	<i>Good question. Will consider this.</i>		X	X				X		
216	Also consider increasing FFY year limit from \$20M to \$35M per FFY due to potential pace of construction spending.	<i>Good comment. Will consider this.</i>		X	X				X		



# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsiveness
217	Is this for new projects or ones that are already underway?	<i>Good question. Specifics have not been determined. Will bring to the committee for discussion and request clarification in the final policy.</i>		x	X					x	
218	So a bridge with a sufficiency lower than 50 still needs to be rehabbed?	live answered	X		X			x			
219	If this policy (#8) was enacted, it would be very helpful to have a simple form to fill out to compare and justify the replacement. Also, would the existing projects be grandfathered in?	Good suggestion and question. We'll bring this back to the committee for further discussion.	X		X			x		x	
220	Set up set a Delay Replacement Policy, then.	<i>Good comment. Will consider this.</i>		x	X					x	
221	Will there be a definition on what is specifically required as engineering analysis to justify replacement over rehabilitation?	<i>Good question. Will discuss with the committee and request clarification on what's required in the final policy.</i>		x	X			x		x	
222	#8 - We have been stuck in a circle on this issue for more than 18 months. CT and HBP has been extremely slow on reviewing, commenting, and approving our engineering justification, which has put our project way behind schedule. Something must be done about the turnaround time for these reviews if this policy is adopted.	<i>Thank you for the comment. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X					x	
223	Could there be some programmatic reasons to replace just to save footwork, time, and money justifying the obvious?	<i>Good question. Specifics have not been determined. Will bring to the committee for discussion and request clarification in the final policy.</i>		x	X			x			
224	Topic #5 Question: This will cost more money for the local agency to perform rehabilitation analysis vs replacement. And then, who decides if rehabilitation is the way to go?	<i>Good question. Specifics have not been determined. Will bring to the committee for discussion and request clarification in the final policy. Caltrans will likely have the final say on what's HBP participating but Local Agencies are responsible for the overall project decisions.</i>		x	X				x	x	
225	Will this be synced with the recommendations provided by Caltrans structures maintenance & inspection reports i.e. assuming the report recommends replacement will this be considered?	<i>Good question. They should be synced. Will bring to the committee for discussion and clarification.</i>		x	X			x			
226	Topic 5: Would this mean the sufficiency rating not apply in evaluating a bridge project?	<i>Good question. No, sufficiency rating will be a consideration but we don't anticipate categorical replacements for SR&lt;50. Will bring to the committee for discussion.</i>		x	X			x			



# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsiveness
227	Topic 5 - Policy 8 - Is there are SR at which this would not apply? Is an "engineering analysis" really necessary on an old timber bridge with a SR < 20?	<i>Good comment. We anticipate that funding availability will be a factor in making future scoping decisions. Statewide analysis indicates at the current funding level local bridges may need to last 150 years. Some bridges will be obvious replacements and will not require sophisticated analysis. However, since funding is limited some bridges that used to be an "obvious" replacement will need to be scoped as a rehab to extend the life of the bridge until funding is available.</i>		x	X			x			
228	When we analysed bridges in the seismic retrofit program, we found many had significant scour issues, but these could not be addressed. Will the bridge program ever have a program to specifically address scour?	Structurally deficient scour critical bridges are currently eligible for HBP funding. Scour mitigation is also an eligible preventative maintenance activity. Talk to your DLAE or local rep about your specific issues.		x	X			x			
229	Topic 5, Policy 8 & 9: Why are policies 8 and 9 combined into one topic?	<i>Thank you for the comment. Sorry for the confusion. Trying to include two important policy topics in a limited amount of time.</i>		x	X		x				
230	is it possible to make rehab or preventative maintenance project much easier and faster to deliver? Otherwise by the time of construction bridge conditions may no longer be in the condition for rehab or maintenance	<i>Good question &amp; comment. Yes it's possible. Will bring the concept to the committee for discussion. We are already looking into environmental streamlining and the potential of defederalizing PM projects utilizing SB137. No guarantees but it's certainly a consideration. Thank you again!</i>		x	X				x		
231	The target for this Policies implementation mentioned is next FY or FFY, 2021/2022?	<i>Next calendar year (January 1, 2021).</i>		x	X		x				
232	Isn't the rehab vs replacement question generally settled by the project scoping study? How is adding another level of analysis, contracting and review reducing costs? I foresee this adding another year or two to each replacement project.	<i>In a way, this policy formalizes what's already done on many projects. Good comment and relevant concerns. Caltrans is hoping their expertise will help resolve scoping and overall project delivery issues on many projects. Will bring your concern to the committee.</i>		x	X			x	x	x	
233	Is the intent of Policy 9 to affect sidewalk/driving lane widths? What about bike lanes?	<i>The intent is to limit HBP participating costs to the minimum AASHTO standard. Local agencies can implement greater local standards but those costs would need to be covered by local agencies.</i>		x	X			x	x		
234	We should have a New Infrastructure Program from the new Transportation ACT extension or new one before this.	<i>Thank you for the comment. Agree!</i>		x	X		x				
235	Does #9 mean that bridges on low volume roads must use the optional lesser standards (like narrower shoulders)?	<i>It means that the low volume road standards will be the basis of what's eligible for HBP reimbursement. Local agencies can build higher standards but the difference will need to be funded with local funds.</i>		x	X			x			

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsivness
236	Policy would require rehab studies for every project, which could be expensive if inspection, NDT, etc. is required to properly evaluate. Maybe some SR limit like if SR<30 no rehab study required?	<i>Thank you for the comment &amp; question. Will consider with the committee.</i>		x	X			x		x	
237	So would every project begin with a full Rehabilitation vs Replacement type analysis, or will there be some other (less extensive) type of scope approval process for bridges that are in worse shape?	<i>Has not been determined. Will request clarifications in the final policy. Good comment &amp; question.</i>		x	X			x		x	
238	How long would Caltrans review process take for Policy #8 take?	<i>Has not been determined. Local committee reps have requested a time commitment. Good question.</i>		x	X				x	x	
239	I believe minimum ASHTO is 28' wide curb to curb for a 2 lane bridge. Our narrowest local road standards is 36' curb to curb. Would some deviation for local minimum standards be allowed?	<i>Local standards can be constructed but the difference between AASHTO and local standards will need to be funded with non-HBP funding (local funds, RSTP, CMAQ, etc)</i>		x	X			x			
240	Currently that scope change from rehab to replace is make new federal number, redo the Preliminary Env Study... Would every replacement project have to do this?	<i>Has not been determined. Good question. Will bring to the committee for discussion.</i>		x	X				x		
241	Rural counties often have bridges, often historic, that do not meet AASHTO minimum standards. We always strive to meet standards but it is not always possible. There needs to be an ability to make exceptions.	<i>Good comment. Will bring to the committee for discussion.</i>		x	X				x		
242	Prefer SLA, not HBP managers, review and approve engineering analysis. This is a structural issue and not a policy decision.	good feedback, thanks	X		X		x				
243	Caltrans and /or AASHTO, the review and standard are not commently used during the Review Process in District, like Permit.	<i>Good comment. Will bring to the committee for discussion.</i>			X			x			
244	Current Caltans estimating forms don't handle non-participating costs well, for example the portions of mob and contingency applied to these non participating items, can the estimating forms be improved?	Good comment/suggestion and we will discuss that at the committee level.	X		X		x		x		
245	What would be the approval process for revising a project from a rehab to a replacement? This could be handled during the Type Selection Approval process by considering "rehab" or "no-build" options), but that process uses PE funding so the project would already have to be programmed.	<i>Has not been determined. Good comment/question. Will bring to the committee for discussion.</i>		x	X				x		

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsivness
246	How will these policies interact with the Bridge Investment Credit (BIC) memo issued by Caltrans 4-5 years ago? Our agency has been spending our own funding to do BPMP projects, and banking the money we spent to use for a future HBP bridge replacement project.	<i>Details have not been determined. Good comment/question. Will bring to the committee for discussion.</i>		x	X					x	
247	How doest these policies impact current projects that are under deign that need additional funding due to the current construction climate?	<i>Details have not been determined. Good comment/question. Will bring to the committee for discussion.</i>		x	X					x	
248	Is it possible to obtain SB! funds to increase the annual HBP funds?	<i>Has not been determined. Good comment/question. Will bring to the committee for discussion.</i>		x	X				x		
249	Has there been a preliminary analysis to determine how these reforms would impact the HBP (i.e., how much programming would be freed up for additional projects)?	<i>Has not been determined. Good comment/question. Will bring to the committee for discussion.</i>		x	X		x				
250	Matt, you're the man! We appreciate the efforts of you and the committee trying to make improvements to this vital program	<i>Awe schucks (Matt says). Thank you. I talked a lot in the webinar but it's really the whole committee effort behind this outreach. We just want to help.</i>		x	X		x				
251	Can the HBP Program somehow advocate for State Funded ATP project applications to not only act as the non-Federal match but also to help fund those features (discussed herein) that the HBP Program will no longer pay for? We fear that in todays fiscal environment, many of the smaller local agencies with eligible bridges will be disadvantaged and thus not be able to utilize the HBP Program.	<i>Good comment/question. Will bring to the committee for discussion.</i>		x	X		x				
252	Most of the proposals will limit the funding and require addiitonal work, but there is not talked on how the most defficiency bridges and agencies with greater needs will be prioritized.	<i>See the LAPG for how HBP projects are currently prioritized. Good comment/question. Will bring to the committee for discussion.</i>		x	X				x		
253	When would these kick in and would they apply to urrent projects in preliminary engineering phase?	<i>Tentatively 1/1/2021, but details haves not been determined. Good comment/question. Will bring to the committee for discussion.</i>		x	X		x				
254	can we save this Q&A chat? Very helpful!	Yes!	X		X		x				
255	The meeting reminder had several other proposed policies, will you address those?	live answered	X		X		x				

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsiveness
256	Are there any policy revisions being considered for the current Advance Construction rules?	<i>Not at this time.</i>		x	X		x				
257	When will the 2020 HBP prioritization list will be made public	<i>The draft lists are on the website. The final list will be published this fall agreed. There are two prongs to addressing this.</i>		x	X		x				
258	HBP program funding capped at \$300M makes it very difficult for the program to fund a lot of the bridge projects. Not sure why it's still at the 2009 funding level.	<i>In the context of this committee, we are focused on #1, but we as local agencies all need to advocate for #2.</i>	X		X				x		
259	The program has gone back and forth for decades which has been largely a result of available programming. Many of the policies that are being suggested already existed and were changed with reengineering; mostly in order to simplify the process and assist with delivery. While considering these new policies, it would be helpful to utilize lessons learned from the past policies (i.e have people on the "policy change" committee that have been through these changes especially SLA).	<i>Good comment/question. Will bring to the committee for discussion.</i>		x	X		x				
260	Why hasn't the \$289 million a year funding not been increased over the last 11+ years? A syou have shown, it is not sustainable, nor will it be with the current funding.	<i>live answered</i>	X		X				x		
261	Is there any possibility of getting SB1 funds into the HBP?	<i>Not likely. The preference for stakeholders was to get flexible funding which could be used on bridges, but also could be used on other things- especially pavement.</i>	X		X				x		
262	Most of the proposed policies make more sense if they are intended for those bridge projects which only involve corrections on structural deficiency (SD).	<i>Good comment. Will bring to the committee for discussion.</i>		x	X			x			
263	What can the group as a whole do to lobby for increased national HBP funding?	<i>As public employees we can't lobby. However, the HBP committee voted to fund the bridge portion of the 2020 local streets and roads needs assessment which can be used to communicate the disparity of bridge needs compared to available funding when the report is completed later this year. We would appreciate your help. Contact us!</i>		x	X		x		x		
264	Has a strong message been sent to Washington DC about increasing the funding for the HBP Program?	<i>Not sure what "strong" means but the local committee reps are working to communicate communicate the disparity of bridge needs compared to available funding. We would appreciate your help. Contact us!</i>		x	X		x				
265	Agree with Anonymous. Need more SLA representation and participation, not less as has been the case now veruss years ago.	<i>Thank you for the feedback. Will share with the committee.</i>		x	X					x	

# Zoom Q&A Report

Webinar Outreach Event

Local Highway Bridge Program Reform Policies

#	Question	Answer	Response During Webinar	Response After Webinar	6/3/2020 Webinar	6/4/2020 Webinar	Comment Category				
							General / Administrative	Technical / Engineering	Funding Concerns	Process Concerns / Clarity	Caltrans Resources / Responsiveness
266	Policy #5 should come with a commitment from Caltrans to review all 6Ds before the annual survey	<i>Thank you for the feedback. Will share with the committee.</i>		x	X					x	
267	What is the funding source for Bridge Investment Credits? And will these new policies impact our ability to get approved for using our banked credits?	<i>Need clarification on this question. Local agencies fund the work to establish the credit and toll credits are used to fund the "credit". Details have not been determined but banked credits can only be used on eligible work. Great question and comment. Will bring to the committee.</i>		x	X				x		
268	Will there be any changes from now to the next Bridge Survey?	<i>Has not been determined.</i>		x	X				x		
269	Is there a way to move bridges with Sufficiency Ratings below 10 or 20 to the top of the list?	<i>Thank you for the feedback. Will share with the committee.</i>		x	X		x				
270	For Policy #3, will the Program contribute the cost of what would have been standard applications toward aesthetics (railing, lighting)?	<i>Has not been determined. Looking like 2% will be eligible.</i>		x	X			x			
271	For most of the proposed policies, suggest that it allows certain flexibility. For example, cap the architectural treatment to, say 5%. But it has to be approved by HBP Managers or the committee case by case for better control of the funds.	<i>Thank you for the feedback. Will share with the committee.</i>		x	X				x		
272	Thank you... very helpful and informative.	<i>Thank you!</i>		x	X		x				
273	thanks	<i>Thank you!</i>		x	X		x				
274	Thank you.	<i>Thank you!</i>		x	X		x				
275	Is there any way California could get relief for initiating temporary construction easements upon payment to property owners? It would be some ROW phase savings if the TCE could be established for an agreed upon time period and not commence immediately.	<i>Thank you for the feedback. Will share with the committee.</i>		x	X				x		