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I. Executive Summary

Dye Management Group, Inc was contracted by UDOT to complete a review of the access permitting process, in part to assist with UDOT’s response to a recent audit finding. In addition, UDOT wishes to continue efforts to improve this process.

Dye Management Group, Inc. used the following approach to gather and analyze information for this report:

- Reviewed and analyzed available documentation related to the current process. This included the UDOT’s Administrative Rule R930-6, application packets and forms used in the various regions, and processes, application materials and rules used by Montana and Colorado.
- Prepared draft process diagrams depicting the permitting process described in UDOT’s Administrative Rule (above).
- Conducted group and individual interviews with regional permit staff, including a review of the process for each region, and discussion of a series of interview questions.
- Conducted phone interviews with permitting managers in Colorado and Montana Departments of Transportation.
- Interviewed the UDOT Statewide Permits Officer on the appeals process that he conducts, and regarding regional differences.
- Analyzed the data and information gathered, and prepared a draft report for review by UDOT.
- Revised the draft report based on UDOT comments, and delivered a final report to UDOT management.

A summary of our analysis and conclusions is presented below:

- **Inter-Regional Analysis**

  All Regions have made significant progress recently in moving toward common approaches and best practices for permitting, and in learning from each others’ experiences. At the same time, differences remain among the regions in the areas of how staff work with applicants, when fees are paid, use and timing of application review meetings, staff support for inspections, percent of permits inspected, and use of the statewide tracking database.

  At this time, only limited data is available for access permits. The total count of access permits for each region is available. For other data, we encountered significant problems, including different data recording practices among regions, differences in how turnaround times are defined, no data on staff time spent on reviewing permits by permit type (access, encroachment, etc.), and inability to report data by Types 1, 2, 3 4 (complexity level). These data gaps and inconsistencies must be addressed in order to reach valid conclusions about actual permitting performance in the regions and throughout the state.
• **Comparison of UDOT with Other States**

Like Utah, Montana and Colorado DOT’s have de-centralized their permit review and approval to regions or districts. Colorado recently completed a permitting standardization effort that used a top-down approach on multiple fronts (legal, standards, regulations, systems, and working directly with staff). For complex “system impact” applications, Montana DOT has standardized on a combination of district receipt, screening and final approval of applications, with headquarters review. This preserves the district role in receiving applications, issuing final approval and permit, and conducting inspections and oversight of projects, while relieving workload on the part of district staff.

• **Best Practices**

Best practices identified by UDOT Regions, Colorado and Montana DOTs include:

– Executive level support for the approval and appeals process should include refusal to short-circuit the process through executive intervention in response to political or economic pressures. This helps ensure consistency and credibility of the permitting program.

– A statewide information system which is used consistently by all permitting staff, and which is responsive to changing business needs.

– Collaborative and interactive approaches to working with applicants.

– Regular forums, such as statewide meetings and newsletters, for regional permit staff to exchange ideas, questions, and solutions.

• **Improvement Opportunities**

We recommend UDOT pursue a number of improvement opportunities. UDOT should form a “Quality Improvement Team” comprised of management and staff to further develop solutions for the highest priority opportunities listed here. The following improvement opportunities hold the greatest promise for benefits for UDOT and its permitting applicants:

– Standardize the process differences among regions. UDOT and its applicants might benefit most from standardizing:
  * When the permit fee is paid (when application is submitted, or when it is approved), and when inspection fees are paid.
  * Whether a permit or simply an approval letter is issued for access.
  * Expanded use of review meetings for pre-application, completeness review, and final review of applications.
  * Use of field work, including upfront/pro-active discussions with landowners, to learn about their access needs prior to a formal application.
  * Collaboration with applicants as they prepare their applications.
- Practices for recording data in a single database, with a common set of data definitions and calculations (for example, for turnaround time).

- Targets for the percentage of access sites inspected, and how and when they are inspected (throughout the project and at the end of the project). This must be coordinated with providing adequate staff coverage for inspections

  - Develop methods and reporting tools that will allow UDOT to more closely determine its cost for permitting (including staff time). To be successful, these methods and tools must have minimal impact on staff workload.

  - Develop a performance measurement program which includes agreeing on performance goals, establishing baseline data, designing and implementing a data gathering program (using the statewide tracking system) which has minimal impact on staff time, and continuous improvement using the performance data gathered.

  - Review and update the permitting Administrative Rule (R930-6) to make it more consistent with actual practice in each of the regions. This should improved definitions of turnaround time standards, variance requirements, and other permitting concepts.

  - Develop a staffing solution that provides regions with fuller and more consistent support for inspections.

  - Improve the statewide online system, to make it more user friendly, ensure uniform use by all regions, provide additional reporting capabilities, record performance data, and incorporate features developed and requested by individual regions.

  - Expand outreach and training to improve applicants’ understanding of review timelines and requirements, so their expectations regarding when UDOT will issue a decision are more realistic, their complaints are reduced, the quality of applications is improved, and the time spent in completeness reviews is reduced.

  - Develop standardized materials, application packets, and checklists for use by all Regions to provide to applicants.
II. Introduction

A. Report Purpose and Audience

The purpose of this report is to examine the process used to review and approve requests for access and encroachment permits by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). Dye Management Group, Inc was contracted by UDOT to complete a review of this process, in part to assist UDOT’s response to a recent audit finding. In addition, UDOT wishes to continue efforts to improve this process statewide and within UDOT’s four regions.

Some of the principal questions addressed in this report are:

- How long does it take to issue permits?
- How much do the regions charge for the permits?
- What process do the regions follow for issuing permits?
- Are the permit review and approval processes consistent across regions?
- What are the performance measures used?
- Are the staffing levels consistent in regions based on number of permits reviewed?
- How does UDOT’s process compare with those used by Montana and Colorado Departments of Transportation?

The audience for this report includes:

- Director of Engineering Services
- The Statewide Permits Officer
- Regional Directors
- Regional Permit Staff

B. Approach

Dye Management Group, Inc. used the following approach to gather and analyze information for this report:

- Reviewed and analyzed available documentation related to the current process. This included the UDOT’s Administrative Rule R930-6, application packets and forms used in the various regions, and processes, application materials and rules used by Montana and Colorado.
• Prepared draft process diagrams depicting the permitting process described in UDOT’s Administrative Rule (above). See Appendix F for a description of the process diagramming approach used.

• Conducted group and individual interviews with regional permit staff, including a review of the process for each region, and discussion of a series of interview questions.

• Conducted phone interviews with permitting managers in Colorado and Montana Departments of Transportation.

• Interviewed the UDOT Statewide Permits Officer on the appeals process that he conducts, and regarding regional differences.

• Analyzed the data and information gathered, and prepared a draft report for review by UDOT.

• Revised the draft report based on UDOT comments, and delivered a final report to UDOT management.
III. Background

A. Types of Permits Analyzed

Two types of permits were analyzed for this report: access and encroachment permits. These are defined in the UDOT Administrative Rule, as follows:

- **Access permit**
  
  “A grant of access permit is required from the Utah Department of Transportation whenever a new driveway, other curb cut, or local street connection is required on a State Highway. This applies to permission to construct a new driveway or vehicular access, modify, or relocate an existing driveway or access, or to close an access on the State Highway right-of-way. A new access permit is also required when there is a change in land and use or a change in the use of an existing Access Permit.”

- **Encroachment permit**
  
  “A document that specifies the requirements and conditions for performing work on the highway right-of-way.”

Typically an encroachment permit is issued for a very limited period of time to allow work to be done for an access which UDOT has authorized. Encroachment permits are also issued for utility poles or other items to be located within a state highway right of way.

B. Types of Applicants

Applicants for access and encroachment permits include individual landowners, local governments (cities and counties), utility companies, residential and commercial developers. Often the party requiring access will contract with a professional engineer or engineering firm to prepare the studies and documents required for the permit application. In many cases, this engineering firm will apply for and hold the encroachment permit authorizing work to be done on the state roadway.

C. Permit Volume

Exhibit 1 below summarizes the volume of access permits processed between 2006 and 2009. Exhibit 1 does not include encroachment permits that may be associated with access permits. Details regarding type of permit applications are provided in Appendix L.
Exhibit 1: Access Permit Volume, 2006 - 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th># of Access Permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region One *</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Two</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Three</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Four</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Permits</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Region One access permit counts are based on data recorded in its regional tracking database. Data for the remaining regions is drawn from the statewide tracking database.
IV. Utah DOT’s Current Process

A. Region 1

1. Permit Process Description

In Region One, the Roadway Right of Way Coordinator has principal responsibility for the permitting process. The process contains five major steps:

- Prepare Permit Application
- Conduct Completeness Review
- Conduct Application and Variance Request Review
- Provide Notice of Access Decision
- Construct Approved Access

The following summary provides the responsible party, time frames, results, and a brief description for each of these major steps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Name</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Permit Application</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Application submitted</td>
<td>The applicant prepares a site plan, contacts UDOT to notify of a pending access request. A pre-application meeting includes right of way and engineering staff, resulting in handouts, instructions and meeting minutes to assist the applicant, and identification of the applicant’s primary contact. The applicant completes various studies and forms, and completes and submits the permit application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Completeness Review</td>
<td>Roadway Right of Way Coordinator</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Application advanced to full review</td>
<td>The Roadway Right of Way Coordinator reviews the application for inclusion of all necessary studies and information. If the application is incomplete, the Permit Applicant is asked for additional information. Once the Permit Applicant has provided all needed information, the application is advanced for full review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step Name: Conduct Application and Variance Request Review
Responsible Party: Roadway Right of Way Coordinator
Time Frame: 20 days (per performance plan)
Results: Application decision
Brief Description: Weekly meetings are held to conduct formal review for complete permit applications. These meetings include pre-construction, traffic safety, and other UDOT staff (e.g., maintenance and environmental). Based on the recommendation from this meeting, the Right of Way Coordinator decides whether to approve access as proposed, approve with modifications, require restrictions, or deny the access. If conditions are specified, the Applicant updates the application to include them. The Region Traffic Engineer decides on any variances requested.

Step Name: Provide Notice of Access Decision
Responsible Party: Region Right of Way Coordinator
Time Frame: Included in previous step
Results: Approval letter to Applicant
Brief Description: If the application is approved, the Applicant pays the permit fee, and then UDOT issues a letter that the permit is available. If the application is not approved, UDOT provides the Applicant with a written explanation of denial.

Step Name: Construct Approved Access
Responsible Party: Permittee
Time Frame: 6 months
Results: Letter of completeness
Brief Description: The Permittee requests and receives approval for an encroachment permit. Once permit has been granted, the Permittee provides details about the construction schedule for installing the access, and then completes the work. The Right of Way Coordinator then notifies Transportation Technician(s) so he or she can schedule needed inspections. The Permittee may request extensions of the six month time frame. Once the project is complete, the permit will be closed out, and inspection hours submitted. A letter of completeness may be issued, if needed.

A set of diagrams summarizing Region One’s access permitting process is contained in Appendix G.
2. Permit Process Features

In measuring turnaround time for permit applications, all Regions use the submission of a complete application as the cycle time starting point for measurement. If the applicant is required to submit additional information, the starting point is reset to when the new information is provided. Region One has an internal goal of 20 days to complete permit review for access permits.

Region One’s processing time varies by application type, with more complex (Type Four) applications requiring more time than less complex (Type One) applications. Region One reports its applications are distributed by Type as follows:

Type 1 - 25%
Type 2 - 60%
Type 3 - 13%
Type 4 – 2%

Region One reports that it spends significant time handling permits that are never approved, and therefore not counted in the statewide permit tracking database.

Region One reports that all of its permitted projects are inspected.

Region One’s charges for permits are according to the statewide standard. Standard permit fees are as follows:

**Access Review Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>$475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional details regarding permit fees are contained in Appendix L.

Region One has developed a customized application packet for its applicants which includes the standard application and descriptions of the various standards and requirements for a complete application.

Region One was not able to quantify either staff time devoted to processing permits, or the overall cost of the process.
B. Region 2

1. Permit Process Description

In Region Two, the Region Right of Way Coordinator has principal responsibility for the permitting process. The process contains four major steps:

- Prepare Permit Application
- Conduct Application and Variance Request Review
- Provide Notice of Access Decision or Request More Information
- Construct Approved Access

The following summary provides the responsible party, time frames, results, and a brief description for each of these major steps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Name</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Permit Application</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Application and fee submitted</td>
<td>The applicant prepares a site plan, contacts UDOT to notify of a pending access request. A pre-application meeting includes right-of-way and traffic engineering staff, resulting in handouts, instructions and meeting minutes to assist the applicant, and identification of the applicant’s primary contact. The applicant completes various studies and forms, and completes and submits the permit application and permit fee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Application and Variance Request Review</td>
<td>16 days</td>
<td>Application decision</td>
<td>The Region Right-of-Way Coordinator reviews the documents submitted for completeness, and requests needed additional information from the Permit Applicant. For completed applications, weekly meetings are held to conduct formal review for complete permit applications. These meetings include pre-construction, traffic safety, and other UDOT staff (e.g., maintenance and environmental). The review committee may identify additional information needed, or make a recommendation for decision. Based on the committee’s recommendation, the Region Right-of-Way Coordinator decides on whether to approve access as proposed, approve with modifications, require restrictions,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or deny the access. If the application is approved, the applicant applies for an encroachment permit.

Step Name: Provide Notice of Access Decision
Responsible Party: Region Right of Way Coordinator
Time Frame: Included in previous step
Results: Approval letter to Applicant
Brief Description: If the application is approved, and then the Region Right-of-Way Coordinator provides a grant of access letter. If the application is not approved, UDOT provides the Applicant with a written explanation of denial.

Step Name: Construct Approved Access
Responsible Party: Permittee
Time Frame: 6 months
Results: Letter of completeness
Brief Description: The Permittee requests and receives approval for an encroachment permit. Once permit has been granted, the Permittee provides details about the construction schedule for installing the access, and then completes the work. This schedule helps the Permits Officer coordinate this work with other UDOT projects. If inspections are required, the Permits Officer schedules a Job Site Inspector to inspect the constructed access. The Permittee may request extensions of the six month time frame. Once the project is complete, upon final inspection the work is accepted and the permit is closed out.

A set of diagrams summarizing Region Two’s access permitting process is contained in Appendix H.

2. Permit Process Features

Region Two’s processing (turnaround) time varies by application level, with more complex (Type Four) permits requiring longer processing time.

A large majority (estimated at 70%) of the applications Region Two receives are initially incomplete, and require resubmission.

Region Two is the only region that has staff dedicated to inspections. As a result, all encroachment permits are inspected for installation/restoration to UDOT standards. These inspections are done by spot checking during the job. Region Two inspectors do not sign off on the completion of the project.

Region Two was not able to quantify either staff time devoted to processing permits, or the overall cost of the process.
Region Two coordinates with other regions on Multi Region permits, special events permits and at quarterly meetings. Coordination with Complex includes Appeals, Breaks in N/A Lines, Billboards, utility agreements, and quarterly meetings.

Region Two’s charges for permits are according to the statewide standard. Region Two has developed a customized application packet for its applicants, which includes the standard application and descriptions of the various standards and requirements for a complete application.

C. Region 3

1. Permit Process Description

In Region Three, the Region Right of Way Coordinator has principal responsibility for the permitting process. The process contains five major steps:

- Prepare Permit Application
- Conduct Completeness Review
- Conduct Application and Variance Request Review
- Provide Notice of Access Decision
- Construct Approved Access

The following summary provides the responsible party, time frames, results, and a brief description for each of these major steps:

Step Name: Prepare Permit Application
Responsible Party: Permit Applicant
Time Frame: Varies
Results: Application submitted
Brief Description: The Permit Applicant contacts UDOT to notify of a pending access request. In response the Region Right-of-Way Coordinator provides initial information about permit requirements, which the Permit Applicant uses to prepare application materials (typically online). If a pre-application meeting is needed, the Region Right-of-Way Coordinator requests the permit fee. Once the Permit Applicant pays the permit fee, a pre-application meeting is held which includes a variety of technical staff, resulting in handouts, instructions, Q&A, and meeting minutes to assist the applicant. The applicant completes various studies and forms (including a Traffic Impact Study and Variance Request, if needed), and completes and submits the permit application packet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Name: Conduct Completeness Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Party: Region Right-of-Way Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame: 10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results: Application advanced to full review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Description: The Right-of-Way Coordinator reviews the application for inclusion of all necessary studies and information. If the application is incomplete, the Permit Applicant is asked for additional information. Once the Applicant has provided all needed information, the application is advanced for full review, and the Permit Applicant is notified that it is scheduled for review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Name: Conduct Application and Variance Request Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Party: Roadway Right-of-Way Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame: 45 days (per state standard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results: Application decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Description: Meetings are held weekly to conduct formal review for complete permit applications. These meetings include pre-construction, traffic safety, and other UDOT staff (e.g., maintenance and environmental). Based on the recommendation from this meeting, the Region Right-of-Way Coordinator decides on whether to approve access as proposed, approve with modifications, require restrictions, or deny the access.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Name: Provide Notice of Access Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Party: Region Right-of-Way Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame: Included in previous step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results: Access approval notice forwarded; Access Denial and Written Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Description: If the application is approved, UDOT provides notice of access approval, which the Permit Applicant then forwards to the contractor or developer. If the application is not approved, UDOT provides the Applicant with a written explanation of denial.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Name: Construct Approved Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Party: Permittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame: 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results: Access and permit closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Description: The Permittee applies for an encroachment permit. The Region Permit Officer reviews the application and issues a permit. The Permittee completes the work, and applies for an extension if needed. Once project is completed, if an inspection is required, Maintenance Staff inspects the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
completed project. The Region Permit Officer then closes and files the permit.

A set of diagrams summarizing Region Three’s access permitting process is contained in Appendix I.

2. Permit Process Features

Overall, Region Three uses the statewide standard of 45 days to process an application as its standard.

There is little coordination on individual permits between Region Three and other regions. Coordination with Complex includes consultation on technical issues, and quarterly statewide meetings.

Nearly all of the Region Three’s permit applications are incomplete and require resubmission.

Region Three was not able to quantify either staff time devoted to processing permits, or the overall cost of the process.

In Region Three, inspections involving thorough on-site review are completed for about 50% of projects. A final inspection is rare.

D. Region 4

1. Permit Process Description

In Region Four, the Region Right of Way Coordinator has principal responsibility for the permitting process. The process contains five major steps:

- Prepare Permit Application
- Conduct Completeness Review
- Conduct Application and Variance Request Review
- Provide Notice of Access Decision
- Construct Approved Access

The following summary provides the responsible party, time frames, results, and a brief description for each of these major steps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Name</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Permit Application</td>
<td>Permit Applicant</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Application submitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brief Description: The Permit Applicant contacts UDOT to notify of a pending access request. In response the Region Right-of-Way Coordinator meets with the applicant, often on site, and may include the Permit Engineer in the meeting. If a permit is needed, with the help of the Permits Coordinator and other UDOT staff, the Permit Applicant prepares the application materials (typically online). The applicant completes various studies and forms, and completes and submits the permit application packet.

Step Name: Conduct Completeness Review
Responsible Party: Region Right-of-Way Coordinator
Time Frame: 10 days
Results: Application advanced to full review
Brief Description: The Region Right-of-Way Coordinator reviews the application for inclusion of all necessary studies and information. The Permits Coordinator conducts and assists with some of these. If the application is incomplete, the Permit Applicant is asked for additional information. Once the Permit Applicant has provided all needed information, the Permit Applicant is notified electronically, and the application is advanced for full review.

Step Name: Conduct Application and Variance Request Review
Responsible Party: Roadway Right-of-Way Coordinator
Time Frame: 14 days (average) for access permits; 7 days for encroachment permits
Results: Application decision
Brief Description: For applications advanced to full review, if a formal review is needed, the Region Right-of-Way Coordinator requests staff reviews (Traffic and Safety, Environmental and other staff). Based on their recommendations, the Region Right-of-Way Coordinator decides on whether to approve access as proposed, approve with modifications, require restrictions, or deny the access. If no formal review is needed, the Region Right-of-Way Coordinator simply reviews the application and makes a decision.

Step Name: Provide Notice of Access Decision
Responsible Party: Region Right-of-Way Coordinator
Time Frame: Included in previous step
Results: Approved access; Access Denial and Written Explanation
Brief Description: If the application is approved, the Permit Coordinator requests the permit fee of the Permit Applicant. The Permit Applicant pays the fee, and the Region Right-of-Way...
The Coordinator provides an access approval permit electronically. If the application is not approved, UDOT provides the Permit Applicant with a written explanation of denial.

**Step Name:** Construct Approved Access
**Responsible Party:** Permittee
**Time Frame:** 6 months
**Results:** Access and permit closed
**Brief Description:** The Permittee requests an encroachment permit. The Right-of-Way Coordinator reviews the application (including schedule, traffic control plan, and special limitations) and approves the permit. The Permits Coordinator ensures uniformity of the permit, and sends on to the Permittee or Contractor. The Permittee completes the work, and applies for an extension if needed. Once the project is completed, if an inspection is required, the Region Right-of-Way Coordinator inspects the constructed access, or may delegate the inspection to other regional staff (Transportation Technician, Station Foreman, or others) or to an independent testing firm. The Permits Coordinator then closes out the permit.

A set of diagrams summarizing Region Four’s access permitting process is contained in Appendix J.

2. **Permit Process Features**

Region Four has internal targets of 14 days turnaround for access permits, and 7 days for encroachment permits.

The most notable feature of Region Four’s permit process is the time and work permitting staff devote to working the potential applicants before they submit formal access requests, and as they develop their applications. Region Four uses a field-based, informal, and highly collaborative approach to working with applicants and potential applicants. They couple this approach with referring applicants to online (web-based) resources and other technical staff in the region. The fact that permit staff are distributed in local communities throughout the region helps them gain knowledge of the community which makes this approach very effective at being responsive to community needs. It is also notable that there have been no appeals to Region Four permitting decisions between 2006 and 2009.

Region Four was not able to quantify either staff time devoted to processing permits, or the overall cost of the process.
An important component of Region Four’s staff is a Permits Coordinator position. This person serves as an initial contact person for many applicants, helps applicants with their use of the online permit application system, directs applicants to finding needed information on UDOT’s web site, assists with the review and quality assurance for applications and permits, and assists in requesting and receiving permit fees. Right of Way Coordinators find this support very helpful in their work with applicants.

E. Appeals Process

1. Process Summary

When a permit application is denied, the Permit Applicant determines whether to appeal. Appeals must be filed within 30 days. If the Permit Applicant appeals, the Statewide Permits Officer meets with the Permit Applicant to discuss acceptable alternate solutions. The Statewide Permit Officer contacts the Region Right of Way Coordinator and proposes suggested solutions. The Region Right of Way Coordinator determines if proposed solutions are acceptable. If so applicant resubmits for review with newly proposed information. If no agreement is reached, the Statewide Permit Officer assembles an Appeals Committee to hear the appeal within 30 days, and recommend a solution. The three-person appeals committee is composed of individuals who are independent of the region’s review of and decision on the original application. During the hearing, both the region and that appellant present their case. The Statewide Permit Office notifies the Appellant of the decision. If the application is approved, the Region Right of Way Coordinator is notified, and a permit is issued with conditions. If the permit is not approved, the Permit Applicant decides within 30 days whether to pursue the next level of appeal. If so, the Regional Director hears and rules on the appeals, usually within one day, and notifies the applicant of the decision. This results either in a permit approval with conditions or no change in permit denial.

Some applicants choose not to appeal but rather refer the permit decision directly to executive management due to special considerations. At times this has resulted in a decision reversal on the part of the Regional Director.

A diagram depicting the Appeals Process, which is standardized for all Regions, is contained in Appendix K.

2. Features and Issues

Twenty-six (26) permit decisions have been appealed since 2006. These appeals are distributed by region and type in Exhibit 2 below:
Two issues with the appeal process were identified by the Statewide Permit Officer and by regional permitting staff:

- The normal appeal process is sometimes short circuited when applicants are successful in their requesting executive management (the Regional Director) to overturn a permit denial. This is often based on economic or political considerations.

- When a decision is overturned after an appeal (which occurred in 11 of the 26 appeals above), the original regional staff are usually called upon to process and approve the permit with any modified conditions defined by the Appeals Committee. This may have the appearance of conflict of interest on the part of regional permit staff and engineers who originally recommended the application be denied. On the other hand, it is not clear what alternative approach might be used for processing these overturned decisions.
V. Experience of Other States

A. Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT)

1. CDOT’s Permit Process

Access permits (equivalent to access/encroachment permits within UDOT), are handled by regional staff in each of CDOT’s six regions. Each regional permit office includes an access permit manager, an assistant permit manager, and one or two inspectors. The permit application form is available from CDOT’s permit web site (http://www.dot.state.co.us/AccessPermits/index.htm). Based on the location of the access site, the applicant submits the application to the correct regional office. Time limits for the application are set by Colorado’s code of regulations: 20 days to identify shortcomings in the application, and 45 days to review and respond to a complete application. Once an application has been reviewed and accepted, a permit is offered with terms and conditions. If the applicant agrees, he/she signs the permit and returns to the regional office with a check for the permit fee. The regional permit manager signs, deposits check, and sends applicant fully executed permit. The applicant is then required to begin construction within 365 days, and to submit construction documentation as part of the applicant’s request for a Notice to Proceed (NTP). Once the work is completed, it is inspected for compliance with the permit terms and conditions.

A diagram summarizing the Colorado Department of Transportation’s permit process for access permits is contained in Appendix C.

2. Process Features

The permit process for access permits is standardized throughout the state. Process and regulatory uniformity for permits across the state is a key goal of CDOT management. Permits are typically processed and approved by staff within each of the six CDOT regions. Permitting, then, is decentralized and standardized across CDOT regions. Standardization has taken place within the past year, and was the result of a multi-year effort. This effort has included improved automated tools and bringing regional staff together on a regular basis to encourage collaboration among regional staff.

A significant exception to how permits are handled in Colorado stems from the fact that, by law, all permitting for the transportation system is retained at the local government level (counties). In most cases, counties have delegated access permitting authority to CDOT. For those counties which have not done so, the application is received by the county, reviewed by the county, and forwarded to CDOT for review.
and comment. There is rarely a conflict between CDOT recommendations and a county’s decision to approve or deny a permit.

CDOT managers interviewed have a high level of satisfaction with the current process.

For access permits, charges are: $50 for a single residence, and some duplexes; $100 for a business applying with no alteration to the roadway; and $300 for a subdivision or commercial complex requiring modification to the roadway. These fees generate about 10% of the current cost of their permit program (which is between $700,000 and $1 million annually). CDOT handled 625 access permits statewide in 2008.

Staff handling access permits number 25 statewide. This includes one or two inspectors per region, depending on the size of the region. CDOT believes it needs more inspectors for access permits.

3. Improvement Opportunities

Improvement opportunities for CDOT’s permit process identified by interviewees include the following:

- CDOT would like to improve its working relationships with local government. Improved awareness of each others’ goals and interests (for example, CDOT’s interest in highway safety and local government interest in tax revenue) can improve collaboration. This can be accomplished by increased sharing of access management plans and access control plans, and more frequent discussions of corridor and roadway functions and purpose.

- CDOT has identified some possible strategies for increasing staff time on inspections. These include:
  - Train and use the highway maintenance staff, when the access location is too far from the central office and within the maintenance patrol area. Care must be taken to not interfere with staff’s normal maintenance duties, as maintenance staff is in a different budget than permitting staff.
  - Use project inspectors that are working on nearby highway projects, when this is feasible.
  - Use utility and outdoor/roadside advertising inspectors, when feasible.
  - Make more frequent use of the state highway access code which allows the department to require permittees to hire and pay for independent inspection at their cost, when the access project scope includes modification and changes to the roadway. This inspection work includes a report provided by the independent inspector or the engineer of record upon satisfactory completion of the access project.
4. **Best Practices**

Best practices identified by CDOT interviewees include the following.

- The interviewees felt that a unique feature of CDOT’s legal and regulatory system is the fact that Colorado is a regulated state regarding control of access; that is, by statute all highways are considered controlled highways, and access control is not a guideline, but a legal requirement. There are clear consequences to the landowner or developer for failing to comply, including closure of the access point, and liability-based prosecution through the Attorney General’s office for crashes that may occur due to unauthorized/illegal access. Though Colorado does not levy fines on violators, these measures are seen as providing important “teeth” to CDOT’s control of state highway access.

- CDOT finds it valuable to work closely with local governments, and to build an understanding of their needs and priorities as they affect CDOT’s review and approval of access requests.

- CDOT has also used a top-down approach to develop standard regulations which provide improved guidance for its regional staff. These have been developed and honed over the past several years, and were recently rolled out to the regions.

- An important factor in the success of CDOT’s recent standardization effort was custom development of database and application tools. These tools provide for online permit application and processing, and are being rolled out by permit type (access, utilities, outdoor advertising). CDOT staff interviewed felt that custom development of an automated system using local resources had important benefits, including easy access to the technical and functional knowledge needed to continue enhancing and improving the system.

B. **Montana Department of Transportation (MDT)**

1. **MDT’s Permit Process**

Access and associated encroachment permit applications (called “approach” permits within MDT) are received and approved or denied by district maintenance staff. There are five districts, and each district is divided into two maintenance divisions, making a total of ten maintenance divisions for MDT. Permit applications for larger projects with potential for system impacts are submitted to district staff, and then reviewed by the Planning and Policy Analysis Unit within the Rail, Transit, and Planning Division at headquarters office in Helena.

The process for smaller, individual landowner projects is handled from beginning to end by ten maintenance staff positions across the state; these permits are approved by the maintenance chief. This includes standard single residential approaches and farm field approaches. The landowner fills out the permit application and sends it to the district maintenance chief. The maintenance chief may delegate work on the permit to
a division superintendent or section manager. MDT staff will visit the site, and complete an environmental checklist. This includes looking for any drainage requirements, and recommending culvert or other drainage needed. If the project doesn’t pose any systems impact concerns, the maintenance chief contacts the land owner, signs off on the permit, and sends a copy to the landowner. The landowner has six months to construct the access. Once the approach is completed, the landowner notifies district MDT staff, and MDT inspects the installed approach to ensure correct slope, removal of debris, etc. Extensions are possible if the construction requires more than six months.

If initial review by district maintenance staff indicates the project will have significant impact on safety and operations, there is existing access control, or for other reasons identified by the district office, the application is sent to the Planning and Policy Analysis Unit within the Rail, Transit and Planning Division at MDT headquarters in Helena. The role of this unit is to provide a point of contact for the applicant, and to coordinate required technical reviews for more complex projects. This unit may have an initial start up meeting or conference call with the applicant. The Planning and Policy Analysis Unit will then coordinate review of the site analysis, traffic impact study, hydraulics study and/or environmental checklist, as well as systems impact, the design plan and/or access location and configuration. A memorandum of agreement is developed and signed with the applicant, if needed. This MOA may also include the local government. This memorandum defines roles and responsibilities for MDT, the developer, and local government (if needed). Once the Planning and Policy Analysis Unit has completed its review, the application is returned to the district, which then issues approval for the applicant to enter the state right of way. The applicant also provides a traffic control plan, work zone safety and mobility analysis, and proof of financial guarantee (if necessary). The district provides oversight over the project during construction, and if required the applicant provides a construction agreement between the contractor and MDT. Once construction is completed, the site is inspected, the district may issue a permit, the applicant provides the district with as-builts and improvements estimate, and MDT releases any financial guarantee the applicant provided.

A diagram summarizing the Montana Department of Transportation’s access permit process for significant projects with system impact is contained in Appendix D.

2. Process Features

The permit process for access permits is standardized throughout the state. Permits are typically processed and approved by staff within each of the five MDT regions. Permitting is decentralized and standardized across MDT districts. The exception to MDT’s decentralized approach to permits is the review and approval of design plans for larger, system impact projects by the Planning and Policy Analysis Unit within the Rail, Transit, and Planning Division at headquarters.

MDT managers interviewed are satisfied with the current process.
There are no charges for approach permits. However, the applicant/developer is required to pay for the cost of any impact the project has on the state highway, including needed improvements or traffic signals. In addition, traffic control plans submitted by the applicant/developer include liquidated damages requirements if the roadway is not open according to schedule.

Staff handling smaller approach permits as part of their daily business includes 10 maintenance chiefs, 22 maintenance superintendents, and 120 maintenance section staff. MDT doesn’t track the time spent on these permits, but it is not a significant portion of maintenance staff time. The Planning and Policy Analysis Unit at MDT’s headquarters offices has five full time staff that coordinate reviews of larger, system impact projects.

Interviewees did not feel there were unique laws or regulations for Montana’s access permitting process. MDT follows accepted standards already developed at the national level or by other states.

At times, executive management will overturn an approach permit decision reached by district staff, for reasons other than those provided for in permit standards and guidelines. This has been a source of concern and frustration for staff. Recently there has been significant support from executive management to maintain the integrity of the appeals process, which includes refusing to accept pre-emptive appeals.

3. Improvement Opportunities

Improvement opportunities identified by interviewees for MDT’s permit process include the following:

- Provide an electronic permitting process for approach permits, so that data for these permits is automatically stored in MDT’s central roadway database.
- Electronically track all approach permits in a central, accessible database. It can be difficult to find all of the approaches approved for a roadway, or in a specific area, in the current hardcopy filing system. This is sometimes needed for legal actions.
- Reduce the impact of political considerations on staff priorities.
- Continually improve turnaround time, so that developers’ needs for schedule-driven financing are balanced with a well-coordinated review and MDT’s need to protect the taxpayers’ investment in the transportation system.

4. Best Practices

Best practices identified during MDT interviews include the following.

- For smaller projects, MDT district maintenance staff members take a pro-active and collaborative approach to working with landowners to find alternative
solutions. Distributing this process out to the districts and divisions makes it possible for maintenance staff to know individual landowners and understand access and approach needs in the local context. It also improves turnaround time on the part of MDT in responding to approach permit applications. Often staff can discuss the landowner’s needs before an approach application is submitted. This leads to very few permit denials.

- Financial guarantees may be provided by developers in phases, rather than a single guarantee for a multi-phase projects. This makes the required guarantees more economically feasible for developer, and provides more specific control over the financial liability for MDT.

- Centrally coordinated technical reviews of larger, complex projects provide consistency and a single point of contact for applicants, relieves the district staff of significant workload required to conduct and coordinate these reviews, while preserving the district’s role in issuing these permits.

- Executive support for a standard, consistent process is an important contributor to process success. This insulates MDT from the negative impact of appeals before an applicant has completed the process.
VI. Analysis and Conclusions

A. Inter-Regional Analysis

1. Overall Observations

- All Regions have recently adopted new practices to improve their consistency, turnaround time and customer service for permit applicants. New practices have included using review committees to conduct completeness and final review of applications; consolidating additional information requirements for an application into a single letter to the applicant; and automated tools for submitting and tracking permit applications. There is a desire to further improve and standardize some of their processes and tools, while recognizing and responding to regional geographic differences.

- There are similarities, and important differences among the Regions in how access and encroachment permits are handled. Similarities include adherence to statewide standards for what is required, fees, definition of permit levels, adherence to the 45-day turnaround standard, and use of the statewide online permit application and tracking system. Differences include timing of permit fees, interpretation of variance requirements; definition of a “permit” (for access, or only for encroachment); support for inspections; use of meetings for pre-application, completeness review, formal review steps; and use of automated tools.

- All Regions appear to be collecting the same basic permit fees. However, there are inconsistencies as to when the fees are collected, and the timing and amount of inspection fees can vary based on the level of inspection required.

- The permits appeal process is standard across the state and is handled by the Statewide Permits Officer.

- The number of incomplete application packages submitted varies among regions from 50% to 100%. Some consider nearly all applications incomplete due to the fact that some documentation (e.g., insurance certificate) is normally submitted later in the application approval process.

2. Regional Process Differences

The following major differences were identified in how the various regions process permit applications:

- **When the permit fee is paid.** Some regions require that permit fees are paid early in the process, others only after permit has been approved. Regions One
and Four request the permit fee once an application has been approved, whereas
Regions Two and Three require the permit fee before reviewing an application.

- **Whether a permit of approval letter is issued for access.** Some regions issue a
  formal “permit” to approve a proposed access, while others issue access approval
  letters. Regions started issuing approval letters to avoid confusion on the part of
  applicants between a permit approving the access, and the encroachment permit
to complete construction work on the state’s right of way.

- **Most regions have developed their own application packets.** Contents of the
  packet primarily reflect common statewide standards, forms and practices, but
  the regions have customized summaries and explanations of these standards.
  Each of these regional permitting packets varies from the others in presentation
  and content.

- **How and when pre-application meetings are held.** These meetings provide an
  opportunity not only to provide the standards and requirements for completing an
  application, but also to discuss the specific project, including site plan and
  project location. UDOT staff compares the proposal to the administrative rule
  and provide guidance regarding traffic study limits and meeting the
  administrative rule requirements prior to the submittal of the formal application.
  Region Four meets with applicants often informally at the proposed access site.
  For other Regions, pre-application meetings are more formal meetings at the
  regional office.

- **Whether a completeness review is conducted.** Region 2 does not conduct a
  separate completeness review.

- **Emphasis on field work.** This includes up front/pro-active discussions with
  landowners, versus waiting for a formal application to be submitted. Field work
  and pro-active discussions are used more heavily in rural areas (e.g., Region
  Four).

- **Level of collaboration with applicant during the process.** Region Four staff
  members work more intensely with applicants while they are completing their
  application, than do those in other regions.

- **Level of support for inspections.** This includes whether inspections are done by
  dedicated permitting staff members or by staff borrowed from other sections
  within the region (for example: Transportation Technicians).

- **Use of automated tools.** Each region has its own set of databases, tracking, and
  mapping and analysis tools to supplement the statewide permit tracking system.
  In some cases, this means regional staff track permit information in both the local
  and statewide systems, and can produce different permit counts. Region One has
  also developed an innovative GIS application which provides both map and
  satellite view of proposed accesses.

- **Incorporating into access approval a requirement to share access in the
  future.** Some regions regularly incorporate into their approval letters and permits
a requirement for the landowner to share the approved access with future developments which may occur, as appropriate. Other regions do not, or do not incorporate this requirement consistently.

In addition, the process as practiced in every region differs in some ways from the process described in UDOT’s administrative rule for permitting. Components of the administrative rule which are not reflected in actual practice include the role of the Region Permits Officer in handling applications (this is done by the Right of Way Coordinator), referring applications for individual review by traffic and construction staff (this is more often done in committee meetings), and the need for the applicant to sign and return the access permit (some issue letters which do not require applicant signature).

3. Permits and Staffing Levels

Very few permit applications are rejected statewide. Of these an even smaller number are appealed. Only twenty-six applications have been appealed from 2006 to present, much less than 1% of the total number of permits.

At this time, only limited data is available for access permits. The total count of access permits for each region is available. For other data related to access permits, we encountered significant problems.

- Data could not be broken out by permit type (type 1, type 2, etc.).
- Because it issues access letters rather than permits, Region One has not reported any access permits in the statewide database. It does track these number is in its own regional database, leaving some uncertainty as to whether permit counts are comparable between Region One and other Regions.
- Region One turnaround times are determined based on the amount of time the application is actually in the hands of UDOT permitting staff. For other regions, turnaround times appear to include time the UDOT staff is waiting for applicant response to questions.
- Data on staff time devoted solely to processing access permits is not available. There are also differences among regions in how permits are recorded and tracked. There may also be differences in how the scope for a permit is defined (for example, handling a large project as one complex permit or breaking the project down into several smaller permits.) Hence, the overall calculation (for all permit types) of permits/FTE can be misleading, and is not especially helpful in determining the staff performance for access permits.

For these reasons, it is not possible at this time to compare access permit counts, turnaround times, or permits/FTE among the four regions or by permit type.

Access permit count and turnaround data reported from the statewide permit tracking database, and by Region One, are included in Appendix M.
Further research and data which is comparable across regions would be required to make any valid comparisons or to establish a baseline for ongoing performance measurement.

In establishing a performance management program, it is important to remember that permit/FTE is not the only important measure of staff productivity. Other activities staff perform include working with local governments to prepare Transportation Management Plans and corridor agreements; monitoring for illegal accesses; working with residents to avoid inappropriate access requests avoided through collaboration with the landowner or developer; and providing training, information and outreach for landowners, developers and contractors.

Staffing levels to support inspections are especially problematic for most regions. Most regions do not have staff dedicated to inspections, and rely on maintenance staff contracted for part time support to assist with this function. Some regions continue to need additional resources for inspections since the time of maintenance staff assigned inspection duties is divided between maintenance and permit responsibilities. As a result, most regions report insufficient staff for this function.

Staff experience levels were not reported by any of the regions as a significant barrier to productivity or quality work.

B. Comparison of UDOT with Other States

All three state DOTs—UDOT, CDOT and MDT—operate an essentially decentralized process for reviewing and approving access and encroachment permits.

- CDOT and MDT both seem to have achieved a more standardized process than UDOT. The most important factor in CDOT’s standardization has been a top-down driven effort on multiple fronts (legal, standards, regulations, and working directly with staff). One important factor in MDT’s standardization has been the involvement of headquarters in reviewing large and complex projects.

- In contrast to UDOT’s distributed review and approval of all projects (simple and complex), for complex “system impact” applications, MDT has standardized on a combination of district receipt, screening and final approval of applications, with headquarters review. This preserves the district role in receiving applications, issuing final approval and permit, and conducting inspections and oversight of projects, while relieving workload on the part of district staff. UDOT does not have a separate or well-defined process for handling complex permits that require coordination with UDOT headquarters. This may contribute to the longer turnaround times for processing complex permit applications due to inefficiencies and coordination challenges in working with Complex staff, as well as delays in scheduling time required of regional technical staff.
• MDT has divided its permit processing along different organizational lines than UDOT. MDT has assigned its approach (access) permits to the district/division maintenance staff.

C. Best Practices

The following best practices were identified by interviewees from other state DOTs as well as by UDOT permitting staff:

• Use of a “hybrid” processing and review approach (combining regional and central office or headquarters review) for complex applications and projects can provide helpful technical support to regional permitting staff, while improving the consistency with which technical issues are handled on larger projects statewide. If coordinated effectively, this approach can also improve efficiency and responsiveness, as well as relieving regional technical staff of extra workload. In addition, it can improve the perception of uniformity and fairness across regions on the part of developers who work statewide.

• MDT managers and some UDOT regions have found that a “high touch,” collaborative and interactive approach to smaller, simpler projects can improve project outcomes, avoid time spent on permit applications which are unlikely to be approved, and reduce the number of appeals by improving applicants’ understanding of state requirements.

• Executive level support for the permit review and approval process should include a refusal to short-circuit the process in response to political or economic pressures. Early appeals and decisions perceived as arbitrary and contrary to state rules and policies can seriously erode the credibility of the permitting program.

• Information systems for permitting should provide a common platform for staff in all regions and incorporate features that respond to their needs, including entering data and reporting on it. The information system should provide a single point of entry of all permitting data, and integrate permitting data with construction and maintenance data. The system should also be supported by readily available technical staff to ensure quick response to changing staff needs.

• Hold regular forums, such as statewide meetings and newsletters, for regional permit staff to exchange ideas, questions, and solutions. This can be a powerful tool for encouraging shared approaches and solutions to common problems, and can bolster a sense of teamwork across regional lines.

D. Improvement Opportunities

The following improvement opportunities are based on issues identified and observations made by UDOT managers and staff who participated in the regional interviews, along with the experience of CDOT and MDT permitting managers. These opportunities are divided into those addressing process, cost, performance, staffing, and automated tools.
We recommend UDOT pursue a number of improvement opportunities. UDOT should form a “Quality Improvement Team” comprised of management and staff to further develop solutions for the highest priority opportunities listed here.

The team should include representatives from each regional permitting team, along with appropriate Complex representatives.

Process

• Standardize some of the process differences among regions, as listed above. UDOT and its applicants might benefit most from standardizing the following practices:
  – When the permit fee is paid (when application is submitted, or when it is approved).
  – Whether a permit or simply an approval letter is issued for access.
  – How and when pre-application meetings are held.
  – Use of a completeness review for applications.
  – Use of review meetings for completeness review and final review of applications. Encourage more consistent use of review meetings, including guidelines for when they are most useful, and technical staff to include in meetings on a consistent basis (for example, traffic, environmental staff).
  – Use of field work, including upfront/pro-active discussions with landowners, to learn about their access needs prior to a formal application.
  – Collaboration with applicants as they prepare their applications.
  – Providing printed information, checklists, sample applications, standards, and guidelines to the applicant early in the process.
  – Practices for recording data in a single database, with a common set of data definitions and calculations (for example, for turnaround time).
  – Online documentation for compliance with UDOT’s new insurance requirements.
  – Targets for the percentage of access sites inspected, and how and when they are inspected (throughout the project and at the end of the project). This must be coordinated with providing adequate staff coverage for inspections.

• Clarify, revise, or develop (as necessary) commonly-agreed to definitions for essential components of UDOT’s permitting process. These include pre-application meeting, completeness review meeting, application review meeting, variance, and other terms. Include these definitions in the Administrative Rule, the application packet, and other documents and orientation materials provided to permitting staff.

• Review and update the permitting Administrative Rule (R930-6) to make it more consistent with actual practice in each of the regions. In particular, revisit the
statewide standards of 10 days for completeness review and 45 days for full application review. Consider incorporating permit complexity in standards, making these both more specific (for example, setting targets by permit type), as well as more flexible (for example, provide flexibility to allow for extremely large or complex projects).

- Statewide Permits Coordinator and other Complex staff should work with regional staff to develop standardized materials, packets, and checklists to provide to applicants. This should include a standard application packet for use by all Regions.
- If the “approval of access” letter approach is agreed to be used by all regions, develop a standard letter for this approval.
- Develop solutions (outreach, additional training) to improve knowledge and understanding of contractors regarding permit requirements, thereby improving percentage applications which are complete, and reducing the time spent in completeness reviews.
- Increase the support (training, information) and incentives (regular status notice to the landowner/developer) for consultants to reduce the number of incomplete submissions.
- Expand outreach and training to improve applicants’ understanding of review timelines, so their expectations regarding when UDOT will issue a decision are more realistic, and their complaints are reduced.
- Improve the information provided to applicants at the beginning of the process about benefits of the permitting process to them (e.g., improved quality and longevity of the finished product, reduced risk) and to the public and taxpayers.
- Provide a checklist or other helpful documents to landowners/small developers for selection and use of contractors to assist in the application and construction process.
- Nearly all regions indicated applicant questions and dissatisfaction with the timeliness of review and approval of access permits. Determine the extent and causes of applicant dissatisfaction with timeliness of UDOT reviews and approval for access permits. Gaining further understanding of the situations most likely to lead to this dissatisfaction and their causes (including applicant perceptions and misunderstandings) can be used to design targeted solutions with the highest payoff for UDOT and its permit applicants. This might also include applicants’ understanding of the “clock reset” policy as it applies to applications which are resubmitted.
- Determine whether getting assistance from technical experts in other Regions or at Headquarters Complex to review large, complicated projects would improve turnaround times or the quality of access designs and installed accesses. Based on the benefits identified, develop standards, procedures, and tools for when and how these projects should be referred.
• Develop alternative or back-up procedures to respond to technical staff (e.g., environmental, utilities) not being available for an application review meeting, or not responding to an application review request.

• Develop an improved definition of requirements for variances. A matrix of factors and solutions for variances may be helpful for statewide coordination.

• Work to simplify the application process so there are fewer steps and less paperwork for the applicant, without reducing the quality of information needed for sound decisions. This could make it easier for applicants to understand and conform to a more standard, simplified process.

• Adopt as a standard practice that, when issuing the encroachment permit, the applicant pay the inspection fee up front, rather than being billed when inspection takes place. This would reduce confusion and dissatisfaction among applicants about the total fees they will be required to pay, as well as reducing billing time for UDOT staff.

• Coordinate with Construction on approval of and conditions for a permit. This may help avoid rework on an access because future project plans were not incorporated into the permit.

• Develop additional coordination tools and strategies to support collaboration among regions, and with cities, counties, UDOT utilities and other divisions, as well as external state and federal agencies. This could improve the statewide consistency, timeliness, and quality of permits issued.

• Identify appropriate opportunities for additional involvement by other UDOT divisions (construction, utilities, environmental, maintenance, others) early in the permit process, to reduce conflicts and misunderstandings later in the process, and to improve UDOT-wide ownership of the resulting permit decision.

• Discuss with senior and executive management at Complex and in the Regions strategies for reducing the impact of political and other special considerations on the credibility of UDOT’s permitting process.

Cost

• Develop methods and reporting tools that will allow UDOT to more closely determine its cost for permitting (including staff time). This should include time working with potential applicants prior to filing an application. To be successful, these methods and tools must have minimal impact on staff workload.

• Use these cost figures to re-assess permit charges. Determine whether an increase in fees is warranted for some permit types, considering both applicant and UDOT interests and need. By necessity, permit costs must consider ability to pay on the part of landowners, and benefit to the community as a whole derived from the access (economic impacts).
Performance

- Develop data gathering and reporting tools which can be used cost-effectively to track progress against a set of meaningful goals and targets established for UDOT’s permitting function.

- Establish performance baselines for permit turnaround time, permits/FTE, cost/permit by permit type, and others. Staff performance data might also include tracking time spent on pre-application activities, tracking illegal encroachments, providing outreach, and public education.

- Develop efficient tools and methods for gathering and tracking staff time for the various kinds of permit-related activities they perform.

- Identify and gather additional data to determine the reasons for increases and decreases in permit turnaround times among regions and from year to year. Additional data will include permit complexity level (types 1, 2, 3, 4), as well as staff time spent on permit applications.

- Region Three has a higher rate of appeals and overturned cases than the other regions. It may be helpful to determine the sources of this higher rate - aspects of Region Three’s permitting process, staffing, or other aspects of how Region Three handles permits, or simply increased number of complex or controversial projects in the region.

Staffing

- Develop a staffing solution that provides regions with fuller and more consistent support for inspections. Because of limited staff available for inspections, some regions are only able to inspect as few as 50% of permitted/approved accesses. Improved inspection support may reduce the incidence of permit holders failing to comply with requirements and conditions in the approval and permit documents. This might start with sharing among regions more information about how they handle inspections. Some options to consider might include those being considered by CDOT, such as: negotiate regular availability of maintenance or utilities staff, use of construction project inspectors, require permittees to pay a fuller percentage of the cost of inspections, require permittees to hire independent inspectors, or some combination of these solutions.

- Develop ways to provide more equitable staff coverage across regions, while supporting regional differences. Most regions agreed that increased staff support would improve the quality and timeliness of permits and authorized accesses.

Automated Tools

- Improve the statewide online system, to achieve the following goals:
  - Ensure uniform use of the system by staff in all regions.
Make it more user friendly for applicants and staff.

Provide additional reporting capabilities.

Record additional data for tracking performance statewide and by region and permit type (for example, access, encroachment, special permits) over time. This includes application permit complexity type (Type 1, Type 2, etc.), staff time spent on permits and other key permit-related activities, pre-application activities, and other cost factors.

Provide additional features and functions to meet the needs of regions which have developed their own tools and databases. This includes permit, project and staff tracking, mapping and site visualization. Where possible, borrow from designs and application components already developed by regional staff.

Provide a technical solution to remote internet communication in rural areas, so that UDOT staff can connect to the online permit system in the field (especially in rural areas).

- Develop data definitions which all regions agree on (for example, defining what permits or other approvals are entered into the system, and the start and stop of the “clock” for calculating turnaround time), and provide an orientation to staff on these definitions and related procedures.

- Standardize regional practices for entering data into the statewide permit tracking system, so that all regions consistently record access permits and approvals, turnaround times, and related data needed for accurate tracking. These practices should be designed to support continual improvement of the quality and timeliness of permit application review and decision making. Provide training and guides on these practices for permitting staff in all regions.

- Find an efficient method for capturing data on staff time spent on pre-application activities and work on applications that don’t result in permit approvals.

- Incorporate into the UDOT permitting web site additional information about standards, guidelines, and templates that may be useful to applicants.
Appendix A: Interview Questions

Utah Department of Transportation

Permit Process Review

Interview Guide

November 19, 2009

1. Current Process

1. What are the major steps involved in handling permit applications?
   a. Who has the primary responsibility for each step?
   b. What are the “hand-offs” from one person to the next, for these major steps?
   c. Who has primary responsibility for the entire process? This includes tracking and taking requisite measures to ensure that the review is completed within the allowed review period.

2. What handouts or forms do you provide applicants to help them complete the application, to notify them of the review results, or for other parts of the process?
   a. How is this information shared with the applicants? (Paper copies, online location on UDOT site, email, other)

3. What materials do you use to evaluate the applications?
   a. Manuals
   b. Administrative Rule R930-6, 933.2, and 933.3
   c. Others

4. What criteria do you use to evaluate the applications?

5. What is the average actual timeline for the process? How does this vary by the type of application/permit, or by some other condition?
   a. What is the maximum allowable time for an application review?
   b. Does UDOT have internal timeline requirements/expectations for each member of review team?
   c. Does the maximum time vary by type of application?

6. How much do you charge for each permit (by permit type)?
   a. Which factors affect the amount charged for each permit?
   b. Do different applicants get charge differently for the same permit type?
      i. If yes to b:
         a) Why are the charges different?
         b) Do you document why different applicants are charged different amounts?
         c) Do you use a cost versus benefit formula/matrix?

7. How long, on average, does the packet stay at each reviewer?
   a. Do some reviews take significantly longer than others? Which ones, and why?

8. How do you coordinate with other UDOT Regions on their processes or applicants?
   a. What forms or procedures do you use to coordinate?
9. How do you coordinate with UDOT Complex?
   a. What forms or procedures do you use to coordinate?

10. How does a negative check affect the process?
    a. Does one negative check end the process?
    b. How is this handled (return to applicant, deny the application, something else)?
    c. If an incomplete package arrives and must be sent back to the applicant for more information, does the 45 day review process start over again?
       i. If not, what effect if any does it have on the timeline?
       ii. What challenges are associated with how incomplete packages affect the timeline?
    d. How often do you get incomplete packages?
    e. How often do people submit applications that don’t need to?
    f. How often do applicants send packages to the wrong location or person?

11. What are the three most frequent questions you get from applicants?

12. What are the appeals frequency & types?
    a. What is the general appeals process?
       i. What are the different levels of appeal?
    b. What percentage of applications ends in appeal?
       i. First level of appeal
       ii. Second level of appeal
    c. What type of applications get appealed most?
    d. How are the appeals committees formed? Are they consistent?
    e. What are the internal costs for appeals (monetary, staff time, etc.)?
    f. Does the appeals process work? What changes would you recommend?
2. **Process performance**

1. What percentage of permits gets inspected?
   a. If this varies by type, what percentage of each type gets inspected?
   b. Is the inspection process consistent across regions?
2. How satisfied are you with the current process?
3. What are the strengths of the current process? Which parts of the current process do you think work very well?
4. What are the most frequent complaints about the process that you hear from applicants?
   a. What other complaints do you believe they have, that you don’t hear?
5. What are the most frequent complaints about the process that you hear from reviewers or other staff involved?
   a. What other complaints do you believe they have, that you don’t hear?
6. What performance measures do you track?
   a. Permits per FTE actual
   b. Permits per FTE ideal
   c. How much time (duration/work time) to complete per permit type?
   d. Other?
7. What are your costs for this process? What is the average cost in your region to process a permit? Does this vary by type, or some other variable? Can you calculate your costs?
3. Issues and Improvement Opportunities

1. Are applicants finding a way to circumvent the process? If so, can you give me an example?
2. What other problems do you see with the process?
3. In your view, is there procedural uniformity among the Regions?
   a. Why or why not?
4. What new procedures or forms of communication would be useful for coordination?
5. How might an intranet or internet tracking site be valuable for you and/or the applicant?
6. Does your region have the appropriate level of autonomy for implementing this process?
   a. Why or why not? How does this affect your ability to perform the process?
7. Are there any steps to the process you think should be added or removed?
8. Is the process expected timeline adequate? Should it be changed? How?
9. Do you have adequate staff to properly process permit applications?
A. Introduction

Dye Management Group, Inc. has been contracted by the Utah Department of Transportation to review its permit process. This effort includes comparing the UDOT permit process to standards and best practices developed in other states. Montana DOT has been selected as one of the states whose process and practices for permits UDOT would like to learn more about. The scope of this study includes the following permit types:

- Driveway and street access permits
- Right of way encroachment permits

Dye Management Group, Inc. staff will contact you shortly to schedule a phone interview, covering the topics listed below.

Thank you in advance for your valuable help in sharing your experience and insights with us.

B. Interview Questions

1. What is the current process used in your state to handle permits?
   a. What are the major steps involved in handling permit applications?
   b. Who has the primary responsibility for each step?
   c. What are the “hand-offs” from one person to the next, for these major steps?
   d. Who has primary responsibility for the entire process? This includes tracking and taking requisite measures to ensure that the review is completed within the allowed review period.

2. Are permit application and approval centralized or decentralized in your state?

3. What, in your opinion, are the unique laws/regulations of your state regarding permits?

4. What is your level of satisfaction with the current process? (High, Medium, Low) What are the primary factors contributing to this level of satisfaction?

5. What do you see as factors/steps that work well in the current process?

6. What improvement opportunities do you see for your permit process?

7. How many staff members statewide handle permits? (FTEs)
   a. What percentage of DOT staff members (both in HQ and in districts) handle permits?
   b. Do you believe you have enough staff? Why/why not?

8. How much do you charge for a permit? Do you believe your state’s charges are appropriate? Why or why not?
9. Is the process uniform across districts? Why or why not?
   a. Overall process
   b. Appeals process
   c. Inspection process and percentage of applications inspected
   d. If no, which parts of the process vary the most?
10. Should this process be standard across the state or handled differently by districts as required?
11. Are there any efforts now underway to standardize the process statewide?
12. Are there best practices you have adopted which may be helpful to other states?
Utah Department of Transportation
Permit Process Review
Process Benchmarking Interview Guide – Colorado DOT
November 23, 2009

A. Introduction

Dye Management Group, Inc. has been contracted by the Utah Department of Transportation to review its permit process. This effort includes comparing the UDOT permit process to standards and best practices developed in other states. Colorado DOT has been selected as one of the states whose process and practices for permits UDOT would like to learn more about. The scope of this study includes the following permit types:

- Driveway and street access permits
- Right of way encroachment permits

Dye Management Group, Inc. staff will contact you shortly to schedule a phone interview, covering the topics listed below.

Thank you in advance for your valuable help in sharing your experience and insights with us.

B. Interview Questions

1. What is the current process used in your state to handle permits?
   a. What are the major steps involved in handling permit applications?
   b. Who has the primary responsibility for each step?
   c. What are the “hand-offs” from one person to the next, for these major steps?
   d. Who has primary responsibility for the entire process? This includes tracking and taking requisite measures to ensure that the review is completed within the allowed review period.
2. Are permit application and approval centralized or decentralized in your state?
3. What, in your opinion, are the unique laws/regulations of your state regarding permits?
4. What is your level of satisfaction with the current process? (High, Medium, Low) What are the primary factors contributing to this level of satisfaction?
5. What do you see as factors/steps that work well in the current process?
6. What improvement opportunities do you see for your permit process?
7. How many staff members statewide handle permits? (FTEs)
   a. What percentage of DOT staff members (both in HQ and in regions) handle permits?
   b. Do you believe you have enough staff? Why/why not?
8. How much do you charge for a permit? Do you believe your state’s charges are appropriate? Why or why not?
9. Is the process uniform across regions? Why or why not?
   a. Overall process
   b. Appeals process
   c. Inspection process and percentage of applications inspected
   d. If no, which parts of the process vary the most?
10. Should this process be standard across the state or handled differently by regions as required?
11. Are there any efforts now underway to standardize the process statewide?
12. Are there best practices you have adopted which may be helpful to other states?
Appendix B: List of UDOT Participants

The following UDOT employees participated in interviews and discussions for this report.

Region One:

Carrie Jacobsen, Region One Assistant Traffic Engineer
Darrin Duersch, Region One Traffic Engineer
Glen Ames, Region One Assistant Traffic Engineer
Rodger Genereux, Region One Permit Officer

Region Two:

Mark Velasquez, Right-of-Way Control Coordinator
Lisa Baird, Region Two Traffic Engineer
Troy Peterson, Region Two Traffic Engineer
Amber Mortensen, Region Two Permit Officer
Robert Miles, Region Two Traffic Operations Engineer
Wes Eggleston, Region Two Permit Officer

Region Three:

Rux Rowland, Region Three Permit Officer
Tonia Wall, Region Three Bluestakes Coordinator
Austin Tripp, Region Three Permit Office
Brandon Hyatt, Region Three Permit Office
Doug Bassett, Region Three Traffic Engineer
Griffin Harris, Region Three Assistant Traffic Engineer
Fess Scott, Region Three Right-of-Way Control Coordinator
Region Four:

Rhett Arnell, Region Four Permit Engineer
Robert Dowell, Region Four Traffic Operations Engineer
Scott Snow, Cedar Right-of-Way Control Coordinator
Steve Kunzler, Richfield Right-of-Way Control Coordinator
Dale Stapley, Price Right-of-Way Control Coordinator
Marsha Chaston, Region Four Permit Officer

Complex (Headquarters):

Justin Sceili, Statewide Permit Officer
Appendix C: Colorado Department of Transportation Access Permitting Process Diagram

CDOT ACCESS APPLICATION & PERMIT PROCESSING

- **APPLIED**
  - Receive Permit Application
  - 20 days
  - Is application complete? NO
  - Review permit application
  - 45 days total
  - Issuing Authority - CDOT? YES
  - Transmitt application to CDOT for review
  - 20 days
  - Deny permit? NO
  - Transmitted Permit and Transmittal Letter, send to applicant
  - 60 days
  - DENIED
  - Transmit denial explanation letter to applicant
  - 60 days
  - Decision appealed? YES
  - APPEALED Process appeal
  - 30 days total
  - NTP materials acceptable?
  - Process appeal
  - COMPLETE
  - NTP REVIEW
  - Receive NTP materials
  - 7 days (first time)
  - 10 days (subsequent)
  - Are NTP materials complete?
  - YES
  - Review NTP materials
  - YES
  - NTP issued
  - Print and transmit NTP
  - YES
  - Construction started within 365 days?
  - NO
  - Renewal in effect?
  - NO
  - NON-COMPLIANCE
  - Reseive construction problems
  - COMPLETE
  - NTP request by permitting?
  - NO
  - Permit removed?
  - NO
  - Expired
  - YES
  - Withdrawn
  - YES

- **REJECTED**
  - Transmit request for more info to applicant
  - 365 days
  - Deposit
  - Bank
  - FILED
  - FILED

- **ISSUED**
  - Sign and return permit to permitting
  - 365 days
  - Permit removed?
  - NO
  - Expired
  - YES
  - WITHDRAWN

- **FILED**
  - Sign and return permit to permitting
  - 365 days
  - Permit removed?
  - NO
  - Expired
  - YES
  - WITHDRAWN

- **FILED**
  - Sign and return permit to permitting
  - 365 days
  - Permit removed?
  - NO
  - Expired
  - YES
  - WITHDRAWN
Appendix D: Montana Department of Transportation Access Permitting Process Diagram

System Impact Action Process

1. Proposed Development Planned
   - Request, complete, and return an Approach Permit Application with the Environmental Checklist
   - District preliminarily screens for System Impact Action

2. Optional Start-up meeting/conference call with MDT for project’s scope

3. Helena
   - MDT Reviews Site Analysis/TIS/Hydraulics/Environmental Checklist

4. Helena
   - MDT Reviews and Approves Design Plan/Report and/or Access Location/Configuration

5. Memorandum of Agreement signed (if needed)

6. District
   - Approval to enter Right of Way prior to construction
   - Traffic Control Plan/Work Zone Safety and Mobility Analysis (required) and proof of Financial Guarantee (if required)

7. District
   - Construction Completed and Inspected

8. Permit Issued (at Districts discretion)

9. As-Builts & Improvements Estimate Form Provided to MDT

10. MDT Releases Financial Guarantee (if required)

See following process steps for definition and submittal requirements
Appendix E: Montana Department of Transportation
Sample Approach Permit Application

---

### State of Montana – Department of Transportation

**Helena, Montana 59620-1001**

**Driveway Approach Application and Permit**

- To be filled in by Department of Transportation Personnel –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F.A. ROUTE NO.:</th>
<th>APPROACH STATION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT: NO.:</td>
<td>MILEPOST:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY:</td>
<td>PROJECT:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DRAINAGE AS DETERMINED BY DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION:

- Type: 
- Size: 
- Length: 

Access Control: □ Yes □ No

Approach Recommended by District Traffic Engineer or Traffic Unit

Approach Application Approved by District Administrator

If Access Control is Yes:

Approach Recommended by Access Manager, RW Bureau

---

**APPLICANT (Property Owner)**

Name: __________________________ Phone: __________________________

Address: __________________________

Herein named the applicant, requests permission to construct approach described and shown on attached plot plan or plan and profile and hereby make a part of this application.

Please indicate if permits or approaches are required from units of government other than the Department of Transportation. Write the number of permits required in the box:

- Federal Government
- State
- County
- City
- NIA

Private: ______ Public: ______

Use of Property or Facility: __________________________

(Road, Trail, Court, Gas Station, Field Access, etc.)

---

**LOCATION**

City or Town: __________________________

Street Name, If any: __________________________

Approach:

- Sight Distance: Left: ______ Right: ______
- Surface: ______

---

**Drainage**

See above as determined by Department of Transportation.

**INSTRUCTION CONCERNING USE OF THIS FORM**

Applicant will complete and deliver this form in duplicate to the District Administrator serving the area to which the Approach Permit is requested.

The District Administrator, in conjunction with the District Traffic Engineer, is designated authority to approve such cuts, public and private approaches existing businesses, residences and agricultural use in such other areas without further consultation of the traffic conditions or not engineered. In congested areas, usually other obstructions.
the District Administrator and District Traffic Engineer can request the Manager, Traffic Unit or Fire for additional technical assistance. If necessary, the approach should be returned to existing plans and proposals showing the highway right of way and sent to the UDOT Permit Process Review Final Utah Department of Transportation Permit Process Review 12/19/2013 46
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comment or Explanation (Use attachments if necessary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Will the proposed action impact any historical sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Will the proposed action impact any publicly owned parks, recreation areas, wildlife or waterfowl refuges?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Will the proposed action impact private farmlands?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. a. Will the proposed action have an impact on the human environment that may result from relocations of persons or businesses, changes in traffic patterns, changes in grade, or other types of changes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. For the proposed action, is there documented controversy on environmental grounds? (i.e., has the applicant received a letter of opposition from an environmental organization)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Will the proposed action require work in, access or adjacent to listed or proposed Wild or Scenic Rivers? (See listing on page 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Will the proposed action impact air quality or increase noise?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Will the proposed project involve hazardous waste sites? (Superfund, spills, underground storage tanks, old mines etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Will the proposed action affect water quality, wetlands, streams or other water bodies? If the answer is yes, an environmental-related permit or authorization may be required (See Attached “Watershed Permitting Guidelines”).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. a. Are there any listed or proposed threatened or endangered species, or critical habitat in the vicinity of the proposed action?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Will the proposed action require an environmental-related permit or authorization? If the answer is yes, please list the specific permits or authorizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Is the proposed action on or within approximately 1 mile of an Indian Reservation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If Yes – Will a Tribal Water Permit be required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is the proposed action in a “Class I Air Shed” (Some Indian Reservations)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The proposed action result in increased traffic volumes, increased walk or delays on state highways, or have adverse impacts on other forms of transportation (rail, transit or air movements)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. In the proposed action part of a project that may require other governmental permits, licenses or easements? If “Yes” than describe the full extent of the project and any other permits, licenses or easements that may be necessary for the applicant to acquire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Attach representative photos of the sites where the proposed action would be implemented.

17. Attach map(s) showing the location(s) of the proposed action(s), Township, Range, Section, highway or route number and approximate mileposts.

18. Describe Magnitude/Importance of potential impacts: (To be completed by Applicant)(Use Attached Sheets)

Checklist prepared by: Applicant Title Date
Reviewed for completeness by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDT District Representative</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Approved by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Services (When any of the items 1 through 13 are checked “Yes”)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Planning (When items 14 or 15 are checked “Yes”)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Checklist Conditions & Required Approvals

A. Applicant is NOT authorized to proceed with the proposed work until ALL of the Checklist Conditions have been met and the required approvals have been obtained.

B. Completes the checklist indicating a “Yes” or “No” for each item.

C. When a “Yes” is indicated on any of the items except 12 or 13, the Applicant must explain the impacts, and for Items 1 through 10, describe any appropriate mitigation measures that will be taken. Use attachments if necessary. If the applicant checks “No” and the District feels there may be potential impacts, the Environmental Checklist must be forwarded to Environmental Services.

D. If a “Yes” is checked in Item 10 a. (threatened or endangered species), please provide information naming the particular species and the expected location, distribution and habitat use in the proposed action area, i.e. within the immediate area of the proposed action and possible direct affects to the species; or, in the general area on occasion (seasonally passes through) but does not nest, den or occupy the area for more than a few days – adverse affects are very unlikely.

E. If the applicant checks “Yes” for any item, the approach permit, occupancy agreement or permit along with the checklist and Applicant’s mitigation proposal, documentation, evaluation and/or permits must be submitted to MDT Environmental Services for review and approval.

F. When the applicant checks “Yes” to any item, the Applicant cannot be authorized to proceed with the proposed work until the MDT Environmental Services and Transportation Planning, as appropriate, review the information and sign the checklist.

G. Applicant must obtain all necessary permits or authorizations from other entities with jurisdiction prior to beginning the proposed action or activity.

Montana’s Wild and Scenic Rivers system as published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, or the U.S. Department of the Interior:

1. Middle Fork of the Flathead River (headwaters to South Fork of the Flathead River confluence)
2. North Fork of the Flathead River (Canadian Border to Middle Fork of the Flathead River confluence)
3. South Fork of the Flathead River (headwaters to Hungry Horse Reservoir)
4. Missouri River (Fort Benton to Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Refuge)
Appendix F: Introduction to Process Diagrams

This report uses the “Rummler-Brache” or “swimlane” technique for diagramming UDOT permit processes. This technique combines two important elements required to make a process work: the sequence of steps which comprise the process, and the people who implement those steps. It provides a map between steps and people, thereby helping an organization define who is accountable for which steps.

These diagrams use the following symbols:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The role, or job function, responsible for one or more steps in the process. The steps and decisions this role is responsible for are placed within the row for this role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A specific step or action an individual takes, as part of the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A decision that is made before moving to the next step(s) in the process. Usually each decision has two possible choices, yes or no.

The flow of events or information that moves the process along.

For UDOT’s permit process, the following are also noted in the title space for each process:

**Customer:** The role or job function who benefits from the process. Often this is the person who receives the final result of the process.

**Primary Responsible Party:** The role or job function that has principle responsibility to ensure the process is completed correctly. This person may delegate parts of the process to others.
# Appendix G: UDOT Region One Permit Process Diagrams

**Region 1: Approve Access or Access Improvement Permit – Summary Level**  
*Customer: Permit Applicant / Permittee*  
*Primary Responsible Party: Roadway Right of Way Coordinator*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Applicant / Permittee</th>
<th>Roadway Right of Way Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Permit Application</td>
<td>Conduct Completeness Review - Within 10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Application and Variance Request Review - Within 45 calendar days</td>
<td>Provide Notice of Access Decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Construct Approved Access -- Within 6 months |}

**Summary Levels**  
- Prepare Permit Application
- Conduct Completeness Review - Within 10 days
- Conduct Application and Variance Request Review - Within 45 calendar days
- Provide Notice of Access Decision
- Construct Approved Access -- Within 6 months
Region 1: Prepare Permit Application
Customer: Roadway Right of Way Coordinator
Primary Responsible Party: Permit Applicant

- Prepare Site Plan
  - Identify primary contact for applicant
  - Handouts, instructions, questions, meeting minutes

- Conduct Pre-Application Meeting (mostly access 98%)
  (engineering support as required)

- Develop Roadway Improvement Plan including Signals - may include structural plans

- Prepare or Refine Site Plan

- Complete Variance Request

- Conduct Traffic Impact Study

- Complete and Submit Permit Application

Engineering Support

- Phone, e-mail or hardcopy request for permit (access, utility)

- Identify Forms and Studies Needed
  - Handouts, instructions, Questions, meeting minutes

- Engineering support as required. Some engineering staff not in the region, invited from Complex

98% access requests
Region 1: Conduct Completeness Review
Customer: Permit Applicant
Primary Responsible Party: Roadway Right of Way Coordinator

Permit Application Submitted → Conduct Completeness Review

- Application Complete?
  - Yes: Application advanced to full review
  - No: Inform Applicant of Incomplete Items

Respond to Questions, Revise Application

Inform Applicant of Incomplete Items
Region 1: Conduct Application and Variance Request Review
Customer: Permit Applicant
Primary Responsible Party: Roadway Right of Way Coordinator

Permit Applicant

Roadway Right of Way Coordinator

Pre-Construction

Traffic and Safety

Other Review Meeting Participants (Maintenance, Environmental, Cultural)

Region Traffic Engineer

Make Decision on Application
- access as proposed
- modifications (conditional approval)
- restrictions
- denial

Respond to Technical Items, Other questions

Conditional approval

Application Decision

Application advanced to full review

Conduct Formal Permit Review Meeting Weekly

Nearly all are approved or approved conditionally. Denials are for access location or variance, not roadway plan.

Less than 10% of permit requests are structural, have to be sent to Complex

Less than 10% of permit requests are structural, have to be sent to Complex

Variance requests not recorded in statewide database. Region 1 uses its own tracking database. Variance request not considered a separate permit. Use their regional computer application to track performance measures.

Issue: Coordination needed with Construction to minimize avoidable rework due to pending projects not referenced in encroachment permits. R1 sometimes brings Project Management Group in.

Mitigation for variance is not well defined.

Variance request not considered a separate permit. Use their regional computer application to track performance measures.

Condition incorporated
Region 1: Provide Notice of Access Decision
Customer: Permit Applicant
Primary Responsible Party: Roadway Right of Way Coordinator

- Permit fee not charged until Final approval
- Pay Permit Fee
- Provide Letter to Contractor
- Denied Access and Written Explanation, Appeal if appropriate

Application Decision

Approved? Yes
- Request Permit Fee
- Send Letter that Permit Available for Bonded Contractor

No

Five or six appeals in Region 1 since 2003, 2 dropped
Region 1: Construct Approved Access
Customer: Roadway Right of Way Coordinator
Primary Responsible Party: Permittee

- Issued Permit
- Request Encroachment Permit
- Provide Schedule, Location, Details of Each Phase
- Complete Access Construction Work
- Extension Required? (Yes: Request Extension)
- Notify Transportation Technicians
- Approve Encroachment Permit (Identify Limitations)
- Grant Extension
- Review Schedule, Traffic Control Plan, Special Limitations on Construction
- Approve Encroachment Permit (Identify Limitations)
- Not consistently done
- Inspect Constructed Access
- Close Out the Permit, Submit Hours
- If Required, Issue Letter of Completeness (to Contractor, sometimes Cities)
- Letter of Completeness
# Appendix H: UDOT Region Two Permit Process Diagrams

## Region 2: Approve Access or Access Improvement Permit – Summary Level

- **Customer**: Permit Applicant / Permittee
- **Primary Responsible Party**: Right of Way Control Coordinator

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Applicant / Permittee</th>
<th>Region Right of Way Control Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Permit Application</td>
<td>Conduct Application and Variance Request Review - Within 45 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide Notice of Access Decision, or Request More Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Approved Access -- Within 6 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

- Initial step: Prepare Permit Application
- Step 1: Conduct Application and Variance Request Review
- Step 2: Provide Notice of Access Decision, or Request More Info
- Final step: Construct Approved Access

---

*Note: The diagram illustrates the flow of the permit process, starting with the preparation of the permit application and concluding with the construction of the approved access.*
Region 2: Prepare Permit Application
Customer: Region Right of Way Control Coordinator
Primary Responsible Party: Permit Applicant

- Conduct Pre-Application Meeting, advise of what plans, requests, fees are required
- Phone or e-mail request for pre-application meeting
- Identify Forms and Studies Needed
  - Forms, instructions, questions
  - Develop Roadway Improvement Plan including Signals
  - Prepare Site Plan
  - Complete Variance Request
  - Conduct Traffic Impact Study
- Complete and Submit Permit Application and Fee

Application and fee submitted
Region 2: Conduct Application and Variance Review
Customer: Permit Applicant
Primary Responsible Party: Region Right of Way Control Coordinator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit Application and fee Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to Questions, Revise Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Approved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes → Apply for Encroachment Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region Right of Way Control Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Submitted Documents for Completeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Complete?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes → Conduct Weekly Review Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Additional Information, Documents Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional info needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Additional Information, Documents Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve/Deny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- access as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- denial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Committee Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application approved/denied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Region 2: Provide Notice of Access Decision

**Customer:** Permit Applicant  
**Primary Responsible Party:** Region Right of Way Control Coordinator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **No conditional approval:** Region gets back Encroachment Permit Permitee will apply within 6 months—ROW Coordinator tracks this  
|  
| **Denied Access and Written Explanation, Appeal if appropriate**  
|  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region Right of Way Control Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Application Decision**  
|  
| **Approved?**  
|  
| **Yes**  
|  
| **Provide Grant of Access (Access Approval)**  
|  
| **No**  
|  
| **Provide Written Explanation of Denial**  
|  

---

*UDOT Permit Process Review Final  
12/19/2013*
Region 2: Construct Approved Access and Encroachment
Customer: Permits Officer
Primary Responsible Party: Permittee

- Access Approval
- Request Encroachment Permit
- Provide Schedule, Location, Details of Each Phase
- Complete Access Construction Work
  - Extension Required?
    - Yes: Request Extension
    - No: Schedule Inspectors
  - Inspection Required?
    - Yes: Inspect Constructed Access
    - No: Accept the Work, Close Permit
- Review Schedule, Traffic Control Plan, Special Limitations on Construction
- Approve Encroachment Permit (Identify Limitations)
- Ensure Coordination with UDOT Projects, Traffic (Reg Encroachments)
- Grant Extension or Require Reapplication for Permit
- Inspect Constructed Access
- Accept the Work, Close Permit
- Closed Permit
Appendix I: UDOT Region Three Permit Process Diagrams

Region 3: Approve Access or Access Improvement Permit – Summary Level
Customer: Permit Applicant / Permittee
Primary Responsible Party: Region Right of Way Coordinator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Applicant / Permittee</th>
<th>Region Right of Way Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Permit Application</td>
<td>Conduct Completeness Review - Within 10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct Application and Variance Request Review - Within 45 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Approved Access -- Within 6 months</td>
<td>Provide Notice of Access Decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region 3: Prepare Permit Application
Customer: Region Right of Way Coordinator
Primary Responsible Party: Permit Applicant

Permit Applicant
- Phone hardcopy request for access
  - Prepare Application Materials (Online)
  - Pay Permit Fee
  - Complete Variance Request (as needed)
  - Conduct Traffic Impact Study
  - Handouts, instructions, questions
  - Complete and Submit Permit Application

Region Right of Way Coordinator
- Provide Initial Information
  - Pre Application Meeting Needed?
    - Yes
      - Request Permit Fee
      - Conduct Pre-Application Meeting
      - Application submitted
    - No
      - Complete Permit Application

Review Committee
- Application submitted
Region 3: Conduct Completeness Review
Customer: Permit Applicant
Primary Responsible Party: Region Right of Way Coordinator

- Permit Applicant:
  - Respond to Questions, Revise Application

- Review Committee Members:
  - Identify Additional Information, Documents Needed

- Region Right of Way Coordinator:
  - Permit Application Submitted
  - Conduct Completeness Review Meeting - Weekly
  - Application Complete?
    - Yes: Notify Applicant that Application is Scheduled for Review (e-mail)
    - No: Application advanced to full review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Applicant</th>
<th>Region Right of Way Coordinator</th>
<th>Review Committee Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application advanced to full review</td>
<td>Conduct Review Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make Decision on Application</td>
<td>Application Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- access as proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- modifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- restrictions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- denial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region 3: Provide Notice of Access Decision
Customer: Permit Applicant
Primary Responsible Party: Region Right of Way Coordinator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forward Approval to Contractor / Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice Forwarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Denial and Written Explanation, Appeal if appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region Right of Way Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Access Approval (6 month duration, with extension possible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Written Explanation of Denial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region 3: Construct Approved Access
Customer: Region Permit Officer
Primary Responsible Party: Permittee

Permittee:
- Approval
  - Apply for Encroachment Permit (Insurance, Bonding, Traffic Control Plan) (within 30 days)
  - Complete Access Construction Work
  - Extension Required? Yes: Request Extension
  - No, project completed

Region Permit Officer:
- Review Encroachment Permit Application, Issue Permit
  - Grant Extension
  - Inspection Required? Yes: Close and File the Review and Encroachment Permit (30 days after encroachment permit issued)
  - No: Access and Permit Closed

Maintenance Staff:
- Inspect Constructed Access - 50% of projects
  - No: Close and File the Review and Encroachment Permit (30 days after encroachment permit issued)
  - Yes: Access and Permit Closed
Appendix J: UDOT Region Four Permit Process Diagrams

Region 4: Approve Access or Access Improvement Permit – Summary Level
Customer: Permit Applicant / Permittee
Primary Responsible Party: Region Right of Way Coordinator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Applicant / Permittee</th>
<th>Region Right of Way Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Permit Application</td>
<td>Conduct Completeness Review - Within 10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct Application and Variance Request Review - Within 45 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Approved Access -- Within 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide Notice of Access Decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region 4: Prepare Permit Application
Customer: Region Right of Way Coordinator
Primary Responsible Party: Permit Applicant

- Phone, online or hardcopy request for access
  - Identify Forms and Studies Needed, Determine Whether to Pursue Access Application
    - Proceed?
      - Yes
        - Develop Roadway Improvement Plan including Signals
      - No
        - Pursue Alternative Solution
          - Prepare Site Plan
          - Complete Variance Request
          - Conduct Traffic Impact Study
            - Complete and Submit Permit Application
              - R4 staff work with people to avoid variances, find solutions without variance request.

- Conduct Pre-Application Meeting (formal, informal, in office, in the field)
  - No standard checklist, A list of basic steps and procedures for applicants could be helpful
    - On site meetings helps to identify accesses that won't work, identify issues early.

- Participate in Site Visit
  - Application submitted

- Assist Applicant with Online Registration
  - Also actively track potential requests..Marsha.
Region 4: Conduct Completeness Review
Customer: Permit Applicant
Primary Responsible Party: Region Right of Way Coordinator

- Permit Applicant
  - Conduct Completeness Review
    - Respond to Questions, Revise Application

- Permits Engineer
  - Identify Additional Information, Documents Needed

- Region Right of Way Coordinator
  - Conduct Completeness Review
    - Application Complete?
      - Yes: Notify Electronically that Application is Complete
      - No: May or may not include meeting

- Permits Coordinator
  - Permit Application Submitted
  - Some will be delegated to Permits Coordinator
Region 4: Conduct Application and Variance Request Review
Customer: Permit Applicant
Primary Responsible Party: Region Right of Way Coordinator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region Right of Way Coordinator</th>
<th>Region Right of Way Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application advanced to full review</td>
<td>Formal Review Needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Request Region Staff Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Make Decision on Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- access as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- denial (rarely)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formal Review Needed? Yes
No

Conduct Staff Review
Region 4: Provide Notice of Access Decision
Customer: Permit Applicant
Primary Responsible Party: Region Right of Way Coordinator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Applicant</th>
<th>Permit Coordinator</th>
<th>Region Right of Way Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay Permit Fee</td>
<td>Request Permit Fee</td>
<td>Approved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide Written Explanation of Denial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide Access Approval Permit (Electronic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yes

No
Appendix K: UDOT Permit Appeals Process Diagram

Appeal Denial of Access Request
Customer: Permit Applicant/Appellant
Responsible Party: Statewide Permit Officer

Permit Applicant/Appellant

Determine Response

Appeal within 30 days

Further appeal within 30 days

Special Consideration?

Yes

No

Yes

No

Permit Denial Unchanged

Submit Revised Permit Application

Proposed Solutions Acceptable?

Yes

Yes

Approve Access with Conditions as Needed

No

No

No

No

Notify Applicant/Appellant of Decision

Discuss Alternative Solutions with Applicant/Appellant

Hear Appeal of Permit Denial, Recommend Solution

Hear and Rule on Appeal - 1 day

Yes

Yes

Reverse Decision

Denied Access and Written Explanation

Approved?

No

Approved?

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes
Appendix L: UDOT Permit Fee Schedule Details

**UDOT ENCROACHMENT PERMIT FEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Permits</th>
<th>$135-$500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Event Permits</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping Permits</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhole Access Permits</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Any Of The Above Are Determined To Cause An Excessive Impact And/Or Duration Fees Shall be Assessed Using the Table Below.

Use the table below to figure the cost. ADT stands for Average Daily Traffic. These costs do NOT include inspection fees or additional UDOT Special Event Traffic Control. If there are questions concerning this, please contact a Permits Officer to verify the fee.

### FEE SCHEDULE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>Linear Footage</th>
<th>Right-of-Way Impact</th>
<th>Road Impact</th>
<th>Road Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;5,000</td>
<td>&lt;50 feet</td>
<td>No asphalt cut or &gt;=6&quot; Bored or Jacked</td>
<td>&lt;20%</td>
<td>All Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,000 to 20,000</td>
<td>89 to 199 feet</td>
<td>8&quot; - 16&quot; Bored or Jacked</td>
<td>20% to 50%</td>
<td>Principal Arterial Freeway/Expressway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&gt;20,000</td>
<td>*200 feet to 1 mile</td>
<td>&lt;16&quot; Bored or Jacked or Open Cut</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
<td>Interstate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POINT VALUE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th><strong>Maximum Permit Time</strong></th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>No construction impact</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7P01</td>
<td>1 thru 7</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7P02</td>
<td>8 thru 11</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7P03</td>
<td>12 thru 15</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AERIAL CABLE INSTALLATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Classification</th>
<th>Road Impact</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Roads</td>
<td>Minor Crossing</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle Arterial/Freeway</td>
<td>Major Crossing</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Roads</td>
<td>Pole Line</td>
<td>$135.00 Min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Permits may be extended at the discretion of the Region Permits Officer*

Rev: 1-13-04  
Page 1 of 2  
Section 303/HB5195
**Hourly Inspection Fees**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal Business Hours</td>
<td>$60.00 an Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Hours and Overtime</td>
<td>$80.00 an Hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UDOT ACCESS REVIEW FEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>$475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access Violations Fees Are $100.00 per Day
# Appendix M: Access Permit Count and Turnaround Data Reported

**UDOT Access Permit Applications, and Turnaround (UDOT Time Only), 2006-2009**

Reported by Region One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Total (Access Permit Count)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Permit Count</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Permit Average Turnaround (Days)</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UDOT Access Permit Applications, and Turnaround (UDOT and Applicant Time), 2006-2009**

Reported from Statewide Tracking Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region (District)</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Total (Access Permit Count)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region Two</td>
<td>Access Permit Count</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Two</td>
<td>Access Permit Average Turnaround (Days)</td>
<td>176.08</td>
<td>157.24</td>
<td>118.10</td>
<td>67.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Three</td>
<td>Access Permit Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Three</td>
<td>Access Permit Average Turnaround (Days)</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>75.41</td>
<td>134.92</td>
<td>48.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Four (Richfield)</td>
<td>Access Permit Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Four (Richfield)</td>
<td>Access Permit Average Turnaround (Days)</td>
<td>57.86</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Four</td>
<td>Access Permit Count</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. This table represents turnaround times as recorded by Region One in its own database. These turnaround times represent only the time UDOT staff were working on the permit, and should not be compared with the “turnaround times” recorded in the statewide database.

2. This table represents turnaround times as recorded by Region Two, Three and Four in the statewide tracking database. These turnaround times include the time the applicant and UDOT staff were working on the permit, and should not be compared with the “turnaround times” recorded in the Region One database.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region (District)</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Total (Access Permit Count)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Cedar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Four (Cedar)</td>
<td>Access Permit Average Turnaround (Days)</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Four (Price)</td>
<td>Access Permit Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Four (Price)</td>
<td>Access Permit Average Turnaround (Days)</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>30.55</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>