## 2019088050

## CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION/CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DETERMINATION FORM

08-KERKIN33         40.044.27.912.0         06-H.2330         N/A           DELCo-Re, for Jocal Agency)         M/P/M         E. AProject No.         Federal-Aid Project No. (Local Project/Project No.           PROJECT DESCRIPTION: (Brefly describe project including need, purpose, location, limits, right-of-way requirements, and adultise involved in this boc. Use Continues The Project would church avenue. The project would church avenue of the project would church avenue. The project would hold by the south of the highway. Dig-outs would be done as necessary. All work would read of anotal form State Route 31 from 03 miles aouth of 20 miles avenue. The project would include two feet of shoulder backling on both side of the highway. Dig-outs would be done as necessary. All work would remain within the existing right-of-way.           CALTRANS CEOA DETERMINATION (Check one)         Not Applicable – Caltrans is not the CEOA Lead Agency         Not Applicable – Caltrans is not the CEOA Lead Agency         Not Applicable – Caltrans is not the CEOA Lead Agency         Not Applicable – Caltrans has prepared an Initial Study or Experimental Impact Report under CEOA           Baed on an examination of this propesal an supporting information, and the above statements, the project is         Exempt by Status. (PRC 2006)); 14 CCR 15300 et seq.)         Exempt by Status. (PRC 2006); 14 CCR 15300 et seq.)           Baed on a seamination of this propesal and supporting information, the foldowing statements are true and exceptions do not app?         The single cale second big opporting information, the foldowing statements are true and exceptions do not apped.           Categorically Exempt. Class 1. (PRC 21004.14 CCR 15300 et seq.) <th></th> <th></th> <th>****</th> <th></th> <th></th>			****		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Grandy describe project including need, purpose, location, limits, right-of-way requirements, and activities involved in this box. Use Continuation State / Recessary)         The California Department of Transportation proposes an overlay project on State Route 33 in Kern and Kings Counties. The project would overlay State Route 41 to 0.3 miles onth of Utia Avenue. The project would include two feet of shoulder backing on both side of the highway. Dig-outs would be done as necessary. All work would remain within the existing right-of-way.         CALTRANS CEQA DETERMINATION (Check one)       Not Applicable – Caltrans is no the CEGA Lead Agency invitonmental impact Report under CEGA         Based on an examination of this proposal, supporting information, and the above staments, the project is the same type in the same 1, (PRC 2108(b); 14 CCR 1526) of eaq.)         Categorically Exempt. Class 1, (PRC 2108(b); 14 CCR 1526) of eaq.)         Based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the following statements are true and exceptions do not apply.         • The evaluation of this proposal and supporting information, the following statement are true and exceptions do not applic table within event class 1, 4, 6 CR 113 do and successive projects of the same type in the same pace, over time.         • The project lise induced and any list compiled pursuant to law.         • The project does not damage a scalic resource within an officially designated state scelic highway.         • The single falls within the seque scale as scale fall within an exempt class, but it can be seen with certainty that there is no passibility that the project will have a significant effect on the environment 4 de Contas Single 2					
activities involved in this box. Use Continuation Steel, If necessary)         The California Department of Transportation proposes an overlay project on State Route 33 in Kern and Kings Counties. The project would overlay State Route 33 from 0.3 miles south of Cymrin Road to 0.2 miles acuth of P* Standard Road, and from State Route 41 to 0.3 miles north of Ulica Avenue. The project would include two feet of shoulder backing on both side of the highway. Dig-outs would be done as necessary. All work would remain within the existing right-of-way.         CALTRANS CEQA DETERMINATION (check one)					
Counties. The project would overlay State Route 33 from 0.3 miles south of Cymric Road to 0.2 miles south of the State Route Att to 0.3 miles or thof Utica Avenue. The project would include two feet of shoulder backing on both side of the highway. Dig-outs would be done as necessary. All work would remain within the existing right-of-way.  CALTRANS CEQA DETERMINATION (Check one)  Based on an examination of this proposal, supporting information, and the above statements, the project is:  Exempt by Statute. (PRC 21080b): 14 CCR 15260 et seq.)  Categorically Exempt. Class 1. (PRC 21041; 41 CCR 15300 et seq.)  Categorically Exempt. Class 1. (PRC 21042; 41 CCR 15300 et seq.)  Categorical by Exempt. Class 1. (PRC 21044; 41 CCR 15300 et seq.)  For will not be a significant cumulative effect by this project an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precledy mapped, and officially dopted pursuant to law.  There will not be a significant cumulative effect by this project and successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time.  This project false on a sean included on any lat compiled pursuant to law. There will not be a significant effect on the environment and use ourse of hazardous or critical concern where designated on as late included on any lat compiled pursuant to law. There is not a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances. This project is not locate a substantial adverse change in the significant dist can be seen whith certainty that there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment as defined by NEPA, and is excluded from the requirements to Prosent and supporting information, the State has determined that this project. Common Sones Exemption. Cliss cont of 23 CFR 771.117(b). Categorical State Stat				Inpose, location, limits, right-of-wa	ay requirements, and
□ Not Applicable – Caltrans is not the CEQA Lead Agency       Invitonmential Impact Report under CEGA         Based on an examination of this proposal, supporting information, and the above statements, the project is       Exempt by Statute, (PRC 21080[b]; 14 CCR 15200 et seq.)         Categorically Exompt. Class 1. (PRC 21048; 14 CCR 15200 et seq.)       Esempt by Statute, (PRC 21080[b]; 14 CCR 15200 et seq.)         Based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the following statements are true and exceptions do not apply:       • If this project fails within exempt class 3, 4, 5, 6 or 11, it does not impact an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted provusant to law.         • There will not be a significant cumulative effect by this project and successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time.         • This project foot domage a scenic resource within an officially designated state scenic highway.         • This project to does not damage a scenic resource within an exempt class, but it can be seen with catently that there is no possibility that the project within an exempt class, but it can be seen with catently that there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment (14 CCR 15061[b][3].)         Share Gunn       Reve Sanchez         Print Name: Senior Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental addined by NEPA, and is excluded from the requirements to prepare an Environmental servinonmental addined by NEPA, and is excluded from the requiremental this project.         11       Signature       Signature       Signature<	Counties. The project would 7 <sup>th</sup> Standard Road, and from feet of shoulder backing on b	overlay State Rou State Route 41 to both side of the h	te 33 from 0.3 mil	es south of Cymric Road to Utica Avenue. The project	0.2 miles south of would include two
Based on an examination of this proposal, supporting information, and the above statements, the project is:         □ Exempt by Statute, (PRC 21080[b]; 14 CCR 15260 et seq.)         □ Categorically Exempt. Class 1, (PRC 21084; 14 CCR 15300 et seq.)         □ Based on an examination of this proposal, and supporting information, the following statements are true and exceptions do not apply:         • If this project fails within exempt class 3, 4, 5, 6 or 11, it does not impact an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially dopted pursuant to law.         • There will not be a significant circulative effect by this project and successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time.         • There is not a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.         • This project to sen to clause a substantial adverse change in the significant of this torical resource.         □ Common Sense Exemption. (This project does not fall within an exempt class, but it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment (4 CCR 15061[b][3].         Share Gunn       Rene Sanchez         Print Name. Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch col       Print Name. Freiget Maneger         Brutone with 23 CFR 771.1171, and based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that this project:       Ades not individually or cumulatively have a significant impacts on the environment as defined by NEPA, and is excluded from the requ	CALTRANS CEQA DETER	MINATION (Chec	k one)		
□ Sempt by Statute, (PRC 21080(b); 14 CCR 15260 et seq.)         □ Categorically Exempt, Class 1, (PRC 21084; 14 CCR 15300 et seq.)         □ Based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the following statements are true and exceptions do not apply:         • If this project fails within exempt class 3, 4, 5, 6 or 11, it does not impact an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law.         • There will not be a significant cumulative effect by this project and successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time.         • Their project does not damage a scenic resource within an officially designated state scenic highway.         • This project does not damage a scenic resource within an officially designated state scenic highway.         • This project does not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.         □ Common Sense Exemption, This project does not fall within an exempt class, but it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment (14 CCR 15061(b)[3).         Shane Gunn       Rene Sanchez         Print Name: Broice TMM that Branch CCE       Print Name: Project Masseer         Bustored       Bustored         Nie accordance with 23 CFR 771.117, and based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that this project:       adeentioned that the project:         • does not indidvidualy or cumulatively have a significant impact o			Environ	mental Impact Report under CE	
Based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the following statements are true and exceptions do not apply:         encome where designated, proceedly mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law.         • There will not be a significant cumulative effect by this project and successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time.         • There will not be a significant cumulative effect by this project and successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time.         • This project does not damage a scenic resource within an officially designated state scenic highway.         • This project does not damage a scenic resource within an officially designated state scenic highway.         • This project does not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource with an officially designated state scenic highway.         • This project does not cause a substantial adverse change in the significant office to the environment (14 CCR 1506(b)[3].)         Shane Gunn       Rene Sanchez         Print Name. Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch CDE       Print Name. Project Baneger         Environmental Branch CDE       Print Name. Project Baneger         NEPA COMPLIANCE       Print Name. Project Baneger         Neaded unsual circumstances as described in 2 CFR 771.117(b).       CALTRANS NEPA DETERMINATION (Check one)         20 US 0326: The State has determined that this project as described in 2 CFR 771.117(b). As such, the project is categorially excluded from the requirements to prepare an Environmental aset of 2 CF				ove statements, the project is:	
Concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law.     There will not be a significant cumulative effect by this project and successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time.     This project is not a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.     This project is not located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to 20x Code § 55962.5 ("Cortese List").     This project to tool located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to 20x Code § 55962.5 ("Cortese List").     This project is not located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to 20x Code § 55962.5 ("Cortese List").     This project does not fause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.     Common Sense Exemption. [This project does not fail within an exempt class, but it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment (14 CCR 15061[b][3].     Shane Gunn     Print Name. Senior Environmental Planner or     Environmental Branch Chie     Signature     Print Name: Project     Signature     Signatu	Based on an examination of th			e following statements are true a	nd exceptions do not
<ul> <li>There is not a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.</li> <li>This project does not damage a scenic resource within an officially designated state scenic highway.</li> <li>This project does not locate as usbatnitial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.</li> <li>Common Sense Exemption. [This project does not fall within an exempt class, but it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment (14 CCR 15061[b][3].)</li> <li>Shane Gunn <ul> <li>Rene Sanchez</li> </ul> </li> <li>Print Name: Sendor Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief</li> <li>Bignature</li> </ul> <li>NEPA COMPLIANCE <ul> <li>In accordance with 23 CFR 771.117, and based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that this project incumstances are significant impact on the environment as defined by NEPA, and is excluded from the requirements to propare an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental impact Statement (EIS), and <ul> <li>has considered unusual circumstances prusuant to 23 CFR 771.117(b).</li> </ul> </li> <li>CALTRANS NEPA DETERMINATION (Check one) <ul> <li>23 USC 236: The State has determined that this project has no significant impacts on the environment as defined by NEPA, and the state. The State has determined that the project is as described in 23 CFR 771.117(b).</li> </ul> </li> <li>CALTRANS NEPA DETERMINATION (Check one) <ul> <li>23 USC 236: The State has determined that this project has no significant impacts on the environment as defined by NEPA, and the state. The State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under: <ul> <li>a Categorical Exclusion under 23 USC 327. The environmental Environmental Policy Act The State has been assigned, and hereby certifies and an amorandum of Understanding dated May 31, 2016, executed between the FHWA and the State. The</li></ul></li></ul></li></ul></li>	concern where designal	ted, precisely mappe	d, and officially adopt	ed pursuant to law.	
This project is not located on a site included on any list complied pursuant to Govt Code § 55962.5 ("Cortese List").     This project does not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Common Sense Exemption. (This project does not fail within an exempt class, but it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment (14 CCR 15061(b)[3].)  Shane Gunn Print Name: Senior Environmential Planner or Environmental Branch Chief Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief NEPA COMPLIANCE In accordance with 23 CFR 771.117, and based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that this project.  CALTRANS NEPA DETERMINATION (Check one) CALTRANS NEPA DETERMINAT	<ul> <li>There is not a reasonab circumstances.</li> </ul>				
□       Common Sense Exemption. [This project does not fall within an exempt class, but it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment (14 CCR 15061(b)[3].)         Shane Gunn       Rene Sanchez         Print Name: Senior Environmential Planner or Environmental Branch Chief       Bits[14]         Signature       Bits[14]         NEPA COMPLIANCE       Bits[14]         In accordance with 23 CFR 771.117, and based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that this project:       Bits[14]         • does not individually or cumulatively have a significant impact on the environmental adefined by NEPA, and is excluded from the requirements to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental impact Statement (EIS), and       • has considered unusual circumstances pursuant to 23 CFR 771.117(b).         CALTRANS NEPA DETERMINATION (Check one)       23 USC 325: The State has determined that this project has no significant impacts on the environment as defined by NEPA, and that there are no unusual circumstances as described in 23 CFR 771.117(b). As such, the project is categorically excluded from the requirements to prepare an EA or EIS under the National Environmental Dioloy Act. The State has determined that this project has the environmental addition pursuant to Chapter 3 of Title 23, United States Code, Section 326 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated May 31, 2016, executed between the FHWA and the State. The State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under:         □ 23 USC 337: Based on an examination of this propocal and supporting information, the Sta	<ul> <li>This project is not locate</li> </ul>	ed on a site included	on any list compiled i	oursuant to Govt. Code § 65962.5	("Cortese List").
Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief       Pint Name: Project Manager       BL/S/19/ Date         Signature       BL/S/19/ Date       BL/S/19/ Date       BL/S/19/ Date         NEPA COMPLIANCE In accordance with 23 CFR 771.117, and based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that this project:       BL/S/19/ Date         • does not individually or cumulatively have a significant impact on the environment as defined by NEPA, and is excluded from the requirements to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and         • has considered unusual circumstances pursuant to 23 CFR 771.117(b).       CALTRANS NEPA DETERMINATION (Check one)         23 USC 326: The State has determined that this project has no significant impacts on the environment as defined by NEPA, and that there are no unusual circumstances as described in 23 CFR 771.117(b). As such, the project is categorically excluded from the requirements to prepare an EA or EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act. The State has been assigned, and hereby certifies that it has carried out the responsibility to make this determination pursuant to Dater 3 of TUB 23, United States Code, Section 326 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated May 31, 2016, executed between the FHWA and the State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under: 23 USC 327: Based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under: 23 USC 327: Based on an examination of this project are being, or have been, carried out by Caltrans pursuant to 23 USC 327 and the Memorandum of Understanding dated December 23, 2016 and executed by FHWA and Caltr	Common Sense Exemption.	[This project does n	ot fall within an exem	of class, but it can be seen with co	
Environmental Branch Chief     Signature     Blishig     Signature     Blishig     Signature     Blishig     Signature     Blishig     Signature     Blishig     Signature     Blishig     Signature     Signature     Signature     Blishig     Date     Signature	Shane Gunn		Rene S	Sanchez	
Signature       Blishing         Signature       Date         NEPA COMPLIANCE       Date         In accordance with 23 CFR 771.117, and based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that this project:       • does not individually or cumulatively have a significant impact on the environment as defined by NEPA, and is excluded from the requirements to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and         • has considered unusual circumstances pursuant to 23 CFR 771.117(b).       CALTRANS NEPA DETERMINATION (Check one)         [] 23 USC 326: The State has determined that this project has no significant impacts on the environment as defined by NEPA, and that there are no unusual circumstances as described in 23 CFR 771.117(b). As such, the project is categorically excluded from the requirements to prepare an EA or EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act. The State has been assigned, and hereby certifies that it has carried out the responsibility to make this determination pursuant to Chapter 3 of Title 23, United States Code, Section 326 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated May 31, 2016, executed between the FHWA and the State. The State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under:         [] 23 USC 327: Based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under:         [] 23 USC 327: Based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under:         [] 23 USC 327: Based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has de		lanner or	Print Nar	ne: Project Manager	
NEPA COMPLIANCE         In accordance with 23 CFR 771.117, and based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that this project:         • does not individually or cumulatively have a significant impact on the environment as defined by NEPA, and is excluded from the requirements to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental impact Statement (EIS), and         • has considered unusual circumstances pursuant to 23 CFR 771.117(b).         CALTRANS NEPA DETERMINATION (Check one)         23 USC 326: The State has determined that this project has no significant impacts on the environment as defined by NEPA, and that there are no unusual circumstances as described in 23 CFR 771.117(b). As such, the project is categorically excluded from the requirements to prepare an EA or EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act. The State has been assigned, and hereby certifies that it has carried out the responsibility to make this determination pursuant to Chapter 3 of Title 23, United States Code, Section 326 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated May 31, 2016, executed between the FHWA and the State. The State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under:         23 USC 327: Based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that the project as USC 327. The environmental review, consultation, and any other actions required by applicable Federal environmental areview, consultation, and any other actions required by applicable Federal environmental Planner or Environmenta	6-6-	- slidi	9 /	and R.	8/15/19
In accordance with 23 CFR 771.117, and based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that this project:  • does not individually or cumulatively have a significant impact on the environment as defined by NEPA, and is excluded from the requirements to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and • has considered unusual circumstances pursuant to 23 CFR 771.117(b).  CALTRANS NEPA DETERMINATION (Check one)  23 USC 326: The State has determined that this project has no significant impacts on the environment as defined by NEPA, and that there are no unusual circumstances as described in 23 CFR 771.117(b). As such, the project is categorically excluded from the requirements to prepare an EA or EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act. The State has been assigned, and hereby certifies that it has carried out the responsibility to make this determination pursuant to Chapter 3 of Title 23, United States Code, Section 326 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated May 31, 2016, executed between the FHWA and the State. The State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under:  23 USC 327: Based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under:  23 USC 327: Based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under 23 USC 327. The environmental review, consultation, and any other actions required by applicable Federal environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief  Signature Date Date Date Date Date Date Date Dat	Signature	Dhie	Şignatur		Dale
determined that this project:       • does not individually or cumulatively have a significant impact on the environment as defined by NEPA, and is excluded from the requirements to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and         • has considered unusual circumstances pursuant to 23 CFR 771.117(b).         CALTRANS NEPA DETERMINATION (Check one)         23 USC 326: The State has determined that this project has no significant impacts on the environment as defined by NEPA, and that there are no unusual circumstances as described in 23 CFR 771.117(b). As such, the project is categorically excluded from the requirements to prepare an EA or EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act. The State has been assigned, and hereby certifies that it has carried out the responsibility to make this determination pursuant to Chapter 3 of Title 23, United States Code, Section 326 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated May 31, 2016, executed between the FHWA and the State. The State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under:         23 CFR 771.117(c): activity (c)()	NEPA COMPLIANCE				
CALTRANS NEPA DETERMINATION (Check one)         23 USC 326: The State has determined that this project has no significant impacts on the environment as defined by NEPA, and that there are no unusual circumstances as described in 23 CFR 771.117(b). As such, the project is categorically excluded from the requirements to prepare an EA or EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act. The State has been assigned, and hereby certifies that it has carried out the responsibility to make this determination pursuant to Chapter 3 of Title 23, United States Code, Section 326 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated May 31, 2016, executed between the FHWA and the State. The State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under: <ul> <li>23 CFR 771.117(c): activity (c)()</li> <li>23 CFR 771.117(c): activity (d)()</li> <li>23 CFR 771.117(c): activity (d)()</li> <li>23 USC 327: Based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under 23 USC 327. The environmental review, consultation, and any other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by Caltrans pursuant to 23 USC 327 and the Memorandum of Understanding dated December 23, 2016 and executed by FHWA and Caltrans.</li></ul>	<ul> <li>determined that this project:</li> <li>does not individually or cumulati requirements to prepare an Env</li> </ul>	vely have a significa ironmental Assessm	nt impact on the envir ent (EA) or Environme	onment as defined by NEPA, and	is excluded from the
23 USC 326: The State has determined that this project has no significant impacts on the environment as defined by NEPA, and that there are no unusual circumstances as described in 23 CFR 771.117(b). As such, the project is categorically excluded from the requirements to prepare an EA or EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act. The State has been assigned, and hereby certifies that it has carried out the responsibility to make this determination pursuant to Chapter 3 of Title 23, United States Code, Section 326 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated May 31, 2016, executed between the FHWA and the State. The State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under:         23 USC 327. The state in Appendix A of the MOU between FHWA and the State has determined that the project are being, or have been, carried out by Caltrans pursuant to 23 USC 327 and the Memorandum of Understanding dated December 23, 2016 and executed by FHWA and Caltrans.         Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief       Print Name: Project Manager/DLA Engineer         Signature       Date       Signature       Date		-			
23 USC 327: Based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under 23 USC 327. The environmental review, consultation, and any other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by Caltrans pursuant to 23 USC 327 and the Memorandum of Understanding dated December 23, 2016 and executed by FHWA and Caltrans.         Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief       Print Name: Project Manager/DLA Engineer	<ul> <li>23 USC 326: The State has of that there are no unusual circ the requirements to prepare a certifies that it has carried out Section 326 and a Memorand has determined that the proje</li> <li>23 CFR 771.117(c): ad 23 CFR 771.117(d): ad</li> </ul>	tetermined that this j umstances as descr in EA or EIS under t the responsibility to lum of Understandin ct is a Categorical E ctivity (c)() ctivity (d)()	project has no signific bed in 23 CFR 771.1 ne National Environm make this determinat g dated May 31, 2016 xclusion under:	17(b). As such, the project is cate ental Policy Act. The State has be ion pursuant to Chapter 3 of Title , executed between the FHWA ar	gorically excluded from een assigned, and hereby 23, United States Code,
Environmental Branch Chief Sovemon's Office of Planning & Researce Signature Date Signature AUG 1 4 2019 Date	23 USC 327: Based on an ex Categorical Exclusion under 2 Federal environmental laws for	amination of this pro 23 USC 327. The er or this project are be	posal and supporting wironmental review, c ing, or have been, car	information, the State has determ onsultation, and any other actions ried out by Caltrans pursuant to 2	s required by applicable
		Planner or	Print Na	me: Project Manager/DLA Engineer SOVEMOT'S Office of Plan	nning & Researci
Date of Categorical Exclusion Checklist completion: N/A Date of ECR of equivalent: 8/8/19 DIMON COMPANY	Signature	Dal	e Signatu	re AUG 14	2019 Date

Briefly list environmental commitments on continuation sheet. Reference additional information, as appropriate (e.g., CE checklist, additional studies and design conditions).