DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR P.O. BOX 942873, MS-49 SACRAMENTO, CA 94273-0001 PHONE (916) 654-6130 FAX (916) 653-5776 TTY 711 www.dot.ca.gov



Governor's Office of Planning & Research

JAN 28 2020

January 15, 2020

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

State Clearing House Office of Planning and Research P.O. Box 3044, Room 113 Sacramento. CA 95812-3044 03-ED-050 PM: 2.70-13.76 EA: 03-1H040 EFIS: 0316000050

To Whomever it May Concern:

Attached is a copy of the Categorical Exemption (CEQA) / Categorical Exclusion (NEPA) and a copy of the Notice of Exemption (NOE) for the El Dorado Culvert Rehabilitation Project. Please return a stamped copy of the NOE in the SASE provided.

For additional information or questions concerning this environmental approval, please contact me at (530) 741-4404.

Sincerely,

Sandeep Sandhu, Associate Environmental Planner North Region Office of Environmental Management, M5

Enclosures: CE/CE and a copy of the NOE

2020010425

Notice of Exemption

Appendix E

То:	ffice of Planning and Research O. Box 3044, Room 113	From: (Public Agency): Caltrans 703 B Street			
	Sacramento, CA 95812-3044	Marysville, CA 95901			
	County Clerk County of:	(Address)			
	ect Title: El Dorado Culvert Rehabilitation				
Proje	ect Applicant: California Department of T	ransportation			
Proje	ect Location - Specific:				
On S	tate Route 50 in El Dorado County				
Proje	ect Location - City: Ponderosa	Project Location - County: El Dorado			
The p		es of Project: d components of the roadway drainage system on Route (SR) ado County. The purpose of this project is is to extend the			
Nam	e of Public Agency Approving Project: <u>Calt</u>	rans			
Nam	e of Person or Agency Carrying Out Project	t: Caltrans			
	npt Status: (check one):				
[Ministerial (Sec. 21080(b)(1); 15268); □ Declared Emergency (Sec. 21080(b)(3) □ Emergency Project (Sec. 21080(b)(4); □ Categorical Exemption. State type and □ Statutory Exemptions. State code numbers 	15269(b)(c));			
The	sons why project is exempt: project is exempt because this is a maintena potential to have an adverse effect on the en	ance project for an existing highway facility and does not have nvironment.			
	Agency act Person: Kelly McNally	Area Code/Telephone/Extension: (530) 741-4134			
;	ed by applicant: 1. Attach certified document of exemption for the second seco	the public agency approving the project? ■ Yes □ No ■ No ■ No ■ No ■ Sr. Environmental Planner ■ Course of Planning & Recognition of Planning &			
		JAN 28 2020			

Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21110, Public Resources Code. Reference: Sections 21108, 21152, and 21152.1, Public Resources Code.

Date Received for filing at OPR: ___

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION/CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DETERMINATION FORM

DistCoRte. (or Local Agency) P.M./P.M. E.A/Project No. Federal-Aid Project No. (Local Project)/Project No. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: (Briefly describe project including need, purpose, location, limits, right-of-way requirements, and activities involved in this box. Use Continuation Sheet, if necessary.) The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is proposing a project to rehabilitate deteriorated components of the roadway drainage system on State Route 50 (SR-50) at post miles (PM) 2.70 – 13.76 in El Dorado County, due to the system exceeding its intended design life. The purpose of this project is to extend the drainage system service life, improve flow characteristics and reduce maintenance costs. CALTRANS CEQA DETERMINATION (Check one) Not Applicable – Caltrans is not the CEQA Lead Agency 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.)									
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: (Briefly describe project including need, purpose, location, limits, right-of-way requirements, and activities involved in this box. <i>Lev Continuation Sheet, in necessary</i> .) The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is proposing a project to rehabilitate deteriorated components of the roadway drainage system on State Route 50 (SR-50) at post miles (PM) 2.70 – 13.76 in El Dorado County, due to the system exceeding its intended design life. The purpose of this project is to extend the drainage system service life, improve flow characteristics and reduce maintenance costs. CALTRANS CEQA DETERMINATION (Check one) Not Applicable – Caltrans is not the CEQA Lead Agency Environmental Impact Report under CEQA Based on an examination of this proposal, supporting information, and the above statements, the project is: Exempt by Statute. (PRC 21080[b]; 14 COR 15200 et seq.) Based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the following statements are true and exceptions do not apply: 'I this project falls within exempt class 3, 4, 5, 6 or 11, it does not impact an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, practicely mapped, and officially adopted 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 foes not damage a scenic resource within an officially designated state scenic highway. This project is not located on a site included on any list 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 located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Cept. Code 5 65862.5 ("Octese List"). There is not a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect on the environment as defined by NEPA, and in the significance of a historical resource. There is not a reasonable po	Dist -Co -Pto (or Local Agency)			0316000050	al Project\/Project No				
The California Department of Transportation California is proposing a project to rehabilitate deteriorated components of the roadway drainage system on State Route 50 (SR-50) at post miles (PM) 2.70 – 13.76 in El Dorado County, due to the system exceeding its intended design life. The purpose of this project is to extend the drainage system service life, improve flow characteristics and reduce maintenance costs. CALTRANS CEQA DETERMINATION (Check one)									
components of the roadway drainage system on State Route 50 (SR-50) at post miles (PM) 2.70 - 13.76 in El Dorado County, due to the system exceeding its Intended design life. The purpose of this project is to extend the drainage system service life, improve flow characteristics and reduce maintenance costs. CALTRANS CEQA DETERMINATION (Check one) Not Applicable — Caltrans is not the CEGA Lead Agency Based on an examination of this proposal, supporting information, and the above statements, the project is: Exempt by Stautte, (PRO 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 falls within exempt class 3 . 4, 5, 6 or 11; it does not impact an environmental resource of hazardous or ortical concorn where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law. • If this project flow in the exempt class 3 . 4, 5, 6 or 11; it does not impact an environmental resource of hazardous or ortical concorn where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law. • The is not a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances. • 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 damage a scenic resource within an officially designated state scenic highway. • This project does not cause a substantial advarse change in the significance of a historical resource. Doramon 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 environmental Branch Chief project Manager (Caltranos to repare an Environmental advarse ch	activities involved in this box. Use	Continuation Sheet, if ne	ecessary.)	arposo, location, infinto, right of wa	y roquironionio, and				
Not Applicable – Caltrans is not the CEQA Lead Agency Mot Applicable – Caltrans has prepared an initial Study or Environmental Impact Report under CEQA Based on an examination of this proposal, supporting information, and the above statements, the project is: □ Exempt by Statute, (PRC 21080[b]; 14 CCR 15360 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 falls 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. ■ There is not a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances. ■ This project does not located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Govt. Code § 65962.5 ("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 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].) Kelly McNally Martin Clark Whith Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief War Description of the project is an exemption 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 EA or EIS under the National Professor Caltrans Project Manager ■ Date	The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is proposing a project to rehabilitate deteriorated components of the roadway drainage system on State Route 50 (SR-50) at post miles (PM) 2.70 – 13.76 in El Dorado County, due to the system exceeding its intended design life. The purpose of this project is to extend								
Not Applicable – Caltrans is not the CEQA Lead Agency Mot Applicable – Caltrans has prepared an initial Study or Environmental Impact Report under CEQA Based on an examination of this proposal, supporting information, and the above statements, the project is: □ Exempt by Statute, (PRC 21080[b]; 14 CCR 15360 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 falls 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. ■ There is not a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances. ■ This project does not located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Govt. Code § 65962.5 ("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 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].) Kelly McNally Martin Clark Whith Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief War Description of the project is an exemption 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 EA or EIS under the National Professor Caltrans Project Manager ■ Date	CALTRANS CEQA DETER	MINATION (Check o	ne)	AND THE PARTY OF T					
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 falls within exempt class 3, 4, 5, 6 or 11, it does not impact an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely imaged, 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 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 Govt. Code § 65962.5 ("Cortese List"). This project is not located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Govt. Code § 65962.5 ("Cortese List"). 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 15081(b)[3].) Kelly McNally Martin Clark	Not Applicable – Caltrans is	not the CEQA Lead Ag	gency Not	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: • If this project falls 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. • There is not a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances. • 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 15081[b][3].) Kelly McNally Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Cheft **Ward Date** **Date** **Date** **Date** **Date** **Date** **Date** **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: • 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 as described in 23 CFR 771.117(b). As such, the project is categorically excluded from the requirements to prepare an Environmental gated May 31, 2016, executed between the FHWA and the State. The State has determined that the project is a described in 23 CFR 771.117(b). As such, the project is categorically excluded from the requirements to prepare an Envi				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. • There is not a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances. • 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. • This project does not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. • This project does not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. • This project does not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. • This project does not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. • This project does not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. • This project does not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment (14 CCR 15061[b][3].) • Kelly McNatly Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief • Print Name: Project Manager • 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: • 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). • Sall uses 23.85. The State has determined that this project has no significant impacts on the envir	Based on an examination of the	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							
There is not a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances. This project does not damage a scenic resource within an officially designated state scenic highway. This project does not located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Govt. Code § 65962.5 ("Cortese List"). This project ose 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].) Kelly McNally Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief Wartin Clark Print Name: Project Manager Signature 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: 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) 2 3 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 conflicts that this scraiced 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:	• If this project falls 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.								
This project does not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Tommon 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].) Kelly McNally Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental 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: 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, 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 FHW	 There is not a reasonab circumstances. 	There is not a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual							
possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment (14 CCR 15061[b][3].) Kelly McNally Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief Wartin Clark Print Name: Project Manager Environmental Branch Chief Wartin Clark Print Name: Project Manager Print Name: Project Manager 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: 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) 2 3 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 25 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 May 31, 2016, accurated by HPWA and Caltrans. Kelly McNally Print Name: Project Manager/DLA Engineer First Name: Project Manager/DLA Engineer Date Marin Clark Print Name: Project Manager/DLA Engineer	• This project is not located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Govt. Code § 65962.5 ("Cortese List").								
Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief Manager					rtainty that there is no				
Environmental Branch Chief Signature									
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: of 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 Poly 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)(□) □ 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. Kelly McNally Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief Signature Date Date Date Date		anner or	Print Nan	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: of 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 Poly 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)(□) □ 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. Kelly McNally Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief Signature Date Date Date Date	Signature MW	W 1/27	120 N	ut thuc	1/27/20				
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 CFR 771.117(c): activity (c)		() Butto	Cignatare	,	Dato				
 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:	In accordance with 23 CFR 771.11	7, and based on an exa	mination of this pro	pposal and supporting information,	the State has				
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(e): activity (c)(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								
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)() 23 CFR 771.117(d): activity (d)() 24 Activity _2 listed in Appendix A of the MOU between FHWA and the State 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. Kelly McNally Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief Marin Clark Print Name: Project Manager/DLA Engineer Signature Date Signature Date	CALTRANS NEPA DETER	MINATION (Check	one)						
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. Kelly McNally Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief Print Name: Project Manager/DLA Engineer Signature Date Date Date	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)() 23 CFR 771.117(d): activity (d)()								
Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief Market Project Manager/DLA Engineer	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								
Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief Market Project Manager/DLA Engineer	Kelly McNally	. 4	Marin	Clark					
Signature Date Signature V27/20 Date	Print Name: Senior Environmental P	lanner or	Print Nar	me: Project Manager/DLA Engineer					
	laun Micha	Uly 1/27/2	20 Signatur	fut Uluc	The state of the s				
		cklist completion: 1/6/20	<i>V</i>						

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

CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION/CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DETERMINATION FORM Continuation Sheet

Continuation Sheet									
03-ED-50 DistCoRte. (or Local Agenc	2.70/13.76 sy) P.M./P.M.	03-1H040 E.A/Project No.	0316000050 Federal-Aid Project No. (Loca	al Project)/Project No.					
Continued from page 1:	2)		7 00070, 7 110 1 10,000, 710 1 (2000)						
			ne roadway drainage system on St he system exceeding its intended						
50) at post miles (PM) R2.7 – R13.8 in El Dorado County, due to the system exceeding its intended design life. Staging									
2 staging areas were identified in the current project plan, which are within the Caltrans Right-of-Way. <u>Disposal/Borrow</u>									
No Disposal/Borrowing is required. All excavated, disturbed soil will remain or be used within the project.									
Right-of-Way Temporary Construction Easements (TCEs) and Permanent Drainage Easements (PDEs) will be required at multiple locations to perform work.									
Consultation/Coordination/Coord	on Coordination is requi	ired.							
Permits No permits were r	reauired.								
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,									
	,								
			•						
		·							
				* 4					