



COUNTY ENGINEERS ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA



OFFICERS 2010-2011

President ~ Julie Bueren
Director of Public Works
Contra Costa County
255 Glacier Drive
Martinez, CA 94553

President-Elect ~ Daniel Woldesenbet
Director of Public Works
Alameda County
399 Elmhurst Street, Room 307A
Hayward, CA 94544

Secretary ~ Tom Mattson
Director of Public Works
Humboldt County
1106 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Past President ~ Patrick DeChellis
Deputy Director of Public Works
Los Angeles County
900 S. Fremont Avenue
Alhambra, CA 91803

Treasurer ~ Mehdi Sadjadi
Former Public Works Director
Marin County
120 Round Court
Petaluma, CA 94952

Parliamentarian ~ Doug Wilson
Former Public Works Director
Tulare County
735 W. Cambridge
Visalia, CA 93277

NACE Representative ~
Peter Rei
Director of Public Works
Tuolumne County
2 S. Green Street
Sonora, CA 95370

Historian ~ Dave Gravenkamp
Former Public Works Director
Siskiyou County
105 4th Street
Yreka, CA 96097

Newsletter Editor ~ Ken A. Miller
Former Public Works Director
San Bernardino County
11374 Oak Hill Lane
Yucaipa, CA 92399

DIRECTORS 2010 ~ 2011

Northern California ~ Rick Tippett
Director of Transportation
Trinity County
P.O. Box 2490
Weaverville, CA 96093

North Bay ~ Don Ridenhour
Director of Public Works
Napa County
1195 Third Street, Ste. 201
Napa, CA 94559

Central Coast ~ Steve Kowalewski
Deputy Director of Public Works
Contra Costa County
255 Glacier Drive
Martinez, CA 94553

Sacramento-Mother Lode ~
Mike Penrose
Director, Department of Transportation
Sacramento County
827 7th Street, Room 304
Sacramento, CA 95814

San Joaquin Valley ~ Matt Machado
Director of Public Works
Stanislaus County
1010 10th St, Suite 3500
Modesto, CA 95354

South Central Coast ~ Scott McGolpin
Director of Public Works
Santa Barbara County
123 East Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Southern California ~ Jeff Pratt
Director, Public Works/Road Commissioner
Ventura County
800 South Victoria Avenue
Ventura, CA 93009-1600

May 12, 2011

Ms. Cindy McKim, Director
California Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 942873
Sacramento, CA94273-0001

California Transportation Infrastructure Funding System Proposal Support from the County Engineers Association of California

Dear Ms. McKim:

The County Engineers Association of California (CEAC) is in strong support of the California Transportation Infrastructure Funding System (CTIFs) proposal that we understand is before you for your consideration for funding. CEAC has been very supportive of the efforts of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for more than a decade to improve the delivery of federally funded local transportation projects in the State. CEAC has had strong representation on the City-County-State-Federal Cooperative Committee which was re-instituted in the late 1990's to facilitate improvement in communications and the dissemination of information between Caltrans, Federal Highway Administration, and local agencies. Approximately three years ago, we added a representative of the Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies to the Committee membership.

CEAC recently learned of the CTIFs proposal during a meeting of the Agenda for Change Subcommittee of the City-County-State-Federal-Cooperative Committee lead by the Division of Local Assistance. The Subcommittee was formed in an effort to bring together local, regional, and state transportation experts to develop proposals for project delivery streamlining that can be implemented through federal or state legislation, regulatory changes, or internal Caltrans policy changes.

As you know, Caltrans currently uses three separate major databases to track and process transportation projects. The databases do not work in tandem with another and therefore require intensive redundant manual processes. Furthermore, cities, counties, and regional agencies do not have access to the existing databases.

The CTIFs proposal would consolidate the existing databases into one streamlined, efficient, and transparent database that would provide many benefits to all parties involved in transportation projects. Benefits include electronic invoicing by local agencies, electronic management and approval of FTIP and FTIP amendments, electronic management of STIP and STIP amendments, and automation of over 150 forms and processes, just to name a few. The system will provide greater accountability, efficiency, transparency, and environmental benefits from reduced paperwork.

For these reasons, CEAC is in strong support of the CTIF proposal and we urge you to give it top priority for funding. Please contact me at (925) 313-2201 or Kiana Buss, Senior Legislative Analyst for the California State Association of Counties, at (916) 650-8185 or at kbuss@counties.org should you have any questions or would like to discuss our support in greater detail.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Julie Bueren".

Julie Bueren, President
County Engineers Association of California
Director of Public Works
Contra Costa County

Proposed Highway Design Manual Changes

<p>FROM: DIVISION OF DESIGN</p>	<p>SPONSORED BY: TERRY L. ABBOTT, Chief</p>	<p>Date: 5/17/11 Page 1 of 7</p>
<p>AREAS WITH PROPOSED CHANGES: ENTIRE MANUAL</p>	<p>ISSUING UNIT: OFFICE OF GEOMETRIC DESIGN STANDARDS</p>	
<p>PROPOSED CHANGES: SEE LIST BELOW FOR SPECIFICS ON CHANGES PROPOSED TO THE SIXTH EDITION</p>	<p>REVIEW NOTIFICATION PROVIDED TO: DESIGN MANAGEMENT BOARD LEGAL DIVISION CALTRANS HQ DIVISIONS – TRAFFIC OPERATIONS ENGINEERING SERVICES RIGHT OF WAY FHWA California Bicycle Advisory Committee ATLC CALPED VARIOUS INDIVIDUALS</p>	

Background

Portions of the entire Sixth Edition of the Highway Design Manual (HDM) [Foreword, Table of Contents; List of Figures; List of Tables; Chapters 10 through 1100, and Index] are proposed to be updated and revised as necessary to implement Departmental Deputy Directive 64- R-1 and also update Department terminology, falsework standards, truck turning guidance, and pavement design procedures. The proposed HDM revisions and changes are summarized in the overview below. The proposed changes are available for review on the Department Design website at:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/Draft-HDM-Complete-St/>

This website has been provided to facilitate both the internal and external review of these proposed changes. The review and comment period for these proposed HDM changes will terminate at the Close of Business (5 PM) on Friday July 8, 2011.

Once all of the commentary has been received and it has been analyzed, the HDM changes currently being provided for review may be modified as deemed appropriate by the Division of Design. Thus, the revisions and changes as currently proposed are subject to change before final publication and should not be used to design projects that are currently in the process of being delivered

Currently, it is anticipated that the HDM update that will result from this review will become available during the fall of 2011. At that time, a manual change transmittal will be provided to communicate how these HDM revisions will be implemented and applied to on-going projects on the State highway system.

For further information, please contact:

Antonette Clark, Editor of the HDM
Email Address = antonette_clark@dot.ca.gov
Phone Number = (916) 653-0180

Kevin Herritt, Chief of the Office of Geometric Design Standards (OGDS) and Chief Editor of the HDM:
Email Address = kevin_herritt@dot.ca.gov
Phone Number = (916) 653-0253

Guidelines & Protocols for Communicating Comments

1. The preferred method of communicating comments on the proposed HDM changes is to indicate edits on a hardcopy of the page(s) of text you wish to comment on, in legible, hand written form. Choose either red or any legible color ink, using the blank areas on the page and arrows to indicate where the comment or change is to be inserted.
2. Please focus comments to the edited text, as indicated by yellow highlighted text in the Draft HDM document that has been provided. Comments on text/figures without yellow highlighting, or information that it is believed is missing can also be submitted but it should be done separately from the comments provided on the draft text.
3. Comments or additions that are technical or pose a significant change in standard or policy must be accompanied by backup data, study, reference, etc. Such significant changes will not be considered without supporting data.
4. If comments/changes are typed on a separate sheet of paper, cut and tape the comments onto a blank portion on the page and use arrows to indicate where the change should be inserted. Check, as appropriate, to ensure that the remaining text on either side of the insertion continues to make sense both grammatically and contextually.
5. Deletions of text should be legible and either shown by a single-line strikeout, in red or any legible color ink. The underlying struck-out text, figure, or table should be visible through the strikeout line.

Overview of the Proposed Highway Design Manual (HDM) Changes

NOTE:

Please be aware that the Table of Contents, List of Figures, List of Tables, and Index have not been provided in the file containing the proposed HDM changes. To navigate through the file containing the draft HDM changes without this information, it is recommended that the existing on-line Table of Contents, List of Figures, List of Tables, and Index be used in coordination with the following overview. The current version of the HDM is available on-line at the following website:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/hdm/hdmtoc.htm>

These portions of the HDM will be updated to be consistent with the updated manual at the time of final publication.

A summary of the most significant revisions in the proposed HDM are as follows:

Foreword

Edited for clarity the purpose of the manual and updated the discussion of Departmental policy on the use of the U.S. Customary (English) and Metric units.

Chapter 10

Index 11.1 and Figure 11.1 have been edited to be consistent with the current Division of Design organization structure.

Chapter 40

Edited to be consistent with current federal legislation and with the current California Stewardship & Oversight Agreement with FHWA.

Chapter 60

Topic 61

Updated and re-alphabetized the list of abbreviations.

Topic 62

Updated, reorganized, enhanced, and clarified the definitions to be consistent with the changes being proposed in the remainder of the manual.

Chapter 80

Index 81.1 - Philosophy

Clarified and enhanced the existing text.

Index 81.2 – Highway Context

New guidance provided that discusses designing a highway that is sensitive to, and respectful of, the surrounding context.

Index 81.3 – Place Types

New guidance provided that discusses “place types” - the physical environment and land uses that surround the State highway.

Index 81.4 – Type of Highway

New discussion has been provided in this portion of the manual to connect highway type terminology to highway context and place types.

Index 81.5 – Access Control

New discussion provided to connect access control to highway context, place types, etc.

Index 81.6 – Design Standards and Highway Context

New discussion provided to communicate that Designers have the ability to design for all modes of travel (vehicular, bicycle, pedestrian and transit); and also to tailor a project to the unique circumstances that relate to it and its location.

Index 82.1(4) – Permissive Standards

Edited text to clarify.

Index 82.2(1) – Mandatory Standards

Edited text to be consistent with current federal legislation and with the current California Stewardship & Oversight Agreement with FHWA.

Tables 81.2 A & B: Mandatory and Advisory Standards

These tables have intentionally not been edited to be consistent with the changes being proposed. Commenting on this is not necessary. These tables will be updated similar to the Table of Contents, List of Figures, List of Tables, and Index as mentioned above.

Chapter 100

Topic 101 – Design Speed

Edited text to provide clarity.

Topic 102 – Highway Capacity

Edited text to provide clarity.

Topic 103 – Design Designation; 103.1 – Relation to Design

Climate region added.

Topic 104 – Control of Access; 104.3 – Frontage Roads

Clarified text that discussed bicyclists and pedestrians.

Topic 105 – Pedestrian Facilities

Clarified and updated the text. Increased the advisory standard for the minimum width a sidewalk should be from 5 feet to 8 feet when directly adjacent to a curb and 6 feet when separated by a planting strip.

Topic 108 – Coordination with Others; 108.2 – Transit Loading Facilities

Added new text and changed terminology from bus to transit.

Topic 108 – Coordination with Others; 108.3 – Commuter and Light Rail Facilities Within State Right of Way

Modified text to focus on commuter and light rail facilities.

Topic 108 – Coordination with Others; 108.4 – Bus Rapid Transit

Edited text to be consistent with changes in Index 108.3.

Topic 108 – Coordination with Others; 108.5 – Coordination with FHWA

Renumbered existing Index 108.4 and edited text to be consistent with changes in Chapter 40.

Topic 110.7 – Traffic Control Plans

Edited text to assure adequate consideration for all users and travel modes.

Topic 110.8 – Safety Reviews

Edited text to assure adequate consideration for all users and travel modes.

Topic 115 – Designing for Bicycle Traffic

New information has been added on this subject.

Topic 116 – Bicyclists and Pedestrians on Freeways

New information has been added on this subject.

Chapter 200

The design guidance that addressed the mobility needs of bicyclists related to Class II bikeways (bike lanes) was distributed into this chapter where it was appropriate. In addition, the text was clarified and updated. Plus, the following specific changes have been made:

Index 204.5 (4) - Sustained Grades; Turnouts

Added guidance that where less than 4' shoulders are provided, consideration should be given to providing bicycle turnouts equal to a standard shoulder width as often as possible.

Table 204.8 - Falsework Span and Depth Requirements

Table has been completely updated.

Index 205.4 - Driveways on Frontage Roads and in Rural Areas

Unpaved driveway crossings of bike paths and pedestrian walkways or driveway intersections with roadways or pedestrian paths are to be paved for a minimum of 15 feet.

Topic 210 - Reinforced Earth Slopes and Earth Retaining Systems

Design guidance has been updated.

Chapter 300

The design guidance that addressed the mobility needs of bicyclists related to Class II bikeways (bike lanes) was distributed into this chapter where it was appropriate. In addition, the text was clarified and updated. Plus, the following specific changes have been made:

Index 301.1 – Lane Width

The minimum lane width on two-lane and multilane highways, ramps, collector roads, and other appurtenant roadways has been modified to allow 11-foot lanes under certain circumstances and conditions.

Topic 303 - Curbs, Dikes, and Side Gutters; 303.1 General Policy

The posted speed related to which the use of curb should be avoided has been changed from posted speeds less than or equal to 45 miles per hour to 40 miles per hour for consistency reasons.

Topic 303 - Curbs, Dikes, and Side Gutters; (1) Types A1-6, A2-6, and A3-6.

The speed environment related to using these curb types has changed from an operating speed of 40 miles per hour to a posted speed of less than 35 miles per hour.

Topic 303 - Curbs, Dikes, and Side Gutters; (5) Type D Curb.

The speed environment related to using these curb types has changed from an operating speed equal or exceeding 50 miles per hour to a posted speed equal or exceeding 45 miles per hour.

Index 303.4 - Curb Extensions

New discussion and information has been provided.

Topic 305 - Median Standards; Index 305.1(2) Conventional Highways

New discussion and information on raised medians at pedestrian crosswalks and bicycle path crossings has been provided.

Index 307.2 - Two-lane Cross Sections for New Construction

Mandatory minimum paved width of each shoulder has been increased from 2 feet to 4 feet.

Index 309.1 - Horizontal Clearances for Highways

New discussion and information on providing bicyclists at least 1 foot of horizontal clearance from the edge of shoulder to fixed objects, guardrail, or barriers to minimize the risk of a bicyclist collision has been added.

Index 309.5 - Structures Across or Adjacent to Railroads

Guidance has been updated.

Topic 310 - Frontage Roads; Index 310.1 Cross Section

The minimum paved 2-lane cross section widths have been changed based upon whether 12-foot or 11-foot lanes are used and if 4-foot or 5-foot shoulders are present.

Chapter 400

The design guidance that addressed the mobility needs of bicyclists related to Class II bikeways (bike lanes) was distributed into this chapter where it was appropriate. In addition, the text was clarified and updated. Plus, the following specific changes have been made:

Topic 401 - Factors Affecting Design

New discussion and information has been provided.

Topic 403 - Principles of Channelization

New discussion and information has been provided related to pedestrians and bicyclists.

Topic 404 - Design Vehicles

Design guidance has been updated.

Index 405.2(2)(a) - Left-turn Channelization; Design Elements, Lane Width

11-foot lane width, for both single and double left-turn lanes on State highways, is acceptable in urban and suburban areas with posted speeds less than 40 mph and where large trucks are not expected.

Index 405.4 - Traffic Islands

Design guidance has been updated.

Chapter 500

The design guidance that addressed the mobility needs of bicyclists related to Class II bikeways (bike lanes) was distributed into this chapter where it was appropriate. In addition, the text was clarified and updated. Plus, the following specific changes have been made:

Index 501.3 - Spacing

Per federal guidelines, a 3 mile minimum interchange spacing on rural Interstates has been added as a mandatory design standard.

Index 502.2 - Local Street Interchanges

The use of isolated off ramps has been changed from an advisory design standard to a mandatory design standard.

Index 502.2(f) - Other Types of Interchanges

Requirement created to have new or experimental interchanges have the Design Coordinator and Traffic Liaison's concurrence before selection.

Index 502.3 - Freeway-to-freeway Interchanges

Per federal guidelines, all interchanges need to provide for each of the eight basic movements (or four basic movements in the case of a three-legged interchange), except in the most extreme circumstances. Less than "full interchanges" may be considered on a case-by-case basis for applications requiring special access for managed lanes (e.g., transit, HOVs, HOT lanes) or park and ride lots.

Topic 503 - Interchange Design Procedure; Index 503.1 - Basic Data

Review procedures and data needed have been updated. The approval of geometric features of all interchanges or modifications to existing interchanges by the Design Coordinator has been changed to a procedural requirement.

Index 504.2(1) - Freeway Entrances and Exits; Basic Policy

Express lanes and Bus (BRT) lanes have been added to the mandatory design standard mandating connections to the right of through traffic.

Index 504.3(7) – Ramps; Two-lane Entrance Ramps

Guidance on these facilities has been eliminated in favor of requiring that whenever these types of entrance ramps are being considered, they be discussed early-on with the HQ Traffic Liaison and Design Coordinator or Design Reviewer.

Index 504.7 - Weaving Sections

Design guidance has been updated.

Chapters 600 to 670

Chapters 600 through 670

Titles and topic matter, as needed, related to the Pavement Management Program and Office of Pavement Engineering were updated in the text. Term structural section has been replaced with pavement structure. Rigid pavement joint terminology updated. In addition, the following specific changes have been made:

Topic 603 – Types of Pavement Projects

Guidance updated related to pavement preservation, roadway rehabilitation, and reconstruction. Text has also been updated to provide clarity.

Table 613.3B - Lane Distribution Factors for Multilane Highways

Notes have been revised.

Table 613.5A - Traffic Index (TI) Values for Ramps and Connectors

Ten-year design life deleted.

Index 613.5 - Specific Traffic Loading Considerations

Text related to the future conversion of a shoulder to a traffic lane and intersections have been updated.

Topic 619 - Life-Cycle Cost Analysis

Text updated to reflect new 20- and 40-year design periods being used.

Topic 620 – Rigid Pavement

Rigid Pavement Catalog tables have been updated.

Chapter 700

Topic 707 – Slope Treatment Under Structures

Clarified guidance related to reducing mud or debris from encroaching upon the traveled way for motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians.

Chapter 800

Index 801.4 - Objectives of Drainage Design

Clarified text.

Index 803.1 - Basic Policy

Clarified text.

Index 803.3(2) – Proposed Upstream Development

Clarified text.

Chapter 830

Chapter Title

Chapter title changed.

Index 830.1 – Basic Concepts

Reworded text to provide clarity by using broader terminology.

Index 831.3 – Design Storm and Water Spread

Reworded text to clarify drainage needs at bus/transit stops.

Index 837.2(2) – Inlet Types; Grates

Reworded text for clarity.

Figure 837.1 – Storm Drain Inlet Types

Added Note 5 for clarity

Index 837.3 – Location and Spacing

Reworded text for clarity.

Chapter 860

Index 861.1 – Introduction

Clarified guidance applies to all transportation facilities and travelers

Index 861.2 – Hydraulic Considerations

Clarified guidance applies to all transportation facilities and travelers

Index 861.4 – Safety Considerations

Clarified guidance applies to all transportation facilities and travelers

Chapter 870

Index 871.1 - Introduction

Clarified guidance that applies to all transportation facilities.

Index 871.2 – Design Philosophy

Clarified guidance that applies to all transportation facilities.

Chapter 900

Index 902.2(1) - Sight Distance Setbacks

Clarified that sight distance requirements applied to all modes of travel.

Index 902.2(2) – Clear Recovery Zone

Added reference to Bike Path guidance related to this subject in Chapter 1000.

Index 902.3(3) – Plant Location

Clarified guidance in relationship to bicyclists and pedestrians.

Index 902.4 – Irrigation Guidelines

Added guidance to avoid the spraying of sidewalks and bikeways.

Index 903.4(4) - Automobile/Long Vehicle Split

Updated terminology used in text.

Index 903.4(5) – Bicycle Parking

Reworded text in title for clarity.

Index 903.5(4) – Parking Areas

Updated terminology used in text.

Index 903.5(6) – Signage

Added reference to DIB 82.

Index 903.5(7) – Walkways

Updated terminology in text and added a minimum clearance of 8 feet from pavement to the lower foliage that is to be provided adjacent to walkways.

Index 903.6(4) - Telephones

Updated terminology used in text.

Index 903.7(1) - Restrooms

Updated terminology used in text.

Index 903.8 – Security and Pedestrian Amenities

Updated terminology used in text.

Index 904.1 – General

Added reference to DIB 82.

Topic 904.3 – Design Features and Facilities

Updated terminology and added reference to DIB 82.

Topic 905 – Park and Ride Standards and Guidelines

Updated terminology and added reference to DIB 82.

Chapter 1000

The design guidance that addressed the mobility needs of bicyclists related to Class II bikeways (bike lanes) was distributed throughout the manual to where it was appropriate. The topics and figures remaining in the chapter were reorganized, updated, and enhanced. New mandatory and advisory standards associated with bicycle transportation have been created. New guidance has been written for topics such as: entry control for bicycle paths; sharing of bus and bicycle lanes; and, trails.



ATTACHMENT B

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FOR NON-INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS (PES(NI))FORM

The Preliminary Environmental Screening for Non-Infrastructure Projects [PES(NI)] form may only be used for local assistance federal-aid “**non-infrastructure**” projects ‘off’ the State Highway System (SHS). **The local agency may not proceed with any reimbursable activities prior to the project’s inclusion in a federally approved Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP) and receipt of “Authorization to Proceed” notification from Caltrans. (See LAPM, Chapter 3, “Project Authorization,” Section 3.2).** Detailed instructions for completing the Preliminary Environmental Screening for Non-Infrastructure Projects [PES(NI)] form are provided below.

Complete the Project Information Section of the PES (NI) form as follows:

Federal-Aid Project No: (Federal Program Prefix-Project No., Agreement No.) Example: RPSTPLE 5017(020). Obtain federal-aid project number from your District Local Assistance Engineer (DLAE). This number is required in order for the District Local Assistance Environmental Generalist to process the PES(NI) form .

To: (Name and address of district local assistance engineer to whom project has been assigned)

From: (Name and address of local agency project engineer or manager)

Is the Project “ON” the SHS? Check “Yes” or “No.” If Yes, **STOP**, and contact the DLAE regarding the Departmental policy on local agency projects “on” the SHS. Based on information contained in the policy memo referenced below, local agency projects “on” the SHS are processed as State Highway Projects in accordance with procedures set forth in the *Caltrans Project Development Procedures Manual*.

Note: The current and long-standing policy is for the Department to be the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) lead agency for improvement projects “on” the SHS. The Department’s practice of acting as CEQA Lead for projects on the SHS is based on the Department’s statutory obligation to plan, design, construct, operate and maintain the SHS as well as its actual ownership of the SHS. Further, as owner of the right of way, the Department is the entity ultimately responsible for property stewardship of all resources within State right of way. This stewardship obligation cannot be delegated to others. This applies even if the project is financed by others.

In certain limited cases, and only when it is in the best interests of the State, the Department may delegate CEQA lead agency status to a local agency. Such delegations can only be made by the District Director. The District Director will provide a written justification for the delegation, which becomes the authorizing document for a cooperative agreement between the Department and the local agency. The delegation is then formalized through an executed written agreement, which outlines the roles and responsibilities of each party. These delegations are the exception rather than the rule.

For guidance on determining CEQA lead agency status on local agency projects on the SHS, see Departmental policy memo provided at:

http://www.dot.ca.gov/ser/downloads/memos/CEQA_Lead_Agency_24Jun04.pdf

Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP): Enter the current FSTIP approval date for the project, write the project description exactly as it appears in the FSTIP, and attach a copy of the approved FSTIP page (showing the project or group of projects) to the PES (NI) form.

The FSTIP information can be obtained from the MPO.

Note: The California FSTIP is a multi-year, statewide, intermodal program of transportation projects that is consistent with the statewide transportation plan and planning processes, metropolitan transportation plans, and Federal Transportation Improvement Programs (FTIPs). The purpose of the FSTIP is to ensure that federal transportation funding continues to flow into California as a result of complying with federal regulations pertaining to programming. The FSTIP is prepared by Caltrans in cooperation with the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and is approved by FHWA and FTA. The FTIPs/FSTIP contains all capital and non-capital transportation projects, or identified phases of transportation projects proposed for funding under the Federal



Transit Act and Title 23 of the United States Code including federally funded projects. The FSTIP must be financially constrained by year and include sufficient financial information to demonstrate that projects can be funded as programmed. Only projects with funds that are reasonably expected to be available may be programmed in the FSTIP.

Construction Programming for FSTIP: Identify the fiscal year and dollar amount programmed in the current FSTIP under the construction phase. *Note: According to the 9/28/07 Interim Policy on Authorization of Non-construction Federal-aid Projects, funding for projects included under grouped project listings (lump sum) are typically programmed under the construction phase in the FSTIP. For non-construction projects, the detailed (back up) listing for the grouped projects shall also show funding under the construction phase. For all other grouped project listings, the detailed listing may show other applicable phases. Funding for non-construction projects that are individually listed shall also be programmed under the construction phase in the FSTIP.*

Complete Section A of the PES (NI) Form:

Check “Yes”, “No” or “TBD” as appropriate for each question. Use “TBD” when there is insufficient information available to provide a definitive “Yes” or “No” response. List all “TBD” items on the PES (NI) Continuation Sheet and research as needed to affirm a “Yes” or “No” response. Based on research results, change all “TBD” responses to either “Yes” or “No” responses as appropriate. One or more “Yes” responses requires preparation of the regular PES. All “TBD” items must have a definitive “Yes” or “No” response prior to the local agency signature on the PES (NI) form. If additional space is not needed for the project description and there are no “TBD” items requiring further research, it is not necessary to include the Continuation sheet with the signed PES(NI) form.

Note(1): Questions 16-21 pertain to indoor and outdoor activities, which have the potential to generate temporary noise and traffic congestion, reduce available parking, temporarily affect access to properties and roadways, and disrupt the quietude of neighborhoods. While activities of this nature are typically regulated by city and county use permit, the terms and conditions of those permits are not known until after the NEPA document is approved. For this reason, a “yes” response to these questions triggers the preparation of a regular PES form to insure consideration of and compliance with the provisions of Sec 4(f) 49 U.S.C. 303), (23 CFR 771.111(h)(2)(iii) impacts on abutting properties, U.S. DOT Order Title VI disrupt neighborhoods/communities, and E.O. 12898 (on Environmental Justice) disproportionate adverse environmental impacts on minority or low-income populations.

Note(2): Questions 24-28 pertain to the development of plans and programs of action. Because plans and programs have the potential to commit to actions before they are fully evaluated under federal environmental law (e.g., Section 7 and Section 106) (23 CFR 771.111(f)(3)), and because SAFETEA-LU mandates the early consideration of environmental resources during planning, projects of this nature may not be processed with the PES(NI). Completion of the regular PES form will be required.

Complete Section B of the PES (NI) Form: (PRELIMINARY NEPA CLASS OF ACTION)

Complete the **NEPA Class of Action** section by placing a check mark next to Categorical Exclusion (CE) under SAFETEA-LU Section 6004 (23 U.S.C. 326) and identify the specific activity that is most applicable for the action. In cases where the project does not qualify under Section 6004, check Section 6005(23 U.S.C. 327).

Complete the **Unusual Circumstances** section by placing a check mark in the box preceding each bulleted item to affirm that action will not result in impacts, controversy or inconsistencies as specified.

Complete the **Compliance with other Federal Environmental requirements** section by placing a check mark in the box preceding each resource listed to affirm the statement.

Complete the Signatory Section of the PES (NI) Form:

The **Local Agency Project Engineer’s** signature means that the PES(NI) form was prepared by them or under their direct supervision and that the screening concluded that the project is of a non-infrastructure nature, involving no disruption to the ground or natural environment.

The **Caltrans District Senior Environmental Planner (or Designee) and DLAE** signatures mean that they concur that the project involves no disturbance to the ground or natural environment, that the action(s) is/are covered under Attachments C and D, that the recommended NEPA Class of Action is a CE pursuant to NEPA, and that the project is in compliance with all other applicable environmental laws, regulations and Executive orders.

Distribution: The original signed PES(NI) form and Attachments C and D shall be maintained in the DLAE’s project file. A copy of the signed PES(NI) form with Attachments C and D shall be retained by the Local Agency Project Manager and the District SEP (*or designee*) for the project file.

Memorandum

*Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!*

To: MARGARET BUSS
Chief, Division of Local Assistance
Office of NEPA Delegation and Environmental Compliance

Date: June 13, 2011

File: Cultural

From: ANMARIE MEDIN
Chief
Cultural Studies Office



Subject: Undertakings exempt from further review

As you know, Attachment 2 of the Programmatic Agreement for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (PA) implemented January 1, 2004 identifies classes of screened undertakings. Certain ground-disturbing activities with minimal potential to affect historic properties may be screened by California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Professionally Qualified Staff (PQS) in the appropriate cultural resources discipline. PQS may determine that one or more such activity has no potential to affect historic properties, and therefore is not subject to further review under the PA.

Separate from this list of screened undertakings, there are a number of non construction-related actions that may use federal aid highway funding and therefore meet the broad definition of an undertaking set forth in 36 CFR Part 800 (the regulations implementing Section 106) but have been determined by Cultural Studies Office PQS to have no potential to affect historic properties

1. Ridesharing activities, including purchase of vehicles, but not including establishment of park-and-ride lots.
2. Program administration, technical assistance activities, and operating assistance to transit authorities to continue existing service or increased service to meet routine changes in demand.
3. Freeway service patrol.
4. Conversion of vehicles to alternative fuels.
5. Alteration of vehicles to make them accessible for the elderly or persons with disabilities
6. Contracts to hire media organizations to produce non-English language commercials.
7. Purchase of transit fare boxes.
8. Upgrading diesel powered vehicles.
9. Purchase of transit buses.
10. Classroom training.
11. Software development.
12. Purchase of CNG or alternative fuel vehicles
13. Purchase of school buses
14. Computer purchases
15. Safety education for pedestrians and bicyclists

16. Virtual museums
17. Educational outreach
18. HSIP safety awareness and public outreach
19. Traffic data collection and analysis
20. Purchase crossing guard uniforms
21. Purchase cones
22. Preparation of crossing plans
23. Publicity
24. Staff time
25. Public awareness campaigns and outreach to press and community leaders
26. Traffic education and enforcement in the vicinity of schools
27. Student sessions on bicycle and pedestrian safety
28. Conducting school traffic safety rodeos or bicycle rodeos
29. Training volunteers and managers of safe routes to school programs
30. Modest incentives for SRTS contests, and incentives that encourage more walking and bicycling over time
31. Creation of safety and educational tokens that also advertise the program.
32. Photocopying, duplicating, and printing costs, including CDs, DVDs, etc.
33. Mailing costs.
34. Costs for data gathering, analysis, and evaluation reporting at the local project level.
35. Pay for substitute teacher if needed to cover for faculty attending SRTS functions during school hours.
36. Costs for additional law enforcement or equipment needed for enforcement activities.
37. Equipment and training needed for establishing crossing guard programs.
38. Stipends for parent or staff coordinators.
39. Costs to engage the services of a consultant (either non-profit or for-profit) to manage an SRTS program as described in the prior bullet.
40. Implementation of walking school bus program
41. Walkability/bikeability audits
42. Preparation of SRTS mapping
43. Conducting an effective traffic enforcement activity at a railway-highway crossing
44. Development of a transportation safety plan.
45. Improvement in the collection and analysis of data
46. Planning integrated interoperable emergency communications equipment, operational activities or traffic enforcement activities (including law enforcement assistance) relating to work zone safety.
47. Conducting road safety audits

Because Caltrans PQS staff have determined in advance that the above-listed activities do not have potential to affect historic properties, these activities may be considered exempt from Section 106 without further review by PQS. The provisions of this memo apply only when the federally-funded undertaking is limited to one or more of the activities listed above. Additional

MBUSS
June 9, 2011
Page 3

review by District PQS will be required if the undertaking involves any activities that are not listed herein, including those listed as screened activities in Attachment 2 of the PA.

This supersedes the memorandum on this subject dated January 16, 2006 (King to Abbott). If you have any questions, please contact Jill Hupp at (916) 654-3567 or jill_hupp@dot.ca.gov.

c: Jill Hupp; Germaine Belanger

Memorandum

*Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!*

To: MARGARET BUSS
OFFICE CHIEF, LOCAL ASSISTANCE
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Date: June 21, 2011

From: *for* GREGG ERICKSON *Gregg Erickson*
Chief, Biology & Technical Assistance Office
Division of Environmental Analysis

Subject: **Non-Infrastructure Project Natural Environmental Study – No Effect Memo**

There have been an increasing number of non-infrastructure projects eligible for federal-aid highway funds. These non-infrastructure projects are part of the Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS), Transportation Enhancement, and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality programs. These projects will not involve engineering design, right of way, ground disturbance or construction.

The Office of Biological and Technical Assistance have determined in advance that the non-infrastructure classes of non-construction related undertakings do not have the potential to affect natural resources. Projects listed below will have no effect or impact on natural resources including but not limited to; state or federally listed species; designated critical habitat, state or federally recognized sensitive habitats, or potential waters of the state or U.S. Furthermore, these activities will not require any permits associated with natural resource laws, regulations, or policies. Therefore, the activities listed below may be considered exempt without further review related to natural resources. Should the description of these undertakings change or involve other activities, additional review will be necessary to assess the effects to natural resources.

List of Non-infrastructure Classes of Non-construction Undertakings

1. Ridesharing activities, including purchase of vehicles, but not including establishment of park-and-ride lots.
2. Program administration, technical assistance activities, and operating assistance to transit authorities to continue existing service or increased service to meet routine changes in demand.
3. Freeway service patrol.
4. Conversion of vehicles to alternative fuels.
5. Alteration of vehicles to make them accessible for the elderly or persons with disabilities
6. Contracts to hire media organizations to produce non-English language commercials.
7. Purchase of transit fare boxes.
8. Upgrading diesel powered vehicles.
9. Purchase of transit buses.
10. Classroom training.
11. Software development.
12. Purchase of CNG or alternative fuel vehicles
13. Purchase of School Buses
14. Computer Purchases
15. Safety Education for Pedestrians and bicyclists
16. Virtual museums

17. Educational outreach
18. HSIP safety awareness and public outreach
19. Traffic data collection and analysis
20. Purchase Crossing guard uniforms
21. Purchase Cones
22. Preparation of Crossing Plans
23. Publicity
24. Staff Time
25. Public awareness campaigns and outreach to press and community leaders
26. Traffic education and enforcement in the vicinity of schools
27. Student sessions on bicycle and pedestrian safety
28. Conducting school traffic safety rodeos or bicycle rodeos
29. Training volunteers and managers of safe routes to school programs
30. Modest incentives for SRTS contests, and incentives that encourage more walking and bicycling over time
31. Creation of safety and educational tokens that also advertise the program.
32. Photocopying, duplicating, and printing costs, including CDs, DVDs, etc.
33. Mailing costs.
34. Costs for data gathering, analysis, and evaluation reporting at the local project level.
35. Pay for substitute teacher if needed to cover for faculty attending SRTS functions during school hours.
36. Costs for additional law enforcement or equipment needed for enforcement activities.
37. Equipment and training needed for establishing crossing guard programs.
38. Stipends for parent or staff coordinators.
39. Costs to engage the services of a consultant (either non-profit or for-profit) to manage a SRTS program as described in the prior bullet.
40. Implementation of walking school bus program
41. Walkability/bikeability audits
42. Conducting an effective traffic enforcement activity

If you have any questions, please contact Gregg Erickson (916) 654-6296.

c: Pettler

Expires – When LPP is issued

Preliminary Environmental Screening Form for Non-Infrastructure Projects [PES(NI)]

I. BACKGROUND

In recent years, there have been an increasing number of non-infrastructure projects eligible for federal-aid highway funds. This is in part a result of legislation allowing or mandating that a percentage of program funds (*e.g.*, *Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS)*, *Transportation Enhancement (TE)*, and *Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)*) be used for non-infrastructure projects.

Non-infrastructure projects are those transportation-related projects that will not involve engineering design, right of way acquisition, or physical construction of transportation facilities. Examples of non-infrastructure projects include but are not limited to: public awareness campaigns and outreach, traffic education and enforcement in the vicinity of schools, student sessions on bicycle and pedestrian safety, freeway service patrol, ridesharing activities, and purchase of vehicles. The eligibility of non-infrastructure projects for federal participation are governed by the various federal funding program guidelines, such as SRTS, TE, and CMAQ Programs.

While non-infrastructure projects will not involve engineering design, right of way, ground disturbance or construction, they are still required to have environmental reviews because of the impact that some of these projects may have on the environment in unanticipated ways.

The purpose of this Office Bulletin (OB) is to disseminate the Preliminary Environmental Screening for Non-Infrastructure Projects [PES(NI)] form, to help streamline the environmental reviews of non-infrastructure projects. The PES(NI) checklist enables local agencies and Caltrans staff to document that no environmental studies would be needed and that the normal Preliminary Environmental Study (PES) form is not required.

II. POLICY

Current policy requires the following for each Local Assistance federal-aid project, that is, projects 'off' the State Highway System (SHS):

- Completion of the PES form (*8 pages, 36-questions*)
- Screening by a qualified CT district PQS (*PES form section*)
- Preparation of a "No Effect" Memo by a qualified CT biologist (*separate memo for file*)
- Completion of a Transportation Air Quality Conformity Findings Checklist (*2 pages, 15 steps*)
- Concurrence by a qualified CT district Air Quality specialist
- Completion of a Categorical Exclusion Checklist (*4 pages*)
- Completion of a Categorical Exemption/Categorical Exclusion Determination Form

Completion of each item is required to affirm or negate a project's potential for impact and to document the project's compliance with federal environmental requirements. Projects having the greatest potential to impact environmental resources are those that involve ground disturbance and construction. A lower level of analysis and documentation may be appropriate for non-infrastructure projects or federal actions involving no ground disturbance. Presently there is no policy or procedure that allows that lower level of documentation.



For this reason, the Division of Local Assistance has developed an abbreviated preliminary environmental screening process for local agency federal-aid “non-infrastructure” projects (*‘off’ the SHS*) involving no ground disturbance or other effects to the environment.

The abbreviated process is outlined in this Office Bulletin, the Preliminary Environmental Screening - Non-Infrastructure Projects (PES-NI) form is provided at Attachment A, and the Instructions for Completing the Preliminary Environmental Screening for Non-Infrastructure Projects [PES(NI)] form is provided at Attachment B.

When all of the questions on the first page of the PES(NI) form can be answered “No”, and the action is included in Attachment C - Undertakings exempt from further review memo (June 13, 2011) and Attachment D – Non-Infrastructure Project Natural Environmental Study – No Effect Memo (June 21, 2011), the project may be processed with the PES(NI) form. The local agency will not need to undertake further studies or complete the *regular* PES form, the District Environmental Generalist will not need to review and sign the *regular* PES form, AQ Checklist or CE Checklist, and the CT District PQS and Biologist will not need to screen for compliance with Section 106 or prepare a “No Effect” memo for compliance with Section 7. The only forms required for non-infrastructure projects are the PES(NI) form and CE/CE Determination form.

When one or more of the questions on the first page of the PES(NI) are answered “Yes”, the local agency will have to follow normal Local Assistance environmental procedures, starting with filling out the *regular* Preliminary Environmental Study(PES) form.

When the project description provides insufficient detail to provide a clear “Yes” or “No” response, or when there are concerns regarding whether or not the action will be ground disturbing, the local agency and/or Caltrans District environmental generalist should check the “TBD” (To Be Determined) box on the first page of PES(NI) form, note the concern or question on the PES(NI) Continuation Sheet and research the matter further until a “Yes” or “No” response can be affirmed.

It is anticipated that this PES(NI) form will provide for the judicious assessment of environmental impacts associated with non-infrastructure projects, and ensure compliance with NEPA and other federal environmental laws with much less time and effort.

III. PROCEDURES

The local agency should not complete the PES(NI) form until the following conditions are met:

1. The project is programmed in the federally-approved FTIP/FSTIP.
2. The project will not involve R/W acquisition and/or physical construction of any facilities.
3. The local agency is ready to request federal Authorization to Proceed for the project.

Local Agency:

- Completes the PES(NI) form
- Provides additional information on the PES(NI) Continuation sheet for all “TBD” responses
- Sends completed PES(NI) form to the DLAE

Caltrans District Local Assistance Senior Environmental Planner (or designee)

- Reviews, corrects and signs the PES(NI) form
- Confirms that the project is included on Attachment C
- Confirms that the project is included on Attachment D
- Prepares the CE/CE Determination form



ATTACHMENT A

Preliminary Environmental Screening for Non-Infrastructure Projects [PES(NI)] Form

Federal Project No.:	
	<i>(Federal Program Prefix-Project No., Agreement No.)</i>

To: _____	From: _____
<i>(District Local Assistance Engineer)</i>	<i>(Local Agency)</i>
<i>(District)</i>	<i>(Project Manager's Name and Telephone No.)</i>
<i>(Address)</i>	<i>(Address)</i>
<i>(E-mail Address)</i>	<i>(E-mail Address)</i>

Is this Project "ON" the State Highway System? Yes No **IF YES, STOP HERE** and contact the District Local Assistance Engineer regarding the completion of other environmental documentation.

Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP):		
	<i>(Current FSTIP Approval Date)</i>	<i>(Attach approved FSTIP listing)</i>

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/oftmp.htm>

Construction Programming for FSTIP		\$	
	<i>(Fiscal Year)</i>		<i>(Dollars)</i>

Detailed Project Description: *(Use Continuation Sheet if necessary)*

SECTION A: Does project involve any of the following:

Check "Yes", "No" or "TBD" as appropriate. Use "TBD" when there is insufficient information in the project description to provide a definitive "Yes" or "No" response. List all "TBD" items on the PES(NI) Continuation sheet for further research.

- | Yes | No | TBD | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Any ground disturbing activities? (e.g., digging of post holes) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Any infrastructure elements? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Installation of permanent data collection devices? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Installation or posting of signs? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. Grading, clearing or grubbing of vegetation? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. Electric vehicle charging station(s)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. Installation of fare boxes? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. Pavement striping or painting? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. Installation of bike cages or racks? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. Currently planned future construction? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 11. Potential to generate public controversy? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 12. Any planting of flowers or any plant species? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 13. Inconsistency with any plans and goals adopted by the community? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 14. Part of a larger project? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 15. Activity or action occurring within a Historic District? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 16. Establishment of temporary parking facility? <i>(outdoor event, etc.)</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 17. Temporally reducing available parking? <i>(outdoor event, etc.)</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 18. Temporally encroaching on state or federal lands? <i>(outdoor event, etc.)</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 19. Temporally encroaching on tribal lands? <i>(outdoor event, etc.)</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 20. Use of a publicly owned public park? <i>(outdoor event, etc.)</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 21. Potential to affect access to properties or roadways? <i>(outdoor event, etc.)</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 22. Potential to disrupt neighborhoods/communities? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 23. Potential to disproportionately affect low-income and minority populations? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 24. Development of Plans? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 25. Creation of Programs? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 26. Conducting planning and research? |



- 27. Implementation of maintenance plans and projects?
- 28. Creation of regional bike and trail maps?
- 29. Historic and scenic site acquisition?

SECTION B: Preliminary NEPA Class of Action

Based on the results of this preliminary environmental screening, the recommended NEPA Class of Action for the proposed project is a Categorical Exclusion (CE) under SAFETEA-LU Section 6004 (23 U.S.C. 326). Yes No

If “yes”, check applicable activity below:

- 23 CFR 771.117(c): (Check one that is most applicable)
 - (1) Activities which do not involve or lead directly to construction.
 - (5) Transfer of Federal lands pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 317 when the subsequent action is not an FHWA action.
 - (11) Determination of payback under 23 CFR part 480 for property previously acquired with Federal-aid participation.
 - (16) Program administration, technical assistance activities, and operating assistance to transit authorities to continue existing service or increase service to meet routine changes in demand.
 - (17) The purchase of vehicles by the applicant where the use of these vehicles can be accommodated by existing facilities or by new facilities which themselves are within a CE.
 - (20) Promulgation of rules, regulations, and directives.

Project is a CE for a “non-infrastructure” highway project under SAFETEA-LU Section 6005(23 U.S.C. 327)

Yes No (Use only if project does not qualify under Section 6004)

The project does not involve the following Unusual Circumstances identified under 23 CFR 771.117(b)

Affirm each of the following by placing a check mark in the preceding box. Use of the PES(NI) will not be possible if all statements cannot be positively affirmed.

- Significant environmental impacts
- Substantial controversy on environmental grounds
- Significant impact on properties protected by Section 4(f) of the DOT Act or Section 106 of the National Preservation Act, or
- Inconsistencies with any Federal, State or local law, requirement or administration determination relating to the environmental aspects of the action.

Affirm each of the following by placing a check mark in the preceding box. Use of the PES(NI) will not be possible if all statements cannot be positively affirmed.

- Air Quality:** Project is exempt from conformity per 40 CFR 93.126, Table 2, because it is an activity which does not involve or lead directly to construction.
- Noise:** Project will not generate any long or short term noise to sensitive receptors.
- Water, Wetland, Floodplains:** Project will not impact waters, wetlands or floodplains.
- Biology:** Project is one of the types covered by the *Non-Infrastructure Project Natural Environmental Study – No Effect memo, dated June 21, 2011.*
- Cultural Resources:** Project is one of the types covered by the *Undertakings exempt from further review memo, dated June 13, 2011.*
- Sec 4(f):** Project does not use a Section 4(f) property or result in the temporary occupancy of a Section 4(f) project.
- Coastal Zone:** Project is not in a Coastal Zone or qualifies for an exemption.
- Relocation:** Project does not involve any relocations.
- Hazardous Waste and Materials:** Project does not involve the generation or disposal of any hazardous waste or excess material.

Local Agency Project Engineer Signature

This Preliminary Environmental Screening – Non-Infrastructure [PES(NI)] form was prepared by me or under my direct supervision. The screening concluded that the project is of a non-infrastructure nature, involving no disruption to the ground or natural environment.

(Signature of Local Agency)

(Date)

(Telephone No.)

Caltrans District Senior Environmental Planner (or Designee) and DLAE Signatures

Based on the information provided on the PES(NI) , I concur that the project will involve no disturbance to the ground or natural environment, that the actions is covered under both Attachments C & D of this Office Bulletin, that the recommended NEPA Class of Action is a Categorical Exclusion pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act as specified above, and that the project is in compliance with all other applicable environmental laws, regulations and Executive orders.

(Signature of Senior Environmental Planner or Designee)

(Date)

(Telephone No.)

(Print Name)

(Signature of District Local Assistance Engineer or Designee)

(Date)

(Telephone No.)

(Print Name)



Continuation of Project Description (if necessary):

Clarification of all “TBD” responses identified under Section A:

(Once clarification is obtained and provided below, change response from TBD to either “Yes” or “No” as applicable, and cross-reference discussion below.)

Distribution 1) Original - DLAE, 2) Copy - Local Agency Project Manager, 3) Copy - Senior Environmental Planner (or designee) for project file.



Caltrans District Local Assistance Senior Environmental Planner

- Signs the CE/CE Determination form

Caltrans District Local Assistance Engineer:

- Reviews and signs the PES(NI) form
- Reviews and signs the CE/CE Determination form

IV. APPLICABILITY/IMPACTS

This Office Bulletin applies to all local assistance federal-aid non-infrastructure and non-construction projects 'off' the State Highway System.

This policy/procedure is subject to annual review and recommendation of Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA Delegation Audit Teams and Department NEPA Delegation Self Assessment Review Teams.

Recommended: Original Signed By 7/7/11
 Germaine Belanger, SEP Date
 NEPA Delegation and Environmental Compliance Office

Approved: Original Signed By 7/7/11
 Margaret Buss, Chief Date
 NEPA Delegation and Environmental Compliance Office

Attachments:

- Attachment A– Preliminary Environmental Screening Form for Non-Infrastructure Projects [PES(NI)] Form
- Attachment B – Instructions for Completing the Preliminary Environmental Screening for Non-Infrastructure [PES(NI)]
- Attachment C – Undertakings exempt from further review memo dated June 13, 2011
- Attachment D – Non-Infrastructure Project Natural Environmental Study – No Effect Memo dated June 21, 2011