

1. Project Description

This is a fully funded roadway rehabilitation project located on State Route 65 (SR 65) near Wheatland in Yuba County. This job is estimated to begin construction in 2011. The limits are from PM 2.9 to R4.7. The approximate limits are from just north of Dairy Road to approximately 0.5 miles north of Rancho Road. The existing road surface has deteriorated significantly. This project would replace asphalt concrete within the traveled way in order to preserve the structural section. Two alternatives are being considered, a no-build alternative a build alternative as described below.

No-build alternative: The no-build alternative provides a basis of comparison with the build alternative in the future analysis year of 2030. This No-Build Alternative would include all currently planned and programmed projects in this area through the year 2030.

Build alternative: The build alternative shall consist of the following activities:

- Cold plane to a maximum depth of 0.25 feet of the existing mainline asphalt surface
- Replace with hot mix asphalt
- Replace existing striping and markings in kind
- Replace center line rumble strip and striping in kind

Because the no-build alternative has no effect on existing stormwater impacts, only the build alternative is discussed for the remainder of this report.

Per the EPA definition for the CGP, this project is considered routine maintenance because it maintains the original line and grade, hydraulic capacity, and original purpose of the facilities. This project provides preventative maintenance to existing highway facilities and maintains existing facility functions. Since this project is routine maintenance, it is exempt from the Construction General Permit requirements. Because the project consists of work only on existing facilities and within existing paved areas, this project also qualifies for a Class 1 Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Because the work shall be confined to the traveled way, no soil disturbance is anticipated. There will be no shoulder backing or changes to the drainage profile. None of the work is anticipated to take place within any railroad right-of-way (R/W) or on bridge structures, and no permits are required.

The only potential project pollutants are asphalt concrete (AC) grindings, striping paint, and miscellaneous non-stormwater pollutants the contractor may be using on-site. This project does not anticipate the need for any equipment/staging areas. No materials are anticipated to be tracked through the project site.

The receiving water body for this project is Best Slough, which is not on the 2006 Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments. Because this project would not disturb soil or create new impervious area, the project should have minimal water quality impacts.

This project is located within the Yuba County Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit area.

2. Construction Site BMPs

This project has no disturbed soil area, and therefore will require a Water Pollution Control Program rather than a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. Because there is no disturbed soil area, the project is also exempt from the Construction General Permit and associated risk assessment.

Because there is no disturbed soil area, no erosion control is anticipated to be required. Only general housekeeping tasks are anticipated to be necessary. The Construction Site Management and Additional Water Pollution Control items are anticipated to cover the cost of all Construction Site Best Management Practices (BMPs). The BMP costs for this Project are estimated based on the “Percent of Total Cost Method” presented in Appendix F.6.1 of the Caltrans *Project Planning and Design Guide*.

A coordination meeting with the Caltrans Construction Storm Water Coordinator will be held during later phases of the Project for BMP concurrence.

3. Required Attachments¹

- Vicinity Map
- Evaluation Documentation Form

4. Supplemental Attachments

- SWDR Tracking Form
- Storm Water BMP Cost Summary (Caltrans internal use only)

EXAMPLE ONLY

¹ Additional attachments may be required as applicable or directed by the District/Regional Design Storm Water Coordinator (e.g. BMP line item estimate, DPP, CS checklists, etc).



Evaluation Documentation Form (EDF)

DATE: 08-26-10

Project ID (or EA): XXXXXXXXXX

NO.	CRITERIA	YES ✓	NO ✓	SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR EVALUATION
1.	Begin Project Evaluation regarding requirement for consideration of Treatment BMPs	✓		See Figure 4-1, Project Evaluation Process for Consideration of Permanent Treatment BMPs. Go to 2
2.	Is this an emergency project?		✓	If Yes, go to 10. If No, continue to 3.
3.	Have TMDLs or other Pollution Control Requirements been established for surface waters within the project limits? Information provided in the water quality assessment or equivalent document.		✓	If Yes, contact the District/Regional NPDES Coordinator to discuss the Department's obligations under the TMDL (if Applicable) or Pollution Control Requirements, go to 9 or 4. _____ (Dist./Reg. SW Coordinator initials) If No, continue to 4.
4.	Is the project located within an area of a local MS4 Permittee?	✓		If Yes. (<i>Yuba County</i>), go to 5. If No, document in SWDR go to 5.
5.	Is the project directly or indirectly discharging to surface waters?	✓		If Yes, continue to 6. If No, go to 10.
6.	Is it a new facility or major reconstruction?		✓	If Yes, continue to 8. If No, go to 7.
7.	Will there be a change in line/grade or hydraulic capacity?		✓	If Yes, continue to 8. If No, go to 10.
8.	Does the project result in a <u>net increase of one acre or more of new impervious surface</u> ?			If Yes, continue to 9. If No, go to 10. 0 acres (Net Increase New Impervious Surface)
9.	Project is required to consider approved Treatment BMPs.			See Sections 2.4 and either Section 5.5 or 6.5 for BMP Evaluation and Selection Process. Complete Checklist T-1 in this Appendix E.
10.	Project is not required to consider Treatment BMPs. <i>FWS</i> (Dist./Reg. Design SW Coord. Initials) <i>BR</i> (Project Engineer Initials) <i>08/26/10</i> (Date)	✓		Document for Project Files by completing this form, and attaching it to the SWDR.

See Figure 4-1, Project Evaluation Process for Consideration of Permanent Treatment BMP

EXAMPLE ONLY

Report Date	Dist EA	District	EA	County	Route	Beg PM	End PM	Descrip	Phase	LongSWDR	PhaseRptDate	Exempt	TBMP	Pollution Program	Land Disturbance Acreage	AddImpArea	PercentTreated	MS4Area	MS4C/Co	Water Bodies Affected	Criteria	BioStrip	BioSwale	Detention	Infiltration	InfilTrench	GSRD	TST	DryWeath	MedFilter	MCTI	WetBasin	Const Start	Const Comp	SWComment
8/26/2010	03-XXXX	3	XXXXXX	Yub	65	2.9	R4.7	Maintenr	PID	FALSE	8/26/2010	TRUE	FALSE	WPCP	0	0	0	TRUE	Yuba	Best Slough	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9/1/2011	10/31/2011	

EXAMPLE ONLY

EXAMPLE ONLY

Storm Water BMP Cost Summary

THIS INFORMATION IS FOR **CALTRANS INTERNAL USE ONLY**

Project Name:	SR 65 Resurfacing
District:	03
County:	Yuba
Route:	65
Postmile Limits:	2.9/R4.7
Project ID (or EA):	03-XXXXXX

1.0 DPP BMPs

BMP Quantity	Unit Cost

SUBTOTAL \$ -

2.0 Treatment BMPs

Miles of Pavement	\$xxx,xxx per Mile

SUBTOTAL \$ -

3.0 Prepare WPCP

Total Construction Cost	Cost per Table F-6
500000	1100

SUBTOTAL \$ 1,100

RQM Value (if SWPPP is required):

4.0 Construction Site BMPs

Total Construction Cost	x.x% per Table F-3
500000	0.0325

SUBTOTAL \$ 16,250

5.0 ROW Acquisition

Length of ROW	Unit Cost per Length

SUBTOTAL \$ -

6.0 Stormwater Monitoring

Project Risk Level	SWM Cost (PPDG Appen F)

SUBTOTAL \$ -

TOTAL COST FOR STORM WATER BMPs	\$ 17,350
--	------------------

EXAMPLE ONLY