PLACER 267 CAPM PROJECT

INITIAL STUDY

with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration



PLACER COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

DISTRICT 3 – PLA – 267 — Post Miles 0.0 to 9.63

EA 03-2J190 / EFIS 0321000197

Prepared by the
State of California Department of Transportation

March 2026



General Information About This Document

What is in this document?

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has prepared this Initial Study with proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) which examines the potential environmental impacts of the Placer 267 CAPM Project on State Route 267 in Placer County, California.

Caltrans is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This document tells you why the project is being proposed, how the existing environment could be affected by the project, the potential impacts of the project, and proposed avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures.

What you should do:

- Please read this document.
- Additional copies of this document and related technical studies are available upon request at:
    - Truckee Library, 10031 Levon Avenue, Truckee, CA 96161
    - Kings Beach Public Library, 301 Secline Street, Kings Beach, CA 96143
- This document may be downloaded at the following website: https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-3/d3-programs/d3-environmental/d3-environmental-docs
- We'd like to hear what you think. If you have any comments about the proposed project, please attend the public meeting and/or send your written comments to Caltrans by the deadline: April 8, 2026
- Please send comments via U.S. mail to:

    Caltrans – North Region Environmental–District 3
    Attention: Caitlin Greenwood
    703 B Street
    Marysville, CA 95901

- Send comments via e-mail to: 03_2J190_Project_Inbox@dot.ca.gov
- Be sure to send comments by the deadline: April 8, 2026

What happens after this?

After comments are received from the public and reviewing agencies, Caltrans may (1) give environmental approval to the proposed project, (2) do additional environmental studies, or (3) abandon the project. If the project is given environmental approval and funding is obtained, Caltrans could complete the design and construct all or part of the project.

Alternate Formats

For individuals with sensory disabilities, this document can be made available in Braille, in large print, on audiocassette, or on computer disk. To obtain a copy in one of these alternate formats, please call or write to Caltrans, Attention: John O'Connell, Public Information Officer - District 3, 703 B Street, Marysville, CA 95901; (530) 701-9459 Voice, or use the California Relay Service 1 (800) 735-2929 (TTY to Voice), 1 (800) 735-2922 (Voice to TTY), 1 (800) 855-3000 (Spanish TTY to Voice and Voice to TTY), 1-800-854-7784 (Spanish and English Speech-to-Speech) or 711.

PLACER 267 CAPM PROJECT

Pavement and drainage rehabilitation and truck climbing lane extension
on State Route 267 in Placer County between
Post Miles 0.0 and 9.63 south of Truckee.

INITIAL STUDY

with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration

Submitted Pursuant to:

State: Division 13, California Public Resources Code

Federal: 42 USC 4332(2)(C)

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Department of Transportation

03/03/2026
Date of Approval

Erin Dwyer
Erin Dwyer, Office Chief
North Region Environmental–District 3
California Department of Transportation
CEQA Lead Agency

The following person may be contacted for more information about this document:

Caltrans North Region Environmental–District 3
Caitlin Greenwood
703 B Street
Marysville, CA 95901
(530) 821-8296

or use the California Relay Service TTY number, 711, or 1-800-735-2922



PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Pursuant to: Division 13, California Public Resources Code

State Clearinghouse Number: 2025070675

Project Description

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) proposes the Placer 267 CAPM Project on State Route (SR) 267 between Post Miles 0.0 and 9.63 in Placer County. The project proposes to rehabilitate pavement and drainages and extend a truck climbing lane.

Determination

This proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is included to give notice to interested agencies and the public that it is Caltrans' intent to adopt an MND for this project. This does not mean that Caltrans' decision regarding the project is final. This MND is subject to change based on comments received by interested agencies and the public.

Caltrans has prepared an Initial Study for this project and, following public review, has determined from this study that the proposed project would have *No Impact* on:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forest Resources
- Energy
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources

The proposed project would have *Less than Significant Impacts* to:

- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Noise

DRAFT

- Utilities and Service Systems
- Wildfire
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

With mitigation measures incorporated, the project would have Less than Significant Impacts to Biological Resources.

Impacts to the bed, bank, and channel of West Martis Creek and adjacent riparian habitat would result in the need for a California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement under section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code. Mitigation for these impacts would be required from a CDFW approved mitigation bank. If no credits through mitigation banks are available, other mitigation options will be explored during the design phase.

LRWQCB would also require mitigation for the impacts to waters. Further coordination with LRWQCB is ongoing to determine how these impacts would be mitigated.

Erin Dwyer

Erin Dwyer, Office Chief
North Region Environmental–District 3
California Department of Transportation

03/03/2026

Date

Table of Contents

PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION ..... **i**

Table of Contents ..... **i**

List of Appendices ..... **iii**

List of Figures ..... **iv**

List of Tables **iv**

Acronyms and Abbreviated Terms ..... **vi**

CHAPTER 1. PROPOSED PROJECT **1**

1.1 Introduction/Project History 1

1.2 Project Description 1

1.3 Purpose and Need 5

1.4 Proposed Alternatives 5

1.5 Permits and Approvals Needed 12

1.6 Standard Measures and Best Management Practices Included in All Alternatives 13

1.7 Discussion of the NEPA Categorical Exclusion 20

CHAPTER 2. CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST **21**

2.1 Aesthetics 26

2.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources 30

2.3 Air Quality 32

2.4 Biological Resources 39

2.5 Cultural Resources 59

2.6 Energy 64

2.7 Geology and Soils 65

2.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions 74

2.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials 98

2.10 Hydrology and Water Quality 103

2.11 Land Use and Planning 110

2.12 Mineral Resources 111

2.13 Noise 112

2.14 Population and Housing 116
2.15 Public Services 117
2.16 Recreation 118
2.17 Transportation....120
2.18 Tribal Cultural Resources 122
2.19 Utilities and Service Systems 124
2.20 Wildfire....128
2.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance 133
2.22 Cumulative Impacts 136
CHAPTER 3. AGENCY AND PUBLIC COORDINATION....138
CHAPTER 4. LIST OF PREPARERS....140
CHAPTER 5. DISTRIBUTION LIST 142
CHAPTER 6. REFERENCES 146

List of Appendices

APPENDIX A. **Project Layouts**

APPENDIX B. **Title VI Non-Discrimination Policy Statement**

APPENDIX C. **USFWS, NMFS, CDFW–CNDDB, and CNPS Species Lists**

List of Figures

Figure 1. Project Vicinity Map 3

Figure 2. Project Location Map 4

Figure 3. U.S. 2021 Greenhouse Gas Emissions 78

Figure 4. California 2020 Greenhouse Gas Emissions by Economic Sector 79

Figure 5. Change in California Gross Domestic Product (GDP), Population, and GHG Emissions since 2000 80

Figure 6. Sea Level Rise within Project Study Area from NOAA Sea Level Rise Viewer 94

Figure 7. Project location in relation to CAL FIRE Hazard Severity Zones 129

List of Tables

Table 1. Proposed Drainage/Culvert Work 7

Table 2. Temporary and Permanent Right of Way Required 11

Table 3. Agency, Permit/Approval Needed and Status 12

Table 4. Air Quality Pollutant Effects and Sources 33

Table 5. Findings of Special Status Plant Species that May Potentially Occur within the Environmental Study Limits 45

Table 6. Special Status Animal Species that May Potentially Occur within the Project Study Limits 49

Table 7. Regional and Local Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plans 81

Table 8. CAL-CET Estimates of GHG Emissions During Construction 84

Table 9. Agency Coordination and Professional Contacts 139



Acronyms and Abbreviated Terms

Acronym/Abbreviation	Description
AB	Assembly Bill
ADL	Aerially Deposited Lead
AVE	Area of Visual Effect
APE	Area of Potential Effects
BMPs	Best Management Practices
BSA	Biological Study Area
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAFE	Corporate Average Fuel Economy
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Cal/OSHA	California Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAPM	Capital Preventative Maintenance
CAPTI	Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFGC	California Fish and Game Code
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CGP	Construction General Permit
CH	Critical Habitat
CH_4	methane
CIA	Cumulative Impact Analysis
CIPP lining	Cured-in-Place Pipe lining
CMP	Corrugated Metal Pipe
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	carbon monoxide
CO_2	carbon dioxide
CO_2e	carbon dioxide equivalent
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CSP	Corrugated Steel Pipe
CTP	California Transportation Plan
CWA	Clean Water Act
dB	decibels
Department	Caltrans
DOT	Department of Transportation

Acronym/Abbreviation	Description
DP	Director's Policy
DPS	Distinct Population Segment
ECL	Environmental Construction Liaison
EFH	Essential Fish Habitat
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EO(s)	Executive Order(s)
EP	Edge of Pavement
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESA(s)	Environmentally Sensitive Area(s)
ESL	Environmental Study Limits
ºF	degrees Fahrenheit
FES	Flared End Section
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
FHSZ	CAL FIRE – Fire Hazard Severity Zone
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FR	Federal Register
GHG	greenhouse gas
GWP	Global Warming Potential
H_2S	hydrogen sulfide
HDPE	High Density Polyethylene (culvert)
HFCs	hydrofluorocarbons
HMA-A	Hot Mix Asphalt-Type A
HW	Headwall
IS	Initial Study
ISA	Initial Site Assessment
IS/MND	Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
LRWQCB	Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board
LSAA	Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (CDFW)
MASH	Manual for Assessing Safety Hardware
MBGR	Metal Beam Guardrail
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MGS	Midwest Guardrail System
MLD	Most Likely Descendent
MMT	million metric tons
MND	Mitigated Negative Declaration
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
$MTCO_2$	metric ton carbon dioxide
N_2O	nitrous oxide
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards

Acronym/Abbreviation	Description
NAGPRA	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NB	northbound
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NES/MI	Natural Environment Study/Minimal Impacts
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NO_2	nitrogen dioxide
NOA	Naturally Occurring Asbestos
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NO_x	nitrogen oxide
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
OPR	Governor's Office of Planning and Research
OSD	Overside Drain
Pb	Lead
PCTPA	Placer County Transportation Planning Agency
PDT	Project Development Team
$PM_{2.5}$	Fine Particular Matter
PM_{10}	Respirable Particular Matter
PM(s)	Post Mile(s)
Porter-Cologne Act	Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act
PPV	Peak Particle Velocity
PQS	Professionally Qualified Staff
Project	Placer 267 CAPM Project
PRC	(California) Public Resources Code
RCP	Reinforced Concrete Pipe
RMA	Routine Maintenance Agreement
ROG	Reactive Organic Gases
RSP	Rock Slope Protection
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RTPA	Regional Transportation Planning Agency
SB	Senate Bill
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy
SF_6	sulfur hexafluoride
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SHS	State Highway System
SNC(s)	Sensitive Natural Community(ies)
SO_2	sulfur dioxide
SO_x	sulfur oxides
SR	State Route

Acronym/Abbreviation	Description
SRA	State Responsibility Area
SSC	Species of Special Concern
SSP	Caltrans Standard Special Provisions
SWDR	Storm Water Data Report
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TBMP	Treatment Best Management Practices
TCE	Temporary Construction Easement
THVF	Temporary High Visibility Fencing
TMP	Transportation Management Plan
TRPA	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
TWW	Treated Wood Waste
U.S. or US	United States
U.S. 101 or US 101	U.S. (United States) Highway 101
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USC	United States Code
U.S. DOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
U.S. EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
VIA	Visual Impact Assessment
VOCs	volatile organic compounds
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
VRP	Visibility Reducing Particles
WOTUS	Waters of the U.S.
WPCP	Water Pollution Control Program

CHAPTER 1. PROPOSED PROJECT

1.1 Introduction/Project History

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) proposes the Placer 267 Capital Preventative Maintenance (CAPM) Project. The project is located on State Route (SR) 267 in Placer County, between Post Miles 0.0 and 9.63. The proposed project would perform maintenance activities within the project limits including pavement and drainage rehabilitation and other roadway improvements. Caltrans is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The original draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND) was circulated to the public on July 15, 2025. However, after the completion of the draft IS/ND it was determined that the cost of the proposed retaining walls between PM 6.30 and 6.80 would put the project over budget. The project development team (PDT) evaluated multiple options to reduce the cost of the project. Ultimately it was decided that adding fill at the southwest end of the culvert at PM 6.26 near Martis Peak Road to accommodate the truck climbing lane and wider shoulders would be the best option; the truck climbing lane would remain in the project scope and wider shoulders could be added without increasing costs outside of the programable amount. Additional discussion of the reviewed alternatives is included in section 1.4 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated From Further Discussion.

1.2 Project Description

Caltrans proposes this Capital Preventative Maintenance (CAPM) Project along State Route 267 (SR 267) in Placer County between Post Mile (PM) 0.0 at the Nevada County Line and PM 9.63 at the intersection of SR 267 and Dolly Varden Avenue (Figure 1).

This project proposes to cold-plane and overlay 0.20-foot of Hot Mix Asphalt-Type A (HMA-A) where required. The existing southbound truck climbing lane would be extended approximately 1,600 feet from 370 feet south of Martis Peak Road (PM 6.28) and ends before Carnelian Bay Avenue (PM 6.59). The shoulders adjacent to the truck climbing lane between PM 6.16 and PM 6.33 would be widened to 8 feet. Increasing the shoulder width around the culvert at PM 6.26 would require added fill at the southwest end of the culvert and a 30 foot extension to the culvert itself. The proposed project would also extend the life of existing drainage systems in poor

condition by replacing or lining. Other work would include replacing nonstandard guardrails to Midwest Guardrail System (MGS) with end terminals that meet current Manual for Assessing Safety Hardware (MASH) standards; replacing HMA-A dikes with concrete dikes; upgrading sign panels and striping to meet current standards; placing shoulder backing; constructing new or modifying existing stormwater treatment facilities between PM 6.00 and PM 7.00 to treat the stormwater runoff from the newly widened roadway; and rehabilitating the existing cut slope for SR 267 northbound (NB) on the east side from PM 4.95 to PM 5.07 (540-foot-long) by excavating and replacing rock slope protection (RSP) (*Appendix A – Project Layouts)*.

VICINITY MAP
PLACER 267 CAPM

PLA 267 PM 0.0/9.63 EA 03-2J190K




Figure 1. Project Vicinity Map




Figure 2. Project Location Map

1.3 Purpose and Need

Purpose

The purpose of this project is to preserve and extend the pavement service life by addressing existing pavement in fair and poor condition with HMA overlay, extend the service life of drainage systems by lining or replacing systems in poor condition; upgrade sign panels and striping to meet current standards; upgrade existing guardrails with end terminals as well as crash cushions that are not up to current standards; extend the truck climbing lane to improve traffic operations.

Need

The existing pavement within the project limits exhibit signs of distress. If pavement conditions are not addressed, the existing pavement is expected to further deteriorate, resulting in higher maintenance costs. The project is needed to extend the service life of the roadway and drainage systems as well as upgrade guardrail, signage, and striping to current standards. The existing truck climbing lane ends before trucks reach higher speeds, creating speed differences at the merge point.

1.4 Proposed Alternatives

No-Build (No-Action) Alternative

The No-Build Alternative would maintain the facility in its current condition and would not meet the purpose and need of the project. For each potential impact area discussed in Chapter 2, the No-Build Alternative has been determined to have no impact. Under the No-Build Alternative, no alterations to the existing conditions would occur and the proposed improvements would not be implemented.

Build Alternative

Pavement

- Repair locations of severe existing asphalt pavement failure with digouts. Digouts are assumed to be required on 10% of the existing roadway area.
- Place an overlay of 0.20-foot Hot Mix Asphalt-Type A (HMA-A) on all lanes and shoulders from edge of pavement (EP) to EP.

- Place imported material shoulder backing at the outside edge of shoulders, where needed.
- Restripe lanes and shoulders with recessed striping and pavement markings.
- Replace HMA dike with concrete curb where feasible.
- Two Traffic Management Systems (TMS) Census Stations that are in poor condition will be replaced. Electrical elements of Roadside Weather Information System (RWIS) at PM 6.75 that will be affected by roadway work will be replaced in kind.

Truck Climbing Lane

- Extend existing SR 267 southbound truck climbing lane from its current end point at PM 6.28 to PM 6.59. This includes roadway widening for the extended lane and widening shoulders to 8 feet. The proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surfaces with the extension of the truck climbing lane which has the potential to increase the amount of runoff water from SR 267.
- Removal of trees and vegetation will be required for construction of the cut slope.
- Soil from the cut slope would be used as fill around the culvert at PM 6.26 to support the widened shoulders and extended truck climbing lane. The culvert at this location would be extended by 30 feet.
- Approximately 20,000 square feet of impervious surfaces will be added from the addition of the truck climbing lane.
- Utility conflicts are anticipated and may require relocation of AT&T overhead lines. Utility detection would occur during the environmental phase.
- At minimum, an 8-foot-wide shoulder would be maintained throughout the truck climbing lane.

Repair Side Slope

- On SR 267, rehabilitate existing cut slope on the east side from PM 5.10 to PM 5.20 for approximately 540' by excavating and placing RSP. Permanent property acquisition from a single parcel would be required for this work.

Drainages

- Rehabilitate and/or replace 36 poor condition drainages including culverts, downdrains, and on-site detentions.
- Acquire Temporary Construction Easements (TCEs), drainage easements, or permanent property acquisitions for drainage improvements, as needed.

Table 1. Proposed Drainage/Culvert Work

Location	Post Mile	Existing Drainage	Proposed Work
1	0.11	12"-diameter by 26'-long downdrain	Upsize: replace downdrain with 18"-diameter by 26'-long Corrugated Steel Pipe (CSP).
2	0.11	18"-diameter by 80'-long culvert	Cementitious pipeliner 80' of existing culvert, remove and replace in-kind the existing flared end section (FES) at the outlet, add RSP.
3	0.82	18"-diameter by 53.3'-long culvert	Cementitious pipeliner 53.3' of existing culvert, remove and replace in-kind the existing FES at the inlet.
4	1.59	18"-diameter by 47.5'-long culvert	Cementitious pipeliner 47.5' of existing culvert
5	2.89	3.5' high, 6' wide, and 82.5' long ellipsoid culvert	Pave invert for 82.5', requires clear water diversion, replace RSP.
6	3.09	18"-diameter by 50'-long CSP with a drainage inlet	Upsize: replace existing culvert with 24"-diameter by 50'-long Reinforced Concrete Pipe (RCP), replace drainage inlet, add concrete FES.
7	3.16	18"-diameter by 56'-long CSP	Upsize: replace existing culvert with 24"-diameter by 56'-long RCP replace headwall (HW), add concrete FES and RSP.
8	3.18	12"-diameter by 18'-long Overside Drain (OSD)	Remove and replace OSD in-kind, replace FES, add RSP.
9	3.31	12"-diameter by 15'-long OSD	Remove and replace OSD in-kind, add FES and RSP.
10	3.59	No existing drainage at this location.	Construct new OSD at this location.
11	3.71	8"-diameter by 16'-long OSD	Upsize: Replace existing OSD with 18"-diameter by 16'-long OSD, add FES and RSP.

Location	Post Mile	Existing Drainage	Proposed Work
12	3.75	18"-diameter by 72'-long culvert with manhole and drainage inlet	CIPP lining from manhole to drainage inlet (72' in length)
13	3.90	8"-diameter by 10'-long OSD	Upsize: replace existing OSD with 18"-diameter by 10'-long OSD, leave existing RSP.
14	3.99	12"-diameter by 15'-long Overside Drain (OSD) drainage	Upsize: replace existing OSD with 18"-diameter by 15'-long OSD.
15	4.13	24"-diameter by 69.4'-long CSP	Replace existing culvert with 24"-diameter by 69.4'-long RCP, add a concrete FES and replace RSP at both inlet and outlet.
16	4.36	48"-diameter by 140'-long culvert	Pave invert for 140' of existing culvert, construct temporary culvert adjacent to existing culvert to divert water flows during construction.
17	5.11	18"-diameter by 66'-long culvert with Treatment Best Management Practices (TBMP) drainage inlet	Replace existing TBMP drainage inlet with new TBMP drainage inlet with back entrance.
18	5.42	12"-diameter by 9.5'-long culvert	Replace existing culvert in-kind, add RSP.
19	5.42	18"-diameter by 54'-long culvert	CIPP lining 54' of existing culvert.
20	5.42	18"-diameter by 6'-long culvert	CIPP lining 6' of existing culvert.
21	5.82	18"-diameter by 60'-long culvert with TBMP drainage inlet	Replace existing TBMP drainage inlet with new TBMP drainage inlet with back entrance.
22	5.94	24"-diameter by 44'-long downdrain	Remove and replace downdrain in-kind.
23	6.18	Traction sand trap with 12"-diameter by 21'-long culvert	Replace existing TBMP drainage inlet in-kind to sand trap or loading dock.
24	6.25	Traction sand trap with 12"-diameter by 14'-long culvert	Replace existing TBMP drainage inlet in-kind to sand trap or loading dock
25	6.26	78"-diameter by 173.5'-long culvert	Construct temporary dam and clear water diversion, pave invert for 173.5', extend the culvert by 30' to the southwest, and place RSP at the inlet and outlet.
26	6.32	Traction sand trap with 12"-diameter by 36'-long culvert	Replace existing TBMP drainage inlet in-kind to sand trap or loading dock.

Location	Post Mile	Existing Drainage	Proposed Work
27	6.32	Traction sand trap with 12"-diameter by 9.3'-long culvert	Replace existing TBMP drainage inlet in-kind to sand trap or loading dock.
28	6.82	18"-wide slot drain with drainage inlets	Replace slot drain and drainage inlets in-kind.
29	6.82	18"-diameter by 54'-long culvert	Upsize: replace existing culvert with 24"-diameter by 54'-long RCP, replace TBMP drainage inlet.
30	6.82	24"-diameter by 53'-long culvert	Replace TBMP drainage inlet with new TBMP drainage inlet.
31	7.05	18"-diameter by 30'-long culvert	Replace existing culvert with 18"-diameter by 30'-long CSP
32	8.22	18"-diameter by 52'-long culvert	Cementitious pipeliner 52' of existing culvert.
33	8.39	18"-diameter by 100'-long culvert with drainage inlets	Upsize: replace existing culvert with 24"-diameter by 100'-long RCP, replace both drainage inlets
34	8.50	18"-diameter by 104'-long culvert	CIPP lining 104' of existing culvert, remove and replace FES at outlet.
35	9.19	18"-diameter by 75.6'-long culvert	Upsize: replace existing culvert with 24"-diameter by 75.6'-long RCP, add concrete FES on both inlet and outlet.
36	9.4	18"-diameter by 25'-long culvert	Upsize: replace existing culvert with 24"-diameter by 25'-long RCP, add concrete FES on both inlet and outlet.
37	9.4	18"-diameter by 25'-long culvert	Upsize: replace existing culvert with 24"-diameter by 25'-long RCP, add concrete FES on both inlet and outlet.

Signs

- Upgrade roadside signs to current standards.

Safety

- Replace all metal beam guardrail (MBGR) with steel post Midwest Guardrail System (MGS) with appropriate end terminals, as well as upgrade crash cushions to the current Manual for Assessing Safety Hardware (MASH) standards.

Complete Streets

- Two curb ramps at Shafer Mill Road (PM 0.25) have worn-out plastic Detectable Warning Surface (DWS). DWS will be replaced with metal truncated domes. Pedestrian crossings will be replaced in kind.

Right of Way Requirements

- TCEs, drainage easements, and acquisitions of portions of vacant parcels are needed for the construction of the project (Table 2). No relocations of any people from their place of residence would be required. Encroachment permits would also be required from Placer County for drainage work.

Table 2. Temporary and Permanent Right of Way Required

Post Mile	Type of Right of Way	Parcel Owner	Parcel Number (APN)	Area (Square feet)
0.1	Drainage Easement	Martis Valley Storage Group LLC	080-270-008-000	360
2.9	TCE	Truckee Donner Land Trust	110-030-040-000	4,094
3.09	Drainage Easement	Truckee Donner Land Trust	110-030-040-000	504
3.16	Drainage Easement	Truckee Donner Land Trust	110-030-041-000	672
3.18	Drainage Easement	Truckee Donner Land Trust	110-030-041-000	684
3.31	Drainage Easement	Truckee Donner Land Trust	110-030-041-000	504
3.61	Drainage Easement	Truckee Donner Land Trust	110-030-042-000	504
3.71	Drainage Easement	Truckee Donner Land Trust	110-030-042-000	504
3.79	Drainage Easement	Truckee Donner Land Trust	110-030-042-000	1,224
3.75	Drainage Easement	Trimont Land Company	110-081-049-000	1,136
3.90	Drainage Easement	Trimont Land Company	110-030-051-000	384
3.99	Drainage Easement	Trimont Land Company	110-030-051-000	648
4.13	Drainage Easement	Trimont Land Company	110-030-051-000	504
4.36	TCE	Trimont Land Company	110-030-051-000	4,144
4.36	TCE	Trimont Land Company	110-030-088-000	2,156
5.1	Acquisition	Trimont Land Company	110-030-051-000	8,425
5.15	Acquisition	Sierra Pacific Industries	110-051-023-000	25,136
5.3	TCE	Sierra Pacific Industries	110-051-023-000	2,773
6.15	Acquisition	MVWP Development LLC	110-060-069-000	48,977
6.25	TCE	Sierra Pacific Industries	110-060-070-000	12,424
6.26	Acquisition	Sierra Pacific Industries	110-060-070-000	2,177

Post Mile	Type of Right of Way	Parcel Owner	Parcel Number (APN)	Area (Square feet)
8.4	TCE	Kings Run	111-080-001-000	300
9.22	TCE	James Vernades	112-290-015-000	877

Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion

The build alternative in the original draft IS/ND circulated in July 2025 had two retaining walls including 2,650 feet long retaining wall along the easternly cut slope adjacent to the proposed truck climbing lane extension. After the draft IS/ND was circulated to the public, it was determined that the cost of the retaining walls would put the project significantly over budget. Additional funds could not be added to the project to cover the budget shortfall and this alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

During the PDT review of the project to determine other feasible construction methods and alternatives to reduce the overall project cost, removing the truck climbing lane extension from the project scope was also explored. This would have brought the total project cost below the programable amount; however, the project would not meet the purpose and need so this option was also eliminated from further discussion.

1.5 Permits and Approvals Needed

Table 3 below identifies the permits, licenses, agreements, and certifications (PLACs) required for project construction.

Table 3. Agency, Permit/Approval Needed and Status

Agency	PLACs	Status
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	404 Nationwide Permit 3	Preparing for submittal to USACE.
California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)	Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (LSAA)	Preparing for submittal to CDFW.
Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (LRWQCB)	Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification	Preparing for submittal to LRWQCB.
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)	Environmental Improvement Program	Preparing for submittal to TRPA.

1.6 Standard Measures and Best Management Practices Included in All Alternatives

Under CEQA, "mitigation" is defined as avoiding, minimizing, rectifying, reducing/ eliminating, and compensating for an impact. In contrast, Standard Measures and Best Management Practices (BMPs) are prescriptive and sufficiently standardized to be generally applicable, and do not require special tailoring for a project. These are measures that typically result from laws, permits, agreements, guidelines, resource management plans, and resource agency directives and policies. For this reason, the measures and practices are not considered "mitigation" under CEQA; rather, they are included as part of the project description in environmental documents.

The project contains a number of standardized project features, standard practices (measures), and Best Management Practices (BMPs) which are employed on most, if not all, Caltrans projects and were not developed in response to any specific environmental impact resulting from the proposed project and, as such, are included as part of the project description. Any project-specific avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures that would be applied to reduce the effects of project impacts are listed further below as Additional Measures or in Section 2.4.–Biological Resources.

Aesthetics Resources

AR-1: Aesthetic treatment to bridges/guardrails would be included to address context sensitivity.

AR-2: Temporary access roads, construction easements, and staging areas that were previously vegetated would be restored to a natural contour and revegetated with regionally-appropriate native vegetation.

AR-3: Where feasible, guardrail terminals would be buried; otherwise, an appropriate terminal system would be used, if appropriate.

AR-4: Where feasible, construction lighting would be temporary, and directed specifically on the portion of the work area actively under construction pursuant to California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA) lighting requirements.

AR-5: Where feasible, the removal of established trees and vegetation would be minimized. To demarcate areas where vegetation would be preserved

and root systems of trees protected, Temporary High Visibility Fencing (THVF) would be installed in Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) before start of construction.

AR-6: To ensure that the vegetation control will be visually compatible with the scenic corridor, provide integral colored or stained Vegetation Control (Minor Concrete), at all MGS replacement locations. The color and application method will be determined during the final design phase of the project.

Biological Resources

BR-1: General

Before start of work, as required by permit or consultation conditions, a Caltrans biologist or Environmental Construction Liaison (ECL) would meet with the contractor to brief them on environmental permit conditions and requirements relative to each stage of the proposed project, including, but not limited to, work windows, drilling site management, and how to identify and report regulated species within the project areas.

BR-2: Animal Species

To protect migratory and nongame birds (occupied nests and eggs), if possible, vegetation removal would be limited to the period outside of the bird breeding season (removal would occur between September 16 and January 31). If vegetation removal is required during the breeding season, a nesting bird survey would be conducted by a qualified biologist within five days prior to vegetation removal. If an active nest is located, the biologist would coordinate with CDFW to establish appropriate species-specific buffer(s) and any monitoring requirements. The buffer would be delineated around each active nest and construction activities would be excluded from these areas until birds have fledged, or the nest is determined to be unoccupied.

A qualified biologist would monitor in-stream construction activities that could potentially impact sensitive biological receptors (e.g., amphibians, fish). To ensure adherence to permit conditions, the biological monitor would be present during activities such as installation and removal of

dewatering or diversion systems to ensure adherence to permit conditions. In-water work restrictions would be implemented as determined by conditions included in any required permits.

Cultural Resources

CR-1: An archaeological monitor and Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California tribal monitor would be used during ground-disturbing activities.

CR-2: If cultural materials are discovered during construction, work activity within a 60-foot radius of the discovery would be stopped and the area secured until a qualified archaeologist can assess the nature and significance of the find in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO).

CR-3: If human remains and related items are discovered on private or State land, they would be treated in accordance with State Health and Safety Code (H&SC) § 7050.5. Further disturbances and activities would cease in any area or nearby area suspected to overlie remains, and the County Coroner contacted. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code (PRC) § 5097.98, if the remains are thought to be Native American, the coroner would notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who would then notify the Most Likely Descendent (MLD).

Human remains and related items discovered on federally-owned lands would be treated in accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA) (23 USC 3001). The procedures for dealing with the discovery of human remains, funerary objects, or sacred objects on federal land are described in the regulations that implement NAGPRA 43 CFR Part 10. All work in the vicinity of the discovery shall be halted and the administering agency's archaeologist would be notified immediately. Project activities in the vicinity of the discovery would not resume until the federal agency complies with the 43 CFR Part 10 regulations and provides notification to proceed.

Geology, Seismic/Topography, and Paleontology

GS-1: The project would be designed to minimize slope failure, settlement, and erosion using recommended construction techniques and Best Management Practices (BMPs). New earthen slopes would be vegetated to reduce erosion potential.

GS-2: In the unlikely event that paleontological resources (fossils) are encountered, all work within a 60-foot radius of the discovery would stop, the area would be secured, and the work would not resume until appropriate measures are taken.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GHG-1: Caltrans Standard Specification "Air Quality" requires compliance by the contractor with all applicable laws and regulations related to air quality (Caltrans Standard Specification [SS] 14-9).

GHG-2: Compliance with Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), which includes restricting idling of diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles and equipment with gross weight ratings of greater than 10,000 pounds to no more than 5 minutes.

GHG-3: Caltrans Standard Specification “Emissions Reduction” ensures that construction activities adhere to the most recent emissions reduction regulations mandated by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) (Caltrans SS 7-1.02C).

GHG-4: Use of a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to minimize vehicle delays and idling emissions. As part of this, construction traffic would be scheduled and routed to reduce congestion and related air quality impacts caused by idling vehicles along the highway during peak travel times.

GHG-5: All areas temporarily disturbed during construction would be revegetated with appropriate native species, as appropriate. Landscaping reduces surface warming and, through photosynthesis, decreases CO_2. This replanting would help offset any potential CO_2 emissions increase.

GHG-6: Pedestrian and bicycle access would be maintained on State Route 267 during project activities.

Hazardous Waste and Material

HW-1: Per Caltrans requirements, the contractor(s) would prepare a project-specific *Lead Compliance Plan* (CCR Title 8, § 1532.1, the "Lead in Construction" standard) to reduce worker exposure to lead-impacted soil. The plan would include protocols for environmental and personnel monitoring, requirements for personal protective equipment, and other health and safety protocols and procedures for the handling of materials containing lead.

HW-2: When identified as containing hazardous levels of lead, traffic stripes would be removed and disposed of in accordance with Caltrans Standard Special Provision "Remove Yellow Traffic Stripes and Pavement Markings with Hazardous Waste Residue" (SSP 14-11.12).

HW-3: If treated wood waste (such as removal of sign posts or guardrail) is generated during this project, it would be disposed of in accordance with Standard Specification 14-11.14 "Treated Wood Waste."

HW-4: If asbestos-containing material is removed during this project, it would be removed and disposed of in accordance with Standard Special Provisions (SSP) 14–11.16 Asbestos-containing Construction Materials in Bridges".

Traffic and Transportation

TT-1: A Transportation Management Plan (TMP) would be prepared for the project. The contractor would be required to schedule and conduct work to avoid unnecessary inconvenience to the public and to maintain access to driveways, houses, and buildings within the work zones. Pedestrian and bicycle access would be maintained during construction.

Utilities and Emergency Services

UE-1: All emergency response agencies in the project area would be notified of the project construction schedule and would have access to State Route 267 throughout the construction period.

UE-2: Caltrans would coordinate with utility providers to plan for relocation of any utilities to ensure utility customers would be notified of potential service disruptions before relocation.

UE-3: The project is located within the *Very High* California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ). The contractor would be required to submit a jobsite Fire Prevention Plan as required by Cal/OSHA before starting job site activities. In the event of an emergency or wildfire, the contractor would cooperate with fire prevention authorities.

Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff

WQ-1: The project would comply with the provisions of the Caltrans Statewide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit (Order 2022-0033-DWQ), effective January 1, 2023. If the project results in a land disturbance of one acre or more, coverage under the Construction General Permit (CGP) (Order 2022-0057-DWQ) is also required.

Before any ground-disturbing activities, the contractor would prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) (per the Construction General Permit Order 2022-0057-DWQ) or Water Pollution Control Program (WPCP) (projects that result in a land disturbance of less than one acre) that includes erosion control measures and construction waste containment measures to protect Waters of the State during project construction. For SWPPP projects (which are governed according to both the Caltrans NPDES permit and the Construction General Permit), soil disturbance is permitted to occur year-round as long as the Caltrans NPDES and CGP and the corresponding requirements of those permits are adhered to. For WPCP projects (which are governed according to the Caltrans NPDES permit), soil disturbance is permitted to occur year-round as long as the Caltrans NPDES permit is adhered to.

The SWPPP or WPCP would identify the sources of pollutants that may affect the quality of stormwater; include construction site Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control sedimentation, erosion, and potential chemical pollutants; provide for construction materials management; include non-stormwater BMPs; and include routine inspections and a monitoring and reporting plan. All construction site BMPs would follow the latest edition of the *Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbooks: Construction Site BMPs Manual* to control and reduce the impacts of construction-related activities, materials, and pollutants on the watershed.

The project SWPPP or WPCP would be continuously updated to adapt to changing site conditions during the construction phase.

Construction may require one or more of the following temporary construction site BMPs:

- Any spills or leaks from construction equipment (e.g., fuel, oil, hydraulic fluid, and grease) would be cleaned up in accordance with applicable local, state, and/or federal regulations.
- Accumulated stormwater, groundwater, or surface water from excavations or temporary containment facilities would be removed by dewatering.
- Water generated from the dewatering operations would be discharged on-site for dust control and/or to an infiltration basin or disposed of offsite.
- Temporary sediment control and soil stabilization devices would be installed.
- Existing vegetated areas would be maintained to the maximum extent practicable.
- Clearing, grubbing, and excavation would be limited to specific locations, as delineated on the plans, to maximize the preservation of existing vegetation.
- Vegetation reestablishment or other stabilization measures would be implemented on disturbed soil areas, per the Erosion Control Plan.

- For SWPPP projects (which are governed according to both the Caltrans NPDES permit and the Construction General Permit), soil disturbance is permitted to occur year-round as long as the Caltrans NPDES and CGP and the corresponding requirements of these permits are adhered to. For WPCP projects (which are governed according to the Caltrans NPDES permit), soil disturbance is permitted to occur year-round as long as the Caltrans NPDES permit is adhered to.

WQ-2: The project would incorporate pollution prevention and design measures consistent with the *2016 Caltrans Storm Water Management Plan* (Caltrans 2016). This plan complies with the requirements of the Caltrans Statewide NPDES Permit (Order 2022-0033-DWQ).

The project design may include one or more of the following:

- Vegetated surfaces would feature native plants, and revegetation would use the seed mixture, mulch, tackifier, and fertilizer recommended in the Erosion Control Plan prepared for the project.
- Where possible, stormwater would be directed in such a way as to sheet flow across vegetated slopes, thus providing filtration of any potential pollutants.

1.7 Discussion of the NEPA Categorical Exclusion

This document contains information regarding compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and other state laws and regulations. Separate environmental documentation supporting a Categorical Exclusion determination will be prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). When needed for clarity, or as required by CEQA, this document may contain references to federal laws and/or regulations (CEQA, for example, requires consideration of adverse effects on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)—in other words, species protected by the Federal Endangered Species Act).

CHAPTER 2. CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors noted below would be potentially affected by this project. Please see the CEQA Environmental Checklist topics on the following pages for additional information.

Potential Impact Area	**Impacted: Yes / No**
Aesthetics	No
Agriculture and Forest Resources	No
Air Quality	**Yes**
Biological Resources	**Yes**
Cultural Resources	**Yes**
Energy	No
Geology and Soils	**Yes**
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	**Yes**
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	**Yes**
Hydrology and Water Quality	**Yes**
Land Use and Planning	No
Mineral Resources	No
Noise	**Yes**
Population and Housing	No
Public Services	No
Recreation	No
Transportation	No
Tribal Cultural Resources	No
Utilities and Service Systems	**Yes**
Wildfire	**Yes**
Mandatory Findings of Significance	**Yes**

The CEQA Environmental Checklist identifies physical, biological, social, and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the project will indicate there are no impacts to a particular resource. A "NO IMPACT" answer in the last column of the checklist reflects this determination. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the CEQA Environmental Checklist are only related to potential impacts pursuant to CEQA. The questions in the CEQA Environmental Checklist are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

Project features, which can include both design elements of the project, as well as standardized measures that are applied to all or most Caltrans projects (such as Best Management Practices [BMPs] and measures included in the Standard Plans and Specifications or as Standard Special Provisions [Section 1.6]), are considered to be an integral part of the project and have been considered prior to any significance determinations documented in the checklist or document.

Project Impact Analysis Under CEQA

CEQA broadly defines "project" to include "*the whole of an action, which has a potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment"* (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] § 15378). Under CEQA, normally the baseline for environmental impact analysis consists of the existing conditions at the time the environmental studies began. However, it is important to choose the baseline that most meaningfully informs decision-makers and the public of the project's possible impacts. Where existing conditions change or fluctuate over time, and where necessary to provide the most accurate picture practically possible of the project's impacts, a Lead Agency may define existing conditions by referencing historic conditions, or conditions expected when the project becomes operational, or both, that are supported with substantial evidence. In addition, a Lead Agency may also use baselines consisting of both existing conditions and projected future conditions that are supported by reliable projections based on substantial evidence in the record. The CEQA Guidelines require a "statement of the objectives sought by the proposed project" (14 CCR § 15124(b)).

CEQA requires the identification of each potentially "significant effect on the environment" resulting from the project, and ways to mitigate each significant effect. Significance is defined as *"Substantial or potentially substantial adverse change to any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project"* (14 CCR § 15382). CEQA determinations are made prior to and separate from the development of mitigation measures for the project.

The legal standard for determining the significance of impacts is whether a "fair argument" can be made that a "substantial adverse change in physical conditions" would occur. The fair argument must be backed by substantial evidence including facts, reasonable assumption predicated upon fact, or expert opinion supported by facts. Generally, an environmental professional with specific training in an area of environmental review can make this determination.

Though not required, CEQA suggests Lead Agencies adopt thresholds of significance, which define the level of effect above which the Lead Agency will consider impacts to be significant, and below which it will consider impacts to be less than significant. Given the size of California and it's varied, diverse, and complex ecosystems, as a Lead Agency that encompasses the entire State, developing thresholds of significance on a state-wide basis has not been pursued by Caltrans. Rather, to ensure each resource is evaluated objectively, Caltrans analyzes potential resource impacts in the project area based on their location and the effect of the potential impact on the resource as a whole. For example, if a project has the potential to impact 0.10 acre of wetland in a watershed that has minimal development and contains thousands of acres of wetland, then a "less than significant" determination would be considered appropriate. In comparison, if 0.10 acre of wetland would be impacted that is located within a park in a city that only has 1.00 acre of total wetland, then the 0.10 acre of wetland impact could be considered "significant."

If the action may have a potentially significant effect on any environmental resource (even with mitigation measures implemented), then an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared. Under CEQA, the Lead Agency may adopt a Negative Declaration (ND) if there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a potentially significant effect on the environment (14 CCR § 15070(a)). A proposed Negative Declaration must be circulated for public review, along with a document known as an Initial Study. CEQA also allows for a "Mitigated Negative Declaration"

in which mitigation measures are proposed to reduce potentially significant effects to less than significant (14 CCR § 15369.5).

Although the formulation of mitigation measures shall not be deferred until some future time, the specific details of a mitigation measure may be developed after project approval when it is impractical or infeasible to include those details during the project's environmental review. The Lead Agency must (1) commit itself to the mitigation, (2) adopt specific performance standards the mitigation will achieve, and (3) identify the type(s) of potential action(s) that can feasibly achieve that performance standard and that will be considered, analyzed, and potentially incorporated in the mitigation measure. Compliance with a regulatory permit or other similar processes may be identified as mitigation if compliance would result in implementation of measures that would be reasonably expected, based on substantial evidence in the record, to reduce the significant impact to the specified performance standards (§ 15126.4(a)(1)(B)).

Per CEQA, measures may also be adopted, but are not required, for environmental impacts that are not found to be significant (14 CCR § 15126.4(a)(3)). Under CEQA, mitigation is defined as avoiding, minimizing, rectifying, reducing, and compensating for any potential impacts (CEQA 15370). Regulatory agencies may require additional measures beyond those required for compliance with CEQA. Though not considered "mitigation" under CEQA, these measures are often referred to in an Initial Study as "mitigation", Good Stewardship, or Best Management Practices. These measures can also be identified after the Initial Study/Negative Declaration is approved.

CEQA documents must consider direct and indirect impacts of a project (California Public Resources (CPR) Code § 21065.3). They are to focus on significant impacts (14 CCR § 15126.2(a)). Impacts that are less than significant need only be briefly described (14 CCR § 15128). All potentially significant effects must be addressed.

No-Build (No-Action) Alternative

For each of the following CEQA Environmental Checklist questions, the "No-Build" Alternative has been determined to have "No Impact". Under the "No-Build" Alternative, no alterations to the existing conditions would occur and no proposed improvements would be implemented. The "No-Build" Alternative will not be discussed further in this document.

Definitions of Project Parameters

When determining the parameters of a project for potential impacts, the following definitions are provided:

Project Area: This is the general area where the project is located. This term is mainly used in the *Affected Environment* section (e.g., watershed, climate type, etc.).

Project Limits: This is the beginning and ending post miles for a project. This is different than the Environmental Study Limits in that it sets the beginning and ending limits of a project along the highway. It is the limits programmed for a project, and every report, memo, etc., associated with a project should use the same post mile limits. In some cases, there may be areas associated with a project that are outside of the project limits, such as staging and disposal locations.

Project Footprint: The area within the Environmental Study Limits (ESL) the project is anticipated to impact, both temporarily and permanently. This includes staging and disposal areas.

Environmental Study Limits (ESL): The project engineer provides the Environmental team the ESL as an anticipated boundary for potential impacts. The ESL is *not* the project footprint. Rather, it is the area *encompassing* the project footprint where there could *potentially* be direct and indirect disturbance by construction activity. The ESL is larger than the project footprint in order to accommodate any future scope changes. The ESL is also used for identifying the various Biological Study Areas (BSAs) needed for different biological resources.

Biological Study Area (BSA): The BSA encompasses the ESL plus any areas outside of the ESL that could be potentially affected by a project (e.g., noise, visual, Coastal Zone, etc.). Depending on resources in the area, a project could have multiple BSAs. Each BSA should be identified and defined. If the project is within the Coastal Zone, this area would also include the required 100 foot buffer. For the purposes of the Placer 267 CAPM Project, no buffers were required for special status species; therefore, the ESL and the BSA are the same.

2.1 Aesthetics

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
Would the project: c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
Would the project: d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A

Regulatory Setting

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) establishes it is the policy of the state to take all action necessary to provide the people of the state "with…enjoyment of *aesthetic*, natural, scenic and historic environmental qualities" (California Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21001[b]).

California Streets and Highways code Section 92.3 directs Caltrans to use drought resistant landscaping and recycled water when feasible, and incorporate native

wildflowers and native and climate-appropriate vegetation into the planting design when appropriate.

Affected Environment

A *Visual Impact Assessment Memorandum* completed for the Placer 267 CAPM Project on February 12, 2025 (Caltrans 2025f). The project's Area of Visual Effect (AVE) consists of those areas from which the project may be visible that are influenced by the presence or absence of topography, vegetation, and structures**.** For this project, the AVE is mostly limited to the areas adjacent to SR 267; however, at some locations along the project route, the AVE extends out to the surrounding landscape.

The project's AVE contains visual and scenic resources. SR 267 is not classified as an Officially Designated State Scenic Highway or an Eligible State Scenic Highway. SR 267 is designated as a scenic corridor by Placer County and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA 2024). In addition, TRPA considers all federal and state highways within the Tahoe area as scenic routes (TRPA, 2023). Visual resources and scenic resources within the project AVE include Martis Valley which opens to views of the valley floor and forested hills. The valley also affords views of Lookout Mountain within Northstar Ski Resort and Martis Peak, which are also striking mountain features. At higher elevations within the project AVE, Brockway Summit offers distant mountain views of peaks and ridges. Brockway Summit is a TRPA-designated scenic resource (TRPA 2024).

The visual character of the landscape within the AVE is rural and mostly undeveloped. The most prominent landscape features include coniferous forests, hills, mountain ridges, open vistas, Martis Creek, Martis Peak, and Lookout Mountain. The predominant vegetation includes various species of pine trees and chapparal. The built elements within the project AVE are located mostly at the north end of SR 267 near Truckee and at the south end near Kings Beach.

Environmental Consequences

The proposed work, including the cut slope, would be mostly compatible with the rest of the project AVE. Creation of the cut slope would not impact any scenic views and could potentially enhance the existing views of distant mountains by opening up vistas through the removal of trees.

While trees would be removed where the cut slope is created, these trees are common, repetitious, and not unique to this area; therefore, removal of these trees is not anticipated to diminish scenic resources.

Road rehabilitation and culvert repair would be slightly noticeable; however, this work would be temporary, occurring only during construction. Therefore, upon completion of construction, there would be no impact to scenic resources or vistas.

The cut slope would not substantially degrade the visual quality and character of the project area and its surroundings. There are already cut slopes within the project area, so the cut slopes created by the extension of the truck climbing lane would not substantially change the visual quality and character if the AVE. The fill added near PM 6.26 to support the widened shoulder would not be visible from the road and would only be visible if a person was to the northeast of SR 267 looking at the roadway. There are only forested lands surrounding the location of the proposed fill so the addition would not be noticeable.

Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures

Based on the determinations made in the CEQA Environmental Checklist, no mitigation measures are proposed.

Discussion of CEQA Environmental Checklist Question 2.1—Aesthetics

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

NO IMPACT. The proposed project's AVE does not contain any expansive views of a highly valued landscape. The AVE does contain scenic views of open valleys, forested hills and mountain ridgelines, but the proposed cut slopes and fill would not obstruct or diminish scenic views along the project area. The embankment at the proposed cut slopes would be pushed back, further away from traveler views, which would enhance views of distant mountains and peaks from the roadway. The other proposed work, such as the extended truck climbing lane and drainage improvements, would not have any impact on scenic vistas. For these reasons, there would be no impact.

b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. The proposed project site is not located on an eligible or official State Scenic Highway; however SR 267 is locally designated as a scenic corridor. There are views of scenic and visual resources within the project AVE, including expansive views of Martis Valley, the surrounding forested hills, views of Lookout Mountain, and views of distant mountain peaks and ridgelines at Brockway Summit. The project would remove conifer trees that are on top of the proposed cut slope location (PM 5.05 to 5.25). These trees are common, repetitious, and not unique to this area. As the proposed project is on a locally designated scenic corridor and some trees would be removed, there would be a less than significant impact to scenic resources.

c) Would the project, in non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. The proposed project would create a moderately adverse visual change to the environment. The cut slopes wall would be somewhat incompatible with the visual character of the landscape, due to its engineered appearance; however, the existing cut slopes with RSP along the project already appear somewhat engineered. These proposed cut slopes would cause a change to the existing visual character and quality of the public views from the highway, however the changes would be minor; therefore there would be a less than significant impact.

d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. The proposed project would not create any new permanent substantial sources of light or glare as no new lighting would be installed. Nighttime lighting is anticipated during construction work, but the lighting would be limited to the area of work. For these reasons, there would be a less than significant impact from light sources affecting night time views.

2.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project; the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

"No Impact" determinations in this section are based on the scope, description, and location of the proposed project, as well as the *Land Use, Utilities, and Emergency Services Memorandum* dated October 11, 2024 (Caltrans 2024b). Due to the limited scope of work and because the proposed work would mainly occur within the existing Caltrans right of way, potential impacts to agricultural and forest resources are not anticipated.

While the proposed project would mainly occur on facilities within the existing Caltrans right of way, TCEs, drainage easements, and partial acquisitions from vacant would be necessary to perform specific activities such as culvert repair, cut slope repair, and sand vault installation. More information about the right of way requirements can be found in Section 1.4 and Table 2.

Work would occur on some parcels outside the Caltrans right of way which are zoned Forest Land; however, due to the focused scope of work, these activities would not conflict with forest zoning or cause the conversion of forest land to non-forest land. The areas where work would occur outside of the Caltrans right of way in land zoned as forest land would not impact any actual timber production as the lands proximity to SR 267 means it is not utilized for harvesting timber resources. There are no parcels zoned for agricultural purposes adjacent to the project, therefore there would be no impacts to farmlands or Williamson Act contracts.

2.3 Air Quality

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
Would the project: d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

Regulatory Setting

The federal Clean Air Act (CAA), as amended, is the primary federal law that governs air quality, while the California Clean Air Act is its corresponding state law. These laws, and related regulations by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and California Air Resources Board (CARB), set standards for the concentration of pollutants in the air.

Federal air quality standards and regulations provide the basic scheme for project-level air quality analysis under NEPA. In addition to this analysis, a parallel "Conformity" requirement under the federal CAA also applies. U.S. EPA regulations at 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 93 govern the conformity process.

Conformity requirements do not apply in unclassifiable/attainment areas for National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and do not apply at all for state standards regardless of the status of the area.

Affected Environment

An *Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas, and Energy Analysis* was completed for the Placer 267 CAPM Project on February 28, 2025 (Caltrans 2025a). The climate of eastern Placer County near the project area tends to have warm dry summers with little cloud cover, while the winters tend to be long with freezing and snowy conditions. Most of the precipitation in this area falls during winter, from November to March. The proposed project is to the north of Lake Tahoe. Temperature around Lake Tahoe is buffered by the lake's large surface area and water capacity, which helps reduce temperature extremes in both summer and winter (Tahoe Conservancy 2020). In summer, between June and September, the average daily high temperature is above 73°Fahrenheit (°F). Average high temperatures in summer fluctuate between 60°F and 90°F with July being the hottest month of the year. In winter, the average daily high temperature is below 43°F. Average low temperatures can fluctuate between 35°F and 5°F during the winter with January being the coldest month of the year.

Placer county is in nonattainment for NAAQS pollutants ozone and fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$).

Table 4. Air Quality Pollutant Effects and Sources

Pollutant	Principal Health and Atmospheric Effects	Typical Sources
Ozone	High concentrations irritate lungs. Long-term exposure may cause lung tissue damage and cancer. Long-term exposure damages plant materials and reduces crop productivity. Precursor organic compounds include many known toxic air contaminants. Biogenic volatile organic compound (VOC) may also contribute.	Low-altitude ozone is almost entirely formed from reactive organic gases/volatile organic compounds (ROG and VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) in the presence of sunlight and heat. Common precursor emitters include motor vehicles and other internal combustion engines, solvent evaporation, boilers, furnaces, and industrial processes.

Pollutant	Principal Health and Atmospheric Effects	Typical Sources
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	CO interferes with the transfer of oxygen to the blood and deprives sensitive tissues of oxygen. CO also is a minor precursor for photochemical ozone. Colorless, odorless.	Combustion sources, especially gasoline-powered engines and motor vehicles. CO is the traditional signature pollutant for on-road mobile sources at the local and neighborhood scale.
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	Irritates eyes and respiratory tract. Decreases lung capacity. Associated with increased cancer and mortality. Contributes to haze and reduced visibility. Includes some toxic air contaminants. Many toxic & other aerosol and solid compounds are part of PM_{10}.	Dust- and fume-producing industrial and agricultural operations; combustion smoke and vehicle exhaust; atmospheric chemical reactions; construction and other dust-producing activities; unpaved road dust and re-entrained paved road dust; natural sources.
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	Increases respiratory disease, lung damage, cancer, and premature death. Reduces visibility and produces surface soiling. Most diesel exhaust particulate matter – a toxic air contaminant – is in the $PM_{2.5}$ size range. Many toxic &other aerosol and solid compounds are part of $PM_{2.5}$	Combustion including motor vehicles, other mobile sources, and industrial activities; residential and agricultural burning; also formed through atmospheric chemical and photochemical reactions involving other pollutants including NOx, sulfur oxides (SOx), ammonia, and ROG.
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2)	Irritating to eyes and respiratory tract. Colors atmosphere reddish-brown. Contributes to acid rain & nitrate contamination of stormwater. Part of the “NOx” group of ozone precursors.	Motor vehicles and other mobile or portable engines, especially diesel; refineries; industrial operations.
Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)	Irritates respiratory tract; injures lung tissue. Can yellow plant leaves. Destructive to marble, iron, steel. Contributes to acid rain. Limits visibility.	Fuel combustion (especially coal and high-sulfur oil), chemical plants, sulfur recovery plants, metal processing; some natural sources like active volcanoes. Limited contribution possible from heavy-duty diesel vehicles if ultra-low sulfur fuel not used.
Lead (Pb)	Disturbs gastrointestinal system. Causes anemia, kidney disease, and neuromuscular and neurological dysfunction. Also, a toxic air contaminant and water pollutant.	Lead-based industrial processes like battery production and smelters. Lead paint, leaded gasoline. Aerially deposited lead from older gasoline use may exist in soils along major roads.

Pollutant	Principal Health and Atmospheric Effects	Typical Sources
Sulfates	Premature mortality and respiratory effects. Contributes to acid rain. Some toxic air contaminants attach to sulfate aerosol particles.	Industrial processes, refineries and oil fields, mines, natural sources like volcanic areas, salt-covered dry lakes, and large sulfide rock areas.
Hydrogen Sulfide (H_2S)	Colorless, flammable, poisonous. Respiratory irritant. Neurological damage and premature death. Headache, nausea. Strong odor.	Industrial processes such as: refineries and oil fields, asphalt plants, livestock operations, sewage treatment plants, and mines. Some natural sources like volcanic areas and hot springs.
Visibility Reducing Particles (VRP)	Reduces visibility. Produces haze. NOTE: not directly related to the Regional Haze program under the Federal Clean Air Act, which is oriented primarily toward visibility issues in National Parks and other "Class I" areas. However, some issues and measurement methods are similar.	See particulate matter above. May be related more to aerosols than to solid particles.
Vinyl Chloride	Neurological effects, liver damage, cancer. Also considered a toxic air contaminant.	Industrial processes

Environmental Consequences

This project is exempt from all air quality conformity analysis requirements per Table 2 of 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 93.126, subsection "Safety" ("Projects that correct, improve, or eliminate a hazardous location or feature."). Conformity requirements do not apply.

The purpose of this project is to improve the condition of the roadway and associated infrastructure. The proposed modifications would not result in changes to the traffic volume, fleet mix, speed, location of existing facility or any other factor that would cause an increase in emissions relative to the No-Build Alternative; therefore, this project would not cause an increase in operational emissions. No minimization measures are recommended for operational emissions.

During construction, short-term degradation of air quality may occur due to the release of particulate emissions (airborne dust) generated by excavation, grading, hauling, and other construction-related activities.

Emissions from construction equipment also are expected and would include carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NOx), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), directly-emitted particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$), and toxic air contaminants such as diesel exhaust particulate matter. Construction activities are expected to increase traffic congestion in the area, resulting in increases in emissions from traffic during the delays. These emissions would be temporary and limited to the immediate area surrounding the construction site.

Fugitive dust would be generated during grading and construction operations. Sources of fugitive dust include disturbed soils at the construction site and trucks carrying uncovered loads of soils. Unless properly controlled, vehicles leaving the site may deposit mud on local streets, which could be an additional source of airborne dust after it dries. PM_{10} emissions may vary from day to day, depending on the nature and magnitude of construction activity and local weather conditions. PM_{10} emissions depend on soil moisture, silt content of soil, wind speed, and the amount of equipment operating. Larger dust particles would settle near the source, while fine particles would be dispersed over greater distances from the construction site.

Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures

In addition to measures described in Caltrans Standard Measures and Best Management Practices (Section 1.6), implementation of the following measures, some of which may also be required for other purposes such as stormwater pollution control, will reduce air quality impacts resulting from construction activities. Please note that although these standard measures are anticipated to reduce construction-related emissions, these reductions cannot be quantified at this time.

- Water or a dust palliative will be applied to the site and equipment as often as necessary to control fugitive dust emissions.
- Construction equipment and vehicles will be properly tuned and maintained. All construction equipment will use low sulfur fuel as required by California Code of Regulations Title 17, Section 93114.
- Equipment and materials storage sites will be located as far away from residential and park uses as practicable. Construction areas will be kept clean and orderly.

- Track-out reduction measures, such as gravel pads at project access points to minimize dust and mud deposits on roads affected by construction traffic, will be used.
- All transported loads of soils and wet materials will be covered before transport, or adequate freeboard (space from the top of the material to the top of the truck) will be provided to minimize emission of dust during transportation.
- Dust and mud that are deposited on paved, public roads due to construction activity and traffic will be promptly and regularly removed to reduce PM emissions.
- To the extent feasible, construction traffic will be scheduled and routed to reduce congestion and related air quality impacts caused by idling vehicles along local roads during peak travel times.

Based on the determinations made in the CEQA Environmental Checklist, no mitigation measures are proposed.

Discussion of CEQA Environmental Checklist Question 2.3—Air Quality

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

NO IMPACT. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of applicable air quality plans as the project would not have any impacts which could contribute to operational emissions and is exempt from all air quality conformity analysis; therefore, there would be no impact.

b) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

NO IMPACT. The operational effects of the proposed project would not change the traffic volume, fleet mix, speed, location of an existing facility, or any other factor which would cause an increase in emissions; therefore, there would be no impact to a net increase of a criteria pollutant.

c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT. The construction of the proposed project may result in the temporary release of particulate emissions and emissions from construction equipment. This release of emissions during construction could result in the short term degradation of air quality near the proposed project. Homes near the project could experience a reduction in air quality due to these emissions, however the reduction in air quality would be temporary and limited to the construction of the project. Implementation of the standard measures described above would help reduce any temporary reductions in air quality due to construction; therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

d) Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

NO IMPACT. The proposed project would not lead to long term emissions of any kind and the construction of the proposed project would not cause the release of other types of emissions, such as emissions that lead to odor. Therefore, there would be no impact.

2.4 Biological Resources

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or NOAA Fisheries?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A
Would the project: c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A
Would the project: d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

Regulatory Setting

Within this section of the document (2.4. Biological Resources), the topics are separated into Natural Communities, Wetlands and Other Waters, Plant and Animal Species, including Threatened and Endangered Species, and Invasive Species. Threatened and endangered special status plant and animal species include USFWS, NMFS and CDFW candidate species and CDFW Fully Protected (FP) species. CDFW Species of Special Concern (SSC) and California Native Plant Society (CNPS) rare plants are covered in their respective Plant and Animal sections.

The following sections rely on Chapter 4 of the project Natural Environment Study Minimal Impacts (NES/MI) (Caltrans 2025c).

Natural Communities

This section of the document discusses Natural Communities of Special Concern. The focus is on biological communities, not individual plant or animal species. CDFW maintains a list of sensitive natural communities (SNCs). SNCs are those natural communities that are of limited distribution statewide or within a county or region and are often vulnerable to environmental effects of projects. These communities may or may not contain special status taxa or their habitat. This section also includes information on wildlife corridors, and habitat fragmentation. Wildlife corridors are areas of habitat used by wildlife for seasonal or daily migration.

Habitat fragmentation involves the potential for dividing sensitive habitat and thereby lessening its biological value.

Habitat areas that have been designated as critical habitat (CH) under the Federal Endangered Species Act are discussed below in the Threatened and Endangered Species section.

Wetlands and Other Waters

Wetlands and Waters of the United States and State are protected under several laws and regulations. The primary laws and regulations governing wetlands and other waters include:

- Federal: Clean Water Act (CWA)–33 United States Code (USC) 1344 (USACE–Section 404 Permits)
- Federal: Executive Order for the Protection of Wetlands (Executive Order [EO] 11990)
- State: California Fish and Game Code (CFGC)–Sections 1600–1607
- State: Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act–Section 3000 et seq.

Plant Species

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) have regulatory responsibility for the protection of special status plant species. "Special status" species are selected for protection because they are rare and/or subject to population and habitat declines. The primary laws governing plant species include:

- Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA)–USC 16 Section 1531, et seq. See also 50 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 402
- California Endangered Species Act (CESA)–California Fish and Game Code (CFGC) Section 2050, et seq.
- Native Plant Protection Act–California Fish and Game Code Sections 1900–1913
- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)–40 CFR Sections 1500 through 1508

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)–California Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 21000–21177

Animal Species

The USFWS, NMFS, and CDFW have regulatory responsibility for the protection of special status animal species. The primary federal laws and regulations relevant to wildlife include the following:

- National Environmental Policy Act–40 CFR Sections 1500 through 1508
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act–16 USC Sections 703–712
- Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act–16 USC Section 661

State laws and regulations relevant to wildlife include the following:

- California Environmental Quality Act
- Sections 1600–1603 of the California Fish and Game Code
- Sections 4150 and 4152 of the California Fish and Game Code

Threatened and Endangered Species

The primary laws governing threatened and endangered species include:

- FESA–16 USC Section 1531, et seq. See also 50 CFR Part 402
- CESA–California Fish and Game Code Section 2050, et seq.
- CESA–California Fish and Game Code Section 2080
- CEQA–California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000–21177
- Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, as amended–16 USC Section 1801

Invasive Species

The primary laws governing invasive species are Executive Order (EO) 13112 and NEPA.

Affected Environment

A NES/MI was prepared for the project. Regulatory agencies have not been contacted regarding the proposed project, however agencies would be contacted during the permitting process. The following information relies on the NES/MI.

The climate in the project region is generally snowy, highland climate featuring chilly winters with regular snowfall, and summers that feature warm to hot days and cool nights with very low humidity. The average summer high temperature is 80 degrees Fahrenheit (°F); the average winter low temperature is 18°F. Precipitation occurs primarily in the winter, from October through May, with a distinct dry period from June through September.

The project occurs within the Sierra Nevada ecological subsection M261E (Sierra Nevada Section), which is characterized by parallel ranges and folded, faulted, and metamorphosed strata; the rounded crests are of subequal height.

The BSA is within the Northern High Sierra Nevada District of the California Floristic Province (Baldwin et al., 2012). Land uses within the ESL and the surrounding area are primarily recreational and forested land. The topography of the BSA is relatively level, with elevations of approximately 6,237 feet (1901 meters) above mean sea level. The elevation increases near the Brockway Summit to approximately 7,199 feet (2,194 meters) above mean sea level.

The project area is largely highly disturbed featuring developed urban areas with recreational, commercial, and residential use.

SENSITIVE NATURAL COMMUNITIES

Affected Environment

Riparian habitat is considered a sensitive natural community. There is riparian habitat at both the inlet and outlet of the culvert at PM 6.26. There are no wildlife corridors or known fish passages within the project work area.

Environmental Consequences

Approximately 0.18 acres of riparian would be removed at the culvert at PM 6.26. Impacts to riparian would occur from the added fill and culvert extension which would occur due to the widening of the shoulders adjacent to the truck climbing lane.

Approximately 10 ponderosa pines (*Pinus ponderosa*) of Diameter Breast Height (DBH) of 12 inches or greater could be removed from the riparian area due to this work.

Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures

Mitigation for the permanent impacts to riparian would be purchased from a CDFW approved mitigation bank. If no credits through mitigation banks are available, other mitigation options would be explored during the design phase.

WETLANDS AND OTHER WATERS

Affected Environment

Jurisdictional wetlands and Waters of the U.S. and State are present within the ESL. During field reviews on June 6, 2024, and January 21, 2025, culverts where work would be conducted were examined for jurisdictional features. The culvert at PM 2.89 conveys a perennial stream and exhibits potential jurisdictional features such as bed, bank and channel. The culverts at PM 0.11, 5.82, 5.94, 6.26, 8.22 and 9.19 convey potentially jurisdictional features; however, the bed, bank and channel characteristics of these features are less obvious and would be further categorized during permitting. The remaining culverts (Table 1) that are included in the project scope do not convey any creeks, streams, or other waterbodies and do not exhibit jurisdictional features.

Environmental Consequences

Approximately 0.041 acres of temporary fill to waters would result from work at the culverts at PM 0.11, 2.89, 8.22 and 9.19. The 30 foot extension of the culvert at PM 6.26 and the addition of RSP at the inlet and outlet would result in 0.05 acres of permanent fill to waters. The proposed work at PM 5.82 and 5.94 would not impact the potential bed, bank, or channel and therefore would not result in fill.

The proposed work at these culverts would be covered under a 401 permit from Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (LRWQCB), a Nationwide 404 permit from USACE, and a 1600 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Invert pave work conducted at the culvert at PM 2.89 would consist of paving the interior of the culvert with concrete which likely would be covered under the Routine Maintenance Agreement

(RMA) with CDFW as this work is similar to Cured-In-Place-Pipe (CIPP) lining which is typically covered under the RMA. Final permitting would be determined during 1 Phase.

Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures

Mitigation for the Section 1600 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement for the permanent impacts to waters would be purchased from a CDFW approved mitigation bank. If no credits through mitigation banks are available, other mitigation options would be explored during the design phase. LRWQCB would require mitigation for the impacts to waters. Further coordination with LRWQCB is ongoing to determine how these impacts would be mitigated.

PLANT SPECIES

Botanical surveys were conducted on June 6, 2024, and May 14, 2025, during the blooming season of plants which have the possibility of occurring within the project limits. Additional botanical surveys would occur in the spring and summer of 2026 in the area where fill would be added near the culvert at PM 6.26.

Based on queries to the USFWS, CDFW California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) and CNPS databases, the following special status (FESA/CESA) plant species could potentially occur in the project Environmental Study Limits (ESL) (Table 5).

Table 5. Findings of Special Status Plant Species that May Potentially Occur within the Environmental Study Limits

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	Status Federal/State[1] CRPR[2]	Effect/ Impact Determination	Effect Finding for Critical Habitat (if applicable)
Galena Creek rockcress	*Arabis rigidissima* var. *demota*	--/--/1B.2	No Impact	N/A
Threetip sagebrush	*Artemisia tripartite* ssp. *tripartita*	--/--/2B.3	No Impact	N/A
Mingan moonwort	*Botrychium minganense*	--/--/4.2	No Impact	N/A
Davy's sedge	*Carex davyi*	--/--/1B.3	No Impact	N/A
Woolly-fruited sedge	*Carex lasiocarpa*	--/--/2B.3	No Impact	N/A
Clustered-flower cryptantha	*Cryptantha glomeriflora*	--/--/4.3	No Impact	N/A

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	Status Federal/State[1] CRPR[2]	Effect/ Impact Determination	Effect Finding for Critical Habitat (if applicable)
Obtuse starwort	*Obtuse starwort*	--/--/4.3	No Impact	N/A
Donner Pass buckwheat	*Eriogonum umbellatum* var. *torreyanum*	--/--/1B.2	No Impact	N/A
Slender cottongrass	*Eriophorum gracile*	--/--/4.3	No Impact	N/A
Subalpine aster	*Eurybia merita*	--/--/2B.3	No Impact	N/A
Plumas ivesia	*Ivesia sericoleuca*	--/--/1B.2	No Impact	N/A
Center basin rush	*Juncus hemiendytus* var. *abjectus*	--/--/4.3	No Impact	N/A
Santa Lucia dwarf rush	*Juncus luciensis*	--/--/1B.2	No Impact	N/A
Gray's lomatium	*Lomatium grayi*	--/--/2B.3	No Impact	N/A
Whitebark pine	*Pinus albicaulis*	FT/--/--	No Impact	N/A
Robbins' pondweed	*Potamogeton robbinsii*	--/--/2B.3	No Impact	N/A
Alder buckthorn	*Rhamnus alnifolia*	--/--/2B.2	No Impact	N/A
Tahoe yellow cress	*Rorippa subumbellata*	--/--/1B.1	No Impact	N/A
Marsh skullcap	*Scutellaria galericulata*	--/--/2B.2	No Impact	N/A
Northern slender pondweed	*Stuckenia filiformis* ssp. *alpina*	--/--/2B.2	No Impact	N/A

[1]Federal Status: -- = no listing status; FT = Federal Threatened
State Status: -- = no listing status

[2]CRPR = California Rare Plant Rank

Based on the same queries, the following special status (FESA/CESA) plant species was either not observed during botanical surveys or the species is out of the elevational range of the project study area; therefore, this species would not be impacted by the project and is not discussed further:

- Whitebark Pine (*Pinus albicaulis*) – USFWS threatened species

The following special status plant species have the potential to occur within the ESL and are discussed further.

Plumas ivesia

Affected Environment

Plumas ivesia (*Ivesia sericoleuca*) has a rare plant rank of 1B.2 according to CNPS. It is found in lower montane coniferous forest, meadows, and seeps and vernal pools. CNDDB indicates numerous occurrences of the species and there is suitable habitat within the ESL.

Environmental Consequences

Plumas ivesia potentially could occur around the project limits but was determined to be absent from the ESL. The work associated with the proposed project would occur mostly within the right of way, which is heavily disturbed due to maintenance activities and traffic on SR 267. No plants were observed while conducting botanical surveys during the blooming period. No impacts to Plumas ivesia are expected to occur.

Avoidance and Minimization Measures

Based on the discussion above, no avoidance and minimization measures are proposed for this species.

Gray's lomatium

Affected Environment

Gray's lomatium (*Lomatium grayi*) has a rare plant rank of 2B.3 according to CNPS. It is found in pinyon and juniper woodlands. CNDBB lists an occurrence in the vicinity of the proposed project. Suitable habitat is present within the ESL.

Environmental Consequences

Gray's lomatium potentially could occur around the project limits but was determined to be absent from the ESL. The work associated with the proposed project would mostly occur within the right of way which is heavily disturbed due to maintenance activities and traffic on SR 267. No plants were observed while conducting botanical surveys during the blooming period. No impacts to Gray's lomatium are expected to occur.

Avoidance and Minimization Measures

Based on the discussion above, no avoidance and minimization measures are proposed for this species.

ANIMAL SPECIES

Based on the USFWS, NMFS, and CDFW-CNDDB database queries, Table 6 below indicates those special status animal species which could potentially occur within the Environmental Study Limits/Biological Study Area and thus could potentially be impacted by project construction.

Table 6. Special Status Animal Species that May Potentially Occur within the Project Study Limits

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	Status* Federal/State	Effect/Impact Finding	Effect Finding for Critical Habitat or Essential Fish Habitat
AMPHIBIANS/REPTILES				
Northern leopard frog	*Lithobates pipiens*	--/SSC	No Impact	N/A
Northwestern pond turtle	*Actinemys marmorata*	FPT/SSC	No Effect No Impact	N/A
Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog	*Rana sierrae*	FE/ST/WL	No Effect No Take	N/A
Southern long-toed salamander	*Ambystoma macrodactylum sigillatum*	--/SSC	No Impact	N/A
BIRDS				
American goshawk	*Accipiter atricapillus*	--/SSC	No Impact	N/A
Bald eagle	*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*	DL/FP	No Effect	N/A
California spotted owl – Sierra Nevada Distinct Population Segment (DPS)	*Strix occidentalis occidentalis*	FPT/--	No Effect	N/A
Golden eagle	*Aquila chrysaetos*	DL/FP	No Effect	N/A
Willow flycatcher	*Empidonax traillii*	--/SE	No Take	N/A
Yellow warbler	*Setophaga petechia*	--/SSC	No Impact	N/A
FISH				
Lahontan cutthroat trout	*Oncorhynchus clarkii henshawi*	FT/SSC	No Effect No Impact	N/A
Lahontan Lake tui chub	*Siphateles bicolor pectinifer*	--/SSC	No Impact	N/A
Lahontan mountain sucker	*Catostomus lahontan*	--/SSC	No Impact	N/A
Mountain whitefish	*Prosopium williamsoni*	--/SSC	No Impact	N/A

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	Status* Federal/State	Effect/Impact Finding	Effect Finding for Critical Habitat or Essential Fish Habitat
MAMMALS				
Gray wolf	*Canis lupus*	FE/--	No Effect	N/A
North American wolverine	*Gulo luscus*	FT/--	No Effect	N/A
Sierra Nevada mountain beaver	*Aplodontia rufa californica*	--/SSC	No Impact	N/A
Sierra Nevada red fox–Sierra Nevada DPS	*Vulpes vulpes necator (Pop. 2)*	FE/ST	No Effect No Take	N/A
Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare	*Lepus americanus tahoensis*	--/SSC	No Impact	N/A
INVERTEBRATES				
Monarch butterfly	*Danaus plexippus*	FPT/--	No Effect	N/A
Western bumble bee	*Bombus occidentalis*	--/SCE	No Take	N/A

*Listing Status

Federal: FPT – federal proposed threatened; FT = Federal Endangered; FE = Federal Endangered; FP = Fully Protected; DL = Delisted

State: SE = State Endangered; ST = State Threatened; FP = Fully Protected; SCE = State Candidate Endangered; SSC = Species of Special Concern; WL = Watch List; DL = Delisted

Those special status animal species that would not be impacted by the project, either because the project is out of the geographical range of the species or there is no suitable habitat for the species, are listed below and will not be discussed further.

- Northern leopard frog (*Lithobates pipiens*)–CDFW Species of Special Concern
- Northwestern pond turtle (*Actinemys marmorata*)–Federally Proposed Threatened/CDFW Species of Special Concern
- Southern long-toed salamander (*Ambystoma macrodactylum*)–CDFW Species of Special Concern
- American goshawk (*Accipiter atricapillus*)–CDFW Species of Special Concern
- Bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*)–Federally Delisted/CDFW Fully Protected
- California spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis occidentalis*)-Sierra Nevada DPS–Federally Proposed Threatened
- Golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*)–Federally Delisted/CDFW Fully Protected
- Willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii*)–State Endangered
- Yellow warbler (*Setophaga petechia*)–CDFW Species of Special Concern
- Lahontan Lake tui chub (*Siphateles bicolor pectinifer*)–CDFW Species of Special Concern
- Lahontan mountain sucker (*Catostomus lahontan*)–CDFW Species of Special Concern
- Mountain whitefish (*Prosopium williamsoni*)–CDFW Species of Special Concern
- Gray wolf (*Canis lupus*)–Federally Endangered
- North American wolverine (*Gulo luscus*)–Federally Threatened
- Sierra Nevada mountain beaver (*Aplodontia rufa californica*)–CDFW Species of Special Concern
- Sierra Nevada red fox (*Vulpes vulpes necator)*-Sierra Nevada DPS (Pop. 2)–Federally Endangered/State Threatened

- Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare (*Lepus americanus tahoensis*)–CDFW Species of Special Concern
- Monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*)–Federal Proposed Threatened
- Western bumble bee (*Bombus occidentalis*)–State Candidate Endangered

Sierra Nevada Yellow-legged Frog

Affected Environment

Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog (*Rana sierrae*) is a federally endangered/state threatened species. Habitat for Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog (SNYLF) includes freshwater lakes, ponds, marshes, meadows and streams at higher elevations for breeding.

Environmental Consequences

A documented occurrence of SNYLF is listed within the ESL at West Martis Creek, however the likelihood of the frog being present is low. The date of the documented occurrence of SNYLF within the ESL is from 1939. In addition, the ESL lacks connectivity to suitable habitat consisting of alpine lakes. Bullfrogs were observed in the vicinity of the project during field surveys, which would indicate high levels of predation toward SNYLF. No SNYLF were observed during field surveys and no work is planned in West Martis Creek. For these reasons, it is not anticipated that SNYLF would occur within the ESL, therefore no impacts to SNYLF are expected to occur.

Per FESA, there would be no effect to SNYLF.

Per CESA, there would be no take/no impact to SNYLF.

Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures

Based on the determinations made in the CEQA Environmental Checklist, no mitigation measures are proposed for this species.

Lahontan Cutthroat Trout

Affected Environment

The Lahontan cutthroat trout *(Oncorhynchus clarkii henshawi)* if federally threatened and a CDFW Species of Special Concern. It is one of 13 living sub-species of cutthroat trout. This fish is native to the Lahontan Basin of northern Nevada, northeastern California and southeastern Oregon. These migratory trout inhabit freshwater lakes, rivers and streams, and feed primarily on aquatic insects, crustaceans, small fishes, and floating plant matter. Historical records indicate that native Lahontan trout used to migrate between Pyramid Lake and Lake Tahoe. According to the CNDDB occurrence data for Lahontan cutthroat trout, a population of Lahontan cutthroat trout was known to be present in Martis Creek in 1993, however by 2001 the population was found to be extirpated with only a few hybrid species present, such as rainbow trout, brown trout and brook trout (CDFW 2025).

Environmental Consequences

While suitable habitat for Lahontan cutthroat trout occurs within West Martis Creek, no work is planned within West Martis Creek during construction of the proposed project. The culverts at PM 2.89 and PM 6.26 facilitate Middle Martis Creek. The work at these locations includes invert paving of the existing culvert and RSP replacement. A clear water diversion would be needed to complete the proposed work at these locations and the area would be restored to preexisting conditions. The existing conditions at Middle Martis Creek are not suitable habitat for Lahontan cutthroat trout and are not in close proximity to suitable habitat. No fish were observed during field surveys. Therefore, there would be no impacts to Lahontan cutthroat trout.

Per FESA, there would be no effect to Lahontan cutthroat trout.

Per CESA, there would be no take/no impact to Lahontan cutthroat trout.

Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures

Based on the determinations made in the CEQA Environmental Checklist, no mitigation measures are proposed for this species.

Discussion of CEQA Environmental Checklist Question 2.4a)— Biological Resources

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or NOAA Fisheries/NMFS?

PLANT SPECIES

NO IMPACT. No candidate, sensitive, or special status plant species were observed within the project limits during botanical surveys. In addition, the project area is highly disturbed and not suitable for the growth of candidate, sensitive, or special status plant species, making their presence highly unlikely. For these reasons, there would be no impact to candidate, sensitive, or special status plant species.

ANIMAL SPECIES

NO IMPACT. No federal or state special status animal species or CDFW Species of Special Concern or Fully Protected species were observed within the project limits. The species listed in Table 6 either have no record of occurring or there is no suitable habitat present. The project area is highly disturbed and does not contain suitable habitat for these species, making their presence highly unlikely. For these reasons, there would be no effect/no impact to special status animal species, CDFW Species of Special Concern or Fully Protected species.

THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

NO IMPACT. Besides Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog and Lahontan cutthroat trout, the species listed in Table 6 either have no record of occurring or there is no suitable habitat present. The project area is highly disturbed and does not contain suitable habitat for these species, making their presence highly unlikely. For these reasons, there would be no effect/no impact to threatened and endangered species.

Sierra Nevada Yellow-legged Frog

The SNYLF is a state threatened and federally endangered species with the potential to occur in West Martis Creek within the project limits. However, no work is planned in West Martis Creek, therefore no impacts to SNYLF are expected to occur.

Per FESA, there would be no effect to SNYLF.

Per CESA, there would be no take/no impact to SNYLF

Lahontan Cutthroat Trout

The Lahontan cutthroat trout is a federally threatened species with the potential to occur within the project limits. While there is potentially suitable habitat for Lahontan cutthroat trout within West Martis Creek, due to hybridization and extirpation it is unlikely that Lahontan cutthroat trout would occur within West Martis Creek. Lahontan cutthroat trout are not likely to be present at Middle Martis Creek. The culverts which convey Middle Martis creek under SR 267 at PM 2.89 and PM 6.26 is not suitable habitat. Therefore, there would be no effect on Lahontan cutthroat trout.

Per FESA, there would be no effect on Lahontan cutthroat trout.

Per CESA, there would be no impact on Lahontan cutthroat trout

INVASIVE SPECIES

No Impact. There is minimal risk of introducing invasive species under the current proposed scope of work. Standard Measures and Best Management Practices (Section 1.6) would be implemented to prevent spreading invasive species further within the site, to include ensuring the use of invasive-free soils, as outlined in the Federal Highway Administration Guidance on Invasive Species issued August 10, 1999, in accord with EO 13112 (FHWA 1999). Erosion control seed mixes would be reviewed by the project biologist to ensure no invasive plant species are included. Due to the low risk of introducing or spreading invasive species, there would be no impact from invasive species.

Discussion of CEQA Environmental Checklist Question 2.4b)— Biological Resources

b) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Sensitive Natural Communities

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION. Impacts to riparian habitat would occur when adding fill and extending the culvert at PM 6.26. Approximately 0.18 acres of impacts to riparian would occur during this work. Mitigation for the impacts to riparian would be purchased from a CDFW approved mitigation bank. If no credits through mitigation banks are available, other mitigation options would be explored during the design phase.

Invasive Species

NO IMPACT. Standard Measures and Best Management Practices would be implemented during construction to reduce the risk of introducing or spreading invasive species. As there is no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities within the project limits, there would be no impact.

Discussion of CEQA Environmental Checklist Question 2.4c)— Biological Resources

c) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Wetlands and Other Waters

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION. Approximately 0.041 acres of temporary fill would result from the proposed work at the culverts at PM 0.11, 2.89, 8.22 and 9.19. Approximately 0.05 acres of permanent fill would be added to waters at the culvert at PM 6.26, This fill would consist of the culvert extension and RSP placement to would slow the flow of water when entering and

exiting the culvert. Permitting would be required for the impacts, including a Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board and a Section 1600 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW. Mitigation for the Section 1600 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement for the permanent impacts to waters would be purchased from a CDFW approved mitigation bank. If no credits through mitigation banks are available, other mitigation options would be explored during the design phase. LRWQCB would require mitigation for the impacts to waters. Further coordination with LRWQCB is ongoing to determine how these impacts would be mitigated.

Discussion of CEQA Environmental Checklist Question 2.4d)— Biological Resources

d) Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Animal Species

NO IMPACT. There are no animal corridors within the project limits. There are also no known fish passages in the ESL. The proposed project would not substantially change SR 267 from its existing state nor interfere with the movement of native wildlife or fish species. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Invasive Species

NO IMPACT. The proposed project would not change the dispersal or introduction of invasive species within the project area. The proposed project would not change the existing biological conditions to make the area more favorable to invasive species than currently exists as the main purpose of the project is to maintain and repair existing highway facilities. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Discussion of CEQA Environmental Checklist Question 2.4e)— Biological Resources

e) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

NO IMPACT. The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances which protect biological resources. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) has a regional plan which encompasses Lake Tahoe and the surrounding areas. The regional plan starts at PM 6.60 on SR 267. PM 6.60 to PM 9.63 of the proposed project is within the TRPA regional plan and is therefore subject to its goals. The goals of the plan include policies protecting riparian and wetland habitat, threatened, endangered, and sensitive plant species, old-growth tree stands, and preserving habitat for threatened, endangered, rare, or sensitive wildlife species, in addition to others. Due to the limited impacts this project would have on biological resources, the project would not conflict with the TRPA regional plan; therefore, there would be no impact.

Discussion of CEQA Environmental Checklist Question 2.4f)—Biological Resources

f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

NO IMPACT. SR 267 within the project limits is not within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. As the project is not within the boundaries of one of these plans, there would be no impact.

2.5 Cultural Resources

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
Would the project: b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
Would the project: c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

Regulatory Setting

The term “cultural resources,” as used in this document, refers to the built environment (e.g., structures, bridges, railroads, water conveyance systems, etc.), places of traditional or cultural importance, and archaeological sites (both prehistoric and historic), regardless of significance. Under California state laws, cultural resources that meet certain criteria of significance are referred to by various terms including *archaeological resources, historic resources, historic districts, historical landmarks, and tribal cultural resources* as defined in PRC § 5020.1(j) and PRC § 21074(a). The primary state laws and regulations governing cultural resources include:

- California Historical Resources–PRC § 5020 et seq.
- California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR)–PRC § 5024 et seq. (codified 14 CCR § 4850 et seq.)

PRC § 5024, Memorandum of Understanding (MOU): The MOU between Caltrans and the State Historic Preservation Officer streamlines the PRC § 5024 process.

- California Environmental Quality Act–PRC § 21000 et seq. (codified 14 CCR § 15000 et seq.)

- Native American Historic Resource Protection Act–PRC § 5097 et seq.
- Assembly Bill (AB) 52, amends California Environmental Quality Act and the Native American Historic Resource Protection Act:
    - An effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, as defined in PRC § 21074(a), is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment
    - Additional consultation guidelines and timeframes
- California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act–California Health and Safety Code §§ 8010-8011

Sections 5024(f) and 5024.5 require state agencies to provide notice to and consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) before altering, transferring, relocating, or demolishing state-owned historical resources that are listed on or are eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or are registered or eligible for registration as California Historical Landmarks. Procedures for compliance with PRC Section 5024 are outlined in a Memorandum of Understanding 1 (MOU) between the California Department of Transportation and SHPO, effective January 1, 2015. For most federal-aid projects on the State Highway System, compliance with the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement will satisfy the requirements of PRC Section 5024.

Affected Environment

Analysis of the cultural resources for the proposed project was carried out by Caltrans Professionally Qualified Staff (PQS) in a manner consistent with Caltrans' regulatory responsibilities under Section 106 of the NHPA (36 CFR Part 800) as it pertains to the administration of the Federal Aid Highway Program in California and pursuant to the January 2014 Programmatic Agreement (PA) among Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the California SHPO. Methods used to support the studies for the analysis include records searches, field surveys (including Phase I pedestrian surveys), and Native

[1] The MOU is located on the SER at https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/ser/5024mou-15-a11y.pdf

American consultation with tribal entities. A summary of consultation with tribal entities can be found in Chapter 3. Agency and Public Coordination. Consultation with the local historical society (Placer County Historical Society) was also conducted. All consultation with historical societies will remain open during the life of this project.

An *Archaeological Survey Report, Historic Property Survey Report, and Finding of No Adverse Effect* dated May 2025 were completed for this project (Caltrans 2025b). An ESA Action Plan and Archaeological Monitoring Plan have also been completed for this project.

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) is the area studied for cultural resources present within the general project area and which may extend beyond the boundary of the project study area. The APE is created to avoid impacts to cultural resources when feasible, and where avoidance does not conflict with the purpose and need of the proposed project. The APE encompasses the area within which direct and indirect effects associated with the proposed project could cause alterations in the character or use of any historic property, if present. In cases where any part of an archaeological property could be affected, the entire site boundary, as currently understood, is included in the archaeological APE. The APE, therefore, encompasses the existing and proposed new right of way, easements, and the boundaries for known archaeological resources.

Caltrans, in accordance with Section 106 PA Stipulation VIII.C.5 has determined there are cultural resources within the APE that were previously determined not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP with SHPO concurrence and those determinations remain valid:

- P-31-003396/CA-PLA-002629H

Three archaeological sites are considered eligible for purposes of the project only, in accordance with Section 106 PA Stipulation VII.C.3, because they would be protected through the establishment of ESAs:

- P-31-000132/CA-PLA-000006
- P-31-003352/CA-PLA-002330H
- P-31-006789/CA-PLA-002933H

Caltrans, in accordance with Section 106 PA Stipulation VIII.C.5 has determined there are properties within the APE that were previously determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP and those determinations remain valid:

- P-31-000131/CA-PLA-000005

The only other properties present within the APE represent Type 6 properties (altered buildings, structures, objects, districts, and sites that appear to be more than 30 years old) as defined in Attachment 4 of the Section 106 PA and are exempt from evaluation.

Environmental Consequences

Caltrans assessed the effect of the Build Alternative on the built environment properties assumed eligible for the purpose of the undertaking and determined there would be no adverse effect. Caltrans also determined there would be no adverse effect from project activities on the four archaeological properties within the APE because they would be protected in their entirety with ESA fencing. An archaeological monitor and tribal monitor would supervise work near site P-31-000131 to help prevent impacts to that site. The Finding of No Adverse Effect would be submitted to the SHPO in June 2025 to consult and assess effects to the NRHP-eligible property. The SHPO is anticipated to provided concurrence of this finding in July 2025.

With the implementation of the Finding of Effect and the Environmental Sensitive Area Action Plan, the overall finding for the project, regardless of alternative, is *No Adverse Effect with non-standard conditions*.

Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures

Based on the determinations made in the CEQA Environmental Checklist, no mitigation measures are proposed.

Discussion of CEQA Environmental Checklist Question 2.5—Cultural Resources

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. One eligible built environment resource was identified within the APE. Caltrans determined that the project would not cause an adverse effect to eligible resources under the NRHP or California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) nor to the historical resources assumed eligible for the purpose of this undertaking only. As the project would not cause an adverse effect to these resources, the impact would be less than significant.

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. Three archaeological resources were identified within the APE. All sites would be protected in their entirety with the use of an Environmental Sensitive Area Action Plan and Archaeological Monitoring Plan. Standard measures would be included in the design package to ensure that if any cultural materials are discovered during construction, the appropriate measures would be taken to protect them. There would be a less then significant impact to archaeological resources.

c) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

NO IMPACT. The research and field reviews completed for this project indicate that there are no known human remains within the project limits. As it is not anticipated that any human remains would be disturbed from the construction of this project, there would be no impact.

2.6 Energy

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

"No Impact" determinations in this section are based on the scope, description, and location of the proposed project, as well as the *Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas, and Energy Analysis for the PLA 267 CAPM Project* dated February 28, 2025 (Caltrans 2025a).

Potential impacts to energy are not anticipated as there would be no increase in long term energy consumption from the proposed project. While energy would be consumed for construction activities, the energy use associated with construction would represent a small demand on local and regional energy supplies and could be easily accommodated. In addition, all energy use would cease after construction and there would be no new source of energy demand after construction; therefore, there would be no impact.

2.7 Geology and Soils

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
iv) Landslides?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
Would the project: c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

Regulatory Setting—Geology and Soils

The primary laws governing geology and soils include:

- Historic Sites Act of 1935–16 USC 461 et seq.
- CEQA–California Public Resources Code (PRC) 21000

Affected Environment—Geology and Soils

A Geology Memorandum was completed for the Placer 267 CAPM Project on October 16, 2024 (Caltrans 2024a).

Seismic Activity

Placer County is within the seismically active area of the western United States. The western and central parts of the county have low seismicity. The eastern part of the county has relatively high seismicity but there are no faults well defined enough to be designated as a hazard zone (Placer County). In the project area there are no faults delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. The nearest faults delineated on this map are at the south end of the Lake Tahoe (California Department of Conservation 2024).

The Tahoe-Truckee area has the largest ground shaking risk from earthquakes in the county. Hilly and mountainous areas throughout the county are most prone to slope instability and associated landslides from earthquakes (Placer County). The project area has not been evaluated by the seismic hazards program for landslides or liquefaction (California Geological Survey) but soil types prone to liquefaction are found throughout Placer County.

Soils

Deep-seated landslide potential helps estimate the likelihood of deep landsliding based on regional estimates of slope steepness and rock strength. Steep slopes and weak rock are generally more likely to produce landslides, however it is not an useful indicator of shallow landslides (Wills 2011). The landslide susceptibility increases through the classes labeled 0, III, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, and X. Classes VIII, IX, and X indicate very high landslide susceptibility (Wills 2011). The Deep-Seated Landslide Susceptibility in the project area is dependent upon the terrain in the area. At the north and very south end of the project where the terrain is relatively flat, the landslide susceptibility class is mostly between 0 and V, with some areas in class VI or VII. In the central proposed project area where the terrain is more mountainous, the landslide susceptibility class increases to VIII and IX, however immediately adjacent to SR 267 the class is V in most locations (California Geological Survey).

Soils in eastern Placer County have high or very high erosion potential. Expansive soils are generally located in western Placer County between the city of Rocklin to the county line (Placer County 1994).

Environmental Consequences—Geology and Soils

Impacts to geology and soils have the potential to occur during ground-disturbing activities. Ground disturbance from this project may happen through tree and vegetation removal, removal and replacement of culverts, cut and fill of slopes, and the removal and installation of guardrail and signposts.

Impacts to faults and seismic activity are unlikely. The work is occurring in the roadbed, road fill material, or to previously disturbed soils outside of areas with defined faults or high seismic activity. Some areas within the project have steep slopes which means the area may be at risk for landslides; however, work associated with this project (such as maintaining and repairing existing Caltrans drainages and the road surface) would not have an impact on landslides.

RSP and other soil stabilization measures would be installed to cut slopes to help prevent land movement. No work from this project would have an impact on liquefaction or strong seismic ground shaking.

The proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Ground disturbance would mostly be limited to roadbed fill or to previously disturbed areas. The areas where vegetation would be removed are directly adjacent to the road and are limited in size. Soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would be prevented at locations where vegetation is removed by implementing erosion control measures and RSP. In addition, the repair of drainages throughout the project limits would encourage water to flow through specified channels, thus lowering the chance of erosion from water flowing over soils outside of the stream channel or roadside drainages.

Most of the project is outside of areas where there is potential for expansive soils. In placer county, expansive soils are typically limited to low-lying areas in the western part of the county (Placer County 1994). As the proposed work for this project would occur mostly within road fill or in previously disturbed soil, the work would not have a direct impact on any potential expansive soils that may occur within the project limits. In addition, expansive soils are unlikely to occur in the eastern part of Placer county at elevations where the project is occurring. The project would repair and maintain existing highway facilities; therefore, there would be no substantial risk to life or property as a result of this project.

Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures–Geology and Soils

Based on the determinations made in the CEQA Environmental Checklist, no mitigation measures are proposed.

Discussion of CEQA Environmental Checklist Questions 2.7a-e)—Geology and Soils

a) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

NO IMPACT. While the project is within an area of relatively high seismic activity compared to the rest of the county, there are no faults in the area which have been delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. Faults in the general project area are not well defined. The proposed work on existing highway facilities (such as drainages, pavement, and guardrail) would not have an impact on any known faults as the work would occur on the pavement, within the roadbed fill material, or in shallow soils. The existing southbound truck climbing lane would be extended approximately 2,800 feet from Martis Peak Road (PM 6.30) to Carnelian Bay Avenue (PM 6.80). This work would require roadway widening to accommodate the added lane and the construction of a 3,145-foot-long soil nail wall adjacent to SR 267 at the easterly cut slope. While this proposed work would move large amounts of soil, because the work is still relatively shallow and as there are no well-defined faults in the region, there would be no impact to a known earthquake fault.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

NO IMPACT. While the Truckee-Tahoe region has the greatest chance of strong seismic ground shaking in the county, the proposed work would not have an impact on potential ground shaking in the area as there would be minimal change to the existing highway and its associated facilities and there is no evidence that the construction of the proposed project would cause adverse effects through strong seismic ground shaking. Therefore, there would be no impact.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

NO IMPACT. Soil types that are potentially prone to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, are found throughout the county. The proposed project is unlikely to cause potential adverse effects involving seismic-related ground failure as the scope of the project would not substantially change the existing highway and its associated facilities so the risk of seismic related ground failure is unlikely to change. Therefore, there would be no impact.

iv) Landslides?

NO IMPACT. Most of the proposed project scope includes work that would rehabilitate existing facilities on SR 267. This work would not change the existing landslide risk. Saturated soils and rock material is a condition that precipitates landslides, therefore there is a possibility that the improvements in the drainages could reduce the chance of landslide as it may reduce the saturation of soil and rock material with water (Association of Environmental Engineering and Geologists). In addition, according to the California Geologic Survey, most of the land immediately adjacent to SR 267 is not in the classes of very high landslide susceptibility. Where road widening would occur for the truck climbing lane, there would be cut slopes and. Slope stabilization measures can prevent or reduce landslides and, in combination with improved drainage, are unlikely to cause adverse effects from landslides. Therefore, there would be no impact.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. Most of the proposed work for this project would be rehabilitation of the existing highway and associated facilities. The proposed maintenance and rehabilitation activities would cause minimal erosion as very little soil would be exposed. Implementation of Standard Measures and Best Management Practices (BMPs) (Section 1.6) during construction would help ensure minimal erosion. In locations where more soil movement would occur construction BMPs would be necessary to reduce erosion.

It is unlikely the project would result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil once stabilization work is completed; therefore, there would be a less than significant impact.

c) Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

NO IMPACT. The proposed work for this project includes maintenance and rehabilitation activities on the existing highway. This work would not change the soil stability as the existing facilities would remain generally the same. Stabilization measures would prevent instability in cut slopes. In addition, improvements to drainages throughout the project limits could potentially lead to a reduction in landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse as these would help reduce saturation of soils and rock materials. Therefore, there would be no impact.

d) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

NO IMPACT. Expansive soils are more likely to exist in western Placer County, west of the city of Rocklin. As there is no evidence that expansive soils exist around the project, there would be no impact. In addition, the proposed work would mainly occur on or within the roadway prism on imported road bed material and not in native soils that may possibly have expansive properties. What work is occurring in native soil is minor in nature and would not cause a substantial risk to life or property due to being located on expansive soils.

e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

NO IMPACT. The proposed project would not be installing septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available; therefore, this question does not apply to this project and there would be no impact.

Regulatory Setting—Paleontological Resources

Several sections of the California Public Resources Code protect paleontological resources, including Sections 5097.5 and 30244.

Affected Environment–Paleontological Resources

A Paleontological Technical Study was completed for the Placer 267 CAPM Project on October 12, 2024 (Caltrans 2024d). The review of the project's impacts on paleontological resources consisted of the evaluation of previously completed Caltrans documents, data from the Digital Archive of Geotechnical Data, paleontological sensitivity maps, geologic maps of the Lake Tahoe Basin, and information from published literature.

Environmental Consequences–Paleontological Resources

Between Post Miles 0.0 and 0.2, the roadway is elevated between 3 and 5 feet with engineered fill to avoid flooding from Martis Creek Lake. Holocene to Pleistocene-age deposits mapped in this zone are Alluvium, Alluvial fan deposits, Outwash deposits, Prosser Creek alluvium, and Pliocene and/or Pleistocene Unnamed gravels, sand and alluvium. The roadway in this area is elevated 3 to 5 feet on engineered fill above the Pleistocene deposits, most of which are glacial, high-energy outwash deposits.

Between Post Miles 2.0 and 9.2, the SR 267 roadway consists of approximately 3 inches of asphalt paving over 2 feet of aggregate base rock and engineered road fill. Throughout these post miles there are mapped unnamed volcanic and intrusive rocks. These volcanics do not contain fossils where road widening and excavation is proposed. From Post Miles 9.2 to 9.63, the roadway is underlain by Holocene Lake deposits, which does not contain fossils.

The proposed surficial work would not impact the underlying geologic units at depth, including the Pleistocene sediments mapped below the Caltrans right of way from PM 0.00 to PM 2.0. The proposed project would not affect or negatively impact paleontological resources.

Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures–Paleontological Resources

Based on the determinations made in the CEQA Environmental Checklist, no mitigation measures are proposed.

Discussion of CEQA Environmental Checklist Question 2.9f)—Paleontological Resources

f) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

NO IMPACT. The proposed project would not perform work that disturbs soil at depths that could impact paleontological resources; therefore, there would be no impact.

2.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
Would the project: b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A

Climate Change

Climate change refers to long-term changes in temperature, precipitation, wind patterns, and other elements of the Earth's climate system. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, established by the United Nations and World Meteorological Organization in 1988, is devoted to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction and climate change research and policy. Climate change in the past has generally occurred gradually over millennia, or more suddenly in response to cataclysmic natural disruptions. The research of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and other scientists over recent decades, however, has unequivocally attributed an accelerated rate of climatological changes over the past 150 years to GHG emissions generated from the production and use of fossil fuels.

Human activities generate GHGs consisting primarily of carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), tetrafluoromethane, hexafluoroethane, sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6), and various hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs). CO_2 is the most abundant GHG; while it is a naturally occurring and necessary component of Earth's atmosphere, fossil-fuel combustion is the main source of additional, human-generated CO_2 that is the main driver of climate change. In the U.S. and in California, transportation is the largest source of GHG emissions, mostly CO_2.

The impacts of climate change are already being observed in the form of sea level rise, drought, extended and severe fire seasons, and historic flooding from changing storm patterns. The most important strategy to address climate change is to reduce GHG emissions. Additional strategies are necessary to mitigate and adapt to these impacts. In the context of climate change, “mitigation” involves actions to reduce GHG emissions to lessen adverse impacts that are likely to occur. “Adaptation” is planning for and responding to impacts to reduce vulnerability to harm, such as by adjusting transportation design standards to withstand more intense storms, heat, and higher sea levels. This analysis will include a discussion of both in the context of this transportation project.

Regulatory Setting

For a full list of laws, regulations, and guidance related to climate change (GHGs and adaptation), please refer to Caltrans’ Standard Environmental Reference (SER), Chapter 16, Climate Change.

FEDERAL

To date, no nationwide numeric mobile-source GHG reduction targets have been established; however, federal agencies are mandated to consider the effects of climate change in their environmental reviews.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 United States Code [USC] Part 4332) is the basic national charter for protection of the environment which establishes policy, sets goals, and provides direction for carrying out the policy. NEPA requires federal agencies to assess the environmental effects of their proposed actions prior to making a decision on the action or project.

Early efforts by the federal government to improve fuel economy and energy efficiency to address climate change and its associated effects include The Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 (42 USC Section 6201) and Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) Standards. The U.S. Department of Transportation’s National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration (NHTSA) sets and enforces corporate average fuel economy standards for on-road motor vehicles sold in the United States. The Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) calculates average fuel economy levels for manufacturers, and also sets related GHG emissions standards for vehicles under the Clean Air Act. These standards are periodically updated and published through the federal rulemaking process.

STATE

California has been innovative and proactive in addressing GHG emissions and climate change by passing multiple Senate and Assembly bills and executive orders (EOs).

In 2005, EO S-3-05 initially set a goal to reduce California's GHG emissions to 80 percent below year 1990 levels by 2050, with interim reduction targets. Later EOs and Assembly and Senate bills refined interim targets and codified the emissions reduction goals and strategies. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) was directed to create a climate change scoping plan and implement rules to achieve "real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gases." Ongoing GHG emissions reduction was also mandated in Health and Safety Code (H&SC) Section 38551(b). In 2022, the California Climate Crisis Act was passed, establishing state policy to reduce statewide human- caused GHG emissions by 85 percent below 1990 levels, achieve net zero GHG emissions by 2045, and achieve and maintain negative emissions thereafter.

Beyond GHG reduction, the State maintains a climate adaptation strategy to address the full range of climate change stressors, and passed legislation requiring state agencies to consider protection and management of natural and working lands as an important strategy in meeting the state's GHG reduction goals.

Environmental Setting

The proposed project is in a rural area, with a primarily natural-resources based agricultural and tourism economy. SR 267 is the main transportation route to and through the area for both passenger and commercial vehicles. The nearest alternate route is SR 89, approximately 2.5 miles to the west. Traffic counts are low. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency guides transportation development. The Placer County General Plan Circulation address GHGs in the project area.

GHG INVENTORIES

A GHG emissions inventory estimates the amount of GHGs discharged into the atmosphere by specific sources over a period of time. Tracking annual GHG emissions allows countries, states, and smaller jurisdictions to understand how emissions are changing and what actions may be needed to attain emission reduction goals. U.S. EPA is responsible for documenting GHG emissions

nationwide, and the CARB does so for the state of California, as required by H&SC Section 39607.4. Cities and other local jurisdictions may also conduct local GHG inventories to inform their GHG reduction or climate action plans.

NATIONAL GHG INVENTORY

The annual GHG inventory submitted by the U.S. EPA to the United Nations provides a comprehensive accounting of all human-produced sources of GHGs in the United States. Total national GHG emissions from all sectors in 2022 were 5,489.0 million metric tons (MMT), factoring in deductions for carbon sequestration in the land sector. (Land Use, Land Use Change, and Forestry provide a carbon sink equivalent to 15% of total U.S. emissions in 2022 [U.S. EPA 2024a].) While total GHG emissions in 2022 were 17% below 2005 levels, they increased by 1% over 2021 levels. Of these, 80% were CO_2, 11% were CH_4, and 6% were N_2O; the balance consisted of fluorinated gases (Figure 2). From 1990 to 2022, CO_2 emissions decreased by only 2% (U.S. EPA 2024a).

The transportation sector's share of total GHG emissions remained at 28% in 2022 and continues to be the largest contributing sector (Figure 2). Transportation activities accounted for 37% of U.S. CO_2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion in 2022. This is a decrease of 0.5% from 2021 (U.S. EPA 2024a, 2024b)).




Figure 3. U.S. 2021 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

(Source: U.S. EPA 2024b)

STATE GHG INVENTORY

The CARB collects GHG emissions data for transportation, electricity, commercial and residential, industrial, agricultural, and waste management sectors each year. It then summarizes and highlights major annual changes and trends to demonstrate the state's progress in meeting its GHG reduction goals. Overall statewide GHG emissions declined from 2000 to 2020 despite growth in population and state economic output (Figures 3 and 4) (CARB 2022a).




Figure 4. California 2020 Greenhouse Gas Emissions by Economic Sector

(Source: CARB 2022a)




Figure 5. Change in California Gross Domestic Product (GDP), Population, and GHG Emissions since 2000

(Source: CARB 2022a

AB 32 required the CARB to develop a Scoping Plan that describes the approach California will take to achieve the goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and to update it every 5 years. The AB 32 Scoping Plan, and the subsequent updates, contain the main strategies California will use to reduce GHG emissions. The CARB adopted the first scoping plan in 2008 (CARB 2008). The second updated plan, California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan, adopted on December 14, 2017, reflects the 2030 target established in EO B-30-15 and SB 32. The 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality, adopted September 2022, assesses progress toward the statutory 2030 reduction goal and defines a path to reduce human-caused emissions to 85 percent below 1990 levels and achieve carbon neutrality no later than 2045, in accordance with AB 1279 (CARB 2022b).

REGIONAL PLANS

As required by The Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008, the CARB sets regional GHG reduction targets for California's 18 metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) to achieve through planning future projects that will cumulatively achieve those goals, and reporting how they will be met in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). Targets are set at a percent reduction of passenger vehicle GHG emissions per person from 2005 levels. The proposed project is included in the RTP/SCS for Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. The regional reduction target for Tahoe Regional Planning Agency is -5% percent by 2035 (CARB 2021). Portions of the project area are not within the jurisdiction of an MPO and therefore not subject to CARB GHG reduction targets. However, the PCTPA is the regional transportation planning agency (RTPA) for the project area. The 2020 Placer County Sustainability Plan identifies a target of reducing GHG by -4.4 metric ton carbon dioxide ($MTCO_2$) per person by 2030 (County of Placer 2020).

Table 7. Regional and Local Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plans

Title	GHG Reduction Policies or Strategies
Placer County Sustainability Plan (adopted January 2020) (County of Placer 2020)	• Improvements to transit including expanding service and stops and improving mobility hubs • Pedestrian and bicycle improvements • Trip reduction ordinance update • Ride matching service • Zero Emission buses • Non-transportation GHG strategies include promoting solar, retrofitting buildings, using energy efficient appliances, and increasing the proportion of renewable energy supplied by power supplies
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Sustainability Action Plan (adopted December 2013) (Tahoe Regional Planning Agency 2013)	• Reduce energy consumption from new and existing developments • Increase renewable energy generation in the region • Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) • Increase access and use of non-vehicle travel mode choices • Reduce construction related emissions

Project Analysis

GHG emissions from transportation projects can be divided into those produced during operation and use of the State Highway System (SHS) (operational emissions) and those produced during construction. The primary GHGs produced by the transportation sector are CO_2, CH_4, N_2O, and HFCs. CO_2 emissions are a product of burning gasoline or diesel fuel in internal combustion engines, along with relatively small amounts of CH_4 and N_2O. A small amount of HFC emissions related to refrigeration is also included in the transportation sector. (GHGs differ in how much heat each traps in the atmosphere, called global warming potential, or GWP. CO_2 is the most important GHG, so amounts of other gases are expressed relative to CO_2, using a metric called "carbon dioxide equivalent", or CO_2e. The global warming potential of CO_2 is assigned a value of 1, and the GWP of other gases is assessed as multiples of CO_2.)

The CEQA Guidelines generally address greenhouse gas emissions as a cumulative impact due to the global nature of climate change (Public Resources Code § 21083(b)(2)). As the California Supreme Court explained, "because of the global scale of climate change, any one project's contribution is unlikely to be significant by itself." (Cleveland National Forest Foundation *v.* San Diego Assn. of Governments (2017) 3 Cal.5th 497, 512.) In assessing cumulative impacts, it must be determined if a project's incremental effect is "cumulatively considerable" (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(h)(1) and 15130).

To make this determination, the incremental impacts of the project must be compared with the effects of past, current, and probable future projects. Although climate change is ultimately a cumulative impact, not every individual project that emits greenhouse gases must necessarily be found to contribute to a significant cumulative impact on the environment.

Operational Emissions

Non-Capacity-Increasing Projects

The purpose of the proposed project is to maintain and repair pavement and drainages and improve freight mobility through the mountainous region of the project and will not increase the vehicle capacity of the roadway. This type of project generally causes minimal or no increase in operational GHG emissions.

Because the extension of the truck climbing lane would not change the capacity of SR 267 due to the highway's rural nature, the proposed project would not result in an increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). While some GHG emissions during the construction period would be unavoidable, no increase in operational GHG emissions is expected. There may also be long term benefits to GHG from smoother pavement surfaces and improved traffic flow due to the extended truck lane in the mountainous region.

Construction Emissions

Construction GHG emissions would result from material processing and transportation, on-site construction equipment, and traffic delays due to construction. These emissions will be produced at different levels throughout the construction phase; their frequency and occurrence can be reduced through innovations in plans and specifications and by implementing better traffic management during construction phases. While construction GHG emissions are only produced for a short time, they have long-term effects in the atmosphere, so cannot be considered "temporary" in the same way as criteria pollutants that subside after construction is completed.

Use of long-life pavement, improved traffic management plans, and changes in materials can also help offset GHG emissions produced during construction by allowing longer intervals between maintenance and rehabilitation activities.

Construction is expected to begin in 2028 and last approximately 250 working days. The proposed project would result in generation of construction-related GHG emissions. Construction GHG emissions consist of emissions produced as a result of material processing, emissions produced by on-site construction equipment, and emissions arising from traffic delays and detours due to construction. These emissions would be generated at different levels throughout the construction phase.

The CAL-CET2021 v1.0.2 was used to estimate average carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), Black Carbon (BC), and hydrofluorocarbon-134a (HFC-134a) emissions from construction activities. Table 8 below summarizes estimated GHG emissions generated by on-site equipment for the project. The total CO_2e produced during construction is estimated to be 691 metric tons.

Table 8. CAL-CET Estimates of GHG Emissions During Construction

Construction Year	CO_2 (tons)	CH_4 (ton)	N_2O (ton)	BC (ton)	HFC-134a (ton)	CO_2e* (metric ton)
2028	543	0.013	0.026	0.021	0.012	524
2029	175	0.003	0.011	0.027	0.006	172
Total	**718**	**0.017**	**0.037**	**0.027**	**0.018**	**696**

* A quantity of GHG is expressed as carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) that can be estimated by the sum after multiplying each amount of CO_2, CH_4, N_2O, and HFCs by its global warming potential (GWP). Each GWP of CO_2, CH_4, N_2O, and HFCs is 1, 25, 298, and 14,800, respectively.

All construction contracts include Caltrans Standard Specifications related to air quality. Sections 7-1.02A and 7 1.02C, Emissions Reduction, require contractors to comply with all laws applicable to the project and to certify they are aware of and will comply with all CARB emission reduction regulations. Section 14-9.02, Air Pollution Control, requires contractors to comply with all air pollution control rules, regulations, ordinances, and statutes. Certain common regulations, such as equipment idling restrictions, that reduce construction vehicle emissions also help reduce GHG emissions.

CEQA Conclusion

Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. While the proposed project would result in GHG emissions during construction, it is anticipated the project would not result in any increase in operational GHG emissions. The proposed project does not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. With implementation of construction GHG reduction measures, the impact would be less than significant.

GHG emissions after the project is complete would remain unchanged from the existing condition on SR 267. Due to the rural nature of the project and the limited alternative routes to SR 267, the extension of the truck climbing lane would not result in an increase in capacity or GHG emissions as the scope of work would not lead to increased vehicles using SR 267. The project would not result in changes to the traffic volume, fleet mix, speed, location of existing facility or any other factor that

would cause an increase in emissions relative to the No Build Alternative. Culvert and pavement repair, sign upgrades, and cut slope rehabilitation are not activities which would result in the potential increase of GHG. While the proposed project would result in GHG emissions during construction, it is anticipated the project would not result in any increase in operational GHG emissions. Since the project would not increase operational GHG emissions, it does not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. With implementation of Caltrans Standard Measures and Best Management Practices (Section 1.6) for reduction of GHG emissions during construction, the impact would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. Caltrans is firmly committed to implementing measures to help reduce GHG emissions. These measures are outlined in the following section.

Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies

STATEWIDE EFFORTS

In response to Assembly Bill 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act, California is implementing measures to achieve emission reductions of GHGs that cause climate change. Climate change programs in California are effectively reducing GHG emissions from all sectors of the economy. These programs include regulations, market programs, and incentives that will transform transportation, industry, fuels, and other sectors to take California into a sustainable, cleaner, low-carbon future, while maintaining a robust economy (CARB 2022c).

Major sectors of the California economy, including transportation, will need to reduce emissions to meet 2030 and 2050 GHG emissions targets. The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) identified five sustainability pillars in a 2015 report:

1) Increasing the share of renewable energy in the State's energy mix to at least 50 percent by 2030
2) Reducing petroleum use by up to 50 percent by 2030
3) Increasing the energy efficiency of existing buildings by 50 percent by 2030

4) Reducing emissions of short-lived climate pollutants; and

5) Stewarding natural resources, including forests, working lands, and wetlands, to ensure that they store carbon, are resilient, and enhance other environmental benefits (California Governor's OPR 2015).

The transportation sector is integral to the people and economy of California. To achieve GHG emission reduction goals, it is vital that the state build on past successes in reducing criteria and toxic air pollutants from transportation and goods movement. GHG emission reductions will come from cleaner vehicle technologies, lower-carbon fuels, and reduction of vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Reducing today's petroleum use in cars and trucks is a key state goal for reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 (California Environmental Protection Agency 2015).

In addition, SB 1386 (*in* Wolk 2016) established as state policy the protection and management of natural and working lands and requires state agencies to consider that policy in their own decision making. Trees and vegetation on forests, rangelands, farms, and wetlands remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere through biological processes and sequester the carbon in above- and below-ground matter.

Subsequently, Governor Gavin Newsom issued Executive Order N-82-20 to combat the crises in climate change and biodiversity. It instructs state agencies to use existing authorities and resources to identify and implement near- and long-term actions to accelerate natural removal of carbon and build climate resilience in our forests, wetlands, urban greenspaces, agricultural soils, and land conservation activities in ways that serve all communities and in particular low-income, disadvantaged, and vulnerable communities. To support this order, the California Natural Resources Agency released *Natural and Working Lands Climate Smart Strategy* (California Natural Resources Agency 2022).

CALTRANS ACTIVITIES

Caltrans continues to be involved on the Governor's Climate Action Team as the CARB works to implement EOs S-3-05 and S-01-07 and help achieve the targets set forth in AB 32. EO B-30-15, issued in April 2015, and SB 32 in 2016 set an interim target to cut GHG emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030. The following major initiatives are underway at Caltrans to help meet these targets.

Climate Action Plan For Transportation Infrastructure

The *California Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure* (CAPTI) builds on executive orders signed by Governor Newsom in 2019 and 2020 targeted at reducing GHG emissions in transportation, which account for more than 40% of all polluting emissions, to reach the state's climate goals. Under CAPTI, where feasible and within existing funding program structures, the state will invest discretionary transportation funds in sustainable infrastructure projects that align with its climate, health, and social equity goals (California State Transportation Agency 2021).

California Transportation Plan

The *California Transportation Plan* (CTP) is a statewide, long-range transportation plan to meet our future mobility needs and reduce GHG emissions. It serves as an umbrella document for all the other statewide transportation planning documents. The CTP 2050 presents a vision of a safe, resilient, and universally accessible transportation system that supports vibrant communities, advances racial and economic justice, and improves public and environmental health. The plan's climate goal is to achieve statewide GHG emissions reduction targets and increase resilience to climate change. It demonstrates how GHG emissions from the transportation sector can be reduced through advancements in clean fuel technologies; continued shifts toward active travel, transit, and shared mobility; more efficient land use and development practices; and continued shifts to telework (Caltrans 2021a).

Caltrans Strategic Plan

The *Caltrans 2020–2024 Strategic Plan* includes goals of stewardship, climate action, and equity. Climate action strategies include developing and implementing a Caltrans Climate Action Plan; a robust program of climate action education, training, and outreach; partnership and collaboration; a VMT monitoring and reduction program; and engaging with the most vulnerable communities in developing and implementing Caltrans climate action activities (Caltrans 2021b).

Caltrans Policy Directives And Other Initiates

Caltrans Director's Policy 30 (DP-30) Climate Change (June 22, 2012) established a policy to ensure coordinated efforts to incorporate climate change into Caltrans decisions and activities. Other Director's policies promote energy efficiency, conservation, and climate change, and commit Caltrans to sustainability practices in all planning, maintenance, and operations. *Caltrans Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Mitigation Report* (Caltrans 2020) provides a comprehensive overview of Caltrans' emissions and current Caltrans procedures and activities that track and reduce GHG emissions. It identifies additional opportunities for further reducing GHG emissions from Caltrans-controlled emission sources, in support of Caltrans and State goals.

Project-Level Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies

The following measures would also be implemented in the project to reduce GHG emissions and potential climate change impacts from the project.

- Creation of a bike lane along SR 267 from Carnelian Bay Avenue to PM 9.63.
- The construction contractor must comply with the Caltrans Standard Specifications in Section 14-9.
- Compliance with Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, which includes idling restrictions of construction vehicles and equipment to no more than 5 minutes.
- Caltrans Standard Specification 7-1.02C "Emissions Reduction" ensures that construction activities adhere to the most recent emissions reduction regulations mandated by the California Air Resource Board.
- Utilize a Transportation Management Plan to minimize vehicle delays.

- To the extent feasible, construction traffic will be scheduled and routed to reduce congestion and related air quality impacts caused by idling vehicles along local roads during peak travel times.
- Maintain equipment in proper tune and working condition.

Adaptation Strategies

Reducing GHG emissions is only one part of an approach to addressing climate change. Caltrans must plan for the effects of climate change on the state's transportation infrastructure and strengthen or protect the facilities from damage. Climate change is expected to produce increased variability in precipitation, rising temperatures, rising sea levels, variability in storm surges and their intensity, and in the frequency and intensity of wildfires. Flooding and erosion can damage or wash out roads; longer periods of intense heat can buckle pavement and railroad tracks; storm surges, combined with a rising sea level, can inundate highways. Wildfire can directly burn facilities and indirectly cause damage when rain falls on denuded slopes that landslide after a fire. Effects will vary by location and may, in the most extreme cases, require a facility be relocated or redesigned. Furthermore, the combined effects of transportation projects and climate stressors can exacerbate the impacts of both on vulnerable communities in a project area. Accordingly, Caltrans must consider these types of climate stressors in how highways are planned, designed, built, operated, and maintained.

FEDERAL EFFORTS

Under NEPA Assignment, Caltrans is obligated to comply with all applicable federal environmental laws and FHWA NEPA regulations, policies, and guidance.

The *Fifth National Climate Assessment*, published in 2023, presents the most recent science and "analyzes the effects of global change on the natural environment, agriculture, energy production and use, land and water resources, transportation, human health and welfare, human social systems, and biological diversity; [It] analyzes current trends in global change, both human-induced and natural, and projects major trends for the subsequent 25 to 100 years … to support informed decision-making across the United States." Building on previous assessments, it continues to advance "an inclusive, diverse, and sustained process for assessing and communicating scientific knowledge on the impacts, risks, and vulnerabilities

associated with a changing global climate" (U.S. Global Change Research Program 2023).

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) provides sea level rise projections for all U.S. coastal waters to help communities and decision makers assess their risk from sea level rise. Updated projections through 2150 were released in 2022 in a report and online tool (NOAA 2022).

STATE EFFORTS

Climate change adaptation for transportation infrastructure involves long-term planning and risk management to address vulnerabilities in the transportation system. A number of state policies and tools have been developed to guide adaptation efforts.

California's Fourth Climate Change Assessment (Fourth Assessment–2018) provides information to help decision makers across sectors and at state, regional, and local levels protect and build the resilience of the state's people, infrastructure, natural systems, working lands, and waters. The Fourth Assessment reported that if no measures are taken to reduce GHG emissions by 2021 or sooner, the state is projected to experience an up to 8.8 degrees Fahrenheit increase in average annual maximum daily temperatures; a two-thirds decline in water supply from snowpack resulting in water shortages; a 77% increase in average area burned by wildfire; and large-scale erosion of up to 67% of Southern California beaches due to sea level rise. These effects will have profound impacts on infrastructure, agriculture, energy demand, natural systems, communities, and public health (State of California 2018).

Sea level rise is a particular concern for transportation infrastructure in the Coastal Zone. Major urban airports will be at risk of flooding from sea level rise combined with storm surge as early as 2040; San Francisco airport is already at risk. Miles of coastal highways vulnerable to flooding in a 100-year storm event will triple to 370 by 2100, and 3,750 miles will be exposed to temporary flooding. The Fourth Assessment's findings highlight the need for proactive action to address these current and future impacts of climate change.

To help actors throughout the state address the findings of California's Fourth Climate Change Assessment, AB 2800's multidisciplinary Climate-Safe Infrastructure Working Group published *Paying it Forward: The Path Toward Climate-Safe Infrastructure in California*. This report provides guidance on assessing

risk in the face of inherent uncertainties still posed by the best available climate change science. It also examines how state agencies can use infrastructure planning, design, and implementation processes to respond to the observed and anticipated climate change impacts (Climate-Safe Infrastructure Working Group 2018).

EO S-13-08, issued in 2008, directed state agencies to consider sea level rise scenarios for 2050 and 2100 during planning to assess project vulnerabilities, reduce risks, and increase resilience to sea level rise. It gave rise to the *2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy*, the *Safeguarding California Plan*, and a series of technical reports on statewide sea level rise projections and risks, including the *State of California Sea-Level Rise Guidance Update* in 2018. The reports addressed the full range of climate change impacts and recommended adaptation strategies. The current *California Climate Adaptation Strategy* incorporates key elements of the latest sector-specific plans such as the *Natural and Working Lands Climate Smart Strategy*, *Wildfire and Forest Resilience Action Plan*, *Water Resilience Portfolio*, and the *CAPTI* (described above). Priorities in the *2023 California Climate Adaptation Strategy* include acting in partnership with California Native American tribes, strengthening protections for climate-vulnerable communities that lack capacity and resources, implementing nature-based climate solutions, using best available climate science, and partnering and collaboration to best leverage resources (California Natural Resources Agency 2023).

EO B-30-15 recognizes that effects of climate change threaten California's infrastructure and requires state agencies to factor climate change into all planning and investment decisions. Under this EO, the Office of Planning and Research published *Planning and Investing for a Resilient California: A Guidebook for State Agencies*, to encourage a uniform and systematic approach to building resilience.

SB 1 Coastal Resources: Sea Level Rise (*in* Atkins 2021) established statewide goals to "anticipate, assess, plan for, and, to the extent feasible, avoid, minimize, and mitigate the adverse environmental and economic effects of sea level rise within the Coastal Zone.

As the legislation directed, the Ocean Protection Council collaborated with 17 state planning and coastal management agencies to develop the *State Agency Sea-Level Rise Action Plan for California* in February 2022. This plan promotes coordinated actions by state agencies to enhance California's resilience to the impacts of sea level rise (California Ocean Protection Council 2022).

CALTRANS ADAPTATION EFFORTS

Caltrans Vulnerability Assessments

Caltrans completed climate change vulnerability assessments to identify segments of the State Highway System vulnerable to climate change effects of precipitation, temperature, wildfire, storm surge, and sea level rise.

The climate change data in the assessments were developed in coordination with climate change scientists and experts at federal, state, and regional organizations at the forefront of climate science. The findings of the vulnerability assessments guide analysis of at-risk assets and development of Adaptation Priority Reports as a method to make capital programming decisions to address identified risks.

Caltrans Sustainability Programs

The Director's Office of Equity, Sustainability and Tribal Affairs supports implementation of sustainable practices at Caltrans. The *Sustainability Roadmap* is a periodic progress report and plan for meeting the Governor's sustainability goals related to EOs B-16-12, B-18-12, and B-30-15. The Roadmap includes designing new buildings for climate change resilience and zero-net energy, and replacing fleet vehicles with zero-emission vehicles (Caltrans 2023).

PROJECT ADAPTATION EFFORTS

In addition to statewide efforts, each Caltrans District has prepared a *Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment* to help determine the impacts of climate change within the district for various metrics including temperature, sea level rise, precipitation, and wildfire (Caltrans 2019). Predictions of future conditions for these metrics were made in the report to show the scale of climate impacts throughout the district. The Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment helps guide project adaptation efforts as well as the district's plan overall. These studies help with understanding the vulnerability of California's State Highway System and other

Caltrans assets to future changes in the climate. The objectives of the Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment are:

- Understand the types of weather-related and longer-term climate change events that will likely occur with greater frequency and intensity in future years,
- Conduct a vulnerability assessment to determine those Caltrans assets vulnerable to various climate-influenced natural hazards.
- Develop a method to prioritize candidate projects for actions that are responsive to climate change concerns when financial resources become available.

Future climate conditions are in some ways uncertain. While it is documented that the climate is changing, the degree of change depends on the quantity of GHG emissions currently and in the future. Climate-change risk analysis involves uncertainties as to the timing and intensity of potential risks. Increased levels of GHG emissions will result in more climate change. These changes to the climate can have impacts on transportation assets which could potentially increase the costs of maintenance and construction of transportation projects, disrupt local economies, and damage the State Highway System. Individual project adaptation efforts are required to help minimize climate change-related impacts on the State Highway System and help make the system more resilient**.**

Sea Level Rise

The proposed project is outside the Coastal Zone (Figure 5) and not in an area subject to sea level rise. Accordingly, direct impacts to transportation facilities due to projected sea level rise are not expected.




Figure 6. Sea Level Rise within Project Study Area from NOAA Sea Level Rise Viewer

Source: NOAA 2025

Precipitation and Flooding

The southwest region of the United States is predicted to have less precipitation in the future due to climate change. However, individual precipitation events have the potential to be heavier with more precipitation falling as rainfall. Heavy precipitation can impact transportation assets by flooding, landslides, washouts, or structural damage. Site-specific hydrological analysis of flood flows will be required to determine how precipitation events will affect bridges and culverts. By 2055 the percent change in the 100 year storm precipitation depth in the project area will be between 5.0–9.9%.

The increased precipitation in the project area would require implementing designs that are more adaptive to changing conditions. Heavy precipitation events occurring without proper drainage allowing for increased water around the roadway could cause severe damage to the State Highway System and the local economy.

Heavy precipitation events could impact the project area by flooding the roadway, causing safety issues for the traveling public. As the proposed project resides in a rural community, flooded roadways could cause difficulties traveling or the inability to travel depending on the amount of flooding. Heavy precipitation could also increase the risk of landslides as the steep slopes along the project area are already prone to landslides. Landslides have the potential to block or damage roadways and cause safety concerns for the traveling public.

This project proposes to improve the existing pavement condition, improve and restore existing drainage systems, and construct new or modify existing stormwater treatment facilities. Culverts throughout the proposed project would either be lined to restore their functionality or replaced with a culvert larger in diameter to improve water transmission. In addition to the improving and repairing culverts, the proposed project would also construct improvements to roadside ditches at locations where the transmission of water from the road surface to stormwater treatment facilities needs to be improved.

Poor condition culverts do not transmit water efficiently. CIPP lining would improve the condition of the culvert, allowing for more effective transfer of water away from the road during heavy precipitation or flood events. Increasing the diameter of culverts improves the flow capacity of the culvert, which can help reduce the risk of flooding. Both of these strategies would help prevent safety issues for the public, keep the roads accessible during heavy precipitation, and help prevent flooding. Improving drainage can also help stabilize slopes that are prone to landslides.

Wildfire

Increasing temperatures and changes to precipitation patters as a result of increased GHG in the atmosphere are expected to affect wildfire frequency and intensity. Wildfire can directly impact many transportation assets including any components made of wood, vegetation along the roadside including landscaping, rock and concrete structures, and the safety of road users.

Wildfire can also indirectly contribute to landslide and flooding risk by burning soil-stabilizing land cover (such as plants) and reducing the capacity of soil to absorb water. Smoke can also impact visibility and the health of the public. Wildfire can also contribute to bottlenecks or operational failures, particularly during evacuations in remote areas. Impacts to transportation assets from wildfire can be costly, necessitating emergency projects to repair fire-related damages which can require months or years of time to complete. The level of wildfire concern for the project area in 2055, according to the Caltrans District 3 Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment, is high and very high.

As the proposed project is in an area of future high and very high wildfire concern and is currently in the “high” and “very high” categories for the Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ) in the State Responsibility Area (SRA) according to Office of the State Fire Marshal, wildfire will likely affect the project area. As SR 267 has rural communities living adjacent to it, damage to roads caused by wildfire could cause safety concerns for residents during or after a fire. SR 267 is the main evacuation route in the area, so damage to the road or hazards such as heat and smoke created from wildfire could delay or prevent evacuation. Wildfire could also increase landslide risk through the loss of vegetation. There is a moderate risk of landslide throughout the project area, with areas with steeper slopes being more prone to landslides. Landslides have the potential to damage or block roadways, further restricting movement by residents and the traveling public and potentially creating safety issues.

The proposed project does not include vegetation management strips, fire hardening structures, or any other work which is specifically included to reduce the incidence or severity of wildfire. However, some of the proposed improvements would help create a highway system more resilient to wildfires. The proposed project would help protect transportation assets from wildfire by replacing culverts with reinforced concrete pipe culverts which would help prevent burning or collapse during a wildfire, which then would help prevent damage to the road. Guardrail replacement with metal beams would occur throughout the project limits. Metal beam guardrail is less likely to burn or be damaged during wildfire events. The extension of the truck climbing lane requires the creation of cut slopes and fill which would require tree removal for construction. This widening of both SR 267 and the removal of trees directly adjacent to the highway would help create a fire break which could help slow the spread of flames during a wildfire.

Temperature

Temperature rise is a direct outcome of increased GHG in the atmosphere. Heat waves are expected to become more frequent as temperatures continue to rise. By 2055, the change in absolute minimum air temperature around the project limits in Placer county will decrease by 6.0–7.9°F. By 2055 the average maximum temperature over seven days will increase between 4.0–7.9°F. There is potential for increased temperature to impact the design life of pavement, as the change in both the minimum temperature and average high temperature can affect the pavement binder. Economic consequences of rising temperatures could include more frequent pavement maintenance due to deterioration of the pavement binder.

The cold plane and pavement overlay used to repair pavement in this project has a design life of 10 years and is suitable for current temperature ranges. This pavement option is considered a temporary pavement repair focused on improving the road surface as existing pavement within the project limits is in fair and poor condition. Repairing the road surface would extend the pavement service life and help prevent further deterioration of the road surface while also keeping SR 267 in good operating condition, allowing the travel of goods and people.

2.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
Would the project: b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
Would the project: c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

Regulatory Setting

Hazardous materials, including hazardous substances and wastes, are regulated by many state and federal laws. Statutes govern the generation, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials, substances, and waste, and also the investigation and mitigation of waste releases, air and water quality, human health, and land use.

The primary laws governing hazardous materials, waste and substances include:

- California Health and Safety Code–Chapter 6.5
- Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act–§ 13000 et seq.
- CFR Title 22 Division 4.5 Environmental Health Standards for the Management of Hazardous Waste, Title 23 Waters, and Title 27 Environmental Protection

Worker and public health and safety are key issues when addressing hazardous materials that may affect human health and the environment. Proper management and disposal of hazardous material is vital if it is found, disturbed, or generated during project construction.

Affected Environment

An Initial Site Assessment (ISA) was completed for the Placer 267 CAPM Project on April 15, 2022 (Caltrans 2022*).* The review for potentially hazardous waste within the project limits included a review of project plans, a review of Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) maps, and a review of the GeoTracker database which contains information on hazardous waste sites. Treated wood waste (TWW) and thermoplastic/paint would also be encountered during construction of this project. This project is not located on the Cortese list.

Environmental Consequences

Aerially deposited lead (ADL) from the historical use of leaded gasoline, exists along roadways throughout California. Within the limits of the proposed project, there is the likely presence of soils with elevated concentrations of lead as a result of ADL on the State Highway System right of way. Soil determined to contain lead concentrations exceeding stipulated thresholds must be managed under the July 1, 2016, ADL Agreement between Caltrans and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control. This ADL Agreement allows such soils to be safely reused within the project limits as long as all requirements of the ADL Agreement are met.

No contaminated properties would be acquired as a part of this project.

Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures

Based on the determinations made in the CEQA Environmental Checklist, no mitigation measures are proposed.

Discussion of CEQA Environmental Checklist Question 2.9—Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. There is potential for ADL to occur within the project limits. The probability of the project creating a significant hazard to the public or environment through transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials is less than significant because Caltrans Standard Special Provisions (SSPs) would be

used to address the potential contamination. These SSPs would be placed in the Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) package to ensure that the contamination would not create a significant hazard to the public, construction crew, or the environment which would in turn leads to the impact being less than significant.

b) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. There is potential for ADL to occur within the project limits. The addition of SSPs listed in section *1.6 Standard Measures and Best Management Practices* to the PS&E package would prevent a reasonably foreseeable hazardous waste accident involving the release of hazardous materials, therefore making the impact less than significant.

c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

NO IMPACT. There are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project; therefore, there would be no impact.

d) Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

NO IMPACT. There are no hazardous materials sites within the project limits pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, otherwise known as a Cortese listed site; therefore, there would be no impact.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

NO IMPACT. The proposed project is approximately 0.34 miles away from the Truckee Tahoe Airport. As there would be no change in land use caused by this project and the project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working within the project area, there would be no impact.

f) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

NO IMPACT. The proposed project would not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; therefore, there would be no impact.

g) Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

NO IMPACT. The project would not expose people or structures, directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The proposed work would not expose people or structures to any significant risks from wildfire as the work occurring would not change the existing risk of wildfire. Therefore, there would be no impact.

2.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
Would the project: b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: (i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

Regulatory Setting

The primary laws and regulations governing hydrology and water quality include:

- Federal: Clean Water Act (CWA)–33 USC 1344
- Federal: Executive Order for the Protection of Wetlands–EO 11990
- State: California Fish and Game Code (CFGC)–Sections 1600–1607
- State: Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act– Sections 13000 et seq.

Affected Environment

A *Water Quality Assessment* was completed for the Placer 267 CAPM Project on February 27, 2025 (Caltrans 2025g). The proposed project is within two watersheds: PM 0.0 to PM 6.7 is within the Truckee River watershed and PM 6.7 to PM 9.63 is within the Lake Tahoe watershed. The primary receiving waters of this project are various water bodies that are tributaries to Lake Tahoe and the Truckee River. Caltrans is a stakeholder for Lake Tahoe and Truckee River's Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDLs) for sedimentation and siltation.

Environmental Consequences

The proposed project falls within the Lake Tahoe Basin's MS4 permit which requires Caltrans comply with the requirements of municipalities and other local, regional, and/or state agencies regarding stormwater discharges to separate storm sewer systems or other watercourses within Caltrans' jurisdiction. Coordination with other agencies would be required. This includes National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and stormwater programmatic coordination with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA).

All inland surface waters within the Lahontan Basin have water quality objectives that are standard and include ammonia, coliform bacteria, biostimulatory substances, chemical constituents, chlorine, color, dissolved oxygen, floating materials, oil and grease, nondegradation of aquatic communities, pH, radioactivity, sediment, settleable materials, suspended materials, taste and odor, temperature, toxicity, and turbidity. Furthermore, the Truckee River has water quality objectives for total dissolved solids, sulfate, phosphorus, nitrate as nitrogen, total nitrogen, total Kjeldahl nitrogen, and iron.

The proposed project is within a High Risk Receiving Watershed. Both the Truckee River and Lake Tahoe meet the criteria for being considered a High Risk Receiving Watershed.

Temporary Construction Site Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be implemented and maintained during construction to avoid and reduce potential water quality impacts. At this time, a Storm Water Data Report (SWDR) has not been prepared for the project. As a result, recommendations for Design Pollution Prevention and Construction Site BMPs are unknown. However, the BMPs (Section 1.6) that are typically implemented and common for projects having similar scopes of work and field operations include, but are not limited to, concrete washouts and bins, drainage inlet protection, plastic covering, straw wattles, silt fencing, temporary erosion control, wind erosion control, non-stormwater management BMPs, materials pollution control, stabilized construction vehicle ingress and egress points, vacuum trucks, and pavement sweepers.

Within the project limits, there are already 92 Temporary BMPs, which mostly comprise traction sand traps. The proposed project would construct additional sand traps and repair existing ones to help preserve water quality and contain stormwater.

Caltrans would also adhere to the conditions of the Caltrans' Statewide NPDES Permit No. CAS000003 issued by the State Water Resources Control Board Order No. 2022-0033-DWQ. Projects which disturb one acre or more of land are also regulated by the Statewide NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities, Order No. 2022-0057-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002 and adopted amendments. This is also known as the Construction General Permit.

Caltrans also is required to adhere to Section 13 in the 2024 Caltrans Standard Specifications which includes specifications related to water pollution control and general specifications for preventing, controlling, and abating water pollution to Caltrans-owned Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s), streams, waterways, and other bodies of water. The contractor is also required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan which incorporates Construction Site BMPs to help protect water quality. Sediment and erosion control measures would be implemented to protect receiving waters to the maximum extent practicable.

As the proposed project would add over 10,000 square feet of impervious surfaces, it is likely that permanent treatment BMPs would need to be installed due to the requirements of the Caltrans' MS4 permit.

Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures

Based on the determinations made in the CEQA Environmental Checklist, no mitigation measures are proposed.

Discussion of CEQA Environmental Checklist Question 2.10—Hydrology and Water Quality

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. Indirect impacts to surface water could occur due to siltation and erosion runoff from adjacent project activities, which could result in reduced water quality. Due to the limited proposed project scope and Caltrans' existing requirements to comply with stormwater regulations, consultation with regional agencies, and the implementation of Standard Measures and BMPs, the project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact.

b) Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

NO IMPACT. The proposed project would not cause a decrease in groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. The proposed project is maintaining or upgrading existing facilities and the work would not impact groundwater recharge or management; therefore, there would be no impact.

c) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. There is potential for the proposed project to result in erosion during construction. Temporary BMPs would be installed and preventative measures taken during construction to help prevent substantial erosion. Slopes would be stabilized with RSP which would help prevent erosion after construction. For these reasons, there would be a less than significant impact.

(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. Due to the widening of the road to make space for the extension of the truck climbing lane, it is likely that the rate or amount of surface runoff would increase as a result of the added impervious surfaces. Drainages throughout the project, including near the truck climbing lane extension, would be improved during construction of the proposed project which would accommodate the increased drainage from runoff from the road due to the added impervious surfaces. This would help prevent flooding on- or off-site; therefore, there would be a less than significant impact.

(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

NO IMPACT. The proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surfaces with the extension of the truck climbing lane, which has the potential to increase the amount of runoff water from SR 267. However, drainages and treatment BMPs would be repaired near this portion of the project which would compensate for the added impervious surfaces resulting in stormwater drainage systems that can handle the capacity of the potential runoff. Therefore, there would be no impact.

(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

NO IMPACT. The proposed project would not impede or redirect flood flows. Drainages throughout the project would be improved by upsizing the diameter of some drainages and repairing the remaining drainages. This would prevent flows from being impeded as the drainages would have the appropriate capacity to deal with runoff. Therefore, there would be no impact to flood flows.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

NO IMPACT. As the proposed project is not in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone, there would be no impact.

e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

NO IMPACT. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Caltrans is required to comply with existing stormwater regulations, including any local, regional, or state regulations, which would prevent conflicts with a water quality control plan. Accordingly, this project would not impact groundwater.

2.11 Land Use and Planning

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Physically divide an established community?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

"No Impact" determinations in this section are based on the scope, description, and location of the proposed project, as well as the *Land Use, Utilities, and Emergency Services Memorandum* dated October 11, 2024 (Caltrans 2024b).

Potential impacts to Land Use and Planning are not anticipated due to the proposed scope of work which includes mostly maintenance and rehabilitation activities occurring within the existing Caltrans right of way.

The proposed project would mainly repair and maintain existing highway facilities, including the road surface and culverts. These proposed maintenance activities would not physically divide an established community or conflict with a land use plan. The lengthening of the truck climbing lane would require widening of the highway system; however, due to the rural nature of the project there would be no impact on the potential division of the local community. All of the proposed work for this project would occur within the existing highway alignment or immediately adjacent to SR 267.

2.12 Mineral Resources

Question:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

"No Impact" determinations in this section are based on the scope, description, and location of the proposed project, as well as the *Mineral Resources Memorandum* dated October 16, 2024 (Caltrans 2024c).

Potential impacts to mineral resources are not anticipated due to the proposed work occurring mainly on paved surfaces, with very little work outside of the roadway prism or outside of the existing Caltrans right of way. In addition, the work would not impede access to Teichert Aggregates. Teichert Aggregates is accessed from Joerger Drive, which accesses State Route 267 via Soaring Way approximately half a mile to the north of the proposed project.

No work from this project would result in the loss of availability of a known, valuable mineral resource of local, regional, or state importance.

2.13 Noise

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in: a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
Would the project result in: b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
Would the project result in: c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

Regulatory Setting

The primary laws governing noise are NEPA and CEQA.

Affected Environment

A *Noise Study Report* was completed for the Placer 267 CAPM Project on April 8, 2025 (Caltrans 2025e). Land uses in the project area include single family and multi-family residences, places of worship, recreational, hotel and office, commercial retail uses, and undeveloped. Noise impacts under CEQA are evaluated by comparing the existing noise level to the predicated noise level with the constructed project. If noise abatement is considered for the project, significant environmental effects caused by the construction of the noise abatement can also be considered an impact under

CEQA. Noise and vibration is typically generated either through construction of the proposed project or through increased vehicle traffic. Although all developed land uses are evaluated in the Noise Study Report analysis, noise abatement under NEPA is only considered for areas of frequent human use that would benefit from a lowered noise level. Accordingly, the noise impact analysis focuses on locations with defined outdoor activity areas, such as residential backyards and common use areas at multi-family residences.

Environmental Consequences

The dominant source of noise in the proposed project area is highway noise. The traffic noise modeling results for existing conditions and design-year conditions with and without the proposed project are presented in the Noise Study Report. The maximum increase in noise level between existing conditions and the design-year (2049) at the sensitive receptors (schools, churches, hotels, residences, and recreational facilities) is predicted to be 1 dB. In typical noisy environments, changes in noise of 1 to 2 dB are generally not perceptible. However, it is widely accepted that people may be able to begin to detect sound level increases of 3 dB in typical noisy environments. Further, a 5-dB increase is generally perceived as a distinctly noticeable increase, and a 10-dB increase is generally perceived as a doubling of loudness.

During construction, noise from construction activities may intermittently dominate the noise environment in the immediate area of construction. Project construction is anticipated to include clearing and grubbing, earthwork, and paving.

Noise abatement for this project was considered at the condominiums at 1001 Commonwealth Drive due to NEPA criteria. Under NEPA, noise abatement is considered where noise impacts are predicted in areas of frequent human use that would benefit from a lowered noise level. For any noise barrier to be considered reasonable from a cost perspective, the estimated cost of the noise barrier should be equal to or less than the total cost allowance calculated for the barrier. The cost calculations of the noise barrier must include all items appropriate and necessary for construction of the barrier, such as traffic control, drainage modification, landscaping for graffiti abatement, and right-of-way costs.

The *Noise Abatement Decision Report* determined the noise barrier did not meet the criteria for reasonability as the estimated cost of the wall is over the total cost allowance calculated for the barrier and was therefore rejected from consideration (Caltrans 2025d).

Construction activities result in varying degrees and types of ground vibration depending on the type of equipment, construction methods, the intensity and duration of the specific construction activity, and underlying soil types. Generally, vibrations will spread through the ground and diminish in strength as the distance from the vibration source increases.

Vibratory rollers during pavement compaction are expected to produce the largest vibration amplitudes on this project. Vibratory rollers typical produce a peak particle velocity (PPV) of 0.210 inches per second at a reference distance of 25 feet. Vibratory rollers operating within 25 feet of historic buildings, 20 feet of older residential buildings or 15 feet of new residential and commercial structures have the potential to cause damage. Vibrations from vibratory rollers would be considered severe within 15 feet, strongly perceptible at 40 feet, distinctly perceptible at 75 feet and would be barely perceptible beyond 190 feet from the operation. These machines would cause perceptible vibration near the proposed project during pavement work; however, vibration would not be severe enough to cause damage to buildings or be strongly perceptible.

Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures

Based on the determinations made in the CEQA Environmental Checklist, no mitigation measures are proposed.

Discussion of CEQA Environmental Checklist Question 2.13—Noise

a) Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT. The predicted noise levels for this project do not substantially exceed the existing noise levels (defined as an increase of 12 dBA or more in the Caltrans Traffic Noise Protocol) at sensitive receptors identified in the project area such as schools, churches, hotels, residences, and recreational facilities. Additionally, the predicted change in noise level is generally considered not perceptible. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant, and mitigation would not be required.

b) Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT. Vibrations from construction activity are not expected to exceed the damage thresholds at structures within the project area. Vibration levels would be perceptible at various locations and may cause disturbances at residences near the project area during operation of heavy equipment; however, these effects would be short-term and intermittent and would cease once construction is completed. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant, and mitigation would not be required.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

NO IMPACT. The Truckee Tahoe Airport is located approximately 0.34 miles from the north end of the project. The change in traffic noise between the existing condition and the conditions of the proposed project in 2049 (the design-year which estimates the future traffic demand and volume) are expected to be less than 1 dB within the vicinity of the airport. The project would not expose people working or residing in the project area to excessive noise levels; therefore, there would be no impact.

2.14 Population and Housing

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

"No Impact" determinations in this section are based on the scope, description, and location of the proposed project, as well as the *Land Use, Utilities, and Emergency Services Memorandum* dated September 25, 2024 (Caltrans 2024b).

Potential impacts to Population and Housing are not anticipated as there are no growth-inducing elements of the project. While the extension of the truck climbing lane could improve travel times, it is unlikely that this addition to the existing truck climbing lane would lead to reasonably foreseeable project-related growth impacts. This is due to the rural location and the short length of the addition to the truck climbing lane.

No right of way acquisitions would occur that would displace people or require acquisitions of substantial portions of parcels from outside the existing Caltrans right of way. As there would be no changes to Population and Housing, there would be no impacts to Population and Housing.

2.15 Public Services

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Police protection?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Schools?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Parks?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Other public facilities?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

"No Impact" determinations in this section are based on the scope, description, and location of the proposed project, as well as the *Land Use, Utilities, and Emergency Services Memorandum* dated October 11, 2024 (Caltrans 2024b).

Potential impacts to Public Services are not anticipated as the proposed project would not result in an increase in demand for police, fire, or emergency medical services, nor would the project result in increased growth or otherwise result in new or physically altered government facilities. The Transportation Management Plan requires coordination with local authorities including California Highway Patrol, Placer County, and NorthStar Community Services during construction. However, after construction is complete, response times would likely return to pre-project levels or be improved due to the added truck climbing lane.

2.16 Recreation

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

"No Impact" determinations in this section are based on the scope, description, and location of the proposed project, as well as the *Land Use, Utilities, and Emergency Services Memorandum* dated October 11, 2024.

Potential impacts to recreation are not anticipated as there would be no need for the construction or expansion of recreational facilities nor an increased use of recreational facilities due to the proposed project. The proposed project would not induce growth; therefore, would not require the expansion of recreational facilities or increase the use of existing ones. While there may be a slight increase in overall accessibility of the project area due to extending the existing truck climbing lane, it is unlikely this would cause an increase in use of existing recreational facilities as this feature would not occur near recreational facilities. Therefore, the project would have no impact on recreation.

Recreational facilities would remain open and accessible in daytime during construction. The Waddle Ranch Elizabethtown Meadows Trailhead and Brockway Summit Tahoe Rim Trail Trailhead may have temporary nighttime closures during construction due to the pavement rehabilitation work. Seven drainage easements and one TCE would be needed from the Truckee Donner Land Trust's Waddle Ranch, Elizabethtown Meadows, and the associated conservation easement

between both of the properties. Both Waddle Ranch and Elizabethtown Meadows have hiking trails and are open to the public for outdoor activities. The drainage easements and TCE are small and immediately next to SR 267. The TCE is needed for accessing a drainage during construction. The drainage easements would allow Caltrans maintenance crews to access drainages to perform routine maintenance as needed. The drainage easements and TCE would not change access to the on site recreation facilities or cause any environmental impacts; therefore, there is no impact to recreation.

2.17 Transportation

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

“No Impact” determinations in this section are based on the scope, description, and location of the proposed project. Potential impacts to transportation are not anticipated due to the limited scope of the proposed project, which would maintain and upgrade existing facilities. There would be no scope elements that would conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or transportation policy.

This project is not a capacity increasing project as the extension of the truck climbing lane would not add additional new lanes. Further, traffic on SR 267 is not anticipated to increase. Therefore, construction of the project would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b).

No hazards would be created by a geometric design feature or incompatible uses due to the construction of this project as the geometric features of the road would remain unchanged.

Emergency access would not be changed due to the construction of this project. During construction, coordination with local authorities such as the California Highway patrol and NorthStar Community Services would be required by the TMP. Therefore, there would be no impact to Transportation as a result of this project.

2.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code § 5020.1(k), or	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

"No Impact" determinations in this section are based on the scope, description, and location of the proposed project, as well as the *Archaeological Survey Report*, *Historic Property Survey Report* dated May 2025 (Caltrans 2025b).

Potential impacts to tribal cultural resources are not anticipated as the tribal cultural resource of concern (P-31-000131/CA-PLA-000005) within the project limits would be protected through implementation of both a vertical and horizontal ESA. Archaeological and tribal monitors would also be present during construction to prevent impacts to the site. The cultural site is adjacent to a culvert which would need to be accessed for the proposed work. With implementation of these protections, impacts to the site would be prevented and there would be no impact.

2.19 Utilities and Service Systems

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities—the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
Would the project: b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Would the project: e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

Regulatory Setting

The primary law governing utilities and service systems is CEQA.

Affected Environment

Determinations in this section are based on the scope, description, and location of the proposed project, as well as the *Land Use, Utilities, and Emergency Services Memorandum* dated October 11, 2024 (Caltrans 2024b).

Within the project area, the known utilities include Southwest Gas Corporation, Truckee Donner Public Utility District, Truckee Sanitary District, NorthStar Community Services District, North Tahoe Public Utility District, Liberty Utilities, and AT&T.

Environmental Consequences

Utility relocations would likely occur during construction of this project as utilities may need to be moved to make way for the creation of the cut slope between PMs 6.3 and 6.8. This relocation would impact Southwest Gas Corporation lines and joint Liberty Utilities and AT&T overhead poles. There is also a possibility that other utilities are discovered during underground utility detection or during construction. Plans to relocate any currently unknown utilities in conflict with the proposed project would be determined at discovery. Once utility detection has been completed, the Caltrans environmental team would broaden their environmental studies to the proposed relocation sites to help avoid impacts.

Some service interruptions would occur during the relocation; the duration of these service outages is currently unknown. Once the Caltrans utilities group is able to complete utility detection and submit conflict plans to the utility owners, the duration of the interruption would be determined.

Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures

Based on the determinations made in the CEQA Environmental Checklist, no mitigation measures are proposed.

Discussion of CEQA Environmental Checklist Question 2.19—Utilities and Service Systems

a) Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities—the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. Utility relocation may be required as a result of the work planned by this project. No expansion of utilities is required to support the proposed project. Beyond temporary service interruptions during utility relocation, utility facilities would remain unchanged; therefore, there would be a less than significant impact.

b) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?

NO IMPACT. The proposed project would only require water supplies during construction. As there would be no requirement for water to serve the project past construction, there would be no impact.

c) Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

NO IMPACT. The proposed project would not require the use of wastewater treatment and would not increase demand of a wastewater treatment facility; therefore, there would be no impact.

d) Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

NO IMPACT. Solid waste would not be generated in excess of State or Local standards as a result of this project; therefore, there would be no impact. Solid waste in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure or in amounts that would impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals would not occur.

e) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

NO IMPACT. The project would comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste; therefore, there would be no impact.

2.20 Wildfire

Question	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near State Responsibility Areas (SRAs) or lands classified as *very high* Fire Hazard Severity Zones, would the project: a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

Senate Bill 1241 required the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, the California Natural Resources Agency, and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) to develop amendments to the "CEQA Environmental Checklist" for the inclusion of questions related to fire hazard impacts for projects located on lands classified as *very high* Fire Hazard Severity Zones. The 2018 updates to the CEQA Guidelines expanded this to include projects "near" these *very high* Fire Hazard Severity Zones.

Regulatory Setting

The primary law governing wildfire is CEQA.

Affected Environment

The proposed project is situated, in part, within the State Responsibility Area (SRA). The Fire Hazard Severity Zones within the SRA adjacent to the project are mostly within the “very high” category. There are a few small portions at the northern end of the proposed project within the “high” category of the fire hazard severity zones. The land owned by the federal government is not included in the fire hazard severity zone data.




Figure 7. Project location in relation to CAL FIRE Hazard Severity Zones

Environmental Consequences

The scope of the proposed project would not increase wildfire risk within the project limits. This project proposes to maintain and repair SR 267 which would include pavement repair, drainage maintenance, and guardrail upgrades. These activities would not change the existing wildfire risk. New guardrail with metal posts would be installed rather than wood posts, which may help reduce wildfire risk.

SR 267 is used as a primary or secondary evacuation route for local communities. The NorthStar community relies on SR 267 for emergency evacuation, as the community has a looped road system with three options for evacuating traffic, all onto SR 267 (NorthStar Community Services District). To the south of the project, the communities of Kingswood, Tahoe Vista, Carnelian Bay, and Ridgewood are instructed to evacuate north on SR 267 in case of emergency evacuations (North Tahoe Fire Protection District). The Town of Truckee is situated at a junction between Interstate 80, SR 89, and SR 267. The Town of Truckee Draft Evacuation Plan states that SR 267 should be used as a secondary evacuation route, with Interstate 80 being the preferred evacuation route during moderate to large scale evacuations (Town of Truckee 2024). If an emergency evacuation were to occur along SR 267 during construction of the proposed project, traffic could potentially be impeded due to one lane traffic control. However, upon completion of the project, there should be no interference to any emergency response or evacuation plans. The proposed maintenance and rehabilitation work would not have an impact on any evacuation plans.

The proposed project would likely not have the potential to exacerbate fire risk. The project would not change the alignment of SR 267, nor would it result in a change in the amount of traffic passing through SR 267. As the scope of the proposed project is to perform work that maintains and rehabilitates the existing highway facilities, it would unlikely change the existing wildfire risk; therefore, additional scope items to reduce wildfire risk were not included in the proposed project.

The proposed project would not require the installation of any new electrical systems including lighting, conduits, and associated utility cabinets. The relocation of existing joint overhead poles and gas lines would occur where the road would be widened and a new cut slope created to accommodate the lengthening of the truck climbing

lane. As these are relocations and not installation of totally new electrical systems, it is anticipated the existing fire risk would not change.

Where the road would be widened to accommodate the extension of the truck climbing lane, slope stabilization measures would be constructed. These measures are effective for slope stability and would help reduce the chance of landslides from post-fire slope instability. While additional impervious surfaces would be added due to the truck climbing lane and adjacent widened shoulder, which could result in increased runoff, the proposed project also includes drainage rehabilitation and improvements to existing drainages which would channel additional water away from the roadway and help prevent flooding. Proposed work on the drainages would also help alleviate the risk of downstream flooding from post-fire drainage changes.

Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures

Based on the determinations made in the CEQA Environmental Checklist, no mitigation measures are proposed.

Discussion of CEQA Environmental Checklist Question 2.20—Wildfire

If located in or near State Responsibility Areas or lands classified as very high Fire Hazard Severity Zones, would the project:

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. The proposed project would repair and maintain existing highway facilities on the State Highway System. During construction, SR 267 would be under single lane traffic control. Coordination with local agencies would occur prior to construction. There are no planned total closures, construction would not fully impede the use of emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. In addition, coordination with local authorities would occur during construction; therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

NO IMPACT. The proposed project would not change the existing slopes, prevailing winds, or other factors that could exacerbate wildfire risk which could in turn expose the public to uncontrolled wildfire spread or pollutant concentrations from wildfire; therefore, there would be no impact.

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

NO IMPACT. No additional infrastructure would be required to support the project. Utilities may need to be relocated at certain locations throughout the project; however, this would not exacerbate fire risk as the existing risk would not change. Therefore, there would be no impact.

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

NO IMPACT. The project would not increase risks related to post-fire slope instability or drainage changes. The project would not change the risk of wildfire, nor would it increase the risk of post-fire landslides or flooding. There would be no changes to the existing slopes within the project area. Rather, the project would improve drainages throughout the project limits, which would reduce the incidence of flooding. Therefore, there would be no impact.

2.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

Does the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A
b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A

Discussion of CEQA Environmental Checklist Question 2.21—Mandatory Findings of Significance

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED. The proposed project would cause temporary impacts of 0.041 acres to aquatic resources of the United States/Waters of the State due to the invert paving at culvert at PM 2.89. Approximately 0.05 acres of permanent fill would be added to waters at the culvert at PM 6.26. This work would require a 401 permit from LRWQCB and a 1600 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW. It is anticipated the invert pave work would cause minimal disturbance and the work would likely qualify under the Routine Maintenance Agreement between CDFW and Caltrans. Mitigation for the Section 1600 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement for the permanent impacts to waters and riparian habitat of 0.18 acres would be purchased from a CDFW approved mitigation bank. If no credits through mitigation banks are available, other mitigation options would be explored during the design phase. LRWQCB would require mitigation for the impacts to waters. Further coordination with LRWQCB is ongoing to determine how these impacts would be mitigated.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

NO IMPACT. There is one other project in or soon to be in construction on SR 267 in the vicinity of the proposed project. Any construction activities that have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts would either be compensated for through permitting or minimized or avoided using standard measures; therefore, the proposed project would not result in any adverse effects that, when considered in

connection with other projects, would be considered cumulatively considerable. Therefore, there would be no impact.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. Based on the scope of work and the studies completed for the proposed project, the project would result in a less than significant impact to human beings by potentially exposing the public to hazards or hazardous materials through their routine transport or possibly interfering with the movement of emergency services through the project area if an emergency evacuation is required during construction. The proposed project would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings by impeding access to public facilities, causing changes to land use, or by other means described in this document. Standard Measures and Best Management Practices would be implemented. No substantial adverse effects on humans would occur. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact.

2.22 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts are those that result from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, combined with the potential impacts of this proposed project. A cumulative impact assessment looks at the collective impacts posed by individual land use plans and projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively substantial impacts taking place over a period of time (CEQA § 15355).

Cumulative impacts to resources may result from residential, commercial, industrial, and highway development, as well as from agricultural development and the conversion to more intensive agricultural cultivation. These land use activities can degrade habitat and species diversity through consequences such as displacement and fragmentation of habitats and populations, alteration of hydrology, contamination, erosion, sedimentation, disruption of migration corridors, changes in water quality, and introduction or promotion of predators. They can also contribute to potential community impacts identified for the project, such as changes in community character, traffic patterns, housing availability, and employment.

Per Section 15130 of CEQA, a Cumulative Impact Analysis (CIA) discussion is only required in "…situations where the cumulative effects are found to be significant." An EIR is required in all situations when a project might result in a "significant" direct, indirect, or cumulative impact on any resource. No resources would be significantly impacted as a result of construction of the proposed project. The proposed project may result in "less than significant" impacts, however these are to resources which are generally in good quality in the area and would not lead to any cumulative impact to any resource. Any "less than significant" impacts would be minor or temporary. Given this, an EIR and CIA were not required for this project.



CHAPTER 3. AGENCY AND PUBLIC COORDINATION

Early and continuing coordination with the general public and public agencies is an essential part of the environmental process. It helps planners determine the necessary scope of environmental documentation and the level of analysis required, and to identify potential impacts and avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation measures and related environmental requirements. Agency and tribal consultation and public participation for this project have been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods, including Project Development Team (PDT) meetings, interagency coordination meetings, tribal outreach, and through letters to property owners, federal agencies, state agencies, local agencies, and other interested groups. This chapter summarizes the results of Caltrans' efforts to identify, address, and resolve project-related issues through early and continuing coordination.

The following agencies, organizations, and individuals were consulted in the preparation of this environmental document.

Coordination with Resource Agencies

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was requested to review the Sacred Lands Files for any Native American sacred site within or adjacent to the project area on February 9, 2024. Caltrans received the results of the Sacred Land Files on February 20, 2024, which were negative for sacred lands.

Initial correspondence was sent February 27, 2024, and was followed up by emails on April 3, 2024, to the tribal entities listed in Table 9. Agency Coordination and Professional Contacts.

Consultation with a local historical society was also conducted. The Placer County Historical Society was asked via email to consult on this project on February 27, 2024. A follow-up request was sent via email on April 3, 2024. At this time, no response has been received. All consultation with historical societies will remain open during the life of this project.

At this time, none of the Tribal partners who were contacted have responded to the request to consult on this project. All consultation efforts with Tribal partners are ongoing and will remain open for the life of the project.

Coordination with Property Owners

Property owners adjacent to the proposed project whose property may require a TCE, acquisition, or drainage easement as a result of this project will be contacted via letter inviting them to review and comment on this document during public circulation

Businesses, organizations, or local agencies whose property is near the project but not directly affected by the project will also be sent letters inviting them to review and comment on this document.

Circulation

The initial draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration was circulated July 11, 2025 to August 10, 2025. The recirculated Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration will be circulated March 10, 2026 to April 8, 2026

Table 9. Agency Coordination and Professional Contacts

Date	Personnel	Purpose of Coordination
February 27, 2024	Clyde Prout III, Chairperson Colfax-Todds Valley Consolidated Tribe	Tribal Contact
February 27, 2024	Richard Johnson, Chairperson Nevada City Rancheria Nisenan Tribe	Tribal Contact
February 27, 2024	Don Ryberg, Chairperson T'si Akim Maidu	Tribal Contact
February 27, 2024	Serrell Smokey, Chairperson Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California	Tribal Contact
February 27, 2024	Jesus Tarango, Chairperson Wilton Rancheria	Tribal Contact
February 27, 2024	Gene Whitehouse, Chairperson United Auburn Indian Community	Tribal Contact
February 27, 2024	Placer County Historical Society	Historical Society Contact

CHAPTER 4. LIST OF PREPARERS

The following individuals performed the environmental work and contributed to the preparation of the Initial Study/Proposed Negative Declaration for this project:

California Department of Transportation, District 3

Veronica Wilson	Senior Environmental Scientist
Caitlin Greenwood	Associate Environmental Planner
Jonathan Edwards	Biologist
Aaron Bali	Air Quality Specialist
Jeff Haney	Archaeologist
Katie Gilroy	Architectural Historian
Rajive Chadha	Hazardous Waste Specialist
Kathyryn Lugo	Landscape Architect
Katherine Jorgensen	Native American Coordinator
Ryan Pommerenck	Noise Specialist
Lauryl Rudolph	Paleontologist
Jim Allen	Paleontologist
Lauryl Rudolph	TRPA Coordinator
Jarod Barkley	Water Specialist
Manroop Narwal	Transportation Engineer
Christopher Sugar	Project Manager



CHAPTER 5. DISTRIBUTION LIST

Federal and State Agencies

California Highway Patrol
10475 Pioneer Trail
Truckee, CA 96161

California Department of Fish and Wildlife
1701 Nimbus Road
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

California Tahoe Conservancy
Attn: Nick Meyer
1061 3rd Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Martis Creek Lake
PO Box 2344
11989 Martis Dam Road
Truckee, CA 96160

United States Fish and Wildlife Service
Federal Building
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605
Sacramento, CA 95825

United States Forest Service
Supervisor's Office
631 Coyote Street
Nevada City, CA 95959

Regional/County/Local Agencies

Placer County Clerk Recorder
3715 Atherton Road
Rocklin, CA 95765

Placer County Public Works Department
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

Placer County Tahoe Truckee Area Regional Transportation (TART)
PO Box 1909
Tahoe City, CA 96145

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

Truckee Fire Protection District
PO Box 2768
Truckee, CA 96160

Truckee Fire Protection District Station 96
10277 Truckee Airport Road
Truckee, CA 96161

Truckee Police Department
10183 Truckee Airport Road
Truckee, CA 96161

Truckee Public Works Department
10969 Stevens Lane
Truckee, CA 96161

Tahoe TART
10183 Truckee Airport Road
Truckee, CA 96161

Local Elected Officials

Placer County Supervisor – District 5
Cindy Gustafson
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Interested Groups, Organizations and Individuals

Northstar California Resort
5001 Northstar Drive
Truckee, CA 96161

Tahoe Rim Trail Association
PO Box 3267
Stateline, NV 89449

Truckee River Watershed Council
PO Box 8568
Truckee, CA 96162

Truckee Tahoe Airport
10356 Truckee Airport Road
Truckee, CA 96161

Truckee Trails Foundation
PO Box 1751
Truckee, CA 96160

Truckee Donner Land Trust
PO Box 8816
Truckee, CA 96162

Utilities, Service Systems, Businesses, and Other Property Owners

Liberty Utilities
PO Box 107
Tahoe Vista, CA 96148

Martis Valley Storage Group LLC
4120 Douglas Boulevard # 306-524
Granite Bay, CA 95746

NorthStar Community Services District
900 Northstar Drive
Truckee, CA 96161

North Tahoe Public Utility District
PO Box 139
Tahoe Vista, CA 96148

Sierra Pacific Industries
Paul Ingles
PO Box 496041
Redding, CA 96049

Southwest Gas Corporation
PO Box 98512
Las Vegas, NV 89193

Truckee Donner Public Utility District
11570 Donner Pass Road
Truckee, CA 96161

Truckee Sanitary District
12304 Joerger Drive
Truckee, CA 96161

CHAPTER 6. REFERENCES

Association of Environmental Engineering and Geologists. Landslides. https://www.aegweb.org/landslides. Accessed September 11, 2024.

Baldwin, Bruce G., Goldman, Douglas H., Keil, David J., Patterson, Robert, Rosatti, Thomas J. and Wilken, Dieter H. 2012. The Jepson Manual Vascular Plants of California. University of California Press. California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2008. *Climate Change Scoping Plan Appendices. Volume II: Analysis and Documentation.* Appendix I, p. I-19. December. https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/scopingplandocument.htm. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

_____. 2021. *SB 375 Regional Plan Climate Targets*. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/sustainable-communities-program/regional-plan-targets. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

_____. 2022a. *California Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory Data–2022 Edition, 2000-2020.* https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/ghg-inventory-data. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

_____. 2022b. *2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality*. Executive Summary. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/ab-32-climate-change-scoping-plan/2022-scoping-plan-documents. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

_____. 2022c. *Climate Change*. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/topics/climate-change. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

California Department of Conservation. 2024. *EQ Zapp: California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application*. https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geohazards/eq-zapp. Accessed September 11, 2024.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2025. *Biogeographic Branch Data. California Natural Diversity Database (Government Version).* http://map.dfg.ca.gov/rarefind/view/RareFind.aspx. Accessed: January 29, 2025.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2016. *Statewide Stormwater Management Plan*. https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/docs/caltrans/swmp/swmp_approved.pdf.

_____. 2019. *Caltrans Climate Change Vulnerability Assessments*. District 3 Technical Report. December. Prepared by WSP. https://dot.ca.gov/programs/transportation-planning/2019-climate-change-vulnerability-assessments.

_____. 2020. *Caltrans Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Mitigation Report*. Final. August. Prepared by ICF, Sacramento, CA. https://dot.ca.gov/programs/public-affairs/mile-marker/summer-2021/ghg. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

_____. 2021a. *California Transportation Plan* 2050. February. https://dot.ca.gov/programs/transportation-planning/division-of-transportation-planning/state-planning-equity-and-engagement/california-transportation-plan. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

_____. 2021b. *Caltrans 2020-2024 Strategic Plan.* https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/f190b9755a184b268719dac9a11153f7. Accessed: November 13, 20233.

_____. 2022. *Initial Site Assessment*. District 3 Technical Report. April. Prepared by Caltrans. Accessed: December 10, 2024.

_____. 2023. *Sustainable Operations at Caltrans–Sustainability Roadmap.* https://dot.ca.gov/programs/esta/sustainable-caltrans. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

_____. 2024a. *Geology Memorandum*. District 3 Technical Report. October. Prepared by Caltrans. Accessed: December 17, 2024.

_____. 2024b. *Land Use, Utilities, and Emergency Services Memorandum*. District 3 Technical Report. September. Prepared by Caltrans. Accessed: December 17, 2024.

_____. 2024c. *Mineral Resources Memorandum*. District 3 Technical Report. October. Prepared by Caltrans. Accessed: December 17, 2024.

_____. 2024d. *Paleontological Technical Study*. District 3 Technical Report. October. Prepared by Caltrans. Accessed: December 17, 2024.

_____. 2025a. *Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas, and Energy Analysis for the PLA 267 CAPM Project*. District 3 Technical Report. February. Prepared by Caltrans. Accessed March 12, 2025.

_____. 2025b. *Historic Property Survey Report*. District 3 Technical Report. May. Prepared by Caltrans. Accessed May 1, 2025.

_____. 2025c. *Natural Environment Study (Minimal Impacts).* District 3 Technical Report. April. Prepared by Caltrans. Accessed March 20, 2025.

_____. 2025d. *Noise Abatement Decision Report*. District 3 Technical Report. June. Prepared by Caltrans. Accessed: June 8, 2025.

_____. 2025e. *Noise Study Report*. District 3 Technical Report. April. Prepared by Caltrans. Accessed: April 8, 2025.

_____. 2025f. *Visual Impact Assessment Memorandum*. District 3 Technical Report. February. Prepared by Caltrans. Accessed: February 12, 2025.

_____. 2025g. *Water Quality Assessment*. District 3 Technical Report. February. Prepared by Caltrans. Accessed: March 25, 2025.

_____. Environmental GIS Library. https://svgcdeaprod.dot.ca.gov/dea_library/. Accessed September 5, 2024.

California Environmental Protection Agency. 2015. *California Climate Strategy–An Integrated Plan for Addressing Climate Change.*

California Geological Survey. Data Viewer. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/DataViewer/. Accessed September 10, 2024.

California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR). 2015. *A Strategy for California @ 50 Million*. November. https://opr.ca.gov/planning/environmental-goals/. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

California Natural Resources Agency. 2022. *Nature-Based Climate Solutions: Natural and Working Lands Climate Smart Strategy.* https://resources.ca.gov/Initiatives/Expanding-Nature-Based-Solutions. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

_____. 2023. *California Climate Adaptation Strategy.* https://resources.ca.gov/Initiatives/Building-Climate-Resilience/2021-State-Adaptation-Strategy-Update. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

California Ocean Protection Council. 2022. *State Agency Sea-Level Rise Action Plan for California.* February. https://www.opc.ca.gov/climate-change/sea-level-rise-2/. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

California State Transportation Agency. 2021. *Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI).* https://calsta.ca.gov/subject-areas/climate-action-plan. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

Climate-Safe Infrastructure Working Group. 2018. *Paying it Forward: The Path Toward Climate-Safe Infrastructure in California*. September. https://resources.ca.gov/CNRALegacyFiles/docs/climate/ab2800/AB2800_Climate-SafeInfrastructure_FinalNoAppendices.pdf. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

County of Placer. 1994. *Placer County General Plan Final EIR Volume 1*. July. https://www.placer.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/68110/Placer-County-General-Plan-EIR-1994-PDF?bidId=. Accessed September 10, 2024.

County of Placer. 2020. *Placer County Sustainability Plan*. January. https://www.placer.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/42940/PCSP-ADOPTION?bidId=. Accessed February 11, 2025.

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). 2022. *Sustainability*. https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sustainability/resilience/. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

_____. No date. *Sustainable Highways Initiative*. https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sustainability/initiative/. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 2022. *2022 Sea Level Rise Technical Report.* https://oceanservice.noaa.gov/hazards/sealevelrise/sealevelrise-tech-report.html. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

Northstar Community Services District. Evacuation Routes. https://www.northstarcsd.org/departments/fire/EvacuationRoutes. Accessed September 5, 2024.

North Tahoe Fire Protection District. Emergency Preparedness and Evacuation Guide. https://ntfire.net/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/NUBIZ-1004-NTFPD-Emergency-Prepared-Brochure.pdf. Accessed September 5, 2024.

State of California. 2018. *California's Fourth Climate Change Assessment.* http://www.climateassessment.ca.gov/. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

Tahoe Conservancy. 2020. *Integrated Vulnerability Assessment of Climate Change in the Lake Tahoe Basin.* https://tahoe.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/257/2020/04/Lake-Tahoe-Basin-IVA-SET-Tech-Memos.pdf. Accessed: March 12, 2025.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. 2013. *Sustainability Action Plan*. https://www.trpa.gov/programs/climate-resilience/#:~:text=Sustainability%20Action%20Plan%3A%20A%2015,zero%20carbon%20emissions%20by%202045. Accessed: March 12, 2025.

_____. 2023. *Code of Ordinances*. https://www.trpa.gov/wp-content/uploads/TRPA-Code-of-Ordinances.pdf.

_____. 2024. *Lake Tahoe Threshold Standards and Regional Plan*. https://www.trpa.gov/wp-

content/uploads/documents/archive/Thresholds_Regional-Plan_Amended_2019_4_24.pdf.

Town of Truckee. 2024. *Town of Truckee Evacuation Plan Draft Document*. https://www.townoftruckee.com/640/Emergency-Plans-Documents. Accessed September 5, 2024

U.S. Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT). 2014. *Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) Standards*. https://www.transportation.gov/mission/sustainability/corporate-average-fuel-economy-cafe-standards. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

_____.2023. *Climate Action*. January. https://www.transportation.gov/priorities/climate-and-sustainability/climate-action. Accessed: November 13, 2023.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 2024a. *Data Highlights*. Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2021. https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/inventory-us-greenhouse-gas-emissions-and-sinks. Accessed: November 13, 2023.


_____. 2024b. *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2021*. https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/inventory-us-greenhouse-gas-emissions-and-sinks. Accessed: November 13, 2023.


U.S. Global Change Research Program. 2023. *Fifth National Climate Assessment.* https://nca2023.globalchange.gov/chapter/front-matter/. Accessed: November 21, 2023.


Wills, C.J., Perez, F.G., Gutierrez, C. I. 2011. California Geological Survey. *Susceptibility to Deep-Seated Landslides in California*. https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/documents/publications/map-sheets/MS_058.pdf. Accessed September 10, 2024.


APPENDIX A. PROJECT LAYOUTS






NOTE:
FOR ACCURATE RIGHT OF WAY DATA, CONTACT RIGHT OF WAY ENGINEERING AT THE DISTRICT OFFICE.
LEGEND:
ESL
CUT LIMIT
FILL LIMIT
SAWCUT
ABBREVIATION:
DE DRAINAGE EASEMENT
Dist 03 | COUNTY Pla | ROUTE 267 | POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT 0.0/9.63 | SHEET No. | TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
COMPLETE ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY
34.61' Lt "A" 106+01.71
Beg MGS (STEEL POST)
END ANCHOR ASSEMBLY (TYPE SFT-M)
44.67' Lt "A" 105+94.29
Beg REMOVE GUARDRAIL
PROPOSED R/W (DE)
REMOVE FES (a)
18" STEEL FES (b)
RSP (150 LB/ CLASS III, METHOD B) (c)
CLEANING, INSPECTING AND PREPARING CULVERT (d)
18" CMP (80 LF) (e)
"A LINE" 103+70.00 CONFORM
Beg OVERLAY
Beg COLD PLANE AC Pvmt
"A LINE" 100+00.00 BEG
EXISTING R/W
"A LINE" 110+48.21 BC
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-2
35.21' Rt "A" 105+98.60
Beg REMOVE GUARDRAIL
ATT IN-LINE TERMINAL SYSTEM
24.34' Rt "A" 106+47.33
Beg MGS (STEEL POST)
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-1
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
TARIQ CHECHI
BORDER LAST REVISED : 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste'508
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE 0321000197



Dist 03 | COUNTY Pla | ROUTE 267 | POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT 0.0/9.63 | SHEET No. | TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER | DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
INCOMPLETE PS&E PLANS
DESIGN STUDY ONLY
NAME XXXXXX
No. XXXXX Exp XX-XX-18 CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY TARIQ CHECHI
CHECKED BY
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
TRUCKEE-TAHOE AIRPORT Rd
SCHAFFER MILL Rd
"A" LINE" 117+39.66 EC
"A" 119+00.00
END COLD PLANE AC Pvmt
39.22' Lt "A" 115+24.09
END REMOVE GUARDRAIL
At IN-LINE
TERMINAL SYSTEM
30.32' Lt "A" 114+74.55
END MGS (STEEL POST)
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-1
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-3
R/W
PM 0.11 /
SYSKO 1926700000111
REMOVE DOWN DRAIN
18" CSP OSD (26LF)
34.84' Rt "A" 114+85.25
END MGS (STEEL POST)
END ANCHOR ASSEMBLY (TYPE SFT-M)
38.72' Rt "A" 114+97.39
END REMOVE GUARDRAIL
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-2
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esd002.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE 0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 13:56



MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-2
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-4
R/W
125
130
135
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-3
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
TARIQ CHECHI
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
Dist 03
COUNTY Plc
ROUTE 267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT 0.0/9.63
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
SIGN DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
INCOMPLETE PLANS FOR DESIGN STUDY ONLY
NAME XXXXX
CIVIL
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esd003.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE 0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 13:58



Dist 03
COUNTY Pla
ROUTE 267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT 0.0/9.63
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
INCOMPLETE DESIGN STUDY ONLY
EXP XX-XX-18
CIVIL
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
PM 0.82
SYSND 192674000082
REMOVE FES
18" STEEL FES
CLEANING, INSPECTING, AND PREPARING CULVERT
18" CIPP (53.3 LF)
EXISTING R/W
EXISTING R/W
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-3
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-5
R/W
R/W
140
145
150
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
TARIQ CHECHI
CHECKED BY
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-4
BORDER LAST REVISED 1/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197ea007.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
0 1 2 3
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:02



MARTIS DAM Rd
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-4
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-6
"A" LINE 151+49.68 EC
R/W
R/W
R/W
R/W
155
160
DIST
TOTAL SHEETS
SHEET NO.
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT
ROUTE
COUNTY
Dist
03
Pla
267
0.0/9.6
SIG
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
NAME
XXXXXX
No.
Exp XX-XX-18
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
INCOMPLETE PLANS
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION STAGE
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-5
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
TARIQ CHECHI
CHECKED BY
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197ea005.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
0 1 2 3
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:02


MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-5
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-7
R/W
"A" LINE 169+27.82 BC
165
170
175
DESIGN
TARIQ CHECHI
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-6
INCOMPLETE PLANS
PRELIMINARY DESIGN STUDY
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
DIST
COUNTY
ROUTE
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT
SHEET NO.
TOTAL SHEETS
03
Pla
267
0.0/9.83
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATE SIGNED
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
NAME
XXXXXX
No.
XX-XX-18
EXP
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => sle1508
DGN FILE => 0321000197ea0068.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
0 1 2 3
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:04



Dist
03
COUNTY
Pla
ROUTE
267
POST MILES
TOTAL PROJECT
SHEET TOTAL
No. SHEETS
INCOMPLETE PLANS FOR DESIGN REVIEW ONLY
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
NAME
XXXXX
No. XX-XX-18
EXP.
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED / DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
TARIQ CHECHI
DRAWN BY
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-6
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-8
R/W
4
PM 1.59
SYSNO 1926000159
CLEANING, INSPECTING AND PREPARING CULVERT
a
b
18" CEMENTITIOUS PIPELINER 147.5 LF
℄ LINE 183+62.79 EC
180
185
190
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-7
BORDER LAST REVISED 1/4/2023
USERNAME => s161508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esl07.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18-NOV-2025



Dist 03
COUNTY Pla
ROUTE 267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT 0.0/9.63
SHEET NO.
TOTAL SHEETS
INCOMPLETE DESIGN STAGE PLANS
18.04' Lt "A" 202+64.83
Beg STAGING AREA (44,345 SQFT)
23.71' Rt "A" 200+91.98
Beg STAGING AREA (48,061 SQFT)
R/W
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-7
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-9
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-8
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
TARIQ CHECHI
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => s167508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esd008.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE 0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18-NOV-2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:09



STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
TARIQ CHECHI
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
Dist 03
COUNTY Pla
ROUTE 267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT 0.0/9.93
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
INCOMPLETE PLANS NOT FOR DESIGN
NAME XXXXXX
No. XX-XX-18
Exp. CIVIL
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
R/W
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-8
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-10
6 7 8 9 210 1 2 3 4 215 6 7 8 9
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-9
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => STE508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esd008.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
0 1 2 3
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:12



17.54' L+ "A" 225+74.61
END STAGING AREA
22.56' R+ "A" 229+39.85
END STAGING AREA
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-9
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-11
R/W
220
225
230
DESIGN
TARIQ CHECHI
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
INCOMPLETE
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-10


Dist
03
COUNTY
Pla
ROUTE
267
POST MILES
TOTAL PROJECT
SHEET NO.
TOTAL SHEETS
INCOMPLETE PLAN
FOR DESIGN STUDY ONLY
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
NAME
XXXXXX
No.
XX-XX-18
Exp.
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
TARIQ CHECHI
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-10
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-12
R/W
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-11
BORDER LAST REVISED
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esd01.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:42


EXISTING R/W
EXISTING R/W
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-11
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-13
"A LINE" 251+88.57 EC
"A LINE" 259+20.28 BC
TCE
R/W
R/W
250
255
260
5 EW 3.69
SYSND 1914T4000289
4 CLEANING, INSPECTING AND PREPARING GUARDRAIL
3 INVERT PAVE 4'-0" X 3.5" ASP (
2 RSP (150 LB, CLASS III, METHOD B
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-12
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
NAME
XXXXXX
No.
XX-XX-18
CIVIL
INCOMPLETE
NOT FOR BID
DESIGN
TARIQ CHECHI
DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
DATE REVISED
REVISED BY
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
BORDER LAST REVISED 1/4/2023
USERNAME => sle508
DGN FILE => 0321000197ea01.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197


ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-13
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
TARIQ CHECHI
EXISTING R/W
PROPOSED R/W (DE)
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-12
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-14
"A" LINE" 261+71.79 EQ
18.50' Lt "A" 261+88.75
Beg STAGING AREA (6,715 SQFT)
22.36' Lt "A" 265+76.52
END STAGING AREA
REMOVE 18" CSP (50 LF)
24" RCP (50 LF)
REMOVE FES
FES
RSP
REMOVE DI
DI TYPE XX
REMOVE 18" CSP (36 LF)
24" RCP (66 LF)
REMOVE OSD (12" x 18" CSP)
12" CSP OSD (18LF)
REMOVE HEADWALL
HEADWALL
SAMPLE PE STAMP
DESIGN STUDY
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
NAME
XXXXXX
XX-XX-18
CIVIL



Dist 03 COUNTY Pla ROUTE 267 POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT 0.0/19.6 SHEET NO. TOTAL SHEETS
INCOMPLETE - STUDY ONLY FOR DESIGN
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
NAME XXXXXX No. XX-XX-18 EXP CIVIL
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
PM 3.31
ESRD 182670000331
REMOVE OSD (12' X 19.0' ESRD)
12" CSP OSD (MAIN)
FES
CSP FLSD (2:1, CLASS 5T, METHOD B)
PROPOSED R/W (DE)
EXISTING R/W
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-13
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-15
"A" LINE" 281+18.76 BC
275
280
285
R/W
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
TARIQ CHECHI
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-14
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE 0321000197





ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS

SCALE: 1" = 50'


ESL-15



Dist 03
COUNTY Pla
ROUTE 267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT 30.9-63
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
SIGD
DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
NAME XXXXXX
No. XXXXX
Exp XX-XX-18
CIVIL
REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
INCOMPLETE PLANS
DESIGN SUBJECT ONLY
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPY OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
PM 3.5
SYSNO 192670000390
13
REMOVE OSD
(12' x 7.0D OSP)
18" CSP (10.0 LF)
PROPOSED R/W (DE)
PM 3.89
SYSNO 192679000499
14
REMOVE OSD
(12' x 15.0 OSP)
18" CSP (15.0 LF)
PROPOSED R/W (DE)
EXISTING R/W
"A" LINE" 305+39.13 EC
"A" LINE" 314+70.43 BC
"A" 303+52.46
END COLD PLANE AC Pvmt
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-15
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-17
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-16
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
TARIQ CHECHI
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esl06.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE 0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:24



Dist
03
COUNTY
Pla
ROUTE
267
POST MILES
TOTAL PROJECT
0.0/9.8
SHEET NO.
TOTAL SHEETS
SIG
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATE
SIGN OVER
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
NAME
XXXXXX
No.
XX-XX-18
Exp.
CIVIL
SAMPLE - PLANS FOR DESIGN STUDY
PM 4.13
SYSMO 1 3267000413
REMOVE 24" CSP (69.4 LF)
24" RCP (69.4 LF)
PES
RSP
"A" 317+44.19
Beg COLD PLANE AC Pvmt
PROPOSED R/W (OB)
EXISTING R/W
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-16
"A" LINE" 322+74.91 EC
320
325
"A" 321+41.54
END COLD PLANE
AC Pvmt
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-18
HIGHLANDS VIEW Rd
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
TARIQ CHECHI
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-17
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esl07.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:26


Dist
03
COUNTY
Pla
ROUTE
267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT
0.0/9.63
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
SAMPLE PLANS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY
NAME
XXXXXX
No.
XX-XX-18
Exp.
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PM 4.36
SYSNO 19267000436
16
18" CMP CULVERT (TEMPORARY) a
CLEANING, INSPECTING, AND PREPARING CULVERT b
INVERT PAVE, 48" DSP (140 LF) c
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-17
EXISTING R/W
"A" LINE 323+93.02 BC
"A" LINE 334+54.78 EC
TCE
Upgrade Census Station
"A" LINE 341+64.78 BC
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-19
R/W
335
340
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
TARIQ CHECHI
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-18
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esl01.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
0 1 2 3
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:28



Dist
03
COUNTY
Pla
ROUTE
267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT
0.0/9.63
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
SIG
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATED
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
INCOMPLETE PLANS
DESIGN STUDY
NAME
XXXXXX
No.
XX-XX-18
Exp.
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
TARIQ CHECHI
CHECKED BY
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-18
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-20
"A" LINE" 345+33.21 EC
"A" LINE" 353+47.65 BC
R/W
345
350
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-19
BORDER LAST REVISED 1/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esl01.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
0 1 2 3
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:31



Dist
03
COUNTY
Pla
ROUTE
267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT
0.0/9.63
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
SIGN DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
INCOMPLETE PLANS
DESIGN STUDY
NAME
XXXXXX
No.
XX-XX-18
Exp.
CIVIL
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-19
R/W
"A" LINE 359+15.75 EC
"A" LINE 364+66.97 BC
PROPOSED R/W
EXISTING R/W
EEF PARCEL
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-21
355
360
365
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
TARIQ CHECHI
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-20
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esl020.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
0 1 2 3
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:33



Dist 03
COUNTY Pla
ROUTE 267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT 0.0/9.63
SHEET NO.
TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATE SIGNED
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
INCOMPLETE DESIGN STUDY PLANS
NAME XXXXXX
No. XXXXX
Exp XX-XX-18
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
PM 5.11
LSYSNO 19267400081
REMOVE DI
DI TYPE(XX.XX)
REMOVE DI
DI TYPE(XX.XX)
28.75' Lt "A" 373+18.72
Beg SHOULDER WIDENING
34.38' Lt "A" 377+29.04
END SHOULDER WIDENING
"A" LINE 375+18.72 BC
"A" LINE 369+98.45 EC
FEE PARCEL
PROPOSED R/W
EXISTING R/W
EXISTING R/W
EXISTING R/W
R/W
R/W
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-20
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-22
23.80' R- "A" 379+10.37
Beg STAGING AREA (5,187 SQFT)
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY TARIQ CHECHI
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-21
BORDER LAS REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esd021.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE 0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:35



INCOMPLETE PLANS
FOR DESIGN STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-22
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-21
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-23
17.55' Rt "A" 381+30.37
END STAGING AREA
18.69' Rt "A" 385+19.71
Beg STAGING AREA (1,952 SQFT)
21.07' Rt "A" 386+81.72
END STAGING AREA
REMOVE 12" CSP (9.6 LF)
12" CSP (9.6 LF)
RSP (150 LB, CLASS III, METHOD B)
CLEANING, INSPECTING AND PREPARING CULVERT
18" CIPP (61 LF)
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
TARIQ CHECHI



Dist
03
COUNTY
Pla
ROUTE
267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT
0.0/9.63
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
INCOMPLETE PLANS
FOR DESIGN STUDY
NAME
XXXXXX
No.
XX-XX-18
CIVIL
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
TARIQ CHECHI
CHECKED BY
DATE REVISED
REVISED BY
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-22
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-24
"A LINE" 398+69.39 EC
"A LINE" 401+86.76 PI
"A LINE" 405+84.89 PI
"A LINE" 407+86.93 EC
R/W
400
405
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-23
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esd23.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
0 1 2 3
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:39



Dist 03 | COUNTY Pla | ROUTE 267 | POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT 0.0/9.63 | SHEET NO. | TOTAL SHEETS
INCOMPLETE SEE PLANS FOR DESIGN STUDY
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
NAME XXXXXX
No. XX-XX-18 Exp. CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
25.86' LT "A" 420+24.53
NO STAGING AREA
20.52' ± "A" 415+83.20
Beg STAGING AREA (10,741 SQFT)
"A" LINE 414+42.75 EC
"A" LINE 419+37.88 BC
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-23
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-25
19.03' RT "A" 417+87.12
Beg MGS (STEEL POST)
ALT IN-LINE TERMINAL SYSTEM
18.62' RT "A" 417+37.12
Beg REMOVE GUARDRAIL
REMOVE DOWNDRAIN (24" X 44' LF)
24" CSP (44 LF)
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-24
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
TARIQ CHECHI
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esd02.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE 0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:41



MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-24
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-26
MARTIS PEAK Rd
EXISTING R/W
TOE
"A" Sta 428+80
Beg SHOULDER WIDENING
END ANCHOR ASSEMBLY (TYPE SFT-M)
Beg REMOVE GUARDRAIL
REMOVE GUARDRAIL
SAND VAULT/LOADING DOCK (S)
INCOMPLETE PLANS
FOR DESIGN STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-25


22.74' Lt "A" 435+83.99
END MGS (STEEL POST)
At IN-LINE
TERMINAL SYSTEM
28.72' Lt "A" 436+32.15
END REMOVE GUARDRAIL
33.06' Rt "A" 436+89.60
END MGS (STEEL POST)
FEE PARCEL
BURIED POST END ANCHOR
(TYPE B-P)
23.28' Rt "A" 437+42.64
END REMOVE GUARDRAIL
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-25
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-27
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-26
DESIGN
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
TARIQ CHECHI
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
INCOMPLETE PLANS
DESIGN STAGE
NAME
XXXXXX
XX-XX-18
CIVIL


MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-26
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-28
445
450
"A" Sta 452+20
END TRUCK CLIMBING LANE
Beg TRUCK CLIMBING LANE TAPER
R/W
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-27
INCOMPLETE PLANS
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
TARIQ CHECHI
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
Dist 03
COUNTY Pla
ROUTE 267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT 0.0/9.63
SHEET NO.
TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATED
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
NAME XXXXXX
No. XX-XX-18
Exp
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
BORDER LAS REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste'508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esd27.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
0 1 2 3
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:56


MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-27
"A" Sta 454+68.91 EC
PM6.8
SYSNO 192674000662
REMOVE DI (a)
DI (TYPE XX) (b)
REMOVE DI VERT (18" Ø 55.0' CSP)
24" RCP 135.0 LF (d)
SYSNO 192674000663
REMOVE DI (a)
DI (TYPE XX) (b)
"A" Sta 458+80
END TRUCK CLIMBING LANE TAPER
REMOVE DI (e)
DI (TYPE XX) (f)
REMOVE SLOT DRAIN (g)
SLOT DRAIN (h)
REMOVE DI (i)
DI (TYPE XX) (j)
CARNELIAN BAY Ave
"A" LINE 462+84 TO EC
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-29
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-28
INCOMPLETE PLANS
DESIGN STUDY
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
TARIQ CHECHI
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
DATE REVISED
REVISED BY
Dist 03
COUNTY Pla
ROUTE 267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT 0.0/9.63
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
NAME XXXXX
No. XXXXX
Exp XX-XX-18
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197ea028.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE 0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:58



MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-28
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-30
"A" LINE 468+54.79 BC
"A" LINE 477+25.94 EC
"A" LINE 477+88.48 BC
29.29' Rt "A" 473+25.51
Beg REMOVE GUARDRAIL
At IN-LINE
TERMINAL SYSTEM
23.19' Rt "A" 473+73.31
Beg MGS (STEEL POST)
23.45' Rt "A" 477+79.24
END REMOVE GUARDRAIL
END ANCHOR ASSEMBLY
(TYPE SFT-M)
22.99' Rt "A" 477+66.67
END MGS (STEEL POST)
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-29
INCOMPLETE PLANS
DESIGN STAGE
DESIGN
TARIQ CHECHI
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION


Dist
03
COUNTY
Pla
ROUTE
267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT
0.0/9.63
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
INCOMPLETE PLANS
NOT FOR DESIGN STUDY
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATE SIGNED
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
NAME
XXXXXX
No.
XX-XX-18
EXP
CIVIL
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-29
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-31
485
490
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
TARIQ CHECHI
CHECKED BY
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-30
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esl030.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
0 1 2 3
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:52


Dist
03
COUNTY
Pla
ROUTE
267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT
0.0/9.63
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
INCOMPLETE DESIGN STATE PLANS
NAME
XXXXXX
No.
Exp XX-XX-18
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
TARIQ CHECHI
DATE REVISED
REVISED BY
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-30
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-32
"A" LINE" 494+65.39 EC
"A" LINE" 504+84.91 BC
495
500
505
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-31
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197ea031.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
0 1 2 3
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:54



26.60' Lt "A" 519+41.37
END REMOVE GUARDRAILS
26.33' Lt "A" 518+63.43
Beg REMOVE GUARDRAILS
25.81' Lt "A" 518+00
Beg MGS (STEEL POST)
END ANCHOR ASSEMBLY
(TYPE SFT-M)
"A" LINE 517+80.11 BEG
"A" LINE 511+89.03 EOC
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-31
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-33
510
515
520
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-32
INCOMPLETE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
TARIQ CHECHI
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
DATE REVISED
REVISED BY
Dist 03
COUNTY Pla
ROUTE 267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT 0.0/9.63
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATE SIGNED
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
XXXXX
XX-XX-18
CIVIL
BORDER LAS REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197ea032.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:55


Dist
03
COUNTY
Pla
ROUTE
267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT
0.0/9.63
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
INCOMPLETE PLANS
NOT FOR DESIGN STUDY
NAME
XXXXXX
XX-XX-18
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
TARIQ CHECHI
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-32
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-34
GAS LINE Blvd
"A LINE" 533+50.50 BC
525
530
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-33
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197ea033.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 14:57





ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'


ESL-34



MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-34
"A" LINE 550+14.32 EC
550
555
560
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-36
"A" 560+00.00
Beg COLD PLANE AC Pvmt
31 PM 8.5
REMOVE FES
FES
RSP
CLEANING, INSPECTING, AND PREPARING SUBGRADE
18" CPP
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-35
INCOMPLETE FINAL DESIGN STUDY
DESIGN
TARIQ CHECHI
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Caltrans
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
DATE REVISED
REVISED BY
District 03 | COUNTY Pla | ROUTE 267 | POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT 0.0/9.63 | SHEET No. | TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER SIG DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
XXXXX
XX-XX-18
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esa035.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
0 1 2 3
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE 0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 15:01


Dist
03
COUNTY
Pla
ROUTE
267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT
0.0/9.63
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
INCOMPLETE PLANS
DESIGN STUDY
NAME
XXXXXX
No.
XX-XX-18
EXP
CIVIL
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
TARIQ CHECHI
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-36
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-37
STEWART WAY
STEWART WAY
℄ LINE 564+18.71 BC
℄ LINE 573+42.65 EC
565
570
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-36
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esa038.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
0 1 2 3
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 15:03


Dist
03
COUNTY
Pla
ROUTE
267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT
0.0/9.63
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
INCOMPLETE DESIGN STUDY PLANS
NAME
XXXXXX
No.
XX-XX-18
Exp
CIVIL
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
TARIQ CHECHI
CHECKED BY
DATE REVISED
REVISED BY
COMMONWEALTH Dr
CAMBRIDGE Dr
KINGSWOOD Dr
LINCOLN GREEN Dr
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-36
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-38
R/W
575
580
585
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-37
BORDER LAST REVISED
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esl037.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 15:05


Dist
03
COUNTY
Pla
ROUTE
267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT
0.0/9.63
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
INCOMPLETE PSR/PDS
NAME
XXXXXX
XX-XX-18
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
CHECKED BY
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-37
EXISTING R/W
ENCROACHMENT PERMIT ESP
RUSTY Rd
GRIFF Ln
PINEDROP Ln
NORTH Ave
TIGER Ave
"A" LINE= 593+67.85 BC
"A" LINE= 594+49.64 EC
"A" LINE= 595+35.57
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-39
93
32
34
24" Conc FES
REMOVE CULVERT
24" RCP (75.0LF)
24" RCP 125.0LF)
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-38
BORDER LAS REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197ea038.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 15:07


Dist
03
COUNTY
Pla
ROUTE
267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT
0.0/9.63
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
INCOMPLETE PLANS
DESIGN STUDENT
NAME
XXXXXX
No.
XX-XX-18
Exp
CIVIL
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-38
"A LINE" 604+09.84 EC
"A LINE" 605+87.53 BC
SPECKLED Ave
DOLLY VARDEN Ave
"A LINE" 612+25.00
END OVERLAY
END COLD PLANE AC Pvmt
605
610
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-40
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
TARIQ CHECHI
CHECKED BY
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-39
BORDER LAST REVISED 1/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esd038.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
0 1 2 3
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 15:03


Dist
03
COUNTY
Pla
ROUTE
267
POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT
0.0/R33.5
SHEET No.
TOTAL SHEETS
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
SIG
DATE
PLANS APPROVAL DATE
INCOMPLETE PLANS
DESIGN STUDY
NAME
XXXXXX
No.
XX-XX-18
Exp.
CIVIL
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF SCANNED COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.
MATCH LINE SHEET ESL-39
ROW
ROW
ROW
ROW
CA LINE 617+45.44 EC
CA LINE 617+77.60 END
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DESIGN
FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
TARIQ CHECHI
CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
TARIQ CHECHI
CHECKED BY
REVISED BY
DATE REVISED
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY LIMITS
SCALE: 1" = 50'
ESL-40
BORDER LAST REVISED 7/4/2023
USERNAME => ste508
DGN FILE => 0321000197esl040.dgn
RELATIVE BORDER SCALE IS IN INCHES
0 1 2 3
UNIT 0323
PROJECT NUMBER & PHASE
0321000197
DATE PLOTTED => 18 NOV 2025
TIME PLOTTED => 15:11



APPENDIX B. TITLE VI–NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY STATEMENT



CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY GAVIN NEWSOM, GOVERNOR

California Department of Transportation

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

September 2023

NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY STATEMENT

The California Department of Transportation, under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, ensures *"No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance."*

Caltrans will make every effort to ensure nondiscrimination in all of its services, programs and activities, whether they are federally funded or not, and that services and benefits are fairly distributed to all people, regardless of race, color, or national origin. In addition, Caltrans will facilitate meaningful participation in the transportation planning process in a non-discriminatory manner.

Related federal statutes, remedies, and state law further those protections to include sex, disability, religion, sexual orientation, and age.

For information or guidance on how to file a complaint, or obtain more information regarding Title VI, please contact the Title VI Branch Manager at (916) 639-6392 or visit the following web page: https://dot.ca.gov/programs/civil-rights/title-vi.

To obtain this information in an alternate format such as Braille or in a language other than English, please contact the California Department of Transportation, Office of Civil Rights, at PO Box 942874, MS-79, Sacramento, CA 94274-0001; (916) 879-6768 (TTY 711); or at Title.VI@dot.ca.gov.

TONY TAVARES
Director

"Provide a safe and reliable transportation network that serves all people and respects the environment"



APPENDIX C. USFWS, NMFS, CDFW–CNDDB, AND CNPS SPECIES LISTS



CNPS Rare Plant Inventory

CALIFORNIA NATIVE PLANT SOCIETY

Search Results

19 matches found. Click on scientific name for details

Search Criteria: , Quad is one of [**3912021:3912031:3912032**]

▲ SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	FAMILY	LIFEFORM	BLOOMING PERIOD	FED LIST	STATE LIST	GLOBAL RANK	STATE RANK	CA RARE PLANT RANK	CA ENDEMIC	DATE ADDED	PHOTO
Arabis rigidissima var. *demota*	Galena Creek rockcress	Brassicaceae	perennial herb	Jul-Aug	None	None	G3T3Q	S1	1B.2		1994-01-01	No Photo Available
Artemisia tripartita ssp. *tripartita*	threetip sagebrush	Asteraceae	perennial shrub	Aug	None	None	G5T4T5	S2	2B.3		2012-08-20	No Photo Available
Botrychium minganense	Mingan moonwort	Ophioglossaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	Jul-Sep(Oct)	None	None	G5	S4	4.2		1994-01-01	 © 2011 Aaron E. Sims
Carex davyi	Davy's sedge	Cyperaceae	perennial herb	May-Aug	None	None	G3	S3	1B.3		1974-01-01	No Photo Available
Carex lasiocarpa	woolly-fruited sedge	Cyperaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	Jun-Jul	None	None	G5	S2	2B.3		1980-01-01	 © 2011 Sierra Pacific Industries
Cryptantha glomeriflora	clustered-flower cryptantha	Boraginaceae	annual herb	Jun-Sep	None	None	G4Q	S4	4.3	Yes	2001-01-01	No Photo Available

Engellaria obtusa	obtuse starwort	Caryophyllaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	May-Sep(Oct)	None	None	G5	S4	4.3		1988-01-01	 ©2014 Kirsten Bovee
Eriogonum umbellatum var. *torreyanum*	Donner Pass buckwheat	Polygonaceae	perennial herb	Jul-Sep	None	None	G5T2	S2	1B.2	Yes	1974-01-01	No Photo Available
Eriophorum gracile	slender cottongrass	Cyperaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb (emergent)	May-Sep	None	None	G5	S4	4.3		2006-10-31	 ©2011 Steven Perry
Eurybia merita	subalpine aster	Asteraceae	perennial herb	Aug	None	None	G5	S3	2B.3		2006-09-14	 ©2014 Richard Spellenberg
Ivesia sericoleuca	Plumas ivesia	Rosaceae	perennial herb	May-Oct	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2	Yes	1974-01-01	 © 2003 Steve Matson
Juncus hemiendytus var. *abjectus*	Center Basin rush	Juncaceae	annual herb	May-Jun(Jul)	None	None	G5T5	S4	4.3		1974-01-01	 ©2008 Steve Matson
Juncus luciensis	Santa Lucia dwarf rush	Juncaceae	annual herb	Apr-Jul	None	None	G3	S3	1B.2	Yes	2009-04-30	 © 2009 Keir Morse
Lomatium grayi	Gray's lomatium	Apiaceae	perennial herb	Apr-Jun	None	None	G5	S1S2	2B.3		2001-01-01	 © 2008 Trent M. Draper

Potamogeton robbinsii	Robbins' pondweed	Potamogetonaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb (aquatic)	Jul-Aug	None	None	G5	S3	2B.3	1994-01-01	 ©2014 Dana York
Rhamnus alnifolia	alder buckthorn	Rhamnaceae	perennial deciduous shrub	May-Jul	None	None	G5	S3	2B.2	2008-03-26	No Photo Available
Rorippa subumbellata	Tahoe yellow cress	Brassicaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	May-Sep	None	CE	G1	S1	1B.1	1974-01-01	No Photo Available
Scutellaria galericulata	marsh skullcap	Lamiaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	Jun-Sep	None	None	G5	S2	2B.2	1994-01-01	 © 2021 Scot Loring
Stuckenia filiformis ssp. *alpina*	northern slender pondweed	Potamogetonaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb (aquatic)	May-Jul	None	None	G5T5	S2S3	2B.2	1994-01-01	 Dana York (2016)

Showing 1 to 19 of 19 entries

Go to top

Suggested Citation:

California Native Plant Society, Rare Plant Program. 2025. Rare Plant Inventory (online edition, v9.5.1). Website https://www.rareplants.cnps.org [accessed 23 September 2025].

}

Selected Elements by Scientific Name

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

California Natural Diversity Database

Query Criteria: Quad IS (Truckee (3912032) OR Kings Beach (3912021) OR Martis Peak (3912031))

Species	Element Code	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
Accipiter atricapillus American goshawk	ABNKC12061	None	None	G5	S3	SSC
Ambystoma macrodactylum sigillatum southern long-toed salamander	AAAAA01085	None	None	G5T4	S2	SSC
Aplodontia rufa californica Sierra Nevada mountain beaver	AMAFA01013	None	None	G5T3T4	S2S3	SSC
Arabis rigidissima var. demota Galena Creek rockcress	PDBRA061R1	None	None	G3T3Q	S1	1B.2
Artemisia tripartita ssp. tripartita threetip sagebrush	PDAST0S1S2	None	None	G5T4T5	S2	2B.3
Bombus morrisoni Morrison bumble bee	IIHYM24460	None	None	G3	S1S2	
Bombus occidentalis western bumble bee	IIHYM24252	None	Candidate Endangered	G3	S1	
Botrychium minganense Mingan moonwort	PPOPH010R0	None	None	G5	S4	4.2
Capnia lacustra Lake Tahoe benthic stonefly	IIPLE03200	None	None	G1	S1	
Carex davyi Davy's sedge	PMCYP033H0	None	None	G3	S3	1B.3
Carex lasiocarpa woolly-fruited sedge	PMCYP03720	None	None	G5	S2	2B.3
Catostomus lahontan Lahontan mountain sucker	AFCJC02330	None	None	GNR	S2	SSC
Empidonax traillii willow flycatcher	ABPAE33040	None	Endangered	G5	S3	
Erethizon dorsatum North American porcupine	AMAFJ01010	None	None	G5	S3	
Eriogonum umbellatum var. torreyanum Donner Pass buckwheat	PDPGN086U9	None	None	G5T2	S2	1B.2
Eurybia merita subalpine aster	PDASTEB030	None	None	G5	S3	2B.3
Helisoma newberryi Great Basin rams-horn	IMGASM6020	None	None	G1	S1S2	
Ivesia sericoleuca Plumas ivesia	PDROS0X0K0	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
Juncus luciensis Santa Lucia dwarf rush	PMJUN013J0	None	None	G3	S3	1B.2

Selected Elements by Scientific Name

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

California Natural Diversity Database

Species	Element Code	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
Lepus americanus tahoensis Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare	AMAEB03012	None	None	G5T3T4Q	S2	SSC
Lithobates pipiens northern leopard frog	AAABH01170	None	None	G5	S2	SSC
Lomatium grayi Gray's lomatium	PDAPI1B0Q0	None	None	G5	S1S2	2B.3
Margaritifera falcata western pearlshell	IMBIV27020	None	None	G3G4	S1S2	
Martes caurina sierrae Sierra marten	AMAJF01014	None	None	G4G5T3	S3	
Oncorhynchus henshawi henshawi Lahontan cutthroat trout	AFCHA02081	Threatened	None	GNRT3	S2	SSC
Potamogeton robbinsii Robbins' pondweed	PMPOT030Z0	None	None	G5	S3	2B.3
Prosopium williamsoni mountain whitefish	AFCHA03060	None	None	G5	S3	SSC
Rana sierrae Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog	AAABH01340	Endangered	Threatened	G2	S2	WL
Rhamnus alnifolia alder buckthorn	PDRHA0C010	None	None	G5	S3	2B.2
Rorippa subumbellata Tahoe yellow cress	PDBRA270M0	None	Endangered	G1	S1	1B.1
Scutellaria galericulata marsh skullcap	PDLAM1U0J0	None	None	G5	S2	2B.2
Setophaga petechia yellow warbler	ABPBX03010	None	None	G5	S3	SSC
Siphateles bicolor pectinifer Lahontan Lake tui chub	AFCJB1303P	None	None	G4T3	S1S2	SSC
Stuckenia filiformis ssp. alpina northern slender pondweed	PMPOT03091	None	None	G5T5	S2S3	2B.2
Stygobromus lacicolus Lake Tahoe amphipod	ICMAL05970	None	None	G1	S1	
Stygobromus sheldoni Sheldon's amphipod	ICMAL05A40	None	None	G1	S1	
Stygobromus tahoensis Lake Tahoe stygobromid	ICMAL05A70	None	None	G1	S1	
Vulpes vulpes necator pop. 2 Sierra Nevada red fox - Sierra Nevada DPS	AMAJA03017	Endangered	Threatened	G5TNR	S1	

Record Count: 38

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Sacramento Fish And Wildlife Office
Federal Building
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605
Sacramento, CA 95825-1846
Phone: (916) 414-6600 Fax: (916) 414-6713

In Reply Refer To:
Project Code: 2025-0049161
Project Name: PLA 267 CAPM 03-2J190

09/23/2025 22:05:45 UTC

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 *et seq.*), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.

A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)

(c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in the "Endangered Species Consultation Handbook" at:

https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/endangered-species-consultation-handbook.pdf

Migratory Birds: In addition to responsibilities to protect threatened and endangered species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), there are additional responsibilities under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) to protect native birds from project-related impacts. Any activity resulting in take of migratory birds, including eagles, is prohibited unless otherwise permitted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)). For more information regarding these Acts, see https://www.fws.gov/program/migratory-bird-permit/what-we-do.

It is the responsibility of the project proponent to comply with these Acts by identifying potential impacts to migratory birds and eagles within applicable NEPA documents (when there is a federal nexus) or a Bird/Eagle Conservation Plan (when there is no federal nexus). Proponents should implement conservation measures to avoid or minimize the production of project-related stressors or minimize the exposure of birds and their resources to the project-related stressors. For more information on avian stressors and recommended conservation measures, see https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/threats-birds.

In addition to MBTA and BGEPA, Executive Order 13186: *Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds*, obligates all Federal agencies that engage in or authorize activities that might affect migratory birds, to minimize those effects and encourage conservation measures that will improve bird populations. Executive Order 13186 provides for the protection of both migratory birds and migratory bird habitat. For information regarding the implementation of Executive Order 13186, please visit https://www.fws.gov/partner/council-conservation-migratory-birds.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Code in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Note: IPaC has provided all available attachments because this project is in multiple field office jurisdictions.

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List
- USFWS National Wildlife Refuges and Fish Hatcheries
- Bald & Golden Eagles
- Migratory Birds
- Wetlands

OFFICIAL SPECIES LIST

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

Sacramento Fish And Wildlife Office
Federal Building
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605
Sacramento, CA 95825-1846
(916) 414-6600

This project's location is within the jurisdiction of multiple offices. However, only one species list document will be provided for all offices. The species and critical habitats in this document reflect the aggregation of those that fall in each of the affiliated office's jurisdiction. Other offices affiliated with the project:

Reno Fish And Wildlife Office
1340 Financial Boulevard, Suite 234
Reno, NV 89502-7147
(775) 861-6300

PROJECT SUMMARY

Project Code: 2025-0049161
Project Name: PLA 267 CAPM 03-2J190
Project Type: Road/Hwy - Maintenance/Modification
Project Description: This project proposes to grind and replace existing pavement with overlay 0.20 feet Hot Mix Asphalt Type A (HMA-A) on all lanes from edge of pavement (EP) to EP; rehabilitate/replace poor condition drainage systems; replace nonstandard/poor condition roadside signs; replace nonstandard guardrails with end terminals as well as crash cushions that do not meet current Manual for Assessing Safety Hardware (MASH) standards; extend existing SR 267 southbound (SB) truck climbing lane from Martis Peak Road (PM 6.23) to Brockway Summit for approximately 3000 feet including roadway widening for the added lane and construction of approximately 2,650 feet long retaining wall along the easterly cut slope; rehabilitate existing cut slope for SR 267 northbound (NB) on the east side from PM 5.1 to PM 5.2 for approximately 540 feet by excavating and placing rock slope protection.

Project Location:

The approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: https://www.google.com/maps/@39.2785212,-120.10364338700377,14z



Counties: Placer County, California

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT SPECIES

There is a total of 9 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species. Note that 1 of these species should be considered only under certain conditions.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries[1], as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

---

1. NOAA Fisheries, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

MAMMALS

NAME	STATUS
Gray Wolf *Canis lupus* Population: U.S.A.: All of AL, AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, IA, IN, IL, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MO, MS, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NV, NY, OH, OK, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, VA, VT, WI, and WV; and portions of AZ, NM, OR, UT, and WA. Mexico. There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4488	Endangered
North American Wolverine *Gulo gulo luscus* No critical habitat has been designated for this species. This species only needs to be considered under the following conditions: ▪ Species may be present based on transient occurrence as it moves through or too suitable habitat. Effects should be considered to species and projects should consult with the Service, however, depending on the project, consultation may not be necessary. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5123	Threatened
Sierra Nevada Red Fox *Vulpes vulpes necator* Population: No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4252	Endangered

BIRDS

NAME	STATUS
California Spotted Owl *Strix occidentalis occidentalis* Population: Sierra Nevada No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7266	Proposed Threatened

REPTILES

NAME	STATUS
Northwestern Pond Turtle *Actinemys marmorata* No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1111	Proposed Threatened

AMPHIBIANS

NAME	STATUS
Sierra Nevada Yellow-legged Frog *Rana sierrae* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9529	Endangered

FISHES

NAME	STATUS
Lahontan Cutthroat Trout *Oncorhynchus clarkii henshawi*	Threatened

NAME	STATUS
No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3964	

INSECTS

NAME	STATUS
Monarch Butterfly *Danaus plexippus* There is **proposed** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743	Proposed Threatened

CONIFERS AND CYCADS

NAME	STATUS
Whitebark Pine *Pinus albicaulis* No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1748	Threatened

CRITICAL HABITATS

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA UNDER THIS OFFICE'S JURISDICTION.

YOU ARE STILL REQUIRED TO DETERMINE IF YOUR PROJECT(S) MAY HAVE EFFECTS ON ALL ABOVE LISTED SPECIES.

USFWS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE LANDS AND FISH HATCHERIES

Any activity proposed on lands managed by the National Wildlife Refuge system must undergo a 'Compatibility Determination' conducted by the Refuge. Please contact the individual Refuges to discuss any questions or concerns.

THERE ARE NO REFUGE LANDS OR FISH HATCHERIES WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA.

BALD & GOLDEN EAGLES

Bald and Golden Eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act [2] and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) [1]. Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to Bald or Golden Eagles, or their habitats, should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate avoidance and minimization measures, as described in the various links on this page.

1. The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940.
2. The Migratory Birds Treaty Act of 1918.

3. 50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)

There are Bald Eagles and/or Golden Eagles in your project area.

Measures for Proactively Minimizing Eagle Impacts
For information on how to best avoid and minimize disturbance to nesting bald eagles, please review the National Bald Eagle Management Guidelines. You may employ the timing and activity-specific distance recommendations in this document when designing your project/ activity to avoid and minimize eagle impacts. For bald eagle information specific to Alaska, please refer to Bald Eagle Nesting and Sensitivity to Human Activity.

The FWS does not currently have guidelines for avoiding and minimizing disturbance to nesting Golden Eagles. For site-specific recommendations regarding nesting Golden Eagles, please consult with the appropriate Regional Migratory Bird Office or Ecological Services Field Office.

If disturbance or take of eagles cannot be avoided, an incidental take permit may be available to authorize any take that results from, but is not the purpose of, an otherwise lawful activity. For assistance making this determination for Bald Eagles, visit the Do I Need A Permit Tool. For assistance making this determination for golden eagles, please consult with the appropriate Regional Migratory Bird Office or Ecological Services Field Office.

Ensure Your Eagle List is Accurate and Complete
If your project area is in a poorly surveyed area in IPaC, your list may not be complete and you may need to rely on other resources to determine what species may be present (e.g. your local FWS field office, state surveys, your own surveys). Please review the Supplemental Information on Migratory Birds and Eagles, to help you properly interpret the report for your specified location, including determining if there is sufficient data to ensure your list is accurate.

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to bald or golden eagles on your list, see the "Probability of Presence Summary" below to see when these bald or golden eagles are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
Bald Eagle *Haliaeetus leucocephalus* This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1626	Breeds Jan 1 to Aug 31
Golden Eagle *Aquila chrysaetos* This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1680	Breeds Dec 1 to Aug 31

PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read "Supplemental Information on Migratory Birds and Eagles", specifically the FAQ section titled "Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report" before using or attempting to interpret this report.


Probability of Presence (▪)

Green bars; the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during that week of the year.

Breeding Season (▪)
Yellow bars; liberal estimate of the timeframe inside which the bird breeds across its entire range.

Survey Effort (|)
Vertical black lines; the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps.

No Data (–)
A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.



Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Eagle Management https://www.fws.gov/program/eagle-management
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/avoiding-and-minimizing-incidental-take-migratory-birds
- Nationwide avoidance and minimization measures for birds https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/nationwide-standard-conservation-measures.pdf
- Supplemental Information for Migratory Birds and Eagles in IPaC https://www.fws.gov/media/supplemental-information-migratory-birds-and-bald-and-golden-eagles-may-occur-project-action

MIGRATORY BIRDS

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) [1] prohibits the take (including killing, capturing, selling, trading, and transport) of protected migratory bird species without prior authorization by the Department of Interior U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service).

1. The Migratory Birds Treaty Act of 1918.
2. The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940.
3. 50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds on your list, see the "Probability of Presence Summary" below to see when these birds are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
American Dipper *Cinclus mexicanus* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/11928	Breeds Mar 21 to Aug 21
Bald Eagle *Haliaeetus leucocephalus* This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1626	Breeds Jan 1 to Aug 31
Black-throated Gray Warbler *Setophaga nigrescens* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9584	Breeds May 1 to Jul 20
California Gull *Larus californicus* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10955	Breeds Mar 1 to Jul 31
California Spotted Owl *Strix occidentalis occidentalis* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7266	Breeds Mar 10 to Jun 15
Calliope Hummingbird *Selasphorus calliope* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9526	Breeds May 1 to Aug 15

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
Cassin's Finch *Haemorhous cassinii* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9462	Breeds May 15 to Jul 15
Clark's Grebe *Aechmophorus clarkii* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10575	Breeds Jun 1 to Aug 31
Evening Grosbeak *Coccothraustes vespertinus* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9465	Breeds May 15 to Aug 10
Golden Eagle *Aquila chrysaetos* This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1680	Breeds Dec 1 to Aug 31
Hermit Warbler *Setophaga occidentalis* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/11957	Breeds May 5 to Jul 15
Lawrence's Goldfinch *Spinus lawrencei* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9464	Breeds Mar 20 to Sep 20
Lewis's Woodpecker *Melanerpes lewis* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9408	Breeds Apr 20 to Sep 30
Oak Titmouse *Baeolophus inornatus* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9656	Breeds Mar 15 to Jul 15
Olive-sided Flycatcher *Contopus cooperi* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3914	Breeds May 20 to Aug 31
Western Grebe *aechmophorus occidentalis* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6743	Breeds Jun 1 to Aug 31

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
Willet *Tringa semipalmata* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10669	Breeds Apr 20 to Aug 5

PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read "Supplemental Information on Migratory Birds and Eagles", specifically the FAQ section titled "Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report" before using or attempting to interpret this report.


Probability of Presence (▪)


Green bars; the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during that week of the year.

Breeding Season (▪)
Yellow bars; liberal estimate of the timeframe inside which the bird breeds across its entire range.

Survey Effort (|)
Vertical black lines; the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps.

No Data (–)
A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.




California Gull
BCC Rangewide
(CON)
California Spotted
Owl
BCC Rangewide
(CON)
Calliope
Hummingbird
BCC Rangewide
(CON)
Cassin's Finch
BCC Rangewide
(CON)
Clark's Grebe
BCC Rangewide
(CON)
Evening Grosbeak
BCC Rangewide
(CON)
Golden Eagle
Non-BCC
Vulnerable
Hermit Warbler
BCC - BCR
Lawrence's
Goldfinch
BCC Rangewide
(CON)
SPECIES
JAN
FEB
MAR
APR
MAY
JUN
JUL
AUG
SEP
OCT
NOV
DEC
Lewis's
Woodpecker
BCC Rangewide
(CON)
Oak Titmouse
BCC Rangewide
(CON)
Olive-sided
Flycatcher
BCC Rangewide
(CON)
Western Grebe
BCC Rangewide
(CON)
Willet
BCC Rangewide
(CON)

Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Eagle Management https://www.fws.gov/program/eagle-management
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/avoiding-and-minimizing-incidental-take-migratory-birds
- Nationwide avoidance and minimization measures for birds
- Supplemental Information for Migratory Birds and Eagles in IPaC https://www.fws.gov/media/supplemental-information-migratory-birds-and-bald-and-golden-eagles-may-occur-project-action

WETLANDS

Impacts to NWI wetlands and other aquatic habitats may be subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, or other State/Federal statutes.

For more information please contact the Regulatory Program of the local U.S. Army Corps of Engineers District.

Please note that the NWI data being shown may be out of date. We are currently working to update our NWI data set. We recommend you verify these results with a site visit to determine the actual extent of wetlands on site.

FRESHWATER FORESTED/SHRUB WETLAND

- PSSA
- PSSC
- PFOA

RIVERINE

- R2UBH
- R4SBC

IPAC USER CONTACT INFORMATION

Agency: California Department of Transportation District 3
Name: Jonathan Edwards
Address: 703 B street
City: Marysville
State: CA
Zip: 95901
Email jonathan.edwards@dot.ca.gov
Phone: 5307203945