

# Mono Chain Up Areas

Mono County, CALIFORNIA  
DISTRICT 9 – MNO – 6 and 395 (PM Various)  
09-36660/0916000008

## Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration



**Prepared by the  
State of California, Department of Transportation**

The environmental review, consultation, and any other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by Caltrans pursuant to 23 USC 327 and the Memorandum of Understanding dated December 23, 2016 and executed by FHWA and Caltrans.



**October 2019**

## **General Information about This Document**

The California Department of Transportation (Department), as assigned by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), has prepared this Initial Study with Mitigated Negative Declaration for the proposed project located in Mono County, California. The Department is the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The Department is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The document tells you why the project is being proposed, what alternatives have been considered for the project, how the existing environment could be affected by the project, the potential impacts of each of the alternatives, and the proposed avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures. The Initial Study circulated to the public for 30 days between August 20, 2019 and September 18, 2019. Comments received during this period are included in Appendix J. Elsewhere throughout this document, a vertical line in the margin indicates a change made since the draft document circulation. Minor editorial changes and clarifications have not been so indicated. Additional copies of this document and the related technical studies are available for review at the Caltrans District 9 Office located at 500 S. Main Street, Bishop, CA 93514.

### **Alternative 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 Department of Transportation, Attn: Florene Trainor, Public Information Officer, 500 South Main Street, Bishop CA 93513; (760) 872-0601 (Voice) or use the California Relay Service 1 (800) 735-2929 (TTY), 1 (800) 735-2929 (Voice) or 711.

Project to widen and lengthen existing vehicle chain-up areas, install lighting, add flashing beacons, add/replace signage, and create two new chain-up areas.


In Mono County on U.S. 395 at various locations from 2 miles north of Mono county line to State Route 270 (Bodie Road), and on U.S. 06 at 2.4 miles north of Chalfant Road

### **INITIAL STUDY with Mitigated Negative Declaration**

Submitted Pursuant to: (State) Division 13, California Public Resources Code

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Department of Transportation

10/25/19  
Date

  
Ryan A. Dermody  
Deputy District Director  
Planning and Environmental Analysis  
California Department of Transportation  
CEQA Lead Agency

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

Bradley Bowers  
Associate Environmental Coordinator  
500 South Main Street  
Bishop, CA 93514  
(760) 872-2331  
Bradley.bowers@dot.ca.gov

## MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Pursuant to: Division 13, Public Resources Code

### ***Project Description***

The California Department of Transportation (the Department) will make improvements to existing chain control turnouts (chain-up areas) by widening and/or lengthening the pavement areas, installing lighting, replacing the existing signages and adding flashing beacons to the new signs. Two new chain-up areas will be built within Caltrans' current right-of-way.

### ***Determination***

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

The Department has prepared an Initial Study for this project, and following public review, has determined from this study that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

The proposed project would have no effect on Agriculture and Forest Resources, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Noise, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, Tribal Cultural Resources, Utilities or Wildfires.

With the following mitigation measure incorporated, the proposed project would have less than significant effects to Aesthetic/Visual resources, Biological resources, and Cumulative Impacts

VIS – 1 All new solar and conventionally-powered lights at chain up areas will only be activated (illuminated) during events when the chain up area could be in use, and deactivated after the event ends.



Ryan A. Dermody  
Deputy District Director Planning and Environmental  
District 9  
California Department of Transportation

10/25/19  
Date



## NEPA Assignment

California participated in the “Surface Transportation Project Delivery Pilot Program” (Pilot Program) pursuant to 23 USC 327, for more than five years, beginning July 1, 2007, and ending September 30, 2012. MAP-21 (P.L. 112-141), signed by President Obama on July 6, 2012, amended 23 USC 327 to establish a permanent Surface Transportation Project Delivery Program. As a result, the Department entered into a Memorandum of Understanding pursuant to 23 USC 327 (NEPA Assignment MOU) with FHWA. The NEPA Assignment MOU became effective October 1, 2012, and was renewed on December 23, 2016 for a term of five years. In summary, the Department continues to assume FHWA responsibilities under NEPA and other federal environmental laws in the same manner as was assigned under the Pilot Program, with minor changes. With NEPA Assignment, FHWA assigned and the Department assumed all of the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) Secretary's responsibilities under NEPA. This assignment includes projects on the State Highway System and Local Assistance Projects off of the State Highway System within the State of California, except for certain categorical exclusions that FHWA assigned to the Department under the 23 USC 326 CE Assignment MOU, projects excluded by definition, and specific project exclusions.

# Table of Contents

## Contents

<b>General Information about This Document</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Chapter 1 – Proposed Project</b>	<b>7</b>
Introduction	7
Purpose and Need	9
Project Description	9
Alternatives	13
Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion Prior to the “draft” initial study	15
Permits and Approvals Needed	18
<b>Chapter 2 – Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Visual/Aesthetics</b>	<b>21</b>
Biological Environment	23
<b>Animal Species</b>	<b>23</b>
Cumulative Impacts	27
<b>Chapter 3 – California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Evaluation</b>	<b>31</b>
Determining Significance under CEQA	31
CEQA Environmental Checklist	32
<b>Climate Change</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Chapter 4 – Comments and Coordination</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Chapter 5 – List of Preparers</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Appendix B. Title VI Policy Statement</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Appendix C. Project Location Images</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Appendix D. Type 15 and Type 21 Light Standards</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>Appendix E. Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Summary</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>Appendix F. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Hazard Map</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Appendix G. Required Consultation/Concurrence Documentation (Reserved for final document)</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Appendix H. Species Lists</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Appendix I. NEPA Categorical Exclusion Checklist and Categorical Exclusion</b>	<b>128</b>

## **Chapter 1 – Proposed Project**

### **Introduction**

The California Department of Transportation (Department) is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Department is the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This Initial Study with Mitigated Negative Declaration was produced to satisfy CEQA requirements. NEPA requirements will be met separately under a Categorical Exclusion (CFR 771.117(c)(27) (Appendix J).

The Department of Transportation (Department) will make improvements to existing chain control turnouts at ten locations on U.S. 395 in between postmile 2.2 and 69.8, and create two new chain control turnouts, one on U.S. 6 postmile 7.0 and the other on U.S. 395 at postmile 25.4. Improvements include widening and/or lengthening the pavement areas, installing solar lighting at one location and conventional lighting at three locations, replacing existing signage and adding flashing beacons to the new signage. New turnouts will be cleared of vegetation, graded, paved, paint-striped, and signs will be installed (see Table 1 for summary of existing conditions and proposed work at each location, and Figure 2 for a project location map).

This project is funded in the 2018 State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) Roadside Safety Improvements Program (20.10.201.235).




Figure 1 - Project locations

## Purpose and Need

The project “purpose” is a set of objectives the project intends to meet. The project “need” is the transportation deficiency that the project was initiated to address.

1. The purpose of this project is to improve the safety and operational efficiency of snow chain installation and removal areas in Mono County.
2. During winter months Mono County is a popular driving destination for winter activities as large crowds travel from Southern California to Mammoth and June Lakes. Snowstorms are a common occurrence and the traveling public often need to use turnouts to install traction control devices (i.e. snow chains, cables etc.) to increase tire traction. The project need was identified by the District 9 Deputy District Director for Maintenance and Operations, the Traffic Operations Branch Chief, and the Maintenance Mountain Area Superintendent, who together reviewed many of the existing chain installation and removal areas in Mono County, discussed their current deficiencies, and proposed improvements which could be made to improve operations and safety for both users of the turnouts and through-traffic. Due to high traffic volumes on winter weekends and holidays, it was determined that more space in chain up areas to accommodate extra vehicles was needed and overhead lights could alert passing motorists that the chain up area is in use.

## Project Description

This section describes the action and the project alternatives considered to meet the purpose and need of the project, while avoiding or minimizing environmental impacts. The alternatives are “Build” (construct the project as proposed) and “No-Build” (take no action).

The project is located at various locations in Mono County on U.S. 395 and U.S. 6. The purpose of this project is to make improvements to ten existing chain control turnouts on U.S. 395 and to build two new turnouts, one on U.S. 6 and one on U.S. 395. Due to increased traffic during winter weekends and holidays, existing chain control turnouts can become crowded during peak times. In 2016 District 9 executive staff reviewed the current chain up area conditions and proposed improvements to enhance safety and usability. A summary of the specific improvements proposed at each location are included in Table 1.

Table 1 - Proposed work at each location

<b><u>Location ID #</u></b>	<b><u>Route</u></b>	<b><u>Postmile</u></b>	<b><u>Description</u></b>
MNO6	6	7.0	Construct new eastbound paved turnout approximately 500 feet long and 22 feet wide; extend existing culvert and install new sign with attached flashing beacon
D00	395	2.2	Replace existing chain control sign with new sign with attached flashing beacon at northbound turnout
D02	395	3.2	Replace existing sign with new sign with attached flashing beacon at northbound turnout
D04	395	6.6	Lengthen northbound paved turnout by 500 feet to the north and 500 feet to the south; extend culverts 5 feet; replace sign with new sign with attached flashing beacon
D08	395	10.6	Install 6 solar lights; replace existing sign with new sign with attached flashing beacon at northbound turnout
D12	395	19.7	Replace existing sign with new sign with attached flashing beacon at northbound turnout
D16	395	24.4	Install new sign with attached flashing beacon at northbound turnout
D19	395	25.4	Construct new southbound chain turnout approx. 1000 feet long and 12 feet wide; supply underground conventional power from existing lights at 395/203 junction to connect 6 new lights; replace existing sign with new sign with attached flashing beacon
D22	395	26.9	Lengthen existing northbound paved turnout 250 feet to the north and 250 feet to the south. Install 5 new lights using underground power from existing conventional lights; replace existing sign with new sign with attached flashing beacon
D39	395	40.24	Replace existing sign with new sign with attached flashing beacon at southbound turnout
D63	395	65.0	Replace existing sign with new sign with attached flashing beacon at southbound turnout
D67	395	69.8	Lengthen southbound paved turnout 500 feet to the south; install 6 new lights using power from existing overhead electric lines. Install stormwater control device; replace existing sign with new sign with attached flashing beacon



The existing features of each location are outlined below. A summary map of proposed work at each location is included as Figure 3. Individual project location maps are available in Appendix C.

MNO6 –At this location U.S. 6 is a 2-lane highway with 12-foot lanes and 4-foot shoulders. There is an existing 36-inch diameter culvert underneath the highway. No chain control turnout or lighting currently occurs at this location.

D00 – At this location U.S. 395 is a 4-lane divided highway with 2 lanes in each direction. Existing lanes are 12 feet wide, and shoulders before and after the existing chain up area are 10 feet wide. The existing northbound pullout is 1,520 feet long and 22 feet wide. No lights currently occur at this location.

D02 - At this location U.S. 395 is a 4-lane divided highway with 2 lanes in each direction. Existing lanes are 12 feet wide, and shoulders before and after the existing chain up area are 10 feet wide. The existing northbound chain up area is 2,500 feet long and 23 feet wide. No lights currently occur at this location.

D04 – At this location U.S. 395 is a 4-lane divided highway with 2 lanes in each direction. The lanes are 12 feet wide and shoulders before and after the existing chain up area are 10 feet wide. The existing northbound chain up area is 500 feet long and 30 feet wide. There are two existing culverts (18-inch steel pipes) that run perpendicular to the highway. No lights currently occur at this location.

D08 – At this location U.S. 395 is a 4-lane divided highway with 2 lanes in each direction. The existing lanes are 12 feet wide and shoulders before and after the existing chain up area are 10 feet wide. The existing northbound chain up area is 675 feet long and 20 feet wide. No lights currently occur at this location.

D12 - At this location State Route 395 is a 4-lane divided highway with 2 lanes in each direction. The existing lanes are 12 feet wide and shoulders before and after the existing chain up area are 10 feet wide. The existing chain up area is 665 feet long and 30 feet wide. No lights currently occur at this location.

D16 – At this location U.S. 395 is a 4-lane divided highway with 2 lanes in each direction. The existing lanes are 12 feet wide and shoulder widths before and after the existing chain up area are 10 feet on the right and 5 feet on the left. The existing northbound chain up area is 1010 feet long and 25 feet wide. No lights currently occur at this location.

D19 – At this location U.S. 395 is a 4-lane divided highway with 2 lanes in each direction. The existing lanes are 12 feet wide and shoulders are 10 feet wide on the left and 5 feet wide on the right. There is currently one conventionally-powered light at this location. The State Route 203 southbound onramp onto State Route 395 is directly north of this location.

D22 – At this location U.S. 395 is a 4-lane divided highway with 2 lanes in each direction. The existing lanes are 12 feet wide and shoulder widths before and after the existing northbound chain up area are 10 feet on the right and 5 feet on the left. The existing chain up area is 620 feet long and 27 feet wide. There is a cross-over median

with a left turn auxiliary lane directly north of this location. There are currently 2 conventionally-powered lights in the chain up area.

D39 – This location is south of the intersection of State Routes 395 and 158 (June Lake Loop). The existing chain up area is 510 feet long and 23 feet wide and currently has 2 conventionally-powered lights.

D63 – At this location U.S. 395 is a 4-lane undivided highway with 2 lanes in each direction. The existing lanes are 12 feet wide and highway shoulders are 8 feet wide. The existing southbound chain up area is 620 feet long and 27 feet wide.

D67 – At this location U.S. 395 is a 3-lane undivided highway with 1 lane in the northbound direction and 2 southbound lanes. The existing lanes are 12 feet wide and highway shoulders are 8 feet wide. The existing southbound chain control area is 650 feet long and 14 feet wide. The intersection of U.S. 395 and State Route 270 (Bodie Road) is directly north of this location. No lighting currently occurs at this project location.




Figure 2 - Summary of proposed work on Mono Chain Up Areas project

## Alternatives

The proposed project had one “build” alternative and one “no-build” alternative. Unless otherwise indicated, all descriptions of proposed work refer to the “build” alternative.

### 1. Proposed Build Alternative

There is one viable build alternative for this project. It proposes to install new chain control signs with attached flashing beacons and current standard sign reflectivity at all twelve locations while removing any existing chain control signage (potential example of sign package example shown in Figure 3, below). Locations MNO6 and D19 will have new chain control areas constructed, locations D04 and D22 will have their existing chain control areas lengthened to both the north and the south, and location D67 will have its existing chain control area lengthened to the south only. These new areas will have a structural section consisting of 1.0' aggregate base and 0.5' hot mix asphalt. Side slopes will be constructed at a 4:1 (horizontal:vertical) or flatter slope, where feasible. The current construction cost estimate escalated to the construction year 2021 is \$3,780,000. Caltrans' existing right-of-way varies in the project locations from 50' to 300' from the highway centerline. Most locations are on existing highway easements from the United States Forest Service (USFS), Bureau of Land Management (BLM) or Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP). No new right-of-way is expected to be acquired to construct this alternative. Construction staging is expected to occur within Caltrans' existing highway right-of-way, however if it is determined that off-highway staging will be needed, the appropriate land use permissions will be acquired from the underlying land owners prior to construction.



*Figure 3 - Example of an existing chain control sign with attached flashing beacon. Due to updating sign standards, new signage proposed in this project will likely be similar but may not exactly match this image.*

Locations MNO6, D04 and D67 have existing culverts that will be extended under this alternative to accommodate new or widened chain up areas. Location MNO6 has one culvert at the north end of the proposed new chain control area that will be lengthened about

five feet on its inlet side, have a new flared end section installed, and will be graded accordingly. Location D04 has two culverts that will be extended, one to the south of the existing chain control area and one to the north of the existing chain control area. Both culverts will be lengthened about five feet on the inlet side, have new flared end sections installed and will be graded accordingly. Location D67 will include a runoff control device to capture and treat stormwater run-off prior to entering Virginia Creek. No regulatory permits are required for these features. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) representatives attended a field review with Caltrans in May 2019 and agreed that the culvert extensions and paving may be done under the existing 1600 Routine Maintenance Agreement (RMA) between Caltrans and CDFW (see Chapter 4). This alternative, therefore, does not require a project-specific streambed alteration permit for culvert work.

There are four project locations that propose installing new overhead lights. Location D08 will install new solar lighting where there are no lights currently, Location D19 and Location D22 will install conventionally-powered lights in addition to lighting that is already in place, and D67 will install new conventionally-powered lighting where currently there are no lights. Location D08 is a test location to determine the feasibility of solar-powered overhead lighting for chain control areas in Mono County. Six lights spaced approximately 200 feet apart are proposed at D08. If deemed successful, this lighting type may be used on future projects (see Chapter 2 - Cumulative Impacts). Location D19 has one existing light pole in place which will be perpetuated with the new proposed lighting. Six new Type 21 lights are proposed at this location that will be approximately thirty-five feet tall and spaced approximately 200 feet apart. New lights at this location will be connected to existing underground power sources. Location D22 has two existing lights which will be perpetuated with the new proposed lighting. Five new lights are proposed at this location, two of which will be located north of the existing chain-up area and the other three located south of the chain-up area. The two lights to the north will be spaced approximately 150 feet apart, and the three new lights to the south will be spaced approximately 160 feet apart. New lights at this location will be connected to existing underground power sources. Location D67 has no existing lighting. The Build alternative proposes to install six Type 15 light poles which will be approximately thirty feet tall and spaced approximately 200 feet apart. Power for these lights will be supplied from an existing Southern California Edison (SCE) overhead power pole located on the east side of the highway. All appropriate utility agreements and permissions will be secured prior to construction. See Appendix D for standard Type 15 and Type 21 dimensions.

All new solar and conventional power lighting, per District policy, will only be turned on during storm events or other emergencies when the chain up areas are likely to be needed by motorists. Caltrans maintenance or traffic management personnel will then turn the lights off after the storm or emergency event passes (Commitment VIS-1, Appendix E). The two locations that have existing lighting (D19 and D22) currently have their lights illuminated every night; not only during chain control events. These lights will be left in their current configuration, however all new lights proposed under this project will be temporarily illuminated in accordance to commitment VIS-1. Flashing beacons attached to chain control signs at all project locations will be activated on an as-needed basis. Typically, chain control signs are turned to face oncoming traffic when chain control requirements are implemented and then turned away from the highway when chains are not required. Beacons will be activated when Caltrans or highway patrol personnel turn the signs to indicate chain controls are active.

The Build Alternative is Caltrans' preferred alternative and was identified as such prior to the public circulation of the Initial Study on August 20, 2019. The Build Alternative was identified as Caltrans' preferred alternative in the Initial Study.

## 2. No-Build (No-Action) Alternative

The No-Build Alternative would leave all proposed project locations in the same existing conditions outlined on pages 10-11. The project need was determined by Caltrans District 9 executive safety and maintenance staff, and the No-Build alternative would not address any of the identified safety and operational improvements.

## **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER DISCUSSION PRIOR TO THE "DRAFT" INITIAL STUDY**

1. From its inception, this project has had only two proposed alternatives: Build and No-Build. Throughout the early project process several stages of refinement have occurred which led to adjustments to the features of the proposed Build Alternative. These adjustments and rationale are outlined below. The original project proposal included sixteen project locations and installing new solar or conventional lighting at all locations. On April 5, 2019 a project development team (PDT) meeting was held in which it was decided to reduce the number of locations and solidify the scope of work at each location.
2. The following locations are no longer included in this project:
  - a. D20 – (U.S. 395 northbound, postmile 26.1) Originally proposed to remove existing chain control signs at a chain control turnout which is no longer in use. The PDT decided to have Caltrans maintenance staff remove the signs while performing routine road maintenance.
  - b. D35 – (U.S. 395 southbound, postmile 38.2) This location was not originally proposed under the Mono Chain Up Areas project but was added in October 2018 per the request of Caltrans Maintenance staff. At that time, it was proposed to construct a new chain control turnout approximately 500 feet long, 12 feet wide, and install solar lights and new signs. Upon further analysis, constructing the turnout was determined to require tree removal and possibly additional right-of-way. To avoid right-of-way costs and environmental impacts this location was dropped by the PDT in April 2019. Project features originally proposed at this location will be analyzed under the future Deadman CAPM project.
  - c. D60 – (U.S. 395 northbound, postmile 59.49) Originally proposed to lengthen the existing turn out to the south by 500 feet and install lighting and signs with an attached flashing beacon. The PDT decided to remove this location from the Mono Chain Up Areas project as it was erroneously included both on this project as well as on another future project. Work at this chain up area will now be analyzed under the Conway Ranch Shoulders project.
  - d. D62 – (U.S. 395 northbound, postmile 61.2) Originally proposed to move the existing chain up location to the north to avoid a dirt road connection and install solar lighting. The PDT decided to remove this location entirely as it is a mid-level chain up area on northbound Conway Summit. This location was deemed unnecessary because the

existing chain up areas at both the foot and crest of Conway Summit are used more frequently by motorists.

The twelve remaining proposed project locations have had the following adjustments since originally proposed. A Project Initiation Document (PID) was completed in June 2016 which outlined all original project locations and conceptual scope of work at each location. A project kickoff meeting was held October 1, 2018 to discuss initial project alterations, and an Environmental Study Request was completed in October 2018 which reflected the updated project locations and scope of work at each location. On April 5, 2019, a Project Development Team (PDT) meeting was held to further discuss altering project locations and work at each location to avoid environmental and budget impacts. Unless otherwise noted, all PDT decisions refer to the April 5, 2019 meeting. Some project features, specifically the addition of solar lights at most locations, were originally proposed under the Mono Chain Up Areas project but have since been removed and placed as features under consideration on future projects. Any potential environmental impacts of these features are no longer part of the Mono Chain Up Areas project but instead will be analyzed under their new projects. The potential cumulative impacts from the addition of lighting at all locations (current and future projects) is discussed in Chapter 2 and summarized in Figure 5.

- e. D00 – (U.S. 395 northbound, postmile 2.2) Originally proposed to install solar lighting throughout the chain up area. The PDT decided to only replace the existing chain control signs on this project and install solar lighting during the Northbound Sherwin Pavement project.
- f. D02 – (U.S. 395 northbound, postmile 3.2) Originally proposed to install solar lighting throughout the chain up area. The PDT decided to only replace the existing chain control signs on this project and install solar lighting during the Northbound Sherwin Pavement project.
- g. D04 – (U.S. 395 northbound, postmile 6.6) Originally proposed to construct a median cross-over access road, lengthen the existing chain control area, and install solar lights. Existing culverts would need to be lengthened and new culverts installed to accommodate a larger chain control area and median cross-over road. The PDT decided to extend the existing chain control area 500 feet to the north and 500 feet to the south, not construct a median cross-over road to avoid culvert work and associated potential environmental impacts, and not install solar lights. Project features removed from this project are anticipated to be included on the Northbound Sherwin Pavement Project.
- h. D08 – (U.S. 395 northbound, postmile 10.6) Originally proposed to widen the existing chain up area 500 feet to the east and install solar lighting. Due to potential water and wetland resources which could be impacted by the widening, it was then proposed to analyze extending the chain up area 500 feet north, instead of widening to the east, however it was determined this may require installing retaining walls to avoid impacts to water resources and tree removal. The PDT determined in April 2019 that the current project will only install solar lights and replace the chain control signs. Potential lengthening, widening, and/or retaining walls at this location will be considered under the Rock Creek Pavement project.



- i. D12 – (U.S. 395 northbound, postmile 19.7) Originally proposed to lengthen the existing chain control area 500 feet to the north and install solar lighting and new signs. Caltrans Maintenance staff requested a southern extension also be investigated so motorists would have a chain up area total of 1500 feet as this location is often where road closures occur due to windy conditions and low visibility. The PDT determined that due to potential underground utilities which would need to be relocated, the current project would only install new signs. Any potential extensions and lighting will be considered under the Long Valley Pavement project.
- j. D16 – (U.S. 395 northbound, postmile 24.4) Originally proposed to lengthen the chain control turnout 200 feet north and 200 feet south, widen the entire turnout 8 feet to the east, and install lighting which will connect to existing lights at the intersection of 395 and Sherwin Creek Road. It was determined that the trenching needed to run underground power to the lights could impact sensitive archaeological resources and additional right-of-way would need to be acquired, so the PDT determined the current project would only install new signs. Any potential lengthening, widening, or installation of lights would be considered under the Long Valley Pavement project.
- k. D19 – (U.S. 395 southbound, postmile 25.4) Was not originally included in the project proposal but was added to the current project per a request by Caltrans Maintenance staff soon after the project was proposed. This location is not currently a chain control area, however southbound motorists entering U.S. 395 from Highway 203 (Mammoth Lakes) will often stop on the highway shoulder to remove vehicle chains. The PDT decided to add this location to the current project in which a new 1000-foot long chain up area will be constructed. Lights will be installed and powered by installing new underground utility lines which connect to the existing onramp lights.
- l. D22 – (U.S. 395 northbound, postmile 26.9) Original proposal included lengthening existing chain control turnout 250 feet to the north and 250 feet to the south, install conventionally-powered lights to augment the existing two lights at this location, and replace the chain control signs. All of these features are included on the Mono Chain Ups project and have not been altered.
- m. D39 – (U.S. 395 southbound, postmile 40.2) Original proposal included creating a new chain control area on the west (southbound) side of U.S. 395 just north of June Lake Junction (Highway 158). The proposed area was intended to serve as both a chain up area and a location where large freight trucks could stop during inclement weather. It was determined by Caltrans Maintenance staff in October 2018 that this location is often exposed to high winds and could potentially lead to trucks being blown over. The PDT decided to instead expand the existing chain up area on the south side of the Highway 158/U.S. 395 junction where trees provide a barrier to high winds. The expansion was proposed as 500 feet of lengthening towards the south and the addition of conventionally-powered lights which would tie into existing intersection lighting. In April 2019 it was determined that new right-of-way may be needed to lengthen the chain up area and access underground conventional power. The PDT then decided to only include new signs with an attached flashing beacon on this project. Lengthening the chain control area and adding lights will be analyzed under the Deadman CAPM project.

- n. D63 – (U.S. 395 southbound, postmile 65.0) Originally proposed to install solar lighting and a flashing beacon. The PDT decided to include new chain control signs and remove solar lighting from the project. The installation of solar lighting will be considered under the Bodie Flat Pavement project.
- o. D67 – (U.S. 395 southbound, postmile 69.85) Originally proposed to lengthen the existing turnout to the south by 500 feet, widen if feasible, and install conventionally-powered lighting or solar lights. In October 2018 the PDT decided to also include new chain control signs with an attached flashing beacon to reflect updated sign standards. This location is near Virginia Creek, and it was determined through biological and water resource studies that widening the chain up area could require additional permitting and potential environmental impacts. In April 2019 the PDT decided to lengthen the turnout 500 feet to the south, not widen the chain up area, install conventionally-powered lighting, a stormwater treatment device, and install new signs with a flashing beacon.
- p. Hwy6 – (U.S. 6 northbound, postmile 7.0) Project features at this location were updated in October 2018 to include new chain control signs, but otherwise remain consistent with features when first proposed.

## Permits and Approvals Needed

No permits from any regulatory agency are anticipated for this project. As noted in the project description, a field meeting occurred between Caltrans Environmental and California Department of Fish and Wildlife staff in which it was decided the proposed culvert extensions may occur under the approval given in the existing 1600 Routine Maintenance Agreement (RMA). No permits are anticipated to be needed from the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board as the project design will avoid impacts to water resources. If unanticipated permits are required after final design, early consultation with the appropriate agency(s) will occur.

## Chapter 2 – Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

As part of the scoping and environmental analysis carried out for the project, the following environmental issues were considered but no adverse impacts were identified. As a result, there is no further discussion about these issues in this document.

**Agricultural and Forest Land** – No protected agricultural or forest/timber lands will be impacted by this project. All project features will occur with Caltrans' existing right-of-way.

**Air Quality** – The project limits lie within the Great Basin Air Pollution Control District boundaries and will have no significant long-term impacts to any air quality parameters. The project type is exempt from air quality conformity and hot spot analyses. A short-term degradation of mesoscale air quality can be expected due to construction equipment exhaust emissions and dust from construction activities. These short-term conditions will be minimized by enforcement of Caltrans' standard emissions control device and dust control specifications which are implemented on all Caltrans projects. *Air, Noise, Water and Hazardous Waste Memo; July 2019.*

Coastal Resources – The proposed project will have no impact on coastal resources as it is located in Mono County, outside of the coastal zone.

Cultural Resources – Caltrans Archaeologist and Professionally Qualified Staff (PQS) conducted a thorough records search including reviewing the Caltrans Cultural Resource Database (CCRD), previous Caltrans project files, the *Cultural Resource Inventory of Caltrans District 9 Rural Conventional Highways in Inyo, Kern, Mono, and Northern San Bernardino Counties* (Leach-Palm et al. 2010), and the *Transportation Enhancement Activities Project: Archaeological Roadside Inventory for Caltrans District 9, Inyo and Mono Counties, California* (Richman and Basgall 1997). Additionally, the Inyo National Forest archaeologist was contacted in November 2018 and the Bureau of Land Management archaeologist was contacted in May 2019; neither party raised any cultural resource concerns with this project. Native American consultation under Section 106 and Assembly Bill 52 was satisfied by sending letters to identified tribes on October 25, 2018. See discussion under Chapter 4 Comments and Coordination for additional information. Two field reviews of the project locations were performed by the Caltrans archaeologist. The results of the efforts outlined above revealed no potential to impact any cultural resources. *Section 106 and CEQA Compliance – Screened Undertaking for the Mono Chain Up Areas Project in Mono County; July 2019*

Floodplains – The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Map Service website was checked in August 2019. The project areas do not occur within a 100-year floodplain and there will be no effects or encroachments on floodplains from this project.

Geology and Soils – The project will not impact any paleontological resource or increase risks of seismic shaking or other geologic hazards.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials – The project does not involve the transport, handling, or disposal of hazardous materials. There are no known sources of hazardous wastes or soil contaminants within the work limits. If it is determined during further design that excess roadside soil material will need to be removed offsite for disposal, aerially-deposited lead (ADL) testing and reporting will be performed prior to construction to ensure proper handling and disposal. During construction, any wastes generated will be properly disposed of off-site according to State and County disposal regulations. Due to the intermittent winter use of chain control areas, the project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to significant risks from wildland fires. *Air, Noise, Water and Hazardous Waste Memo; July 2019.*

Hydrology and Water Quality – The project does not require permitting from any water resource regulatory agencies and will have no impact on water availability or quality.

Land Use and Planning – The project is consistent with all applicable land use plans.

Mineral Resources – The project will not utilize or otherwise burden sources of economically-viable mineral resources.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) – This project is located outside of NMFS jurisdiction; therefore, an NMFS species list is not required and no effects to NMFS species are anticipated.

Noise – The project will cause temporary noise increases during construction activities, however short-term increases will not exceed limits outlined in County ordinances and will occur during normal working hours. Post-construction noise will not be significantly higher than the existing baseline highway noise.

Population and Housing – The project's setting is mostly rural and uninhabited. No displacements or growth inducement will occur as a result of this project. No minority or low-income populations that would be adversely affected by the project have been identified as determined above. Therefore, this project is not subject to the provisions of Executive Order 12898.

Public Services – The project will not close travel lanes or otherwise impede access to public or emergency services. Temporary traffic delays could occur while the project areas are being built as speed limits are lowered through construction areas. These delays will be short in duration and extent and will not cause a significant impact on public services.

Recreation – The project areas are within Caltrans' existing highway right-of-way and will not impact any designated recreational area.

Transportation and Traffic – The project will not alter vehicle capacity or flow patterns of the highways or surrounding roads. Temporary delays during construction could occur as speed limits are lowered for safety, however these delays will be short-term and would only occur at each project area while it is being constructed.

Tribal Cultural Resources – Consultation in adherence to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Assembly Bill 52 was met by sending letters to Tribes who have requested notification within the project limits. On October 25, 2018, letters were sent to Bridgeport Indian Colony, Mono Lake Indian Community, Bishop Paiute, Big Pine Paiute, Washoe Tribe of California and Nevada, and the Utu Utu Gwaitue Paiute Tribe of the Benton Paiute. No responses were received by August 2019.

Utilities –lights at locations D19 and D22 will be connected to existing underground power sources. Lights at location D67 will be connected to an existing overhead power source in coordination with Southern California Edison. Lights at location D08 will be solar powered and will not be connected to any utilities. All appropriate permissions and agreements will be pursued with the appropriate utility company(s) prior to construction.

## **VISUAL/AESTHETICS**

### **Regulatory Setting**

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, establishes that the federal government use all practicable means to ensure all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and *aesthetically* (emphasis added) and culturally pleasing surroundings (42 United States Code [USC] 4331[b][2]). To further emphasize this point, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), in its implementation of NEPA (23 USC 109[h]), directs that final decisions on projects are to be made in the best overall public interest taking into account adverse environmental impacts, including among others, the destruction or disruption of aesthetic values. This document is addressing CEQA impacts only.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) establishes that 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” (CA Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21001[b]).

### **Affected Environment**

A Caltrans Licensed Landscape Architect prepared a Visual Impacts Analysis report and a Visual Impact Assessment Questionnaire in July 2019. The visual setting of the project is a rural, mostly uninhabited 4-lane highway. U.S. 395 through the project limits has been designated as part of the Mono County Scenic Highway System and listed as a Designated State Scenic Highway. The project is within the Eastern Sierra region and is considered a sensitive corridor regarding visual resource issues. High desert, pine forests, and mountainous views are available from the highway along most of the length of the project. The scenic and recreational nature of the region draws visitors from around the U.S. and internationally. The Eastern Sierra region is also known for its easy access to dark skies. The lack of large-scale outdoor lighting has given the region a reputation for optimal viewing of a multitude of stars and other astronomical features such as the Milky Way. No scenic resources are identified within the project limits.

### **Environmental Consequences**

Travelers through the project limits will notice longer paved chain up areas at three locations, new chain up areas at two locations, and new or replaced signage and flashing beacons at each location. Chain up signage and flashing beacons are common along the U.S. 395 corridor in the snow zone and would not greatly affect the scenic quality of the highway. The installation of lighting at chain control locations may create noticeable visual impacts for travelers and local commuters when the lights are illuminated.

To alleviate the potential for impacts to visual resources, an Environmental Commitment has been included in the project. Due to the potential impacts to neighboring residences and night sky viewing by the traveling public, Caltrans has decided to test solar powered lighting at Location D08, near the communities of Tom’s Place and Sunny Slopes. Caltrans District management has decided that these chain control area lights will only be activated during storm events or other emergencies when the chain control turnouts would be needed by the traveling public. Lighting at this location would have a greater potential for visual impacts than the other locations due to its proximity to lodging and residences. Impacts from lighting would most affect those residences with little or no dense tree and shrub cover between their buildings and the

chain control area. Due to management decision to only have the lights illuminated when vehicles would need to use the chain control areas, it is assumed the lights would only be turned on intermittently and only during winter storms with heavy snowfall. The coinciding weather conditions would naturally reduce the quality of astronomical viewing and therefore the lights being illuminated at these times would not pose a significant impact to the baseline visual resource.

Conventional lighting will be installed at location D19 and D22; both near the U.S. 395/203 interchange where intersection lighting currently exists. Night sky views at these locations are already slightly degraded by the existing lights, which are illuminated every night. The additional lights will only be illuminated when the chain control areas are likely to be in use (VIS-1). With this commitment the additional lights will not create a significant impact to visual resources above the current baseline condition.

Location D67 near the intersection of U.S. 395 and U.S. 270 (Bodie Road) will also receive new conventional lights. There are no existing light sources at this location, and the new lights will increase visibility for travelers installing or removing tire chains. Due to the mountains surrounding this location, night sky viewing is currently not optimal as visibility is hindered in all directions. The new lights at this location will also follow the commitment to only be illuminated when conditions dictate the use of the chain control areas (VIS-1) and therefore will not have a significant impact to the baseline condition of the area's visual resources.

The addition of light poles at the above-mentioned locations would not cause a significant impact to the surrounding visual elements as light poles are common roadside features.

### **Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures**

VIS-1: All new solar and conventionally-powered lights at chain up areas will only be activated (illuminated) during events when the chain up area could be in use, and deactivated after the event ends.



## **Climate Change**

Neither the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) nor the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has issued explicit guidance or methods to conduct project-level greenhouse gas analysis. FHWA emphasizes concepts of resilience and sustainability in highway planning, project development, design, operations, and maintenance. Because there have been requirements set forth in California legislation and executive orders on climate change, the issue is addressed in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) chapter of this document. The CEQA analysis may be used to inform the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) determination for the project.

## **BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT**

### **ANIMAL SPECIES**

#### **Regulatory Setting**

Many state and federal laws regulate impacts to wildlife. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries Service), and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) are responsible for implementing these laws. This section discusses potential impacts and permit requirements associated with animals not listed or proposed for listing under the federal or state Endangered Species Act. Species listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered were not observed during field surveys or are anticipated to occur within the project impact areas (see Appendix H for species lists). All other special-status animal species are discussed here, including CDFW fully protected species and species of special concern, and USFWS or NOAA Fisheries Service candidate species.

Federal laws and regulations relevant to wildlife include the following:

- National Environmental Policy Act
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act
- Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act

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
- In addition to federal and state laws regulating impacts to wildlife, work is being done on highway easements over federal land. Proposed work will also adhere to those federal agencies' applicable regulations, policies, and Habitat Conservation Plans.

## **Affected Environment**

A Caltrans project biologist completed a Natural Environment Study (Minimal Impacts) “NESMI” in July 2019. An addendum to this report was completed in August 2019. This project is located outside of National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) jurisdiction; therefore, an NMFS species list is not required and no effects to NMFS species are anticipated. Field reviews and surveys for rare plants and sensitive-status wildlife species were conducted June 5<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> 2019.

## **Habitats and Natural Communities of Special Concern**

Natural communities are considered to be of special concern based on the environmental laws that regulate their protection, limited distributions, and/or the habitat requirements of special-status species that occur within the biological study area (BSA). Wetlands and waters of the U.S. are also protected under federal and state agencies.

No habitats or Natural Communities of Special Concern were found during surveys within the BSA and will therefore not be impacted by the project. No jurisdictional wetlands, Waters of the U.S. or Waters of the State are present in the biological study area; therefore, no coordination was required with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, or California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

The biological study areas for the project are within migration corridors for the Round Valley, Casa Diablo, and Mono Lake deer herds, however there are no anticipated temporary or permanent impacts to migration of the Mule deer herds from the project. Construction footprints will be small and the duration of construction activities at each location will be limited. Construction is likely to occur during the summer of 2021, outside of typical fall and spring deer migration seasons.

## **Special-status Plant Species**

Focused botanical surveys for special-status plant species identified in Appendix H were conducted in 4 separate surveys during June 2019. No special-status plant species were observed within any of the project location BSAs and therefore no special-status plant species will be impacted by the project.

## **Special-status Animal Species**

Animals are considered to be of special concern based on (1) federal, state, or local laws regulating their development, (2) limited distributions, and/or (3) the habitat requirements of special-status animals occurring on site.

No special-status animal species were observed during surveys within the BSAs. Multiple species lists were obtained (Appendix H) and it was determined the project will have no effect to any threatened, endangered, or otherwise special-status species listed.

Since no species listed under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) will be impacted by the project, no consultation with CDFW was required and the project will have No Effect on these species.

Since no species listed under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) will be impacted by the project, no consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was required. There will be No Effect to any federally listed species represented in the USFWS Species List (Appendix H).

No essential fish habitat is present within the biological study area, and therefore no consultation with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Program was required.

### **Discussion of Bat Species**

Bat species were not observed during surveys in 2019 but roosting habitat for several species of bat may be present adjacent to the BSAs, particularly at location D67 where rock crevices, cliffs, and caves are present.

### **Environmental Consequences for Bat Species**

Bat roosting habitat is not present with the project impact areas, therefore there will be no permanent impacts to bat habitat arising from construction activities. Construction activities may result in temporary impacts (noise, human activity) to bat species, however construction activities will only take place during the daytime when bats are roosting. The greatest potential impact to bat species arising from this project is from the installation and use of lighting structures during nighttime hours. Slow-flying, light-shy bat species, particularly *Myotis* spp. are known to reduce activity levels where white and green illumination is present at night (Spoelstra et al. 2017). This reduction of activity and avoidance to light ultimately implies a loss of habitat.

### **Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures for Bat Species**

As outlined by Stone et al. (2015), the “simplest and most effective way to minimize the effects of lighting on bats is to avoid illuminating the areas being used by bats”. As most bat species are inactive (hibernating) during winter months when the chain up areas would be used by motorists and lights would be illuminated, it is assumed that these areas will not be used by bats while lights are active. Environmental Commitment VIS-1 mandates the use illumination of chain up area lights only when conditions require use of the areas by traveling vehicles and for the lights to be turned off after the conditions have passed. This commitment reduces any potential impact on bat species to a less than significant level.

VIS-1: All new solar and conventionally-powered lights at chain up areas will only be activated (illuminated) during events when the chain up area could be in use, and deactivated after the event ends.

### **Discussion of Migratory and Nesting Birds**

There were no special-status bird species observed during field surveys, but there are several species that have the potential to occur within the BSA based on habitat presence (Appendix H). These species were recorded as having potential to be within four U.S. Geological Survey quadrants based on California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) occurrences and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service database searches. Other common bird species were observed during field surveys in 2018 and have the potential to nest in the BSA.

An addendum to the Natural Environment Study – Minimal Impacts (NESMI) was written in August 2019 which added an additional avoidance measure for nesting swallows in the concrete box culvert at U.S. 395 postmile 69.8 (Location D67). Multiple swallow nests were found within the culvert during summer 2019 field surveys and are likely to occur there again during 2021 construction. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) considers February 15 to September 1 to be the swallow's nesting season. Completed nests cannot be disturbed without a permit from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, however outside of these dates inactive nests can be removed without a permit.

### **Environmental Consequences for Migratory and Nesting Birds**

There are no anticipated impacts arising from construction activities to listed, migratory or nesting bird species, however nesting birds could occur in the BSA prior to construction. Vegetation removal within the project impact area is anticipated as part of the project and if present, nesting birds within the impact area could be impacted. Indirect impacts such as noise, vibration, and human activity may cause nesting birds to change their behavior, avoid the area, become stressed, and/or abandon active nests which could result in nest failure. The illumination of lighting structures at night may also impact bird species but will be limited due to the following commitments (BIO 1-7, VIS 1).

### **Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures for Migratory and Nesting Birds**

Potential nesting habitat will be permanently impacted through vegetation removal and indirect impacts could occur from light illumination; however, the following avoidance and minimization measures will reduce any potential impacts below a significant level:

BIO-1: Pre-construction nesting bird surveys will be conducted within 48 hours prior to any work being done regardless of time of year as species' nesting times vary within and outside of the normal nesting period (March-September).

BIO-2: If a nest is found within the project impact area, an appropriate no-work buffer may be implemented as determined by the Project Biologist to reduce impacts caused by construction until nesting season has finished, or nesting activities have completed, and the bird nestling has fledged and left the area.

BIO-3: Any active nest found within the project impact area will be monitored by a qualified biologist.

BIO-4: If a nest is found outside of the direct project impact area, but within 250 feet of construction activities, a no-work buffer may be implemented, and monitoring required as determined by the Project Biologist. If the construction activities do not appear to disrupt nesting activities, the biologist may approve the area for construction activities to proceed.

BIO-5: If an active nest is found beyond 250 feet away from construction, nest monitoring may be required as determined by the Project Biologist.

BIO-6: To avoid the spread of invasive species, Caltrans will direct all construction personnel to implement all standard best management practices as well as Standard Special Provision 14-6.05 to direct the contractor to clean all equipment and vehicles to be used on the project site prior to entering the project site.

**BIO-7:** To ensure the project does not disturb active swallow nests at Location D67, all inactive nests in the culvert will be removed outside of nesting season. Nesting activities will be monitored during 2021 and partially-built inactive nests will be removed at least once per week to ensure no active nests will be within the culvert when construction begins.

**VIS-1:** All new solar and conventionally-powered lights at chain up areas will only be activated (illuminated) during events when the chain up area could be in use, and deactivated after the event ends.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

### **REGULATORY SETTING**

Cumulative impacts are those that result from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, combined with the potential impacts of the proposed project. A cumulative effect 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.

Cumulative impacts to resources in the project area 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.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15130 describes when a cumulative impact analysis is necessary and what elements are necessary for an adequate discussion of cumulative impacts. The definition of cumulative impacts under CEQA can be found in Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines. A definition of cumulative impacts under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) can be found in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 1508.7.

As outlined in Chapter 1 – Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion, the Mono Chain Up Areas project (“current project”) was originally proposed to include more locations and lights. Although these additional locations and lights were eliminated from further consideration on this project, they were designated for analysis under multiple future projects and therefore pose reasonably-foreseeable potential impacts. The current project is proposing new lights to augment existing lights at Locations D19 and D22, new lights where overhead power is available at Location D67, and a pilot study of solar lights where there is no available power at Location D08. Light technology is rapidly improving, and the District intends to analyze the reliability of solar lights at D08 as a test location prior to expanding their use at other locations. There are no cumulative impacts expected from expanding chain control areas due to their small footprints, or cumulative visual impacts from the addition of light poles as they are a common roadside feature. The following is a cumulative impacts analysis for illuminated lighting

(both conventional and solar powered) at all locations originally proposed under Mono Chain Up Areas Build Alternative and are now included within future projects. A visual representation of work proposed at chain control locations under future projects is included in Figure 4, below.




Figure 4 - Future projects which have absorbed elements originally proposed in the Mono Chain Up Areas project.

The addition of 5-6 lights at each of the 16 originally-proposed locations would result in the addition of approximately 80-96 lights throughout a corridor which currently only has lighting in chain control areas near intersections. The installation of these lights has the potential to impact nocturnal and migratory animal species as well as the visual quality of the project area.

As seen in Figure 5, seven locations (D63, D60, D35, D12, D04, D02 and D00) are proposed to receive solar lights on various future projects. The applicability of solar lighting at these locations will be determined after the pilot solar lighting on the Mono Chain Up Areas project (D08) has been analyzed and reviewed for effectiveness. Lights would be spaced approximately 200 feet apart, so the exact number of potential future solar lights is unknown, however assuming 5-6 lights per 1000-foot chain control area, approximately 35 to 42 solar lights could be added by these future projects. Including the 6 solar lights to be built at D08 under the Mono Chain Up Areas project, approximately 42 to 48 solar-powered lights could be added to the U.S. 395 corridor by 2024.



Conventional lighting, powered by overhead or underground utility lines, is proposed at two locations, D39 and D16. Assuming 5-6 new lights per each 1000-foot chain control location, approximately 10-12 conventional lights are proposed to be added under future projects. Including the 17 conventional lights to be built under the Mono Chain Up Areas project (D19, D22, and D67), approximately 27 to 29 conventionally-powered lights could be added to the U.S. 395 corridor by 2024.

Potential impacts from both solar and conventional lighting originate from adding sources of illumination to rural, forested and generally uninhabited areas which currently have few light sources. The total number of additional light sources has the potential to cumulatively affect biological resources (nocturnal and migratory species) as well as the visual/aesthetic quality of the corridor.

### **Analysis of Cumulative Impacts of Lights on Biological Resources**

Loss of Habitat – The current project (Mono Chain Up Areas) proposes to create a total of 3,500 linear feet of new chain control paved areas. Expansion of existing or creation of new chain control areas proposed on future projects (D08, D12, D16, D39, D60) are anticipated to also create approximately 3,500 linear feet of paved chain control areas. Assuming the chain control areas will be approximately 15 feet wide, a total of approximately 2.4 acres of dirt roadway shoulder and/or native vegetation is proposed to be permanently removed. No special-status or sensitive plant or animal species were observed during field surveys in 2019, and no Waters of the U.S., Waters of the State, or California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) jurisdictional waterways are present within any of the project locations. It is anticipated the footprint of these projects will have no significant cumulative effect on habitats for special-status species or other biological resources. Biological field surveys will occur prior to each individual future project to verify these findings and ensure no special-status species, sensitive species, occupied nests or burrows are impacted.

Impacts of Artificial Light at Night (ALAN) – ALAN can negatively affect many wildlife species through attraction and disorientation. From satellite and aerial imagery, street lighting appears to be the dominant terrestrial source of ALAN (Kuechly et al. 2012). Many wildlife species use the timings of dawn and dusk and/or length of daylight hours as cues for foraging, mating, growth, reproduction and migration behaviors. ALAN has been suggested as the cause of observed changes in the timing of singing, activity, foraging and births (Gaston et al. 2014). For diurnal and nocturnal species, ALAN has been suggested as an influence on both competitive and predator-prey interspecific interactions by directly changing the time partitioning of focal species (Schwartz et al. 2010). Significant sources of ALAN can render areas of otherwise suitable habitat unusable by some organisms, available to others, and create barriers or corridors for movement through landscapes.

The degree of potential influence of outdoor electric lighting on biological resources is determined by the direction, intensity, duration, and spectrum of lights. For a decade, only a few commercially-available outdoor lamp types were viable for widespread use, creating consistent light intensity and spectrums. Recent advances in white light technologies like LEDs, however, have brought a new range of spectral characteristics to night lighting. Although LEDs require lower wattage for a given level of illumination, and are therefore energy-efficient, they typically emit considerably more light in the blue portion of the light spectrum than older sodium lighting. The shorter wavelengths, like the blue portion of the spectrum, are known to have greater attraction and/or disorientation impacts on wildlife than longer wavelengths like red, orange, and yellow (Longcore et al. 2018). Filtered yellow-green and amber LEDs are predicted to have less

impacts on wildlife than older high-pressure sodium lamps while blue-rich LED lighting (correlated color temperature “CCT” greater than 2,200) is expected to have greater impacts on wildlife than sodium lamps.

The current design plan is to use Type 21 and Type 15 light poles (see Appendix D) for both conventional and solar lights. There currently is no State standard for solar light spectrums, and a commercially-viable source of solar lighting is still being investigated by Caltrans’ design engineers, so the specific light spectrum of the current and future solar lights is unknown at this time. Caltrans’ current conventional light standards have a correlated color temperature (CCT) ranging from 3,500k to 6,500k and a color rendition index (CRI) of 65 or greater, which exceed the CCT range suggested by Longcore (2018).

Since the color ranges (CCT) of solar and conventional lights are either unknown or known to exceed recommended levels to avoid impacting wildlife, Caltrans District 9 Management decided to implement Environmental Commitment VIS-1, which mandates all new lighting (both solar and conventional) will be built with manual power switches, only activated (illuminated) when weather conditions dictate chain control measures, and turned off after the chain control event passes. Chain control events typically only occur during winter months (November through March) when heavy snow storms and icy road conditions are present. During these months most wildlife species are either hibernating or have migrated to winter range habitat. The use of lights is not anticipated to occur between late spring and early fall when wildlife migrations and bird nesting activities occur. The use of lights only during intermittent winter storms reduces any cumulative impact of chain up area lighting on U.S. 395 to a less than significant level.

### **Analysis of Cumulative Impacts of Lights on Visual Resources**

New or expanded paved chain control areas, signage and flashing beacons are normal roadside elements and will not affect the scenic quality of the U.S. 395 corridor. The project region is known for high-quality night sky viewing opportunities, which could be impacted from the cumulative effects of additional lighting (both solar and conventional). Since some travelers are unable to view the abundance of stars from an off-highway location, highway pullouts and chain up areas are sometimes used by motorists to view night skies. With the exception of location D67, all conventional lighting will be built at locations which currently have intersection lights. All new solar lights will be built in areas which currently do not have significant light sources. Many access roads managed by Mono County, the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management connect with U.S. 395 throughout its entire extent. With the significant amount of alternative locations for night sky viewing, it is expected that travelers will continue further along the roadway until they find an existing pullout in a dark area where they can park and view the sky. Additionally, the implementation of Environmental Commitment VIS-1 (described above) will restrict the use of current and future lights to times when chain control restrictions are implemented. Winter storm events naturally restrict nighttime sky views and outdoor viewing conditions, and only illuminating lights during these events avoids conflicts between the lights and sky viewers. With the implementation of VIS-1, potential cumulative impacts of chain up area lights on visual resources are reduced to a less than significant level.

## Chapter 3 – California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Evaluation

### Determining Significance under CEQA

The proposed project is a joint project by the California Department of Transportation (Department) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and is subject to state and federal environmental review requirements. Project documentation, therefore, has been prepared in compliance with both the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). FHWA's responsibility for environmental review, consultation, and any other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by Caltrans pursuant to 23 United States Code Section 327 (23 USC 327) and the Memorandum of Understanding dated April 18, 2019 and executed by FHWA and Caltrans. The Department is the lead agency under CEQA and NEPA.

One of the primary differences between NEPA and CEQA is the way significance is determined. Under NEPA, significance is used to determine whether an EIS, or a lower level of documentation, will be required. NEPA requires that an EIS be prepared when the proposed federal action (project) *as a whole* has the potential to "significantly affect the quality of the human environment." The determination of significance is based on context and intensity. Some impacts determined to be significant under CEQA may not be of sufficient magnitude to be determined significant under NEPA. Under NEPA, once a decision is made regarding the need for an EIS, it is the magnitude of the impact that is evaluated and no judgment of its individual significance is deemed important for the text. NEPA does not require that a determination of significant impacts be stated in the environmental documents.

CEQA, on the other hand, does require the Department to identify each "significant effect on the environment" resulting from the project and ways to mitigate each significant effect. If the project may have a significant effect on any environmental resource, then an EIR must be prepared. Each and every significant effect on the environment must be disclosed in the EIR and mitigated if feasible. In addition, the CEQA Guidelines list a number of "mandatory findings of significance," which also require the preparation of an EIR. There are no types of actions under NEPA that parallel the findings of mandatory significance of CEQA. This chapter discusses the effects of this project and CEQA significance.

## CEQA Environmental Checklist

This 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 projects will indicate that there are no impacts to a particular resource. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts. The questions in this form 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, and 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, are considered to be an integral part of the project and have been considered prior to any significance determinations documented below; see Chapters 1 and 2 for a detailed discussion of these features. The annotations to this checklist are summaries of information contained in Chapter 2 in order to provide the reader with the rationale for significance determinations; for a more detailed discussion of the nature and extent of impacts, please see Chapter 2. This checklist incorporates by reference the information contained in Chapters 1 and 2.

## AESTHETICS

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### CEQA Significance Determinations for Aesthetics

#### **a,b) No Impact**

The project would not have a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista because the project locations do not include work on any scenic vistas. The project will not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway as no notable scenic features are anticipated to be removed, damaged, or altered.

#### **c) Less Than Significant Impact**

As discussed in the Visual/Aesthetics section in Chapter 2, the project will install approximately 23 lights (17 conventional and 6 solar) at four locations. Two of these locations, D19 and D22, already have street lights (one and two lights, respectively). Locations D08 and D67 have no lights currently and will have six lights installed at each location under this project. The addition of light poles at these locations is not expected to significantly impact the visual character or quality at these locations because of the limited number of new proposed light poles and the existing visual setting already containing light poles. Light poles are a common visual occurrence along highways and the relatively minimal addition of more lighting should not detract from other aesthetic scenery.

#### **d) Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**

As discussed in the Visual/Aesthetics section in Chapter 2, the project will add approximately 23 lights between four locations which currently only have three lights total. Although there are no pertinent Dark Sky provisions which regulate highway streetlighting, Caltrans Environmental staff implemented a provision (VIS-1) which requires all new chain up area lights on this and future projects to be manually switched on by Caltrans Maintenance forces during winter storms when chain control restrictions are in place. The

lights will then be turned off when chain restrictions are lifted. This provision will limit the addition of new day and nighttime light sources to short durations during winter months and thus will not add substantial sources of light that adversely affect views.

## AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

<p>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 Dept. 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 and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</p>				
Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in 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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### CEQA Significance Determinations for Agriculture and Forest Resources

#### **a-e) No Impact**

There are no Farmlands, parcels under a Williamson Act contract, forest lands, or timberlands as identified above within the project limits. No changes to the existing environment will result in conversion or relocation of Farmland or forest land.



## 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.				
Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## CEQA Significance Determinations for Air Quality

### a-e) No Impact

The project is located in the limits of the Great Basin Air Pollution Control District. The project will not have any significant long-term impacts to any air quality parameters and is exempt from air quality conformity and hot spot analysis. It will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants or create objectionable odors. No mitigation is required.

## BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### CEQA Significance Determinations for Biological Resources

#### a-c, e, f) No Impact

The project occurs mostly within existing paved or previously-disturbed dirt highway shoulders. Surveys were conducted in June 2019 which discovered no protected species habitats or Natural Communities of Special Concern, special-status plant species, or special-status animal species present within the Biological Study Area (BSA). No jurisdictional wetlands, Waters of the U.S., or Waters of the State will be impacted by the project since none occur within the project limits. No species listed under the Federal

Endangered Species Act will be impacted by the project so no consultation with the United State Fish and Wildlife Service is required and the project will have no effect on any federally-listed species.

**d) Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**

No bat roosting habitat was found present within the project impact area, although it could occur in rocks and cliffs adjacent to location D67, therefore no roosting habitat will be permanently impacted or removed by the project. The addition of light sources where none currently occur could potentially lead to reduced activity levels for nocturnal bat species, particularly slow-flying species like *Myotis* spp., whose range includes multiple project locations. Environmental Commitment (VIS-1) requires all new lights in chain up areas to be controlled by manual switches and only turned on during chain control events. As most bat species are inactive (hibernating) during the winter months and migratory species such as deer are likely to already have traveled to their winter range when the lights will be in use, this commitment reduces any potential impact from lights on nocturnal and migratory species to a less than significant level.

Migratory and nesting bird species were not observed during 2019 field surveys, however there are several species with the potential to occur within the biological study area based on the type of habitat present. Removal of some vegetation within the project impact area is anticipated to lengthen and/or widen some chain control area which will permanently impact potential nesting habitat. The following Environmental Commitments will avoid and minimize any potential impacts to biological resources, and commitment VIS-1 specifically will mitigate potential impacts to nesting, migratory and nocturnal species to a less than significant level:

BIO-1: Preconstruction nesting bird surveys will be conducted 48 hours prior to any construction work occurring regardless of time of year to identify any nesting birds within the project impact area

BIO-2: If an active nest is identified within the project impact area, an appropriate no-work buffer may be implemented as determined by the project Biologist to reduce impacts caused by construction activities until nesting activities have ended

BIO-3: Any active nest within the project impact area will be monitored by a qualified Biologist until nesting activities have ended

BIO-4: If a nest is found outside of the project impact area, but within 250 feet of construction, a no-work buffer may be implemented, and nest monitoring required at the discretion of the project Biologist

VIS-1: Lighting structures will be equipped with manual switches that allows lights to remain inactive during nesting bird season (March – October) unless necessary for chain controls

## CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### CEQA Significance Determinations for Cultural Resources

#### **a,b) No Impact**

The project is located within Caltrans' right-of-way easements overlying Inyo National Forest (USFS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) property. Caltrans' Principal Investigator of Prehistoric Archaeology conducted records searches, reviewed the Caltrans Cultural Resource Database (CCRD), initiated consultation with Inyo National Forest and BLM archaeologists, and sent letters to identified Tribes pursuant to the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement and Assembly Bill 52 provisions. No Tribal responses have been received to date. Based on the results of these efforts it was determined that this project qualifies as a screened undertaking and is exempt from further review. The project does not have the potential to affect any historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places or historic resources eligible for or listed in the California Register of Historical Resources.

#### **c) No Impact**

The project will occur mostly within paved or previously-disturbed highway shoulders and depth of potential excavation is limited to 1-3 feet. Geologic units underlying the project locations are mainly igneous deposits or Quaternary alluvium; neither of which has a reasonable potential to contain significant fossil resources. No previous fossil discoveries have occurred in or near the project locations and no unique geologic features will be impacted by project construction.

#### **d) No Impact**

No human remains are known to occur in or near the project locations and unknown remains are unlikely to be encountered due to the limited depth of soil disturbance needed to construct the project. If unanticipated remains are discovered during construction, the provisions of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 will be adhered to including

halting construction activities and contacting the County coroner. If applicable, the coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission who will notify the Most Likely Descendent pursuant to CA Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

## GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### CEQA Significance Determinations for Geology and Soils

#### ai,aii) No Impact

Location D19 overlies an area identified by the California State Geologist as an earthquake fault zone per the Alquist-Priolo Act. The work at this location includes widening existing highway shoulder pavement to accommodate a new chain control turnout area. The limited extent of this work poses little to no risk of increasing the risk of rupturing the identified underlying fault. CA Earthquake Hazards Zone Map accessed August 6, 2019 at <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geohazards/eq-zapp>. No other project location is within a fault zone. The risk of strong seismic ground shaking will not be exacerbated by this

project and the chain up areas will be built pursuant to all applicable seismic engineering standards. No mitigation required.

**aiii-aiv) No Impact**

No project location occurs within an identified liquefaction zone or landslide zone. Location D19 lies within a fault zone, however the project will not expose more people to the risk of seismic shaking as users of the new chain up area would be using the highway within the fault zone even without the chain up area being present.

**b) No Impact**

The project would remove some topsoil to grade and pave expanded chain control areas, however topsoil ("duff") is required to be reused onsite to aid revegetation efforts per Caltrans' standard construction specifications. The project will not remove significant amounts of topsoil, and the topsoil which is removed will remain near the project area. No mitigation required.

**c-e) No Impact**

The project does not occur on loose, unstable or expansive soils. Septic tanks are not a feature of this project.



## GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<p>Caltrans has used the best available information based to the extent possible on scientific and factual information, to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of greenhouse gas emissions that may occur related to this project. The analysis included in the climate change section of this document provides the public and decision-makers as much information about the project as possible. It is Caltrans' determination that in the absence of statewide-adopted thresholds or GHG emissions limits, it is too speculative to make a significance determination regarding an individual project's direct and indirect impacts with respect to global climate change. Caltrans remains committed to implementing measures to reduce the potential effects of the project. These measures are outlined in the climate change section that follows the CEQA checklist and related discussions.</p>			
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				

## HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### CEQA Significance Determinations for Hazards and Hazardous Materials

#### a-h) No Impact

The project does not include the handling, transport, or removal of hazardous substances. No schools are located within ¼ mile of any project location, are listed as a hazardous material site on the Cortese List, are near an airport or airstrip, or will interfere with emergency response plans. Due to intermittent winter use of chain control areas, the project will not expose people or structures to significant risks from wildfires.

## HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## **CEQA Significance Determinations for Hydrology and Water Quality**

### **a) Less than Significant Impact**

The project will not require Clean Water Act Section 401 or 404 water resource permits. All appropriate best management practices (BMPs) shall be used as outlined in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Statewide Storm Water Permit. Contamination of any surface waters shall be avoided through a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) or Water Pollution Prevention Program (WPCP) which is required to be prepared by the project contractor and approved by Caltrans prior to construction. If used, no reclaimed water will be allowed to mingle with surface flows. No mitigation needed.

### **b-d) No Impact**

The project will not use groundwater resources or substantially alter existing drainage patterns.

### **e) No Impact**

A stormwater control device will be installed at location D67 to avoid highway runoff impacting nearby Virginia Creek. This device will likely be a grated drop inlet used to collect and treat highway runoff prior to connecting to the existing highway runoff treatment effluent system. No mitigation required.

### **f-j) No Impact**

Water quality will not be substantially impacted by the project. No housing or structures will be built in flood zones, no impacts to dams or levees will occur, and no increased public risks from seiches, mudflows or tsunamis are anticipated.

## LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### CEQA Significance Determinations for Land Use and Planning

#### **a-c) No Impact**

The project will occur within existing highway right-of-way and therefore will not physically divide any established communities. Caltrans is the agency with jurisdiction over the project and is the project proponent. The project does not conflict with any applicable conservation plan. As a State agency, Caltrans is exempt from the Mono County General Plan, Chapter 23 "Dark Sky Regulations" (23.040(A)(4)).

## MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### CEQA Significance Determinations for Mineral Resources

#### **a,b) No Impact**

The project will not use or exhaust the supply of mineral resources.

## NOISE

Would the project result in:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### **a-c) No Impact**

The project will not expose persons to excessive noise levels in excess of local or other applicable legal standards. The project locations are within existing highway right-of-way surrounded by rural, undeveloped and uninhabited properties. Temporary noise will be generated during construction activities however this will be short term in nature and will occur during normal construction hours (no night work). Minimal ground-borne vibration may be generated from pavement equipment. All temporary impacts will cease when construction has finished, and long-term noise levels will not be greater than current baseline noise levels. The project is considered a Type III project per CFR 772 and therefore is exempt from federal noise analyses and abatement.

### **d) No Impact**

Noise levels will be temporarily elevated in the immediate vicinity of the project locations while they are being constructed, and areas surrounding the new chain control turnouts may have some short-term increased noise from idling vehicles using the turnouts. No sensitive receptors are nearby any of the project locations, and slightly elevated noise levels from construction and users of the new turnouts are likely to be imperceptible from the background noise already generated by highway traffic.



**e,f) No Impact**

No project location would expose people living or working near public airports or private airstrips to excessive additional noise levels.

## POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### CEQA Significance Determinations for Population and Housing

#### **a-c) No Impact**

The project will create and modify highway chain up areas within existing highway right-of-way easements. Substantial growth will not be induced, and no people or homes will be displaced because of this project.

## PUBLIC SERVICES

a) 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:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### CEQA Significance Determinations for Public Services

#### **a) No Impact**

The project will not interfere with access to public facilities or services. No lane closures are planned to construct this project.

## RECREATION

	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### CEQA Significance Determinations for Recreation

#### a,b) No Impact

The project will not increase the use of or otherwise impact recreational facilities as none occur in or near the project area.

## TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### CEQA Significance Determinations for Transportation/Traffic

#### **a-f) No Impact**

The project will create or modify highway chain control turnout areas. It will not negatively impact traffic circulation or congestion. No air traffic patterns will be impacted. The project will not create or increase hazards due to design features, interfere with emergency access or conflict with bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

## TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, 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:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### CEQA Significance Determinations for Tribal Cultural Resources

#### a,b) No Impact

As discussed in the CEQA Checklist for Cultural Resources, this project is a screened undertaking and does not have the potential to affect any historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places, historical resources eligible for or listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, or any resource determined significant pursuant to PRC 5024. No Tribal or other cultural resources were identified with the project impact area through record searches, consultation with the Inyo National Forest Archaeologist (November 2018), consultation with the Bureau of Land Management Archaeologist (May 2019), or during field reviews performed by a Caltrans Archaeologist in November 2018 and June 2019.

Native American consultation for Section 106 and Assembly Bill 52 occurred on October 25, 2018. Letters were sent by the Caltrans District Archaeologist to Bridgeport Indian Colony, Mono Lake Indian Community, Bishop Paiute Tribe, Big Pine Paiute, Washoe Tribe of California and Nevada, and the Utu Utu Gwaitu Paiute Tribe of the Benton Paiute. No responses were received by August 2019, however the Tribes also have the opportunity to comment on this draft document during the public circulation period (August 15 – September 15 2019). Please see Chapter 4 Comments and Coordination for additional information.

## UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### CEQA Significance Determinations for Utilities and Service Systems

#### **a-g) No Impact**

The project does not require project-specific permitting from the Water Quality Control Board and will include all appropriate best management practices outlined in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination (NPDES) Statewide Storm Water Permit. No new wastewater or stormwater facilities which could cause significant environmental effects are needed. One stormwater treatment device, most likely a grated drop inlet, will be included to treat runoff water at location D67. Water needed for construction materials will be brought from off-site sources and no new entitlements are needed. Current wastewater treatment facilities and landfills will not be overburdened by the project and all solid waste will be disposed of in accordance with all applicable State and County disposal regulations.



## WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) expose people or structure to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### CEQA Significance Determinations for Wildfire

#### a-d) No Impact

The project does not occur in a state responsibility area or land classified as a very high fire hazard severity zone and therefore will have no impact on risks from wildfires. Cal Fire map obtained 8/13/2019 at <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/wildfire-prevention-planning-engineering/wildland-hazards-building-codes/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps/> (Mono County)

## MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### CEQA Significance Determinations for Mandatory Findings of Significance

#### **a,c) No Impact**

The project does not have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment or have substantial adverse effects on human beings.

#### **b) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**

The project originally included constructing 5-6 lights at each of 16 locations for an approximate total of 80-96 new lights where there currently are few or no lights. Due to the rural, uninhabited setting of many of the project locations, the addition of these lights, if illuminated at all times, could potentially impact nocturnal and migratory animal species and create substantial new sources of light in the human nighttime viewshed. Although this project was refined to eventually only include 23 new lights at 4 locations, the lights removed from this project were designated for consideration under future projects, creating the potential for cumulative impacts. The District commitment (VIS-1) to manually illuminate lights only when needed during winter storm events reduces the potential impacts of lights, both on this project and those proposed in the future, below a

significant level as the lights will only be illuminated for short periods of time, most likely only during winter months which fall outside of wildlife migratory seasons. Nocturnal species will not be subjected to constant illumination, and proponents of dark sky viewing are less likely to be impacted by lights which are only used during storm events. Due to this provision, there is no significant cumulative impact from the addition of lights at any or all these locations.

## Climate Change

Climate change refers to long-term changes in temperature, precipitation, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system. An ever-increasing body of scientific research attributes these climatological changes to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, particularly those generated from the production and use of fossil fuels.

While climate change has been a concern for several decades, the establishment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) by the United Nations and World Meteorological Organization in 1988 has led to increased efforts devoted to GHG emissions reduction and climate change research and policy. These efforts are primarily concerned with the emissions of GHGs generated by human activity, including carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), tetrafluoromethane, hexafluoroethane, sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>), HFC-23 (fluoroform), HFC-134a (s, s, s, 2-tetrafluoroethane), and HFC-152a (difluoroethane).

In the U.S., the main source of GHG emissions is electricity generation, followed by transportation.<sup>1</sup> In California, however, transportation sources (including passenger cars, light-duty trucks, other trucks, buses, and motorcycles) are the largest contributors of GHG emissions.<sup>2</sup> The dominant GHG emitted is CO<sub>2</sub>, mostly from fossil fuel combustion.

Two terms are typically used when discussing how we address the impacts of climate change: "greenhouse gas mitigation" and "adaptation." "Greenhouse gas mitigation" is a term for reducing GHG emissions to reduce or "mitigate" the impacts of climate change. "Adaptation" refers to planning for and responding to impacts resulting from climate change (such as adjusting transportation design standards to withstand more intense storms and higher sea levels).

## Regulatory Setting

This section outlines federal and state efforts to comprehensively reduce GHG emissions from transportation sources.

### ***Federal***

To date, no national standards have been established for nationwide mobile-source GHG reduction targets, nor have any regulations or legislation been enacted specifically to address climate change and GHG emissions reduction at the project level.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 United States Code [USC] Part 4332) requires federal agencies to assess the environmental effects of their proposed actions prior to making a decision on the action or project.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) recognizes the threats that extreme weather, sea-level change, and other changes in environmental conditions pose to valuable transportation infrastructure and those who depend on it. FHWA therefore supports a sustainability approach that assesses vulnerability to climate risks and incorporates resilience into planning, asset management, project development and design, and operations and maintenance practices.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/us-greenhouse-gas-inventory-report-1990-2014>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/data.htm>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sustainability/resilience/>

This approach encourages planning for sustainable highways by addressing climate risks while balancing environmental, economic, and social values—“the triple bottom line of sustainability.”<sup>4</sup> Program and project elements that foster sustainability and resilience also support economic vitality and global efficiency, increase safety and mobility, enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, and improve the quality of life. Addressing these factors up front in the planning process will assist in decision-making and improve efficiency at the program level and will inform the analysis and stewardship needs of project-level decision-making.

Various efforts have been promulgated at the federal level to improve fuel economy and energy efficiency to address climate change and its associated effects.

The Energy Policy Act of 1992 (EPACT92, 102nd Congress H.R.776.ENR): With this act, Congress set goals, created mandates, and amended utility laws to increase clean energy use and improve overall energy efficiency in the United States. EPACT92 consists of 27 titles detailing various measures designed to lessen the nation's dependence on imported energy, provide incentives for clean and renewable energy, and promote energy conservation in buildings. Title III of EPACT92 addresses alternative fuels. It gave the U.S. Department of Energy administrative power to regulate the minimum number of light-duty alternative fuel vehicles required in certain federal fleets beginning in fiscal year 1993. The primary goal of the Program is to cut petroleum use in the United States by 2.5 billion gallons per year by 2020.

Energy Policy Act of 2005 (109th Congress H.R.6 (2005–2006): This act sets forth an energy research and development program covering: (1) energy efficiency; (2) renewable energy; (3) oil and gas; (4) coal; (5) Indian energy; (6) nuclear matters and security; (7) vehicles and motor fuels, including ethanol; (8) hydrogen; (9) electricity; (10) energy tax incentives; (11) hydropower and geothermal energy; and (12) climate change technology.

Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 (42 USC Section 6201) and Corporate Average Fuel Standards: This act establishes fuel economy standards for on-road motor vehicles sold in the United States. Compliance with federal fuel economy standards is determined through the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) program on the basis of each manufacturer's average fuel economy for the portion of its vehicles produced for sale in the United States.

Executive Order 13514, *Federal Leadership in Environmental, Energy, and Economic Performance*, 74 *Federal Register* 52117 (October 8, 2009): This federal EO set sustainability goals for federal agencies and focuses on making improvements in their environmental, energy, and economic performance. It instituted as policy of the United States that federal agencies measure, report, and reduce their GHG emissions from direct and indirect activities.

Executive Order 13693, *Planning for Federal Sustainability in the Next Decade*, 80 *Federal Register* 15869 (March 2015): This EO reaffirms the policy of the United States that federal agencies measure, report, and reduce their GHG emissions from direct and indirect activities. It sets sustainability goals for all agencies to promote energy conservation, efficiency, and management by reducing energy consumption and GHG emissions. It builds on the adaptation and resiliency goals in previous executive orders to ensure agency operations and facilities prepare for impacts of climate change. This order revokes Executive Order 13514.

U.S. EPA's authority to regulate GHG emissions stems from the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Massachusetts v. EPA* (2007). The Supreme Court ruled that GHGs meet the definition of air

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.sustainablehighways.dot.gov/overview.aspx>

pollutants under the existing Clean Air Act and must be regulated if these gases could be reasonably anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. Responding to the Court's ruling, U.S. EPA finalized an endangerment finding in December 2009. Based on scientific evidence it found that six GHGs constitute a threat to public health and welfare. Thus, it is the Supreme Court's interpretation of the existing Act and EPA's assessment of the scientific evidence that form the basis for EPA's regulatory actions.

U.S. EPA in conjunction with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) issued the first of a series of GHG emission standards for new cars and light-duty vehicles in April 2010<sup>5</sup> and significantly increased the fuel economy of all new passenger cars and light trucks sold in the United States. The standards required these vehicles to meet an average fuel economy of 34.1 miles per gallon by 2016. In August 2012, the federal government adopted the second rule that increases fuel economy for the fleet of passenger cars, light-duty trucks, and medium-duty passenger vehicles for model years 2017 and beyond to average fuel economy of 54.5 miles per gallon by 2025. Because NHTSA cannot set standards beyond model year 2021 due to statutory obligations and the rules' long timeframe, a mid-term evaluation is included in the rule. The Mid-Term Evaluation is the overarching process by which NHTSA, EPA, and ARB will decide on CAFE and GHG emissions standard stringency for model years 2022–2025. NHTSA has not formally adopted standards for model years 2022 through 2025. However, the EPA finalized its mid-term review in January 2017, affirming that the target fleet average of at least 54.5 miles per gallon by 2025 was appropriate. In March 2017, President Trump ordered EPA to reopen the review and reconsider the mileage target.<sup>6</sup>

NHTSA and EPA issued a Final Rule for "Phase 2" for medium- and heavy-duty vehicles to improve fuel efficiency and cut carbon pollution in October 2016. The agencies estimate that the standards will save up to 2 billion barrels of oil and reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by up to 1.1 billion metric tons over the lifetimes of model year 2018–2027 vehicles.

Presidential Executive Order 13783, *Promoting Energy Independence and Economic Growth*, of March 28, 2017, orders all federal agencies to apply cost-benefit analyses to regulations of GHG emissions and evaluations of the social cost of carbon, nitrous oxide, and methane.

## **State**

With the passage of legislation including State Senate and Assembly bills and executive orders, California has been innovative and proactive in addressing GHG emissions and climate change.

Assembly Bill 1493, Pavley Vehicular Emissions: Greenhouse Gases, 2002: This bill requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to develop and implement regulations to reduce automobile and light truck GHG emissions. These stricter emissions standards were designed to apply to automobiles and light trucks beginning with the 2009-model year.

Executive Order S-3-05 (June 1, 2005): The goal of this executive order (EO) is to reduce California's GHG emissions to: (1) year 2000 levels by 2010, (2) year 1990 levels by 2020, and (3) 80 percent below year 1990 levels by 2050. This goal was further reinforced with the passage of Assembly Bill 32 in 2006 and SB 32 in 2016.

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.c2es.org/federal/executive/epa/greenhouse-gas-regulation-faq>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.nbcnews.com/business/autos/trump-rolls-back-obama-era-fuel-economy-standards-n734256> and <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/03/22/2017-05316/notice-of-intention-to-reconsider-the-final-determination-of-the-mid-term-evaluation-of-greenhouse>

Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), Chapter 488, 2006: Núñez and Pavley, The Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: AB 32 codified the 2020 GHG emissions reduction goals as outlined in EO S-3-05, while further mandating that ARB create a scoping plan and implement rules to achieve “real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gases.” The Legislature also intended that the statewide GHG emissions limit continue in existence and be used to maintain and continue reductions in emissions of GHGs beyond 2020 (Health and Safety Code Section 38551(b)). The law requires ARB to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG reductions.

Executive Order S-20-06 (October 18, 2006): This order establishes the responsibilities and roles of the Secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) and state agencies with regard to climate change.

Executive Order S-01-07 (January 18, 2007): This order sets forth the low carbon fuel standard (LCFS) for California. Under this EO, the carbon intensity of California’s transportation fuels is to be reduced by at least 10 percent by the year 2020. ARB re-adopted the LCFS regulation in September 2015, and the changes went into effect on January 1, 2016. The program establishes a strong framework to promote the low-carbon fuel adoption necessary to achieve the Governor’s 2030 and 2050 GHG reduction goals.

Senate Bill 97 (SB 97), Chapter 185, 2007, Greenhouse Gas Emissions: This bill requires the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop recommended amendments to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines for addressing GHG emissions. The amendments became effective on March 18, 2010.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), Chapter 728, 2008, Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection: This bill requires ARB to set regional emissions reduction targets for passenger vehicles. The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for each region must then develop a “Sustainable Communities Strategy” (SCS) that integrates transportation, land-use, and housing policies to plan how it will achieve the emissions target for its region.

Senate Bill 391 (SB 391), Chapter 585, 2009, California Transportation Plan: This bill requires the State’s long-range transportation plan to meet California’s climate change goals under AB 32.

Executive Order B-16-12 (March 2012) orders State entities under the direction of the Governor, including ARB, the California Energy Commission, and the Public Utilities Commission, to support the rapid commercialization of zero-emission vehicles. It directs these entities to achieve various benchmarks related to zero-emission vehicles.

Executive Order B-30-15 (April 2015) establishes an interim statewide GHG emission reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 in order to ensure California meets its target of reducing GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. It further orders all state agencies with jurisdiction over sources of GHG emissions to implement measures, pursuant to statutory authority, to achieve reductions of GHG emissions to meet the 2030 and 2050 GHG emissions reductions targets. It also directs ARB to update the Climate Change Scoping Plan to express the 2030 target in terms of million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MMTCO<sub>2e</sub>). Finally, it requires the Natural Resources Agency to update the state’s climate adaptation strategy, *Safeguarding California*, every 3 years, and to ensure that its provisions are fully implemented.

Senate Bill 32, (SB 32) Chapter 249, 2016, codifies the GHG reduction targets established in EO B-30-15 to achieve a mid-range goal of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

## Environmental Setting

In 2006, the Legislature passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32), which created a comprehensive, multi-year program to reduce GHG emissions in California. AB 32 required ARB 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. The Scoping Plan was first approved by ARB in 2008 and must be updated every 5 years. ARB approved the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan on May 22, 2014. ARB is moving forward with a discussion draft of an updated Scoping Plan that will reflect the 2030 target established in EO B-30-15 and SB 32.

The AB 32 Scoping Plan and the subsequent updates contain the main strategies California will use to reduce GHG emissions. As part of its supporting documentation for the Draft Scoping Plan, ARB released the GHG inventory for California.<sup>7</sup> ARB is responsible for maintaining and updating California's GHG Inventory per H&SC Section 39607.4. The associated forecast/projection is an estimate of the emissions anticipated to occur in the year 2020 if none of the foreseeable measures included in the Scoping Plan were implemented.

An emissions projection estimates future emissions based on current emissions, expected regulatory implementation, and other technological, social, economic, and behavioral patterns. The projected 2020 emissions provided in Figure ## represent a business-as-usual (BAU) scenario assuming none of the Scoping Plan measures are implemented. The 2020 BAU emissions estimate assists ARB in demonstrating progress toward meeting the 2020 goal of 431 MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e<sup>8</sup>. The 2017 edition of the GHG emissions inventory (released June 2017) found total California emissions of 440.4 MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e, showing progress towards meeting the AB 32 goals.

The 2020 BAU emissions projection was revisited in support of the First Update to the Scoping Plan (2014). This projection accounts for updates to the economic forecasts of fuel and energy demand as well as other factors. It also accounts for the effects of the 2008 economic recession and the projected recovery. The total emissions expected in the 2020 BAU scenario include reductions anticipated from Pavley I and the Renewable Electricity Standard (30 MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e total). With these reductions in the baseline, estimated 2020 statewide BAU emissions are 509 MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e.


---

<sup>7</sup> 2016 Edition of the GHG Emission Inventory Released (June 2016):  
<https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/data.htm>

<sup>8</sup> The revised target using Global Warming Potentials (GWP) from the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4)



**FIGURE ## 2020 BUSINESS AS USUAL (BAU) EMISSIONS PROJECTION 2014 EDITION**



## Project Analysis

An individual project does not generate enough GHG emissions to significantly influence global climate change. Rather, global climate change is a cumulative impact. This means that a project may contribute to a potential impact through its *incremental* change in emissions when combined with the contributions of all other sources of GHG.<sup>9</sup> 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. To gather sufficient information on a global scale of all past, current, and future projects to make this determination is a difficult, if not impossible, task.

GHG emissions for transportation projects can be divided into those produced during operations and those produced during construction. The following represents a best faith effort to describe the potential GHG emissions related to the proposed project.

<sup>9</sup> This approach is supported by the AEP: *Recommendations by the Association of Environmental Professionals on How to Analyze GHG Emissions and Global Climate Change in CEQA Documents* (March 5, 2007), as well as the South Coast Air Quality Management District (Chapter 6: The CEQA Guide, April 2011) and the US Forest Service (Climate Change Considerations in Project Level NEPA Analysis, July 13, 2009).

These types of projects most likely will have minimal or no increase in operational GHG emissions:

- Pavement rehabilitation
- Shoulder widening
- Culvert/drainage/storm water work
- Landscaping
- CCTVs
- Maintenance vehicle pullouts
- Minor curve corrections

As a project intended to create and modify chain control turnouts along the highway, the project is similar to pavement rehabilitation and shoulder widening projects and will not result in additional vehicle miles traveled or associated increased emissions. Emissions from construction equipment are unavoidable but there will likely be long-term GHG benefits as chain up areas will be able to accommodate more vehicles, which should reduce the amount of engine idling time while waiting for space to safely install or remove tire chains.

## **Construction Emissions**

Construction GHG emissions would result from material processing, 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.

In addition, with innovations such as longer pavement lives, improved traffic management plans, and changes in materials, the GHG emissions produced during construction can be offset to some degree by longer intervals between maintenance and rehabilitation activities.

On August 7, 2019 preliminary construction details were entered into the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Road Construction Emissions Model (<http://www.airquality.org/Businesses/CEQA-Land-Use-Planning/CEQA-Guidance-Tools>) to obtain a reasonable estimate of potential emissions produced by construction equipment. Although the number of working days, number of haul truck trips, and amount of asphalt needed to construct the project will not be known until design plans are further developed, the model returned a preliminary estimate of 70.58 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent emissions produced by construction emissions for construction year 2021.

## **Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies**

### *Statewide Efforts*

In an effort to further the vision of California's GHG reduction targets outlined in AB 32 and SB 32, Governor Brown identified key climate change strategy pillars (concepts). These pillars highlight the idea that several major areas of the California economy will need to reduce emissions to meet the 2030 GHG emissions target. These pillars are (1) reducing today's petroleum use in cars and trucks by up to 50 percent; (2) increasing from one-third to 50 percent our electricity derived from renewable sources; (3) doubling the energy efficiency savings achieved at existing buildings and making heating fuels cleaner; (4) reducing the release of

methane, black carbon, and other short-lived climate pollutants; (5) managing farm and rangelands, forests, and wetlands so they can store carbon; and (6) periodically updating the state's climate adaptation strategy, *Safeguarding California*.




Figure 5 - THE GOVERNOR'S CLIMATE CHANGE PILLARS: 2030 GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION GOALS

The transportation sector is integral to the people and economy of California. To achieve GHG emission reduction goals, it is vital that we build on our past successes in reducing criteria and toxic air pollutants from transportation and goods movement activities. GHG emission reductions will come from cleaner vehicle technologies, lower-carbon fuels, and reduction of vehicle miles traveled. One of Governor Brown's key pillars sets the ambitious goal of reducing today's petroleum use in cars and trucks by up to 50 percent by 2030.

Governor Brown called for support to manage natural and working lands, including forests, rangelands, farms, wetlands, and soils, so they can store carbon. These lands have the ability to remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere through biological processes, and to then sequester carbon in above- and below-ground matter.

### **Caltrans Activities**

Caltrans continues to be involved on the Governor's Climate Action Team as the ARB 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 (2016), set a new interim target to cut GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The following major initiatives are underway at Caltrans to help meet these targets.

### **California Transportation Plan (CTP 2040)**

The California Transportation Plan (CTP) is a statewide, long-range transportation plan to meet our future mobility needs and reduce GHG emissions. The CTP defines performance-based goals, policies, and strategies to achieve our collective vision for California's future statewide,

integrated, multimodal transportation system. It serves as an umbrella document for all of the other statewide transportation planning documents.

SB 391(Liu 2009) requires the CTP to meet California's climate change goals under AB 32. Accordingly, the CTP 2040 identifies the statewide transportation system needed to achieve maximum feasible GHG emission reductions while meeting the state's transportation needs. While MPOs have primary responsibility for identifying land use patterns to help reduce GHG emissions, CTP 2040 identifies additional strategies in Pricing, Transportation Alternatives, Mode Shift, and Operational Efficiency.

#### *Caltrans Strategic Management Plan*

The Strategic Management Plan, released in 2015, creates a performance-based framework to preserve the environment and reduce GHG emissions, among other goals. Specific performance targets in the plan that will help to reduce GHG emissions include:

- Increasing percentage of non-auto mode share
- Reducing VMT per capita
- Reducing Caltrans' internal operational (buildings, facilities, and fuel) GHG emissions

#### *Funding and Technical Assistance Programs*

In addition to developing plans and performance targets to reduce GHG emissions, Caltrans also administers several funding and technical assistance programs that have GHG reduction benefits. These include the Bicycle Transportation Program, Safe Routes to School, Transportation Enhancement Funds, and Transit Planning Grants. A more extensive description of these programs can be found in *Caltrans Activities to Address Climate Change* (2013).

Caltrans Director's Policy 30 (DP-30) Climate Change (June 22, 2012) is intended to establish a department policy that will ensure coordinated efforts to incorporate climate change into departmental decisions and activities.

*Caltrans Activities to Address Climate Change* (April 2013) provides a comprehensive overview of activities undertaken by Caltrans statewide to reduce GHG emissions resulting from agency operations.

#### **Project-Level GHG Reduction Strategies**

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

All Caltrans standard specifications for construction equipment emission control device and idling time requirements will be implemented on this project. Due to the limited footprint area of pavement installation and grading and the spatial distance between project locations, no other reduction measures are feasible for this project.

#### **Adaptation Strategies**

"Adaptation strategies" refer to how Caltrans and others can plan for the effects of climate change on the state's transportation infrastructure and strengthen or protect the facilities from damage—or, put another way, planning and design for resilience. Climate change is expected to produce increased variability in precipitation, rising temperatures, rising sea levels, variability in storm surges and their intensity, and the frequency and intensity of wildfires. These changes may affect the transportation infrastructure in various ways, such as damage to roadbeds from

longer periods of intense heat; increasing storm damage from flooding and erosion; and inundation from rising sea levels. These effects will vary by location and may, in the most extreme cases, require that a facility be relocated or redesigned. These types of impacts to the transportation infrastructure may also have economic and strategic ramifications.

### *Federal Efforts*

At the federal level, the Climate Change Adaptation Task Force, co-chaired by the CEQ, the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), released its interagency task force progress report on October 28, 2011<sup>10</sup>, outlining the federal government's progress in expanding and strengthening the nation's capacity to better understand, prepare for, and respond to extreme events and other climate change impacts. The report provided an update on actions in key areas of federal adaptation, including: building resilience in local communities, safeguarding critical natural resources such as fresh water, and providing accessible climate information and tools to help decision-makers manage climate risks.

The federal Department of Transportation issued *U.S. DOT Policy Statement on Climate Adaptation* in June 2011, committing to “integrate consideration of climate change impacts and adaptation into the planning, operations, policies, and programs of DOT in order to ensure that taxpayer resources are invested wisely and that transportation infrastructure, services and operations remain effective in current and future climate conditions.”<sup>11</sup>

To further the DOT Policy Statement, in December 15, 2014, FHWA issued order 5520 (*Transportation System Preparedness and Resilience to Climate Change and Extreme Weather Events*).<sup>12</sup> This directive established FHWA policy to strive to identify the risks of climate change and extreme weather events to current and planned transportation systems. The FHWA will work to integrate consideration of these risks into its planning, operations, policies, and programs in order to promote preparedness and resilience; safeguard federal investments; and ensure the safety, reliability, and sustainability of the nation's transportation systems.

FHWA has developed guidance and tools for transportation planning that fosters resilience to climate effects and sustainability at the federal, state, and local levels.<sup>13</sup>

### *State Efforts*

On November 14, 2008, then-Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed EO S-13-08, which directed a number of state agencies to address California's vulnerability to sea-level rise caused by climate change. This EO set in motion several agencies and actions to address the concern of sea-level rise and directed all state agencies planning to construct projects in areas vulnerable to future sea-level rise to consider a range of sea-level rise scenarios for the years 2050 and 2100, assess project vulnerability and, to the extent feasible, reduce expected risks and increase resiliency to sea-level rise. Sea-level rise estimates should also be used in conjunction with information on local uplift and subsidence, coastal erosion rates, predicted higher high water levels, and storm surge and storm wave data.

Governor Schwarzenegger also requested the National Academy of Sciences to prepare an assessment report to recommend how California should plan for future sea-level rise. The final report, *Sea-Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington* (Sea-Level Rise

---

<sup>10</sup> <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/administration/eop/ceq/initiatives/resilience>

<sup>11</sup> [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sustainability/resilience/policy\\_and\\_guidance/usdot.cfm](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sustainability/resilience/policy_and_guidance/usdot.cfm)

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legisregs/directives/orders/5520.cfm>

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sustainability/resilience/>

Assessment Report)<sup>14</sup> was released in June 2012 and included relative sea-level rise projections for the three states, taking into account coastal erosion rates, tidal impacts, El Niño and La Niña events, storm surge, and land subsidence rates; and the range of uncertainty in selected sea-level rise projections. It provided a synthesis of existing information on projected sea-level rise impacts to state infrastructure (such as roads, public facilities, and beaches), natural areas, and coastal and marine ecosystems; and a discussion of future research needs regarding sea-level rise.

In response to EO S-13-08, the California Natural Resources Agency (Resources Agency), in coordination with local, regional, state, federal, and public and private entities, developed The California Climate Adaptation Strategy (Dec 2009),<sup>15</sup> which summarized the best available science on climate change impacts to California, assessed California's vulnerability to the identified impacts, and outlined solutions that can be implemented within and across state agencies to promote resiliency. The adaptation strategy was updated and rebranded in 2014 as Safeguarding California: Reducing Climate Risk (Safeguarding California Plan).

Governor Jerry Brown enhanced the overall adaptation planning effort by signing EO B-30-15 in April 2015, requiring state agencies to factor climate change into all planning and investment decisions. In March 2016, sector-specific Implementation Action Plans that demonstrate how state agencies are implementing EO B-30-15 were added to the Safeguarding California Plan. This effort represents a multi-agency, cross-sector approach to addressing adaptation to climate change-related events statewide.

EO S-13-08 also gave rise to the State of California Sea-Level Rise Interim Guidance Document (SLR Guidance), produced by the Coastal and Ocean Working Group of the California Climate Action Team (CO-CAT), of which Caltrans is a member. First published in 2010, the document provided "guidance for incorporating sea-level rise (SLR) projections into planning and decision making for projects in California," specifically, "information and recommendations to enhance consistency across agencies in their development of approaches to SLR." The March 2013 update<sup>16</sup> finalizes the SLR Guidance by incorporating findings of the National Academy's 2012 final Sea-Level Rise Assessment Report; the policy recommendations remain the same as those in the 2010 interim SLR Guidance. The guidance will be updated as necessary in the future to reflect the latest scientific understanding of how the climate is changing and how this change may affect the rates of SLR.

Climate change adaptation for transportation infrastructure involves long-term planning and risk management to address vulnerabilities in the transportation system from increased precipitation, and flooding; the increased frequency and intensity of storms and wildfires; rising temperatures; and rising sea levels. Caltrans is actively engaged in working towards identifying these risks throughout the state and will work to incorporate this information into all planning and investment decisions as directed in EO B-30-15.

The project is outside the coastal zone 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.

---

<sup>14</sup> *Sea Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington: Past, Present, and Future* (2012) is available at: [http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=13389](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13389).

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/adaptation/strategy/index.html>

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.opc.ca.gov/2013/04/update-to-the-sea-level-rise-guidance-document/>

Mono Chain Up Areas (09-36660)

Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study



## Chapter 4 – Comments and 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 interagency coordination meetings, public meetings, public notices, and Project Development Team (PDT) meetings. This chapter summarizes the results of the Department's efforts to fully identify, address, and resolve project-related issues through early and continuing coordination.

### Public Comments

Public comments were received for 30 days from August 20, 2019 through September 18, 2019. Notification of the opportunity to provide comments was posted online, in the local newspaper(s), and posted onsite near the proposed project locations. Physical copies of the "Draft" Initial Study were posted at the Caltrans District 9 Office [500 S. Main St., Bishop CA], the Mammoth Lakes Library [400 Sierra Park Rd., Mammoth Lakes CA], the Lee Vining Post Office [121 Lee Vining Ave, Lee Vining CA], and the Bridgeport Library [94 North School Street., Bridgeport CA]. No public meetings were held or requested by during the comment period. All comments received are included in Appendix J.

### Cultural and Tribal Resources

October 25, 2018 – In accordance with Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR Part 800), Caltrans Archaeologist Katelyn Mohr sent letters describing the proposed project activities, a map of proposed locations, and a request for any comments on the project to the following Tribes: Bridgeport Indian Colony, Mono Lake Indian Community, Bishop Paiute, Big Pine Paiute, Washoe Tribe of California and Nevada, and the Utu Utu Gwaitu Paiute Tribe of the Benton Paiute. No responses were received as of August 2019.

November 11, 2018 – Caltrans Archaeologist Katelyn Mohr initiated consultation with U.S. Forest Service (Inyo National Forest) archaeologist Jacqueline Beidl. Ms. Beidl confirmed that no cultural resources are known to occur in any of the proposed project impact areas.

May 29, 2019 – Caltrans Archaeologist Katelyn Mohr obtained a Field Authorization permit from Bureau of Land Management (BLM) archaeologist Greg Haverstock. No comments or concerns about the proposed project were raised by Mr. Haverstock.

### Biological Resources (All lists available in Appendix H)

March 2, 2019 – Caltrans Biologist Stephen Pfeiler obtained a list of plant and animal species with California special status from the California Natural Diversity Database.

March 20, 2019 – Caltrans Biologist Stephen Pfeiler received an official species list from the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Reno, Nevada,



office. The list was 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”.

March 20, 2019 – Caltrans Biologist Stephen Pfeiler obtained a list of special-status plant species which may occur in the project vicinity through the California Native Plant Society (CNPS).

May 1, 2019 – Caltrans Biologist Stephen Pfeiler, project engineer Kami Bayer, engineer Jamie Robertson, and CDFW Environmental Scientist Nick Buckmaster met for a field review of the MNO6 location. It was determined by all parties that the drainage culvert at this location is non-jurisdictional and extending it to accommodate a chain control area will not require a CDFW permit.

May 9, 2019 – Stephen Pfeiler, Kami Bayer, and Nick Buckmaster met for a field review at Location D04 near the top of Sherwin Grade on U.S. 395. This location has two culverts that will need to be extended to accommodate wider chain control areas. It was determined at this meeting that the southern culvert is non-jurisdictional and will not require a permit, however the northern culvert is in a jurisdictional waterway. Rather than obtaining a project-specific permit for work at this culvert, all parties agreed to operate under the existing 1600 Routine Maintenance Agreement (RMA). Work at this culvert will be documented and submitted to CDFW in the annual RMA report at the end of the year of construction.

June 11, 2019 – Stephen Pfeiler contacted Nick Buckmaster to discuss a culvert outlet extension near location D67. Mr. Buckmaster determined this culvert is in a non-jurisdictional waterway and will not require any permitting.

August 8, 2019 – Due to results of field observations, an addendum to the project Natural Environment Study – Minimal Impacts (NESMI) was written by Caltrans Biologist Stephen Pfeiler. The addendum identified swallows currently nesting in the culvert at Location D67, which are likely to nest there again during construction in the summer of 2021. An additional avoidance measure commitment, BIO-7, was added to the project (Chapter 2 – Animal Species, Appendix E).

## **Chapter 5 – List of Preparers**

The following Department staff and consultants contributed to the preparation of this IS.

Bradley Bowers, Associate Environmental Coordinator and Paleontology Specialist; M.S. Environmental Science and Management, University of California, Santa Barbara; B.S. Geological Sciences & Environmental Hydrogeology, California State University, Los Angeles; 6 years of experience working in the environmental sector. Contribution: Environmental Document Preparation, Paleontological Analysis, Cumulative Analysis, Map Creation, Geological Evaluation

Angela Calloway, Senior Environmental Planner. M.A., Anthropology, California State University, Sacramento; B.S., Anthropology, Indiana State University; 17 years of

experience in California and Great Basin archaeology and environmental document preparation. Contribution: Environmental document oversight.

Matthew Goike, Environmental Engineer. B.S. and M.S. in Civil Engineering from Michigan State University; 19 years of experience in transportation project development, 3 years of experience as a specialist in Air, Noise, Hazardous Waste, Water, Wastewater, and Stormwater. Contribution: Air, Noise, and Hazardous Waste assessment.

Jim Hibbert, District Landscape Architect; B.A. Geography, University of Alaska-Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK; 2nd B.L.A. Landscape Architecture, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR. California Licensed Landscape Architect No. 5136. 19 years of experience in landscape architecture; Contribution: Visual Impacts Analysis, Visual Impact Analysis Questionnaire and Cumulative Analysis.

Mohr Katelyn, Environmental Planner. B.A. in Anthropology for California State University, Chico and M.A. in Anthropology from University of Nevada, Reno; 4 years of experience in Cultural Resource Management. Contribution: Cultural Resource Screening Memo, Section 106 and AB 52 consultation

Stephen Pfeiler, Associate Biologist. B.S. in Environmental Science from California State University Channel Islands; M.S., in Wildlife Biology from Utah State University; 3 years of experience as a geotechnical specialist for quality assurance/quality control in construction-related projects; 6 years of experience in research, restoration, and conservation of biological resources. Contribution: Natural Environment Study (Minimal Impacts) and Natural Environment Study Addendum

# APPENDICES

## Appendix B. Title VI Policy Statement

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

EDMUND G. BROWN Jr., Governor

### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

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



*Making Conservation  
a California Way of Life.*

April 2018

### 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."*

Related federal statutes 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, please visit the following web page:  
[http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/bep/title\\_vi/t6\\_violated.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/bep/title_vi/t6_violated.htm).

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 Business and Economic Opportunity, 1823 14<sup>th</sup> Street, MS-79, Sacramento, CA 95811. Telephone (916) 324-8379, TTY 711, email [Title.VI@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Title.VI@dot.ca.gov), or visit the website [www.dot.ca.gov](http://www.dot.ca.gov).

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Laurie Berman".

LAURIE BERMAN  
Director

*"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system  
to enhance California's economy and livability"*

## Appendix C. Project Location Images




Figure 6 - Location MNO 6






Figure 7 - Locations D00, D02, and D04 on U.S. 395. Inyo/Mono County line indicated by light green horizontal line.





Figure 8 - Location D08 near the communities of Sunny Slopes and Toms Place.




Figure 9 - Locations D12, D16, and D22 near Mammoth Lakes Airport and the U.S. 395/S.R. 203 junction.






Figure 10 - Location D39 at U.S. 395 and Highway 158 junction




Figure 11 - Location D63, U.S. 395 between Virginia Lakes Road and Highway 270 (Bodie Road)







Figure 12 - Location D67 at intersection of U.S. 395 and Highway 270 (Bodie Road)

## Appendix D. Type 15 and Type 21 Light Standards



## Appendix E. Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Summary

In order to be sure that all of the environmental measures identified in this document are executed at the appropriate times, the following mitigation program (as articulated on the proposed Environmental Commitments Record [ECR] which follows) would be implemented. During project design, avoidance, minimization, and /or mitigation measures will be incorporated into the project's final plans, specifications, and cost estimates, as appropriate. All permits will be obtained prior to implementation of the project. During construction, environmental and construction/engineering staff will ensure that the commitments contained in this ECR are fulfilled. Following construction and appropriate phases of project delivery, long-term mitigation maintenance and monitoring will take place, as applicable. As the following ECR is a draft, some fields have not been completed, and will be filled out as each of the measures is implemented. Note: Some measures may apply to more than one resource area. Duplicative or redundant measures have not been included in this ECR.

### Environmental Commitments Record for EA 09-36660\_ / ID 0916000008

Last updated 8/14/2019

#### Mono Chain Up Area

MNO-395-0.000/0.000

Current Project Phase: 0

EP: Bradley Bowers

760-872-2331

CL: Ryan Spaulding

760-872-5244

RE:

Permits							
Permit	Agency	Date Submitted	Date Received	Expiration	Requirements Completed Name	Date	Comments
Commitments							
Task and Brief Description	Source	SSP/ N SSP	Responsible Staff	Action to Comply	Task Completed	Remarks/Due Date	
<b>Pre-Construction</b>							
<b>Biology</b>							
BIO-1: Pre-Construction nesting bird surveys within 48 hours prior to construction start regardless of time of year as species nesting times vary within and outside of the normal nesting period. If nests are found within 250' (songbirds) or 500' (raptors) of the PIA, a monitor may be required for work to be conducted within these buffers. A no-work buffer may be implemented if the Department Biologist determines it necessary. SSP 14-6.03A	Env Doc	SSP	Biologist; RE; Contractor	Contractor notify district biologist 30 days before construction start.			Signature Date
BIO-7: Cliff swallow nests will be removed in box culvert located at PM 69.8 on 395 (location D67). Nest removal will take place outside of nesting bird season of 2021. Nest building activities will be monitored and removed starting February 15 no less than once per week until construction has ceased.	Env Doc	n/a	District Biologist	District biologist(s) will closely monitor nesting activity to prevent swallows from building successful nests. Monitoring and removal will occur no less than once per week throughout nesting bird season until construction is complete.			Signature Date
<b>Construction</b>							
<b>Biology</b>							
BIO-2: District biologist may be required to conduct monitoring for nesting birds or other special-status species is found within buffer distances of the PIA during pre-construction surveys. If necessary District biologist will monitor all active nests or dens until nesting and denning activities have concluded or the Department Biologist deems it unnecessary.	Env Doc		Biologist; RE; Contractor	Contractor notify district biologist 30 days before construction start.			Signature Date
BIO-3: Any active nest found within the project impact area will be monitored by a qualified biologist	Env Doc	SSP	Biologist/RE/C ontractor	CT Biologist and biological monitors will notify construction personnel if			Signature

Page 1

## Environmental Commitments Record for EA 09-36660\_ / ID 0916000008

Last updated 8/14/2019

### Mono Chain Up Area

MNO-395-0.000/0.000

Current Project Phase: 0

EP: Bradley Bowers

760-872-2331

CL: Ryan Spaulding

760-872-5244

RE:

Task and Brief Description	Source	SSP/ NSSP	Responsible Staff	Action to Comply	Task Completed	Remarks/Due Date
				active nests are found. Project biologist will determine if additional monitoring is required	_____	_____
BIO-4: If a nest is found outside of the PIA but within 250 feet of construction activities, a no-work buffer and monitoring may be implemented at the discretion of the project biologist	Env Doc	SSP	Biologist/RE/C ontractor	CT Biologist will assess potential impacts to active nests, if found, and determine appropriate avoidance measures	Signature _____	_____
					Date _____	
BIO-5: If an active nest is found beyond 250 from construction activities, nest monitoring may be required at the discretion of the project biologist	Env Doc	SSP	Biologist/RE/C ontracto	CT Biologist will assess potential impacts to active nests, if found, and determine appropriate avoidance measures	Signature _____	_____
					Date _____	
BIO-6: Invasive Plant NSSP: Implement invasive plant NSSP to ensure reduction in spread of noxious and invasive plant species during construction. NSSP 14-6.05	Env Doc	NSSP	Biologist; RE; Contractor	RE will ensure contractor will implement NSSP requirements and provide any documentation needed.	Signature _____	_____
					Date _____	
<b>Post-Construction</b>						
<b>Visual Resources</b>						
VIS-1: All new solar and conventionally-powered lights at chain up areas will only be activated (illuminated) during events when the chain up area could be in use, and deactivated after the event ends.	Env Doc	n/a	CT Maintenance/D esign Engineer	PE will design lights with switches. District Maintenance staff will be directed to only turn lights on when needed and off after use	Signature _____	_____
					Date _____	



## Appendix F. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Hazard Map




Figure 13 - Earthquake Hazards Map showing location D19 (red star) in earthquake fault zone.

## Appendix G. Required Consultation/Concurrence Documentation (Reserved for final document)

## Appendix H. Species Lists



## United States Department of the Interior

### FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Reno Fish And Wildlife Office

1340 Financial Boulevard, Suite 234

Reno, NV 89502-7147

Phone: (775) 861-6300 Fax: (775) 861-6301

<http://www.fws.gov/nevada/>



In Reply Refer To:

October 21, 2019

Consultation Code: 08ENVD00-2019-SLI-0042

Event Code: 08ENVD00-2020-E-00078

Project Name: MonoChainUps2

Subject: Updated list of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location, and/or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The attached species list indicates threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species and designated or proposed 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 of 1973, as amended (ESA, 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), for projects that are authorized, funded, or carried out by a Federal agency. Candidate species have no protection under the ESA but are included for consideration because they could be listed prior to the completion of your project. Consideration of these species during project planning may assist species conservation efforts and may prevent the need for future listing actions. For additional information regarding species that may be found in the proposed project area, visit <http://www.fws.gov/nevada/es/ipac.html>.

The purpose of the ESA 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 ESA 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 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. Guidelines for preparing a Biological Assessment can be found at: [http://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/section7/ba\\_guide.html](http://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/section7/ba_guide.html).

If a Federal action 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: <http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/TOC-GLOS.PDF>.

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this species list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally listed, proposed, 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 ESA, 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 ECOS-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 ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the attached list.

The Nevada Fish and Wildlife Office (NFWO) no longer provides species of concern lists. Most of these species for which we have concern are also on the Animal and Plant At-Risk Tracking List for Nevada (At-Risk list) maintained by the State of Nevada's Natural Heritage Program (Heritage). Instead of maintaining our own list, we adopted Heritage's At-Risk list and are partnering with them to provide distribution data and information on the conservation needs for at-risk species to agencies or project proponents. The mission of Heritage is to continually evaluate the conservation priorities of native plants, animals, and their habitats, particularly those most vulnerable to extinction or in serious decline. In addition, in order to avoid future conflicts, we ask that you consider these at-risk species early in your project planning and explore management alternatives that provide for their long-term conservation.

For a list of at-risk species by county, visit Heritage's website (<http://heritage.nv.gov>). For a specific list of at-risk species that may occur in the project area, you can obtain a data request form from the website ([http://heritage.nv.gov/get\\_data](http://heritage.nv.gov/get_data)) or by contacting the Administrator of Heritage at 901 South Stewart Street, Suite 5002, Carson City, Nevada 89701-5245, (775) 684-2900. Please indicate on the form that your request is being obtained as part of your coordination with the Service under the ESA. During your project analysis, if you obtain new information or data for any Nevada sensitive species, we request that you provide the information to Heritage at the above address.

Furthermore, certain species of fish and wildlife are classified as protected by the State of Nevada (<http://www.leg.state.nv.us/NAC/NAC-503.html>). You must first obtain the appropriate license, permit, or written authorization from the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) to take, or possess any parts of protected fish and wildlife species. Please visit <http://www.ndow.org> or contact NDOW in northern Nevada (775) 688-1500, in southern Nevada (702) 486-5127, or in eastern Nevada (775) 777-2300.

Please be aware that bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668 *et seq.*), and projects affecting these species may require development of an eagle conservation plan ([http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/eagle\\_guidance.html](http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/eagle_guidance.html)). Additionally, wind energy projects should follow the Service's wind energy guidelines (<http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/>) for minimizing impacts to migratory birds and bats.

The Service's Pacific Southwest Region developed the *Interim Guidelines for the Development of a Project Specific Avian and Bat Protection Plan for Wind Energy Facilities* (Interim Guidelines). This document provides energy facility developers with a tool for assessing the risk of potential impacts to wildlife resources and delineates how best to design and operate a bird- and bat-friendly wind facility. These Interim Guidelines are available upon request from the NFWO. The intent of a Bird and Bat Conservation Strategy is to conserve wildlife resources while supporting project developers through: (1) establishing project development in an adaptive management framework; (2) identifying proper siting and project design strategies; (3) designing and implementing pre-construction surveys; (4) implementing appropriate conservation measures for each development phase; (5) designing and implementing appropriate post-construction monitoring strategies; (6) using post-construction studies to better understand the dynamics of mortality reduction (*e.g.*, changes in blade cut-in speed, assessments of blade "feathering" success, and studies on the effects of visual and acoustic deterrents) including efforts tied into Before-After/Control-Impact analysis; and (7) conducting a thorough risk assessment and validation leading to adjustments in management and mitigation actions.

The template and recommendations set forth in the Interim Guidelines were based upon the Avian Powerline Interaction Committee's Avian Protection Plan template (<http://www.aplic.org/>) developed for electric utilities and modified accordingly to address the unique concerns of wind energy facilities. These recommendations are also consistent with the Service's wind energy guidelines. We recommend contacting us as early as possible in the planning process to discuss the need and process for developing a site-specific Bird and Bat Conservation Strategy.

The Service has also developed guidance regarding wind power development in relation to prairie grouse leks (sage-grouse are included in this). This document can be found at: [http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/Oklahoma/documents/te\\_species/wind%20power/prairie%20grouse%20lek%205%20mile%20public.pdf](http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/Oklahoma/documents/te_species/wind%20power/prairie%20grouse%20lek%205%20mile%20public.pdf).

Migratory Birds are a Service Trust Resource. Based on the Service's conservation responsibilities and management authority for migratory birds under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, as amended (MBTA; 16 U.S.C. 703 *et seq.*), we recommend that any land clearing or other surface disturbance associated with proposed actions within the project area be timed to



avoid potential destruction of bird nests or young, or birds that breed in the area. Such destruction may be in violation of the MBTA. Under the MBTA, nests with eggs or young of migratory birds may not be harmed, nor may migratory birds be killed. Therefore, we recommend land clearing be conducted outside the avian breeding season. If this is not feasible, we recommend a qualified biologist survey the area prior to land clearing. If nests are located, or if other evidence of nesting (*i.e.*, mated pairs, territorial defense, carrying nesting material, transporting food) is observed, a protective buffer (the size depending on the habitat requirements of the species) should be delineated and the entire area avoided to prevent destruction or disturbance to nests until they are no longer active.

Guidance for minimizing impacts to migratory birds for projects involving communications towers (*e.g.*, cellular, digital television, radio, and emergency broadcast) can be found at: <http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/towers.htm>; <http://www.towerkill.com>; and <http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/comtow.html>.

If wetlands, springs, or streams are known to occur in the project area or are present in the vicinity of the project area, we ask that you be aware of potential impacts project activities may have on these habitats. Discharge of fill material into wetlands or waters of the United States is regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) pursuant to section 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1972, as amended. We recommend you contact the ACOE's Regulatory Section regarding the possible need for a permit. For projects located in northern Nevada (Carson City, Churchill, Douglas, Elko, Esmeralda, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Lyon, Mineral, Pershing, Storey, and Washoe Counties) contact the Reno Regulatory Office at 300 Booth Street, Room 3060, Reno, Nevada 89509, (775) 784-5304; in southern Nevada (Clark, Lincoln, Nye, and White Pine Counties) contact the St. George Regulatory Office at 321 North Mall Drive, Suite L-101, St. George, Utah 84790-7314, (435) 986-3979; or in California along the eastern Sierra contact the Sacramento Regulatory Office at 650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-200, Sacramento, California 95814, (916) 557-5250.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. Please include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

The table below outlines lead FWS field offices by county and land ownership/project type. Please refer to this table when you are ready to coordinate (including requests for section 7 consultation) with the field office corresponding to your project, and send any documentation regarding your project to that corresponding office. Therefore, the lead FWS field office may not be the office listed above in the letterhead.

#### Lead FWS offices by County and Ownership/Program

County	Ownership/Program	Species	Office Lead*
<hr/>			

<b>Alameda</b>	Tidal wetlands/marsh adjacent to Bays	Salt marsh species, delta smelt	BDFWO
<b>Alameda</b>	All ownerships but tidal/estuarine	All	SFWO
<b>Alpine</b>	Humboldt Toiyabe National Forest	All	RFWO
<b>Alpine</b>	Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit	All	RFWO
<b>Alpine</b>	Stanislaus National Forest	All	SFWO
<b>Alpine</b>	El Dorado National Forest	All	SFWO
<b>Colusa</b>	Mendocino National Forest	All	AFWO
<b>Colusa</b>	Other	All	By jurisdiction (see map)
<b>Contra Costa</b>	Legal Delta (Excluding ECCHCP)	All	BDFWO
<b>Contra Costa</b>	Antioch Dunes NWR	All	BDFWO
<b>Contra Costa</b>	Tidal wetlands/marsh adjacent to Bays	Salt marsh species, delta smelt	BDFWO
<b>Contra Costa</b>	All ownerships but tidal/estuarine	All	SFWO
<b>Del Norte</b>	All	All	AFWO
<b>El Dorado</b>	El Dorado National Forest	All	SFWO
<b>El Dorado</b>	LakeTahoe Basin Management Unit		RFWO
<b>Glenn</b>	Mendocino National Forest	All	AFWO
<b>Glenn</b>	Other	All	By jurisdiction (see map)
<b>Humboldt</b>	All except Shasta Trinity National Forest	All	AFWO

<b>Humboldt</b>	Shasta Trinity National Forest	All	YFWO
<b>Lake</b>	Mendocino National Forest	All	AFWO
<b>Lake</b>	Other	All	By jurisdiction (see map)
<b>Lassen</b>	Modoc National Forest	All	KFWO
<b>Lassen</b>	Lassen National Forest	All	SFWO
<b>Lassen</b>	Toiyabe National Forest	All	RFWO
<b>Lassen</b>	BLM Surprise and Eagle Lake Resource Areas	All	RFWO
<b>Lassen</b>	BLM Alturas Resource Area	All	KFWO
<b>Lassen</b>	Lassen Volcanic National Park	All (includes Eagle Lake trout on all ownerships)	SFWO
<b>Lassen</b>	All other ownerships	All	By jurisdiction (see map)
<b>Marin</b>	Tidal wetlands/marsh adjacent to Bays	Salt marsh species, delta smelt	BDFWO
<b>Marin</b>	All ownerships but tidal/estuarine	All	SFWO
<b>Mendocino</b>	Russian River watershed	All	SFWO
<b>Mendocino</b>	All except Russian River watershed	All	AFWO
<b>Modoc</b>	Modoc National Forest	All	KFWO
<b>Modoc</b>	BLM Alturas Resource Area	All	KFWO
<b>Modoc</b>	Klamath Basin National Wildlife Refuge Complex	All	KFWO
<b>Modoc</b>	BLM Surprise and Eagle Lake Resource Areas	All	RFWO

<b>Modoc</b>	All other ownerships	All	By jurisdiction (See map)
<b>Mono</b>	Inyo National Forest	All	RFWO
<b>Mono</b>	Humboldt Toiyabe National Forest	All	RFWO
<b>Napa</b>	All ownerships but tidal/estuarine	All	SFWO
<b>Napa</b>	Tidal wetlands/marsh adjacent to San Pablo Bay	Salt marsh species, delta smelt	BDFWO
<b>Nevada</b>	Humboldt Toiyabe National Forest	All	RFWO
<b>Nevada</b>	All other ownerships	All	By jurisdiction (See map)
<b>Placer</b>	Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit	All	RFWO
<b>Placer</b>	All other ownerships	All	SFWO
<b>Sacramento</b>	Legal Delta	Delta Smelt	BDFWO
<b>Sacramento</b>	Other	All	By jurisdiction (see map)
<b>San Francisco</b>	Tidal wetlands/marsh adjacent to San Francisco Bay	Salt marsh species, delta smelt	BDFWO
<b>San Francisco</b>	All ownerships but tidal/estuarine	All	SFWO
<b>San Mateo</b>	Tidal wetlands/marsh adjacent to San Francisco Bay	Salt marsh species, delta smelt	BDFWO
<b>San Mateo</b>	All ownerships but tidal/estuarine	All	SFWO
<b>San Joaquin</b>	Legal Delta excluding San Joaquin HCP	All	BDFWO

<b>San Joaquin</b>	Other	All	SFWO
<b>Santa Clara</b>	Tidal wetlands/marsh adjacent to San Francisco Bay	Salt marsh species, delta smelt	BDFWO
<b>Santa Clara</b>	All ownerships but tidal/estuarine	All	SFWO
<b>Shasta</b>	Shasta Trinity National Forest except Hat Creek Ranger District (administered by Lassen National Forest)	All	YFWO
<b>Shasta</b>	Hat Creek Ranger District	All	SFWO
<b>Shasta</b>	Bureau of Reclamation (Central Valley Project)	All	BDFWO
<b>Shasta</b>	Whiskeytown National Recreation Area	All	YFWO
<b>Shasta</b>	BLM Alturas Resource Area	All	KFWO
<b>Shasta</b>	Caltrans	By jurisdiction	SFWO/AFWO
<b>Shasta</b>	Ahjumawi Lava Springs State Park	Shasta crayfish	SFWO
<b>Shasta</b>	All other ownerships	All	By jurisdiction (see map)
<b>Shasta</b>	Natural Resource Damage Assessment, all lands	All	SFWO/BDFWO
<b>Sierra</b>	Humboldt Toiyabe National Forest	All	RFWO
<b>Sierra</b>	All other ownerships	All	SFWO
<b>Siskiyou</b>	Klamath National Forest (except Ukonom District)	All	YFWO
<b>Siskiyou</b>	Six Rivers National Forest and Ukonom District	All	AFWO
<b>Siskiyou</b>	Shasta Trinity National Forest	All	YFWO

<b>Siskiyou</b>	Lassen National Forest	All	SFWO
<b>Siskiyou</b>	Modoc National Forest	All	KFWO
<b>Siskiyou</b>	Lava Beds National Volcanic Monument	All	KFWO
<b>Siskiyou</b>	BLM Alturas Resource Area	All	KFWO
<b>Siskiyou</b>	Klamath Basin National Wildlife Refuge Complex	All	KFWO
<b>Siskiyou</b>	All other ownerships	All	By jurisdiction (see map)
<b>Solano</b>	Suisun Marsh	All	BDFWO
<b>Solano</b>	Tidal wetlands/marsh adjacent to San Pablo Bay	Salt marsh species, delta smelt	BDFWO
<b>Solano</b>	All ownerships but tidal/estuarine	All	SFWO
<b>Solano</b>	Other	All	By jurisdiction (see map)
<b>Sonoma</b>	Tidal wetlands/marsh adjacent to San Pablo Bay	Salt marsh species, delta smelt	BDFWO
<b>Sonoma</b>	All ownerships but tidal/estuarine	All	SFWO
<b>Tehama</b>	Mendocino National Forest	All	AFWO
<b>Tehama</b>	Shasta Trinity National Forest except Hat Creek Ranger District (administered by Lassen National Forest)	All	YFWO
<b>Tehama</b>	All other ownerships	All	By jurisdiction (see map)
<b>Trinity</b>	BLM	All	AFWO
<b>Trinity</b>	Six Rivers National Forest	All	AFWO
<b>Trinity</b>	Shasta Trinity National Forest	All	YFWO

<b>Trinity</b>	Mendocino National Forest	All	AFWO
<b>Trinity</b>	BIA (Tribal Trust Lands)	All	AFWO
<b>Trinity</b>	County Government	All	AFWO
<b>Trinity</b>	All other ownerships	All	By jurisdiction (See map)
<b>Yolo</b>	Yolo Bypass	All	BDFWO
<b>Yolo</b>	Other	All	By jurisdiction (see map)
<b>All</b>	FERC-ESA	All	By jurisdiction (see map)
<b>All</b>	FERC-ESA	Shasta crayfish	SFWO
<b>All</b>	FERC-Relicensing (non-ESA)	All	BDFWO

**\*Office Leads:**

**AFWO=Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office**

**BDFWO=Bay Delta Fish and Wildlife Office**

**KFWO=Klamath Falls Fish and Wildlife Office**

**RFWO=Reno Fish and Wildlife Office**

**YFWO=Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office**

**Attachment(s):**

- Official Species List
- USFWS National Wildlife Refuges and Fish Hatcheries
- 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:

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



## Project Summary

Consultation Code: 08ENVD00-2019-SLI-0042

Event Code: 08ENVD00-2020-E-00078


Project Name: MonoChainUps2

Project Type: TRANSPORTATION

Project Description: Widening and Lengthening of chain installation areas at various locations along hwy 395

Project Location:

Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: <https://www.google.com/maps/place/37.77648159695383N119.01626897891023W>



Counties: Inyo, CA | Mono, CA

## 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.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries<sup>1</sup>, 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
North American Wolverine <i>Gulo gulo luscus</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5123">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5123</a>	Proposed Threatened
Sierra Nevada Bighorn Sheep <i>Ovis canadensis sierrae</i> Population: Sierra Nevada There is <b>final</b> critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3646">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3646</a>	Endangered

## Birds

NAME	STATUS
Greater Sage-grouse <i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i> Population: Bi-State There is <b>proposed</b> critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8159">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8159</a>	Proposed Threatened

---

## Amphibians

NAME	STATUS
<b>Mountain Yellow-legged Frog <i>Rana muscosa</i></b> Population: Northern California DPS There is <b>final</b> critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8037">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8037</a>	Endangered
<b>Sierra Nevada Yellow-legged Frog <i>Rana sierrae</i></b> There is <b>final</b> critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9529">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9529</a>	Endangered
<b>Yosemite Toad <i>Anaxyrus canorus</i></b> There is <b>final</b> critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7255">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7255</a>	Threatened

## Fishes

NAME	STATUS
<b>Lahontan Cutthroat Trout <i>Oncorhynchus clarkii henshawi</i></b> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3964">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3964</a> Species survey guidelines: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/guideline/survey/population/233/office/14320.pdf">https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/guideline/survey/population/233/office/14320.pdf</a>	Threatened
<b>Owens Pupfish <i>Cyprinodon radiosus</i></b> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4982">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4982</a>	Endangered
<b>Owens Tui Chub <i>Gila bicolor ssp. snyderi</i></b> There is <b>final</b> critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7289">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7289</a>	Endangered

## Critical habitats

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

## 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.

## Migratory Birds

Certain birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act<sup>1</sup> and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act<sup>2</sup>.

Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to migratory birds, eagles, and their habitats should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate conservation measures, as described [below](#).

- 
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)

The birds listed below are birds of particular concern either because they occur on the [USFWS Birds of Conservation Concern](#) (BCC) list or warrant special attention in your project location. To learn more about the levels of concern for birds on your list and how this list is generated, see the FAQ [below](#). This is not a list of every bird you may find in this location, nor a guarantee that every bird on this list will be found in your project area. To see exact locations of where birders and the general public have sighted birds in and around your project area, visit the [E-bird data mapping tool](#) (Tip: enter your location, desired date range and a species on your list). For projects that occur off the Atlantic Coast, additional maps and models detailing the relative occurrence and abundance of bird species on your list are available. Links to additional information about Atlantic Coast birds, and other important information about your migratory bird list, including how to properly interpret and use your migratory bird report, can be found [below](#).

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds on your list, click on the PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY at the top of your list to see when these birds are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
<b>Bald Eagle <i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i></b> 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. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1626">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1626</a>	Breeds Jan 1 to Aug 31
<b>Black-chinned Sparrow <i>Spizella atrogularis</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9447">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9447</a>	Breeds Apr 15 to Jul 31

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
<b>Brewer's Sparrow <i>Spizella breweri</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9291">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9291</a>	Breeds May 15 to Aug 10
<b>Cassin's Finch <i>Carpodacus cassinii</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9462">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9462</a>	Breeds May 15 to Jul 15
<b>Clark's Grebe <i>Aechmophorus clarkii</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.	Breeds Jan 1 to Dec 31
<b>Golden Eagle <i>Aquila chrysaetos</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1680">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1680</a>	Breeds Dec 1 to Aug 31
<b>Green-tailed Towhee <i>Pipilo chlorurus</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9444">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9444</a>	Breeds May 1 to Aug 10
<b>Lesser Yellowlegs <i>Tringa flavipes</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9679">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9679</a>	Breeds elsewhere
<b>Lewis's Woodpecker <i>Melanerpes lewis</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9408">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9408</a>	Breeds Apr 20 to Sep 30
<b>Long-billed Curlew <i>Numenius americanus</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5511">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5511</a>	Breeds Apr 1 to Jul 31
<b>Marbled Godwit <i>Limosa fedoa</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9481">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9481</a>	Breeds elsewhere
<b>Olive-sided Flycatcher <i>Contopus cooperi</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3914">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3914</a>	Breeds May 20 to Aug 31



NAME	BREEDING SEASON
<b>Pinyon Jay <i>Gymnorhinus cyanocephalus</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9420">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9420</a>	Breeds Feb 15 to Jul 15
<b>Rufous Hummingbird <i>selasphorus rufus</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8002">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8002</a>	Breeds elsewhere
<b>Sage Thrasher <i>Oreoscoptes montanus</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9433">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9433</a>	Breeds Apr 15 to Aug 10
<b>Sagebrush Sparrow <i>Artemisiospiza nevadensis</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA	Breeds Mar 15 to Jul 31
<b>Tricolored Blackbird <i>Agelaius tricolor</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3910">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3910</a>	Breeds Mar 15 to Aug 10
<b>Virginia's Warbler <i>Vermivora virginiae</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9441">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9441</a>	Breeds May 1 to Jul 31
<b>White Headed Woodpecker <i>Picoides albolarvatus</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9411">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9411</a>	Breeds May 1 to Aug 15
<b>Willet <i>Tringa semipalmata</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.	Breeds Apr 20 to Aug 5
<b>Williamson's Sapsucker <i>Sphyrapicus thyroideus</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8832">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8832</a>	Breeds May 1 to Jul 31
<b>Willow Flycatcher <i>Empidonax traillii</i></b> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3482">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3482</a>	Breeds May 20 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 and understand the FAQ “Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report” before using or attempting to interpret this report.

### Probability of Presence (■)

Each green bar represents the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during a particular week of the year. (A year is represented as 12 4-week months.) A taller bar indicates a higher probability of species presence. The survey effort (see below) can be used to establish a level of confidence in the presence score. One can have higher confidence in the presence score if the corresponding survey effort is also high.

How is the probability of presence score calculated? The calculation is done in three steps:

1. The probability of presence for each week is calculated as the number of survey events in the week where the species was detected divided by the total number of survey events for that week. For example, if in week 12 there were 20 survey events and the Spotted Towhee was found in 5 of them, the probability of presence of the Spotted Towhee in week 12 is 0.25.
2. To properly present the pattern of presence across the year, the relative probability of presence is calculated. This is the probability of presence divided by the maximum probability of presence across all weeks. For example, imagine the probability of presence in week 20 for the Spotted Towhee is 0.05, and that the probability of presence at week 12 (0.25) is the maximum of any week of the year. The relative probability of presence on week 12 is  $0.25/0.25 = 1$ ; at week 20 it is  $0.05/0.25 = 0.2$ .
3. The relative probability of presence calculated in the previous step undergoes a statistical conversion so that all possible values fall between 0 and 10, inclusive. This is the probability of presence score.

### Breeding Season (■)

Yellow bars denote a very liberal estimate of the time-frame inside which the bird breeds across its entire range. If there are no yellow bars shown for a bird, it does not breed in your project area.

### Survey Effort (|)

Vertical black lines superimposed on probability of presence bars indicate the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps. The number of surveys is expressed as a range, for example, 33 to 64 surveys.


### No Data (—)


A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.

### Survey Timeframe



Surveys from only the last 10 years are used in order to ensure delivery of currently relevant information. The exception to this is areas off the Atlantic coast, where bird returns are based on all years of available data, since data in these areas is currently much more sparse.





Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Birds of Conservation Concern <http://www.fws.gov/birds/management/managed-species/birds-of-conservation-concern.php>
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds <http://www.fws.gov/birds/management/project-assessment-tools-and-guidance/conservation-measures.php>
- Nationwide conservation measures for birds <http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/pdf/management/nationwidestandardconservationmeasures.pdf>

## Migratory Birds FAQ

**Tell me more about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds.**

[Nationwide Conservation Measures](#) describes measures that can help avoid and minimize impacts to all birds at any location year round. Implementation of these measures is particularly important when birds are most likely to occur in the project area. When birds may be breeding in the area, identifying the locations of any active nests and avoiding their destruction is a very helpful impact minimization measure. To see when birds are most likely to occur and be breeding in your project area, view the Probability of Presence Summary. [Additional measures](#) and/or [permits](#) may be advisable depending on the type of activity you are conducting and the type of infrastructure or bird species present on your project site.

**What does IPaC use to generate the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location?**

The Migratory Bird Resource List is comprised of USFWS [Birds of Conservation Concern \(BCC\)](#) and other species that may warrant special attention in your project location.

The migratory bird list generated for your project is derived from data provided by the [Avian Knowledge Network \(AKN\)](#). The AKN data is based on a growing collection of [survey, banding, and citizen science datasets](#) and is queried and filtered to return a list of those birds reported as occurring in the 10km grid cell(s) which your project intersects, and that have been identified as warranting special attention because they are a BCC species in that area, an eagle ([Eagle Act](#) requirements may apply), or a species that has a particular vulnerability to offshore activities or development.

Again, the Migratory Bird Resource list includes only a subset of birds that may occur in your project area. It is not representative of all birds that may occur in your project area. To get a list of all birds potentially present in your project area, please visit the [AKN Phenology Tool](#).

**What does IPaC use to generate the probability of presence graphs for the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location?**

The probability of presence graphs associated with your migratory bird list are based on data provided by the [Avian Knowledge Network \(AKN\)](#). This data is derived from a growing collection of [survey, banding, and citizen science datasets](#).

Probability of presence data is continuously being updated as new and better information becomes available. To learn more about how the probability of presence graphs are produced and how to interpret them, go the Probability of Presence Summary and then click on the "Tell me about these graphs" link.

**How do I know if a bird is breeding, wintering, migrating or present year-round in my project area?**

To see what part of a particular bird's range your project area falls within (i.e. breeding, wintering, migrating or year-round), you may refer to the following resources: [The Cornell Lab of Ornithology All About Birds Bird Guide](#), or (if you are unsuccessful in locating the bird of interest there), the [Cornell Lab of Ornithology Neotropical Birds guide](#). If a bird on your migratory bird species list has a breeding season associated with it, if that bird does occur in your project area, there may be nests present at some point within the timeframe specified. If "Breeds elsewhere" is indicated, then the bird likely does not breed in your project area.

**What are the levels of concern for migratory birds?**

Migratory birds delivered through IPaC fall into the following distinct categories of concern:

1. "BCC Rangewide" birds are [Birds of Conservation Concern](#) (BCC) that are of concern throughout their range anywhere within the USA (including Hawaii, the Pacific Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands);
2. "BCC - BCR" birds are BCCs that are of concern only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA; and
3. "Non-BCC - Vulnerable" birds are not BCC species in your project area, but appear on your list either because of the [Eagle Act](#) requirements (for eagles) or (for non-eagles) potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities (e.g. offshore energy development or longline fishing).



Although it is important to try to avoid and minimize impacts to all birds, efforts should be made, in particular, to avoid and minimize impacts to the birds on this list, especially eagles and BCC species of rangewide concern. For more information on conservation measures you can implement to help avoid and minimize migratory bird impacts and requirements for eagles, please see the FAQs for these topics.

**Details about birds that are potentially affected by offshore projects**

For additional details about the relative occurrence and abundance of both individual bird species and groups of bird species within your project area off the Atlantic Coast, please visit the [Northeast Ocean Data Portal](#). The Portal also offers data and information about other taxa besides birds that may be helpful to you in your project review. Alternately, you may download the bird model results files underlying the portal maps through the [NOAA NCCOS Integrative Statistical Modeling and Predictive Mapping of Marine Bird Distributions and Abundance on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf](#) project webpage.

Bird tracking data can also provide additional details about occurrence and habitat use throughout the year, including migration. Models relying on survey data may not include this information. For additional information on marine bird tracking data, see the [Diving Bird Study](#) and the [nanotag studies](#) or contact [Caleb Spiegel](#) or [Pam Loring](#).

**What if I have eagles on my list?**

If your project has the potential to disturb or kill eagles, you may need to [obtain a permit](#) to avoid violating the Eagle Act should such impacts occur.

**Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report**

The migratory bird list generated is not a list of all birds in your project area, only a subset of birds of priority concern. To learn more about how your list is generated, and see options for identifying what other birds may be in your project area, please see the FAQ “What does IPaC use to generate the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location”. Please be aware this report provides the “probability of presence” of birds within the 10 km grid cell(s) that overlap your project; not your exact project footprint. On the graphs provided, please also look carefully at the survey effort (indicated by the black vertical bar) and for the existence of the “no data” indicator (a red horizontal bar). A high survey effort is the key component. If the survey effort is high, then the probability of presence score can be viewed as more dependable. In contrast, a low survey effort bar or no data bar means a lack of data and, therefore, a lack of certainty about presence of the species. This list is not perfect; it is simply a starting point for identifying what birds of concern have the potential to be in your project area, when they might be there, and if they might be breeding (which means nests might be present). The list helps you know what to look for to confirm presence, and helps guide you in knowing when to implement conservation measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts from your project activities, should presence be confirmed. To learn more about conservation measures, visit the FAQ “Tell me about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds” at the bottom of your migratory bird trust resources page.

## 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 EMERGENT WETLAND

- [PEM1A](#)
- [PEM1C](#)
- [PEM1Cx](#)
- [PEM1F](#)

### FRESHWATER FORESTED/SHRUB WETLAND

- [PFOC](#)
- [PSSC](#)
- [PSSCx](#)
- [PFOA](#)
- [PSS1B](#)
- [PSS1C](#)
- [PSSA](#)

### FRESHWATER POND

- [PUBF](#)

### RIVERINE

- [R5UBFx](#)
- [R4SBC](#)
- [R2UBH](#)
- [R4SBCx](#)
- [R2UBHx](#)
- [R5UBF](#)
- [R3UBH](#)
- [R4SBJ](#)



**Summary Table Report**  
**California Department of Fish and Wildlife**  
**California Natural Diversity Database**



**Query Criteria:** Quad<span style="color: Red;"> IS </span>(Toms Place (3711856)<span style="color: Red;"> OR </span>Old Mammoth (3711868)<span style="color: Red;"> OR </span>Crestview (3711878)<span style="color: Red;"> OR </span>June Lake (3711971)<span style="color: Red;"> OR </span>Lee Vining (3711981)<span style="color: Red;"> OR </span>Lundy (3811912)<span style="color: Red;"> OR </span>Big Alkali (3811922)<span style="color: Red;"> OR </span>Convict Lake (3711857)<span style="color: Red;"> OR </span>Chalfant Valley (3711853))

Name (Scientific/Common)	CNDDB Ranks	Listing Status (Fed/State)	Other Lists	Elev. Range (ft.)	Total EO's	Element Occ. Ranks						Population Status		Presence		
						A	B	C	D	X	U	Historic > 20 yr	Recent <= 20 yr	Extant	Poss. Extrap.	Extrap.
<i>Accipiter gentilis</i> northern goshawk	G5 S3	None None	BLM_S-Sensitive CDF_S-Sensitive CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern IUCN_LC-Least Concern USFS_S-Sensitive	6,640 8,900	433 S:12	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	0	12	0	0
<i>Allium atrorubens</i> var. <i>atrorubens</i> Great Basin onion	G4T4 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3	6,750 7,600	19 S:3	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	0
<i>Anaxyrus canorus</i> Yosemite toad	G2G3 S2S3	Threatened None	CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern IUCN_EN-Endangered USFS_S-Sensitive	9,830 10,500	226 S:3	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3	0	0
<i>Aplodontia rufa californica</i> Sierra Nevada mountain beaver	G5T3T4 S2S3	None None	CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern IUCN_LC-Least Concern	6,500 8,500	131 S:3	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	0	0
<i>Artemia monica</i> Mono Lake brine shrimp	G3 S3	None None	IUCN_CD-Conservation Dependent	6,409 6,409	1 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
<i>Astragalus johannis-howellii</i> Long Valley milk-vetch	G2 S1	None Rare	Rare Plant Rank - 1B.2 BLM_S-Sensitive USFS_S-Sensitive	6,880 7,520	19 S:2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	0
<i>Astragalus lemmonii</i> Lemmon's milk-vetch	G2 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 1B.2 BLM_S-Sensitive USFS_S-Sensitive	6,700 6,700	12 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Astragalus monoensis</i> Mono milk-vetch	G2 S2	None Rare	Rare Plant Rank - 1B.2 BLM_S-Sensitive SB_RSABG-Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden USFS_S-Sensitive	7,090 8,800	29 S:22	0	9	3	3	0	7	7	15	22	0	0
<i>Astragalus oophorus</i> var. <i>lavinii</i> Lavin's milk-vetch	G4T2 S1	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 1B.2 BLM_S-Sensitive		2 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0



**Summary Table Report**  
California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
California Natural Diversity Database



Name (Scientific/Common)	CNDDB Ranks	Listing Status (Fed/State)	Other Lists	Elev. Range (ft.)	Total EO's	Element Occ. Ranks						Population Status		Presence		
						A	B	C	D	X	U	Historic > 20 yr	Recent <= 20 yr	Extant	Poss. Extrap.	Extirp.
<i>Atriplex argentea</i> var. <i>hillmanii</i> Hillman's silverscale	G5T4 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.2	5,210 5,210	6 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Atriplex pusilla</i> smooth saltbush	G4 SH	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.1	6,900 6,900	1 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Boechea bodiensis</i> Bodie Hills rockcress	G3 S3	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 1B.3 BLM_S-Sensitive USFS_S-Sensitive	7,075 7,300	31 S:2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	0
<i>Boechea cobrensis</i> Masonic rockcress	G5 S3	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3	7,120 9,400	28 S:10	1	2	2	0	0	5	2	8	10	0	0
<i>Boechea dispar</i> pinyon rockcress	G3 S3	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3 SB_RSABG-Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden	7,000 7,000	97 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Boechea tularensis</i> Tulare rockcress	G3 S3	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 1B.3 USFS_S-Sensitive	8,000 8,000	37 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Bombus morrisoni</i> Morrison bumble bee	G4G5 S1S2	None None	IUCN_VU-Vulnerable	6,500 7,700	85 S:7	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	0	7	0	0
<i>Botrychium ascendens</i> upswept moonwort	G3G4 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3 USFS_S-Sensitive	8,594 8,600	53 S:2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	0
<i>Botrychium crenulatum</i> scaloped moonwort	G4 S3	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.2 USFS_S-Sensitive	8,600 9,890	138 S:3	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3	0	0
<i>Botrychium lunaria</i> common moonwort	G5 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3 USFS_S-Sensitive	6,750 6,750	7 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Botrychium manganense</i> Mingan moonwort	G4G5 S3	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.2 USFS_S-Sensitive	9,850 9,850	130 S:1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
<i>Brachylagus idahoensis</i> pygmy rabbit	G4 S3	None None	BLM_S-Sensitive CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern IUCN_LC-Least Concern USFS_S-Sensitive	6,800 6,833	12 S:2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	0
<i>Bristlecone Pine Forest</i> Bristlecone Pine Forest	G4 S2.3	None None		10,000 10,000	2 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0





**Summary Table Report**  
**California Department of Fish and Wildlife**  
**California Natural Diversity Database**



Name (Scientific/Common)	CNDDB Ranks	Listing Status (Fed/State)	Other Lists	Elev. Range (ft.)	Total EO's	Element Occ. Ranks						Population Status		Presence		
						A	B	C	D	X	U	Historic > 20 yr	Recent <= 20 yr	Extant	Poss. Extrap.	Extrap.
<i>Buteo swainsoni</i> Swainson's hawk	G5 S3	None Threatened	BLM_S-Sensitive IUCN_LC-Least Concern USFWS_BCC-Birds of Conservation Concern	2,160 8,120	2510 S:4	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	4	0	0
<i>Calochortus excavatus</i> Inyo County star-tulip	G2 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 1B.1 BLM_S-Sensitive USFS_S-Sensitive	5,120 7,200	70 S:3	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	3	0	0
<i>Carex duriuscula</i> spikerush sedge	G5 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3	13,500 13,500	4 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Carex scirpoidea ssp. pseudoscirpoidea</i> western single-spiked sedge	G5T4 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.2	7,000 10,200	11 S:3	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	3	0	0
<i>Catostomus fumeiventris</i> Owens sucker	G3G4 S3	None None	CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern	6,440 7,620	35 S:5	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	3	5	0	0
<i>Catostomus platyrhynchus</i> mountain sucker	G5 S3	None None	CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern	7,500 7,500	22 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i> greater sage-grouse	G3G4 S2S3	None None	BLM_S-Sensitive CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern IUCN_NT-Near Threatened USFS_S-Sensitive	6,775 6,775	49 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Chaetadelpa wheeleri</i> Wheeler's dune-broom	G4 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.2	4,500 4,500	25 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Circus hudsonius</i> northern harrier	G5 S3	None None	CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern IUCN_LC-Least Concern	6,400 6,400	53 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Claytonia megarhiza</i> fell-fields claytonia	G5 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3		24 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Corynorhinus townsendii</i> Townsend's big-eared bat	G3G4 S2	None None	BLM_S-Sensitive CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern IUCN_LC-Least Concern USFS_S-Sensitive WBGW_H-High Priority	6,380 9,650	635 S:5	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	5	0	0



**Summary Table Report**  
**California Department of Fish and Wildlife**  
**California Natural Diversity Database**



Name (Scientific/Common)	CNDDB Ranks	Listing Status (Fed/State)	Other Lists	Elev. Range (ft.)	Total EO's	Element Occ. Ranks						Population Status		Presence		
						A	B	C	D	X	U	Historic > 20 yr	Recent <= 20 yr	Extant	Poss. Extrap.	Extrap.
<i>Coturnicops noveboracensis</i> yellow rail	G4 S1S2	None None	CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern IUCN_LC-Least Concern NABCI_RWL-Red Watch List USFS_S-Sensitive USFWS_BCC-Birds of Conservation Concern	6,500 7,184	45 S:3	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	0
<i>Crepis runcinata</i> fiddleleaf hawksbeard	G5 S3	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.2	6,450 8,300	32 S:6	0	1	0	0	0	5	4	2	6	0	0
<i>Cusickiella quadricostata</i> Bodie Hills cusickiella	G2 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 1B.2 BLM_S-Sensitive	6,500 7,600	28 S:13	0	1	1	0	0	11	12	1	13	0	0
<i>Draba cana</i> canescent draba	G5 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3	9,800 9,970	8 S:3	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	0
<i>Draba lonchocarpa</i> spear-fruited draba	G5 S1	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3	10,800 10,800	2 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Draba praealta</i> tall draba	G5 S3	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3	9,800 9,800	7 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Elgaria panamintina</i> Panamint alligator lizard	G3 S3	None None	BLM_S-Sensitive CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern IUCN_VU-Vulnerable USFS_S-Sensitive	6,365 6,365	25 S:1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
<i>Elymus scribneri</i> Scribner's wheat grass	G5 S3	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3	12,800 12,800	12 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Empidonax traillii</i> willow flycatcher	G5 S1S2	None Endangered	IUCN_LC-Least Concern USFS_S-Sensitive USFWS_BCC-Birds of Conservation Concern	6,430 7,770	90 S:7	0	2	0	1	0	4	3	4	7	0	0
<i>Eremothera boothii</i> ssp. <i>boothii</i> Booth's evening-primrose	G5T4 S3	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3	6,375 7,500	35 S:4	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	4	0	0
<i>Erethizon dorsatum</i> North American porcupine	G5 S3	None None	IUCN_LC-Least Concern	6,618 8,611	519 S:5	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	5	0	0



**Summary Table Report**  
**California Department of Fish and Wildlife**  
**California Natural Diversity Database**



Name (Scientific/Common)	CNDDB Ranks	Listing Status (Fed/State)	Other Lists	Elev. Range (ft.)	Total EO's	Element Occ. Ranks						Population Status		Presence		
						A	B	C	D	X	U	Historic > 20 yr	Recent <= 20 yr	Extant	Poss. Extirp.	Extirp.
<i>Erythranthe utahensis</i> Utah monkeyflower	G4G5 S1	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.1	6,400 6,400	5 S:3	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	0
<i>Euderma maculatum</i> spotted bat	G4 S3	None None	BLM_S-Sensitive CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern IUCN_LC-Least Concern WBWG_H-High Priority	6,457 6,457	68 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Eumops perotis californicus</i> western mastiff bat	G5T4 S3S4	None None	BLM_S-Sensitive CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern WBWG_H-High Priority	6,457 6,457	296 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Falco mexicanus</i> prairie falcon	G5 S4	None None	CDFW_WL-Watch List IUCN_LC-Least Concern USFWS_BCC-Birds of Conservation Concern	7,000 8,160	460 S:5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	5	0	0
<i>Festuca minutiflora</i> small-flowered fescue	G5 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3	13,300 13,300	6 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Glyceria grandis</i> American manna grass	G5 S3	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3	6,500 6,500	10 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Gulo gulo</i> California wolverine	G4 S1	Proposed Threatened Threatened	CDFW_FP-Fully Protected IUCN_NT-Near Threatened USFS_S-Sensitive	7,060 14,000	174 S:2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	0
<i>Helodium blandowii</i> Blandow's bog moss	G4 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3 USFS_S-Sensitive	9,450 9,450	16 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
<i>Hesperia miriamae longaevicola</i> White Mountains skipper	G2G3T1 S1	None None		13,140 13,140	9 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Hulsea vestita ssp. inyoensis</i> Inyo hulsea	G5T2T3 S1S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.2	6,300 6,300	11 S:1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Hygrotus fontinalis</i> travertine band-thigh diving beetle	G1 S1	None None		6,640 7,300	4 S:3	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	0



**Summary Table Report**  
**California Department of Fish and Wildlife**  
**California Natural Diversity Database**



Name (Scientific/Common)	CNDDB Ranks	Listing Status (Fed/State)	Other Lists	Elev. Range (ft.)	Total EO's	Element Occ. Ranks						Population Status		Presence		
						A	B	C	D	X	U	Historic > 20 yr	Recent <= 20 yr	Extant	Poss. Extrap.	Extirp.
<i>Kobresia myosuroides</i> sheep kobresia	G5 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.2	8,114 10,500	10 S:4	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	0	0
<i>Larus californicus</i> California gull	G5 S4	None None	CDFW_WL-Watch List IUCN_LC-Least Concern	6,410 6,410	8 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
<i>Lasiurus cinereus</i> hoary bat	G5 S4	None None	IUCN_LC-Least Concern WBWG_M-Medium Priority	6,457 6,457	238 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Lepus townsendii townsendii</i> western white-tailed jackrabbit	G5T5 S3?	None None	CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern	6,500 7,200	24 S:4	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	4	0	0
<i>Lupinus duranii</i> Mono Lake lupine	G2 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 1B.2 BLM_S-Sensitive USFS_S-Sensitive	6,800 9,000	42 S:32	0	12	7	1	0	12	13	19	32	0	0
<i>Martes caurina sierrae</i> Sierra marten	G5T3 S3	None None	USFS_S-Sensitive	7,038 8,500	149 S:5	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	5	0	0
<i>Mentzelia torreyi</i> Torrey's blazing star	G4 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.2	6,400 6,750	17 S:4	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	2	4	0	0
<i>Mono Pumice Flat</i> Mono Pumice Flat	G1 S1.2	None None		6,560 8,800	15 S:14	0	2	2	1	0	9	14	0	14	0	0
<i>Myotis yumanensis</i> Yuma myotis	G5 S4	None None	BLM_S-Sensitive IUCN_LC-Least Concern WBWG_LM-Low-Medium Priority	6,457 6,457	265 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Ochotona princeps schisticeps</i> gray-headed pika	G5T2T4 S2S4	None None	IUCN_NT-Near Threatened	7,240 14,000	332 S:23	0	0	0	0	1	22	3	20	22	1	0
<i>Ovis canadensis nelsoni</i> desert bighorn sheep	G4T4 S3	None None	BLM_S-Sensitive CDFW_FP-Fully Protected USFS_S-Sensitive		46 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Pandion haliaetus</i> osprey	G5 S4	None None	CDF_S-Sensitive CDFW_WL-Watch List IUCN_LC-Least Concern	6,350 6,350	504 S:5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0
<i>Parnassia parviflora</i> small-flowered grass-of-Parnassus	G5? S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.2	7,100 9,100	5 S:3	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3	0	0

Government Version -- Dated September, 29 2019 -- Biogeographic Data Branch  
 Report Printed on Monday, October 21, 2019

Page 6 of 9  
 Information Expires 3/29/2020



**Summary Table Report**  
**California Department of Fish and Wildlife**  
**California Natural Diversity Database**



Name (Scientific/Common)	CNDDB Ranks	Listing Status (Fed/State)	Other Lists	Elev. Range (ft.)	Total EO's	Element Occ. Ranks						Population Status		Presence		
						A	B	C	D	X	U	Historic > 20 yr	Recent <= 20 yr	Extant	Poss. Extrap.	Extirp.
<i>Pedicularis crenulata</i> scallop-leaved lousewort	G4 S1	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.2	7,080 7,080	1 S.1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Pekania pennanti</i> fisher - West Coast DPS	G5T2T3Q S2S3	None Threatened	BLM_S-Sensitive CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern USFS_S-Sensitive	7,700 9,100	741 S.2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	0
<i>Phacelia inyoensis</i> Inyo phacelia	G3 S3	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 1B.2 BLM_S-Sensitive USFS_S-Sensitive	7,000 7,050	19 S.2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	0
<i>Phacelia monoensis</i> Mono County phacelia	G3 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 1B.1 BLM_S-Sensitive USFS_S-Sensitive	7,260 7,375	14 S.3	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0
<i>Picoides arcticus</i> black-backed woodpecker	G5 S2	None None		7,500 7,500	62 S.2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	0
<i>Plagiobothrys parishii</i> Parish's popcornflower	G1 S1	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 1B.1 SB_RSABG-Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden USFS_S-Sensitive	4,280 4,280	16 S.1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Plebejus saepiolus albomontanus</i> White Mountains saepiolus blue butterfly	G5T2 S1S2	None None		12,500 12,500	8 S.2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	0
<i>Pyrgulopsis owensensis</i> Owens Valley springsnail	G1G2 S1S2	None None	USFS_S-Sensitive	5,040 5,040	10 S.1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Pyrgulopsis wongi</i> Wong's springsnail	G2 S2	None None	IUCN_LC-Least Concern USFS_S-Sensitive	7,330 8,130	50 S.3	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	0
<i>Rana sierrae</i> Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog	G1 S1	Endangered Threatened	CDFW_WL-Watch List IUCN_EN-Endangered USFS_S-Sensitive	6,900 7,850	659 S.7	0	1	0	0	0	6	5	2	7	0	0
<i>Ranunculus hydrocharoides</i> frog's-bit buttercup	G4 S1	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.1	7,440 7,440	4 S.1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Riparia riparia</i> bank swallow	G5 S2	None Threatened	BLM_S-Sensitive IUCN_LC-Least Concern	6,775 6,775	298 S.1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
<i>Sabulina stricta</i> bog sandwort	G5 S3	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3	12,700 12,700	18 S.1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0



**Summary Table Report**  
**California Department of Fish and Wildlife**  
**California Natural Diversity Database**



Name (Scientific/Common)	CNDDB Ranks	Listing Status (Fed/State)	Other Lists	Elev. Range (ft.)	Total EO's	Element Occ. Ranks						Population Status		Presence		
						A	B	C	D	X	U	Historic > 20 yr	Recent <= 20 yr	Extant	Poss. Extrap.	Extirp.
<i>Salix brachycarpa</i> var. <i>brachycarpa</i> short-fruited willow	G5T5 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3	9,200 10,650	5 S.3	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3	0	0
<i>Salix nivalis</i> snow willow	G5 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3	9,055 11,100	14 S.3	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	0	0
<i>Setophaga petechia</i> yellow warbler	G5 S3S4	None None	CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern USFWS_BCC-Birds of Conservation Concern	6,400 7,950	73 S.5	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4	5	0	0
<i>Siphateles bicolor snyderi</i> Owens tui chub	G4T1 S1	Endangered Endangered	AFS_EN-Endangered	6,440 7,000	20 S.2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
<i>Sorex lyelli</i> Mount Lyell shrew	G3G4 S3S4	None None	CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern IUCN_LC-Least Concern	6,850 8,000	11 S.3	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	0
<i>Spizella breweri</i> Brewer's sparrow	G5 S4	None None	IUCN_LC-Least Concern USFWS_BCC-Birds of Conservation Concern	6,400 6,400	1 S.1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Streptanthus oliganthus</i> Masonic Mountain jewelflower	G3 S3	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 1B.2 BLM_S-Sensitive USFS_S-Sensitive	7,400 8,360	18 S.3	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	0	3	0	0
<i>Strix nebulosa</i> great gray owl	G5 S1	None Endangered	CDFW_S-Sensitive IUCN_LC-Least Concern USFS_S-Sensitive	8,000 8,000	79 S.1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Stuckenia filiformis</i> ssp. <i>alpina</i> slender-leaved pondweed	G5T5 S2S3	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.2	7,621 7,621	21 S.1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Suaeda occidentalis</i> western seablite	G5 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3	6,600 6,600	9 S.1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Taxidea taxus</i> American badger	G5 S3	None None	CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern IUCN_LC-Least Concern	8,000 8,000	591 S.1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Thelypodium integrifolium</i> ssp. <i>complanatum</i> foxtail thelypodium	G5T4T5 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.2	6,000 6,985	13 S.2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	0



**Summary Table Report**  
**California Department of Fish and Wildlife**  
**California Natural Diversity Database**



Name (Scientific/Common)	CNDDB Ranks	Listing Status (Fed/State)	Other Lists	Elev. Range (ft.)	Total EO's	Element Occ. Ranks						Population Status		Presence		
						A	B	C	D	X	U	Historic > 20 yr	Recent <= 20 yr	Extant	Poss. Extirp.	Extirp.
<i>Townsendia condensata</i> cushion townsendia	G4 S3	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3	11,500 11,500	11 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Townsendia leptotes</i> slender townsendia	G4 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3	11,500 11,500	6 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Trichophorum pumilum</i> little bulrush	G5 S3	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.2	10,000 10,650	5 S:2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	0
<i>Triglochin palustris</i> marsh arrow-grass	G5 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.3	7,600 7,600	18 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<i>Viola purpurea ssp. aurea</i> golden violet	G5T2 S2	None None	Rare Plant Rank - 2B.2	6,700 8,710	29 S:11	2	1	0	0	0	8	3	8	11	0	0
<i>Vulpes vulpes necator</i> Sierra Nevada red fox	G5T1T2 S1	Candidate Threatened	USFS_S-Sensitive	6,830 10,300	201 S:3	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	3	0	0
<i>Water Birch Riparian Scrub</i> Water Birch Riparian Scrub	GNR SNR	None None		5,700 7,900	29 S:5	0	3	0	0	0	2	5	0	5	0	0
<i>Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus</i> yellow-headed blackbird	G5 S3	None None	CDFW_SSC-Species of Special Concern IUCN_LC-Least Concern	6,400 6,400	13 S:1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0



<div> <div>CNPS</div> <div>California Native Plant Society</div> <div>Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants</div> </div>									
Home	About the Inventory	CNPS Home	Join CNPS				Simple Search	Advanced Search	



\*The database used to provide updates to the Online Inventory is under construction. [View updates and changes made since May 2019 here.](#)





## Plant List

66 matches found. [Click on scientific name for details](#)






### Search Criteria

Found in Quads [3711856](#), [3711868](#), [3711878](#), [3711971](#), [3711981](#), [3811912](#), [3811922](#) [3711853](#) and [3711857](#);






[Modify Search Criteria](#)
[Export to Excel](#)
[Modify Columns](#)
[Modify Sort](#)
[Remove Photos](#)

Scientific Name	Common Name	Family	Lifeform	Blooming Period	CA Rare Plant Rank	Habitats	Lowest Elevation	Highest Elevation	Photo
<a href="#">Allium atrorubens</a> <a href="#">var. atrorubens</a>	Great Basin onion	Alliaceae	perennial bulbiferous herb	May-Jun	2B.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Great Basin scrub</li> <li>Pinyon and juniper woodland</li> </ul>	1200 m	2315 m	no photo available
<a href="#">Arabis repanda</a> <a href="#">var. greenei</a>	Greene's rockcress	Brassicaceae	perennial herb	Jun-Aug	3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subalpine coniferous forest</li> <li>Upper montane coniferous forest</li> </ul>	2345 m	3600 m	 2014 Steve Matson
<a href="#">Astragalus johannis-howellii</a>	Long Valley milk-vetch	Fabaceae	perennial herb	(May)Jun-Aug	1B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Great Basin scrub (sandy loam)</li> </ul>	2040 m	2530 m	 2005 Steve Matson
<a href="#">Astragalus lemmonii</a>	Lemmon's milk-vetch	Fabaceae	perennial herb	May-Aug(Sep)	1B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Great Basin scrub</li> <li>Meadows and seeps</li> <li>Marshes and swamps (lake shores)</li> </ul>	1007 m	2200 m	 2008 Steve Matson
<a href="#">Astragalus monoensis</a>	Mono milk-vetch	Fabaceae	perennial herb	Jun-Aug	1B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Great Basin scrub</li> <li>Upper montane coniferous forest</li> </ul>	2110 m	3355 m	 Benjamin C. Hammett 2001 California Academy of Sciences
<a href="#">Atriplex argentea</a> <a href="#">var. hillmanii</a>	Hillman's silverscale	Chenopodiaceae	annual herb	Jun, Aug, Sep	2B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Great Basin scrub</li> <li>Meadows and seeps</li> <li>Alpine boulder and</li> </ul>	1200 m	1700 m	no photo available








[http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/result.html?adv=1&quad=3711856:3711868:3711878:3711971:3711981:3811912:3811922:3711853:3711857#odisp=1,2,3,4,5,6,11,13,12,15\[10/21/2019 8:03:50 AM\]](http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/result.html?adv=1&quad=3711856:3711868:3711878:3711971:3711981:3811912:3811922:3711853:3711857#odisp=1,2,3,4,5,6,11,13,12,15[10/21/2019 8:03:50 AM])

<a href="#"><i>Boechera bodiensis</i></a>	Bodie Hills rockcress	Brassicaceae	perennial herb	Jun-Jul(Aug)	1B.3	rock field • Great Basin scrub • Pinyon and juniper woodland • Subalpine coniferous forest	2085 m	3530 m	no photo available
<a href="#"><i>Boechera cobrensis</i></a>	Masonic rockcress	Brassicaceae	perennial herb	Jun-Jul	2B.3	• Great Basin scrub • Pinyon and juniper woodland	1375 m	3105 m	 1998 Dean Wm. Taylor
<a href="#"><i>Boechera dispar</i></a>	pinyon rockcress	Brassicaceae	perennial herb	Mar-Jun	2B.3	• Joshua tree woodland • Mojavean desert scrub • Pinyon and juniper woodland	1200 m	2540 m	 2009 Thomas Stoughton
<a href="#"><i>Boechera tularensis</i></a>	Tulare rockcress	Brassicaceae	perennial herb	(May)Jun-Jul(Aug)	1B.3	• Subalpine coniferous forest • Upper montane coniferous forest	1825 m	3350 m	 2015 Dana York
<a href="#"><i>Botrychium ascendens</i></a>	upswept moonwort	Ophioglossaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	(Jun)Jul-Aug	2B.3	• Lower montane coniferous forest • Meadows and seeps	1115 m	3045 m	 2005 Steve Matson
<a href="#"><i>Botrychium crenulatum</i></a>	scalloped moonwort	Ophioglossaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	Jun-Sep	2B.2	• Bogs and fens • Lower montane coniferous forest • Meadows and seeps • Marshes and swamps (freshwater) • Upper montane coniferous forest	1268 m	3280 m	 2011 Aaron E. Sims
<a href="#"><i>Botrychium lunaria</i></a>	common moonwort	Ophioglossaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	Aug	2B.3	• Meadows and seeps • Subalpine coniferous forest • Upper	1980 m	3400 m	








<http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/result.html?adv=1&quad=3711856:3711868:3711878:3711971:3711981:3811912:3811922:3711853:3711857#odisp=1,2,3,4,5,6,11,13,12,15>[10/21/2019 8:03:50 AM]

						montane coniferous forest			
									2007 Dr. Amadej Tinkoczy
<a href="#">Botrychium minganense</a>	Mingan moonwort	Ophioglossaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	Jul-Sep	2B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bogs and fens</li> <li>• Lower montane coniferous forest</li> <li>• Meadows and seeps (edges)</li> <li>• Upper montane coniferous forest</li> </ul>	1455 m	2180 m	
									2011 Aaron E. Sims
<a href="#">Calochortus excavatus</a>	Inyo County star-tulip	Liliaceae	perennial bulbiferous herb	Apr-Jul	1B.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chenopod scrub</li> <li>• Meadows and seeps</li> </ul>	1150 m	2000 m	
									1981 Steve Lowens
<a href="#">Carex incurviformis</a>	Mt. Dana sedge	Cyperaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	Jul-Aug	4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alpine boulder and rock field</li> </ul>	3700 m	4060 m	no photo available
<a href="#">Carex scirpoidea</a> ssp. <a href="#">pseudoscirpoidea</a>	western single-spiked sedge	Cyperaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	Jul-Sep	2B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alpine boulder and rock field</li> <li>• Meadows and seeps</li> <li>• Subalpine coniferous forest (rocky)</li> </ul>	2990 m	3700 m	
									2003 Steve Matson
<a href="#">Crepis runcinata</a>	fiddleleaf hawksbeard	Asteraceae	perennial herb	May-Aug	2B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mojavean desert scrub</li> <li>• Pinyon and juniper woodland</li> </ul>	1250 m	2195 m	no photo available
<a href="#">Cryptantha glomeriflora</a>	clustered-flower cryptantha	Boraginaceae	annual herb	Jun-Sep	4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Basin scrub</li> <li>• Meadows and seeps</li> <li>• Subalpine coniferous forest</li> <li>• Upper montane coniferous forest</li> </ul>	1800 m	3750 m	
									2011 Steve Matson
<a href="#">Cryptantha scoparia</a>	gray cryptantha	Boraginaceae	annual herb	Jun-Jul	4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chenopod scrub</li> <li>• Great Basin scrub</li> <li>• Pinyon and juniper woodland</li> </ul>	1890 m	2745 m	no photo available
						• Great Basin			







<http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/result.html?adv=t&quad=3711856:3711868:3711878:3711971:3711981:3811912:3811922:3711853:3711857#odisp=1,2,3,4,5,6,11,13,12,15>[10/21/2019 8:03:50 AM]

<a href="#">Cusickiella quadricostata</a>	Bodie Hills cusickiella	Brassicaceae	perennial herb	May-Jul	1B.2	scrub • Pinyon and juniper woodland	2000 m	2800 m	 2008 Steve Matson
<a href="#">Draba cana</a>	canescent draba	Brassicaceae	perennial herb	Jul	2B.3	• Alpine boulder and rock field • Meadows and seeps • Subalpine coniferous forest	3000 m	3505 m	 2004 Steve Matson
<a href="#">Draba incrassata</a>	Sweetwater Mountains draba	Brassicaceae	perennial stoloniferous herb	Jul-Aug	1B.3	• Alpine boulder and rock field (rhyolitic talus)	2500 m	3965 m	 2012 Steve Matson
<a href="#">Draba lonchocarpa</a>	spear-fruited draba	Brassicaceae	perennial herb	Jun-Jul	2B.3	• Alpine boulder and rock field (carbonate, scree)	3000 m	3295 m	 2013 Dylan Neubauer
<a href="#">Draba praealta</a>	tall draba	Brassicaceae	perennial herb	Jul-Aug	2B.3	• Meadows and seeps (mesic)	2500 m	3415 m	 2009 Steve Matson
<a href="#">Elymus scribneri</a>	Scribner's wheat grass	Poaceae	perennial herb	Jul-Aug	2B.3	• Alpine boulder and rock field	2900 m	4200 m	no photo available
<a href="#">Eremothera boothii</a> ssp. <a href="#">alyssooides</a>	Pine Creek evening-primrose	Onagraceae	annual herb	Apr-Aug	4.3	• Great Basin scrub	600 m	1700 m	no photo available
<a href="#">Eremothera boothii</a> ssp. <a href="#">boothii</a>	Booth's evening-primrose	Onagraceae	annual herb	Apr-Sep	2B.3	• Joshua tree woodland • Pinyon and juniper woodland	815 m	2400 m	 2004 James M. Andre
<a href="#">Eremothera boothii</a> ssp. <a href="#">intermedia</a>	Booth's hairy evening-primrose	Onagraceae	annual herb	(May)Jun	2B.3	• Great Basin scrub (sandy) • Pinyon and juniper woodland	1500 m	2150 m	no photo available
<a href="#">Eriogonum microthecum</a> var. <a href="#">alpinum</a>	alpine slender buckwheat	Polygonaceae	perennial herb	Jul,Sep	4.3	• Alpine dwarf scrub • Great Basin scrub	2500 m	3300 m	 2010 Steve Matson









<http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/result.html?adv=1&quad=3711856:3711868:3711878:3711971:3711981:3811912:3811922:3711853:3711857#odisp=1,2,3,4,5,6,11,13,12,15>[10/21/2019 8:03:50 AM]

<a href="#"><i>Erythranthe utahensis</i></a>	Utah monkeyflower	Phrymaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	Apr	2B.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meadows and seeps</li> <li>• Pinyon and juniper woodland</li> </ul>	610 m	2000 m	 2005 Jim Dunn
<a href="#"><i>Fritillaria pinetorum</i></a>	pine fritillary	Liliaceae	perennial bulbiferous herb	May-Jul(Sep)	4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chaparral</li> <li>• Lower montane coniferous forest</li> <li>• Pinyon and juniper woodland</li> <li>• Subalpine coniferous forest</li> <li>• Upper montane coniferous forest</li> </ul>	1735 m	3300 m	 2008 Michael Gosnell
<a href="#"><i>Glyceria grandis</i></a>	American manna grass	Poaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	Jun-Aug	2B.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bogs and fens</li> <li>• Meadows and seeps</li> <li>• Marshes and swamps (streambanks and lake margins)</li> </ul>	15 m	1980 m	 2004 Dean Wm. Taylor
<a href="#"><i>Hackelia brevicula</i></a>	Poison Canyon stickseed	Boraginaceae	perennial herb	Jul-Aug	3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadleafed upland forest</li> <li>• Great Basin scrub</li> <li>• Subalpine coniferous forest</li> </ul>	2600 m	3200 m	 2006 Trent M. Draper
<a href="#"><i>Hecastocleis shockleyi</i></a>	prickle-leaf	Asteraceae	perennial evergreen shrub	May-Jul	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chenopod scrub</li> <li>• Mojavean desert scrub</li> </ul>	1200 m	2200 m	 2013 Aaron Schusteff
<a href="#"><i>Helodium blandowii</i></a>	Blandow's bog moss	Helodiaceae	moss		2B.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meadows and seeps</li> <li>• Subalpine coniferous forest</li> </ul>	1862 m	2700 m	 2002 John Game
<a href="#"><i>Hordeum intercedens</i></a>	vernal barley	Poaceae	annual herb	Mar-Jun	3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coastal dunes</li> <li>• Coastal scrub</li> <li>• Valley and foothill grassland (saline flats and depressions)</li> <li>• Vernal pools</li> </ul>	5 m	1000 m	 2010 Gary A. Monroe







<a href="#"><i>Hulsea vestita</i> ssp. <i>inyoensis</i></a>	Inyo hulsea	Asteraceae	perennial herb	Apr-Jun	2B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chenopod scrub</li> <li>• Great Basin scrub</li> <li>• Pinyon and juniper woodland</li> </ul>	1645 m	3000 m	 2011 Steve Matson
<a href="#"><i>Hulsea vestita</i> ssp. <i>parryi</i></a>	Parry's sunflower	Asteraceae	perennial herb	Apr-Aug	4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower montane coniferous forest</li> <li>• Pinyon and juniper woodland</li> <li>• Upper montane coniferous forest</li> </ul>	1370 m	2895 m	 2006 Chris Wagner, SBNF
<a href="#"><i>Jamesia americana</i> var. <i>rosea</i></a>	rosy-petalled cliffbush	Hydrangeaceae	perennial deciduous shrub	May-Sep	4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alpine boulder and rock field</li> <li>• Great Basin scrub</li> <li>• Pinyon and juniper woodland</li> <li>• Subalpine coniferous forest</li> </ul>	1980 m	3700 m	 2005 Steve Matson
<a href="#"><i>Kobresia myosuroides</i></a>	seep kobresia	Cyperaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	(Jun)Aug	2B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alpine boulder and rock field (mesic)</li> <li>• Meadows and seeps (carbonate)</li> <li>• Subalpine coniferous forest</li> </ul>	1490 m	3245 m	 2010 Dr. Dean Wm. Taylor
<a href="#"><i>Loeseliastrum depressum</i></a>	depressed standing-cypress	Polemoniaceae	annual herb		4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Basin scrub</li> <li>• Mojavean desert scrub</li> <li>• Pinyon and juniper woodland</li> </ul>	1220 m	2100 m	 2011 Steve Matson
<a href="#"><i>Lupinus duranii</i></a>	Mono Lake lupine	Fabaceae	perennial herb	May-Aug	1B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Basin scrub</li> <li>• Subalpine coniferous forest</li> <li>• Upper montane coniferous forest</li> </ul>	2000 m	3000 m	 2006 Christopher L. Christie
<a href="#"><i>Lupinus lepidus</i> var. <i>culbertsonii</i></a>	Hockett Meadows lupine	Fabaceae	perennial herb	Jul-Aug	1B.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meadows and seeps</li> <li>• Upper montane coniferous forest (mesic, rocky)</li> </ul>	2440 m	3000 m	no photo available
<a href="#"><i>Mentzelia monoensis</i></a>	Mono Craters blazing star	Loasaceae	annual herb	May-Jul	4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Basin scrub</li> <li>• Upper montane coniferous forest</li> </ul>	2005 m	2480 m	no photo available




[http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/result.html?adv=1&quad=3711856:3711868:3711878:3711971:3711981:3811912:3811922:3711853:3711857#odisp=1,2,3,4,5,6,11,13,12,15\[10/21/2019 8:03:50 AM\]](http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/result.html?adv=1&quad=3711856:3711868:3711878:3711971:3711981:3811912:3811922:3711853:3711857#odisp=1,2,3,4,5,6,11,13,12,15[10/21/2019 8:03:50 AM])

<a href="#"><i>Mentzelia torreyi</i></a>	Torrey's blazing star	Loasaceae	perennial herb	Jun-Aug	2B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Basin scrub</li> <li>• Mojavean desert scrub</li> <li>• Pinyon and juniper woodland</li> </ul>	1170 m	2835 m	 2008 Ron Wolf
<a href="#"><i>Parnassia parviflora</i></a>	small-flowered grass-of-Parnassus	Parnassiaceae	perennial herb	Aug-Sep	2B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meadows and seeps</li> </ul>	2000 m	2855 m	 2008 Mary Winter
<a href="#"><i>Pedicularis crenulata</i></a>	scalloped-leaved lousewort	Orobanchaceae	perennial herb	Jun-Jul	2B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meadows and seeps (mesic)</li> </ul>	2100 m	2300 m	 2005 Steve Matson
<a href="#"><i>Penstemon papillatus</i></a>	Inyo beardtongue	Plantaginaceae	perennial herb	Jun-Jul	4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pinyon and juniper woodland</li> <li>• Subalpine coniferous forest</li> </ul>	2000 m	3000 m	 2012 Steve Matson
<a href="#"><i>Phacelia inyoensis</i></a>	Inyo phacelia	Hydrophyllaceae	annual herb	Apr-Aug	1B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meadows and seeps (alkaline)</li> </ul>	915 m	3200 m	no photo available
<a href="#"><i>Phacelia monoensis</i></a>	Mono County phacelia	Hydrophyllaceae	annual herb	May-Jul	1B.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Basin scrub</li> <li>• Pinyon and juniper woodland</li> </ul>	1900 m	2900 m	 2010 Steve Matson
<a href="#"><i>Plagiobothrys parishii</i></a>	Parish's popcornflower	Boraginaceae	annual herb	Mar-Jun(Nov)	1B.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Basin scrub</li> <li>• Joshua tree woodland</li> </ul>	750 m	1400 m	 2006 James M. Andre
<a href="#"><i>Polemonium chartaceum</i></a>	Mason's sky pilot	Polemoniaceae	perennial herb	Jun-Aug	1B.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alpine boulder and rock field</li> <li>• Subalpine coniferous forest</li> </ul>	3290 m	4270 m	 2010 Julie Kierstead Nelson
<a href="#"><i>Ranunculus hydrocharoides</i></a>	frog's-bit buttercup	Ranunculaceae	perennial herb (aquatic)	(May)Jun-Sep	2B.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marshes and swamps (freshwater)</li> </ul>	1100 m	2700 m	 1998 Larry Blakely

<http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/result.html?adv=1&quad=3711856:3711868:3711878:3711971:3711981:3811912:3811922:3711853:3711857#odisp=1,2,3,4,5,6,11,13,12,15>[10/21/2019 8:03:50 AM]



<a href="#">Sabulina stricta</a>	bog sandwort	Caryophyllaceae	perennial herb	Jul-Sep	2B.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alpine boulder and rock field</li> <li>• Alpine dwarf scrub</li> <li>• Meadows and seeps</li> </ul>	2440 m	3960 m	no photo available
<a href="#">Salix brachycarpa</a> var. <a href="#">brachycarpa</a>	short-fruited willow	Salicaceae	perennial deciduous shrub	Jun-Jul	2B.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alpine dwarf scrub</li> <li>• Meadows and seeps</li> <li>• Subalpine coniferous forest</li> </ul>	3000 m	3500 m	 1993 Dan Post
<a href="#">Salix nivalis</a>	snow willow	Salicaceae	perennial deciduous shrub	Jul-Aug	2B.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alpine dwarf scrub</li> </ul>	3100 m	3500 m	 2008 Mike Ireland
<a href="#">Senecio hydrophiloides</a>	sweet marsh ragwort	Asteraceae	perennial herb	May-Aug	4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower montane coniferous forest</li> <li>• Meadows and seeps</li> </ul>	0 m	2800 m	 2008 Dean Wm. Taylor, Ph.D.
<a href="#">Streptanthus oliganthus</a>	Masonic Mountain jewelflower	Brassicaceae	perennial herb	Jun-Jul	1B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pinyon and juniper woodland (volcanic or granitic, rocky)</li> </ul>	1980 m	3050 m	 Margaret Williams and CNPS
<a href="#">Stuckenia filiformis</a> ssp. <a href="#">alpina</a>	slender-leaved pondweed	Potamogetonaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb (aquatic)	May-Jul	2B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marshes and swamps (assorted shallow freshwater)</li> </ul>	300 m	2150 m	no photo available
<a href="#">Suaeda occidentalis</a>	western seablite	Chenopodiaceae	annual herb	Jul-Sep	2B.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Basin scrub (alkaline, mesic)</li> </ul>	1200 m	1500 m	 2003 George W. Hartwell
<a href="#">Thelypodium integrifolium</a> ssp. <a href="#">complanatum</a>	foxtail thelypodium	Brassicaceae	annual / perennial herb	Jun-Oct	2B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Basin scrub</li> <li>• Meadows and seeps</li> </ul>	1100 m	2500 m	 2011 Steve Matson
<a href="#">Trichophorum pumilum</a>	little bulrush	Cyperaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	Aug	2B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bogs and fens</li> <li>• Marshes and swamps</li> <li>• Riparian scrub</li> </ul>	2860 m	3250 m	no photo available
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meadows</li> </ul>			

<a href="#"><i>Triglochin palustris</i></a>	marsh arrow-grass	Juncaginaceae	perennial rhizomatous herb	Jul-Aug	2B.3	and seeps • Marshes and swamps (freshwater) • Subalpine coniferous forest	2285 m	3700 m	 2010 Louis-M. Landry
<a href="#"><i>Utricularia minor</i></a>	lesser bladderwort	Lentibulariaceae	perennial stoloniferous herb (carnivorous) (aquatic)	(May-Jun)Jul-Aug	4.2	• Bogs and fens • Marshes and swamps (assorted shallow freshwater)	800 m	2900 m	 2012 Barry Rice
<a href="#"><i>Viola purpurea ssp. aurea</i></a>	golden violet	Violaceae	perennial herb	Apr-Jun	2B.2	• Great Basin scrub • Pinyon and juniper woodland	1000 m	2500 m	 2012 Steve Matson

**Suggested Citation**

California Native Plant Society, Rare Plant Program. 2019. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (online edition, v8-03 0.39). Website <http://www.rareplants.cnps.org> [accessed 21 October 2019].

**Search the Inventory**[Simple Search](#)[Advanced Search](#)[Glossary](#)**Information**[About the Inventory](#)[About the Rare Plant Program](#)[CNPS Home Page](#)[About CNPS](#)[Join CNPS](#)**Contributors**[The Calflora Database](#)[The California Lichen Society](#)[California Natural Diversity Database](#)[The Jepson Flora Project](#)[The Consortium of California Herbaria](#)[CalPhotos](#)**Questions and Comments**[rareplants@cnps.org](mailto:rareplants@cnps.org)

# Appendix I. NEPA Categorical Exclusion Checklist and Categorical Exclusion

Final National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation will be filed separately from this document. At this time Caltrans is expecting to file a NEPA Categorical Exclusion pursuant to 23 CFR 771.117(c)(27). The anticipated date of NEPA determination is November 1, 2019. The following is the Mono Chain Up Area Project's Categorical Exclusion Checklist.

Categorical Exclusion Checklist	
Dist/Co/Rte/PM:	09/MNO/395 and 6/Various
Fed. Aid No. (Local Project):	
EA/Project No.:	09-36660/0916000008
<b>SECTION A: TYPE OF CE: Use the information in this section to determine the applicable CE and corresponding activity for this project.</b>	
<b>1. Project is a CE under CE Assignment 23 USC 326.</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If "yes", check applicable activity in one of the three tables below (activity must be listed in 23 CFR 771.117 (c) or (d) list or included in activities listed in Appendix A of the CE Assignment MOU to be eligible for 23 USC 326).</i>	
<b>Activity Listed in 23 CFR 771.117(c)</b>	
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Activities that do not involve or lead directly to construction, such as planning and research activities; grants for training; engineering to define the elements of a proposed action or alternatives so that social, economic, and environmental effects can be assessed; and Federal-aid system revisions that establish classes of highways on the Federal-aid highway system.
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Approval of utility installations along or across a transportation facility.
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	Construction of bicycle and pedestrian lanes, paths, and facilities.
4 <input type="checkbox"/>	Activities included in the State's <i>highway safety plan</i> under 23 U.S.C. 402.
5 <input type="checkbox"/>	Transfer of Federal lands pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 107(d) and/or 23 U.S.C. 317 when the land transfer is in support of an action that is not otherwise subject to FHWA review under NEPA.
6 <input type="checkbox"/>	The installation of noise barriers or alterations to existing publicly owned buildings to provide for noise reduction.
7 <input type="checkbox"/>	Landscaping.
8 <input type="checkbox"/>	Installation of fencing, signs, pavement markings, small passenger shelters, traffic signals, and railroad warning devices where no substantial land acquisition or traffic disruption will occur.
9 <sup>1</sup> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The following actions for transportation facilities damaged by an incident resulting in an emergency declared by the Governor of the State and concurred in by the Secretary, or a disaster or emergency declared by the President pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Act (42 U.S.C 5121):<sup>2</sup></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> (i) Emergency repairs under 23 U.S.C 125;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> (ii) The repair, reconstruction, restoration, retrofitting, or replacement of any road, highway, bridge, tunnel, or transit facility (such as a ferry dock or bus transfer station), including ancillary transportation facilities (such as pedestrian/bicycle paths and bike lanes), that is in operation or under construction when damaged and the action:</p> <p>(A) Occurs within the existing right-of-way and in a manner that substantially conforms to the preexisting design, function, and location as the original (which may include upgrades to meet existing codes and standards as well as upgrades warranted to address conditions that have changed since the original construction); and</p> <p>(B) Is commenced within a 2-year period beginning on the date of the declaration.</p>
10 <input type="checkbox"/>	Acquisition of scenic easements.
11 <input type="checkbox"/>	Determination of payback under 23 U.S.C 156 for property previously acquired with Federal-aid participation.
12 <input type="checkbox"/>	Improvements to existing rest areas and truck weigh stations.
13 <input type="checkbox"/>	Ridesharing activities.
14 <input type="checkbox"/>	Bus and rail car rehabilitation.
15 <input type="checkbox"/>	Alterations to facilities or vehicles in order to make them accessible for elderly and handicapped persons.
16 <input type="checkbox"/>	Program administration, technical assistance activities, and operating assistance to transit authorities to continue existing service or increase service to meet routine changes in demand.
17 <input type="checkbox"/>	The purchase of vehicles by the applicant where the use of these vehicles can be accommodated by existing facilities or by new facilities that themselves are within a CE.
18 <input type="checkbox"/>	Track and railbed maintenance and improvements when carried out within the existing right-of-way.
19 <input type="checkbox"/>	Purchase and installation of operating or maintenance equipment to be located within the transit facility and with no significant impacts off the site.

<sup>1</sup> On the CE form, distinguish between c9i or c9ii

<sup>2</sup> Include copy of the emergency declaration in the file

### Categorical Exclusion Checklist

<b>Dist/Co/Rte/PM:</b> 09/MNO/395 and 6/Various		<b>Fed. Aid No. (Local Project):</b>		<b>EA/Project No.:</b> 09-36660/0916000008	
20	<input type="checkbox"/>	Promulgation of rules, regulations, and directives.			
21	<input type="checkbox"/>	Deployment of electronics, photonics, communications, or information processing used singly or in combination, or as components of a fully integrated system, to improve the efficiency or safety of a surface transportation system or to enhance security or passenger convenience. Examples include, but are not limited to, traffic control and detector devices, lane management systems, electronic payment equipment, automatic vehicle locaters, automated passenger counters, computer-aided dispatching systems, radio communications systems, dynamic message signs, and security equipment including surveillance and detection cameras on roadways and in transit facilities and on buses.			
22 <sup>3</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Projects, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101, that would take place entirely within the existing operational right-of-way. Existing operational right-of-way means all real property interests acquired for the construction, operation, or mitigation of a project. This area includes the features associated with the physical footprint of the project including but not limited to the roadway, bridges, interchanges, culverts, drainage, clear zone, traffic control signage, landscaping, and any rest areas with direct access to a controlled access highway. This also includes fixed guideways, mitigation areas, areas maintained or used for safety and security of a transportation facility, parking facilities with direct access to an existing transportation facility, transportation power substations, transportation venting structures, and transportation maintenance facilities.  Note: As a clarifying example, if title 23 (or certain title 49) funds were authorized for the acquisition of the real property, then that property was acquired for an eligible purpose, which was construction, operation, or mitigation, and thus is part of the operational right-of-way. Real property interests acquired with title 23 funds, or otherwise conveyed for title 23 purposes, are eligible for this categorical exclusion as long as the interests are devoted exclusively to the purposes of that facility and the facility is preserved free of all other public or private alternative uses, unless such non-highway alternative uses are permitted by Federal law (including regulations) or the FHWA (23 CFR 710.403(b)).			
23 <sup>4</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>	Federally-funded projects: Enter project cost \$ _____ and Federal funds \$ _____ (i) That receive less than \$5,500,515.05 of Federal funds; or (ii) With a total estimated cost of not more than \$33,003,090.30 and Federal funds comprising less than 15 percent of the total estimated project cost.			
24	<input type="checkbox"/>	Localized geotechnical and other investigation to provide information for preliminary design and for environmental analysis and permitting purposes, such as drilling test bores for soil sampling; archeological investigations for archeology resources assessment or similar survey; and wetland surveys.			
25	<input type="checkbox"/>	Environmental restoration and pollution abatement actions to minimize or mitigate the impacts of any existing transportation facility (including retrofitting and construction of stormwater treatment systems to meet Federal and State requirements under sections 401 and 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1341; 1342) carried out to address water pollution or environmental degradation.			
26	<input type="checkbox"/>	Modernization of a highway by resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, reconstruction, adding shoulders, or adding auxiliary lanes (including parking, weaving, turning, and climbing lanes), if the action meets the constraints in paragraph (e) of this section [771.117(e)]. <b>Note: In order to use this CE, certain constraints must be met. Complete Section A, Item 2 below.</b>			
27	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Highway safety or traffic operations improvement projects, including the installation of ramp metering control devices and lighting, if the project meets the constraints in paragraph (e) of this section [771.117(e)]. <b>Note: In order to use this CE, certain constraints must be met. Complete Section A, Item 2 below.</b>			
28	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bridge rehabilitation, reconstruction, or replacement or the construction of grade separation to replace existing at-grade railroad crossings, if the actions meet the constraints in paragraph (e) of this section [771.117(e)]. <b>Note: In order to use this CE, certain constraints must be met. Complete Section A, Item 2 below.</b>			
29	<input type="checkbox"/>	Purchase, construction, replacement, or rehabilitation of ferry vessels (including improvements to ferry vessel safety, navigation, and security systems) that would not require a change in the function of the ferry terminals and can be accommodated by existing facilities or by new facilities that themselves are within a CE.			
30	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rehabilitation or reconstruction of existing ferry facilities that occupy substantially the same geographic footprint, do not result in a change in their functional use, and do not result in a substantial increase in the existing facility's capacity. Example actions include work on pedestrian and vehicle transfer structures and associated utilities, buildings, and terminals.			
<b>Activity Listed in Examples in 23 CFR 771.117(d)</b>					
1	<i>Reserved.</i>				
2	<i>Reserved.</i>				
3	<i>Reserved.</i>				
4	<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation corridor fringe parking facilities.			
5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Construction of new truck weigh stations or rest areas.			

<sup>3</sup> On the CE form, identify in the project description that all work is within operation right-of-way.

<sup>4</sup> On the CE form, distinguish between e23i or e23ii.

### Categorical Exclusion Checklist

<b>Dist/Co/Rte/PM:</b> 09/MNO/395 and 6/Various <b>Fed. Aid No. (Local Project):</b> <b>EA/Project No.:</b> 09-36660/0916000008	
6 <input type="checkbox"/>	Approvals for disposal of excess right-of-way or for joint or limited use of right-of-way, where the proposed use does not have significant adverse impacts.
7 <input type="checkbox"/>	Approvals for changes in access control.
8 <input type="checkbox"/>	Construction of new bus storage and maintenance facilities in areas used predominantly for industrial or transportation purposes where such construction is not inconsistent with existing zoning and located on or near a street with adequate capacity to handle anticipated bus and support vehicle traffic.
9 <input type="checkbox"/>	Rehabilitation or reconstruction of existing rail and bus buildings and ancillary facilities where only minor amounts of additional land are required, and there is not a substantial increase in the number of users.
10 <input type="checkbox"/>	Construction of bus transfer facilities (an open area consisting of passenger shelters, boarding areas, kiosks and related street improvements) when located in a commercial area or other high activity center in which there is adequate street capacity for projected bus traffic.
11 <input type="checkbox"/>	Construction of rail storage and maintenance facilities in areas used predominantly for industrial or transportation purposes where such construction is not inconsistent with existing zoning, and where there is no significant noise impact on the surrounding community.
12 <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Acquisition of land for hardship or protective purposes. Hardship and protective buying will be permitted only for a particular parcel or a limited number of parcels. These types of land acquisition qualify for a CE only where the acquisition will not limit the evaluation of alternatives, including shifts in alignment for planned construction projects, which may be required in the NEPA process. No project development on such land may proceed until the NEPA process has been completed.</p> <p>(i) Hardship acquisition is early acquisition of property by the applicant at the property owner's request to alleviate particular hardship to the owner, in contrast to others, because of an inability to sell his property. This is justified when the property owner can document on the basis of health, safety or financial reasons that remaining in the property poses an undue hardship compared to others.</p> <p>(ii) Protective acquisition is done to prevent imminent development of a parcel that may be needed for a proposed transportation corridor or site. Documentation must clearly demonstrate that development of the land would preclude future transportation use and that such development is imminent. Advance acquisition is not permitted for the sole purpose of reducing the cost of property for a proposed project.</p>
13 <input type="checkbox"/>	Actions described in paragraphs (c)(26), (c)(27), and (c)(28) of this section that do not meet the constraints in paragraph (e) of this section.
<b>Activity Listed in Appendix A of the CE Assignment MOU for State Assumption of Responsibilities for Categorical Exclusions</b>	
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Construction, modification, or repair of storm water treatment devices (e.g., detention basins, bioswales, media filters, infiltration basins), protection measures such as slope stabilization and other erosion control measures throughout California.
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Replacement, modification, or repair of culverts or other drainage facilities.
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	Projects undertaken to assure the creation, maintenance, restoration, enhancement, or protection of habitat for fish, plants, or wildlife (e.g., revegetation of disturbed areas with native plant species; stream or river bank revegetation; construction of new, or maintenances of existing fish passage conveyances or structures; restoration or creation of wetlands).
4 <input type="checkbox"/>	Routine repair of facilities due to storm damage, including permanent repair, to return the facility to operational condition that meets current standards of design and public health and safety without expanding capacity (e.g., slide repairs, construction or repair of retaining walls).
5 <input type="checkbox"/>	Routine seismic retrofit of facilities to meet current seismic standards and public health and safety standards without expansion of capacity.
6 <input type="checkbox"/>	Air space leases that are subject to Subpart D, Part 710, title 23, Code of Federal Regulations.
7 <input type="checkbox"/>	Drilling of test bores/soil sampling to provide information for preliminary design and for environmental analyses and permitting purposes.



## Categorical Exclusion Checklist

<b>Dist/Co/Rte/PM:</b> 09/MNO/395 and 6/Various	<b>Fed. Aid No. (Local Project):</b>	<b>EA/Project No.:</b> 09-36660/0916000008
---	--------------------------------------	--

**2. This section must be completed in order to use a CE under 23 CFR 771.117(c)(26), (c)(27), or (c)(28).**

☒ The action **DOES NOT** include any of the following constraints found in 23 CFR 771.117(e):

- A. • An acquisition of more than a minor amount of right-of-way or that would result in any residential or nonresidential displacements
- B. • A bridge permit from the U.S. Coast Guard; OR  
• An action that does not meet the terms and conditions of a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers nationwide or general permit under section 404 of the Clean Water Act (i.e., does the project require a Standard 404 permit [Individual Permit or Letter of Permission]? ) AND/OR  
• A permit required under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899
- C. • A finding of "adverse effect" to historic properties under the National Historic Preservation Act; OR  
• The use of a resource protected under 23 U.S.C. 138 or 49 U.S.C. 303 (section 4(f)) except for actions resulting in *de minimis* impacts; OR  
• A finding of "may affect, likely to adversely affect" threatened or endangered species or critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act
- D. • Construction of temporary access or the closure of existing road, bridge, or ramps that would result in major traffic disruptions
- E. • Changes in access control
- F. • A floodplain encroachment other than functionally dependent uses (e.g., bridges, wetlands) or actions that facilitate open space use (e.g., recreational trails, bicycle and pedestrian paths); OR  
• Construction activities in, across, or adjacent to a river component designated or proposed for inclusion in the National System of Wild and Scenic Rivers

If the action includes any of the constraints listed above, it **MAY NOT** be processed under 23 CFR 771.117(c)(26), (c)(27), or (c)(28), however, the project may qualify for a CE under 23 CFR 771.117(d)(13).

**3. Project is a CE for a highway project under NEPA Assignment 23 USC 327.** ☐ Yes ☒ No  
*(Use only if project does not qualify under CE Assignment 23 USC 326 [activities not included in three previous lists above].)*

**4. Independent Utility and Logical Termini**

☒ The project complies with NEPA requirements related to connected actions and segmentation (i.e. the project must have independent utility, connect logical termini when applicable, be usable and be a reasonable expenditure even if no additional transportation improvements in the area are made and not restrict further consideration of alternatives for other reasonably foreseeable transportation improvements). (FHWA Final Rule, "Background," *Federal Register* Vol. 79, No. 8, January 13, 2014.)

**5. Categorical Exclusions Defined (23 CFR 771.117[a]).**

FHWA regulation 23 CFR 771.117(a) defines categorical exclusions as actions which:

- do not induce significant impacts to planned growth or land use for the area;
- do not require the relocation of significant numbers of people;
- do not have a significant impact on any natural, cultural, recreational, historic or other resources;
- do not involve significant air, noise, or water quality impacts;
- do not have significant impacts on travel patterns; or
- do not otherwise, either individually or cumulatively, have any significant environmental impacts.

☒ Checking this box certifies that project meets the above definition for a Categorical Exclusion.

**6. Exceptions to Categorical Exclusions/Unusual Circumstances (23 CFR 771.117[b]).**

FHWA regulation 23 CFR 771.117(b) provides that any action which normally would be classified as a CE but could involve *unusual circumstances* requires the Department to conduct appropriate environmental studies to determine if the CE classification is proper. Unusual circumstances include actions that involve:

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

**All of the above unusual circumstances have been considered in conjunction with this project.** (Please select one.)

☒ Checking this box certifies that **none of the above conditions apply** and that the project qualifies for a Categorical Exclusion.

☐ Checking this box certifies that **unusual circumstances are involved**. However, the appropriate studies/analysis have been completed, and it has been determined that the CE classification is still appropriate.

### Categorical Exclusion Checklist

**SECTION B:** Compliance with FHWA NEPA policy to complete all other applicable environmental requirements<sup>5</sup> prior to making the NEPA determination:

During the environmental review process for which this CE was prepared, all applicable environmental requirements were evaluated. Outcomes for the following requirements are identified below and fully documented in the project file. [NOTE: EVERY SECTION BELOW MUST BE COMPLETED, DO NOT SKIP ANY SECTIONS.]

#### FSTIP

☒ The project description on the Categorical Exemption/Categorical Exclusion Form matches the project description in the FSTIP and RTP, and the appropriate page of the FSTIP is in the project file.

#### Air Quality

☒ Air Quality Conformity Findings Checklist has been completed and project meets all applicable AQ requirements.  
☐ For 23 USC 326 projects which require an air quality conformity determination (this will apply to certain projects under 23 CFR 771.117(c)(22), (c)(23), (c)(26), (c)(27), and (c)(28)), list the date of the Caltrans conformity determination: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ For 23 USC 327 projects, list date of FHWA concurrence on conformity determination: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Cultural Resources

☒ Section 106 compliance is complete. ☒ Screened Undertaking  
 Select appropriate finding: ☐ No Historic Properties Affected ☐ No Adverse Effect with Standard Conditions  
☐ No Adverse Effect without Standard Conditions ☐ Adverse Effect/MOA ☐ Phasing/Project PA

#### Noise

23 CFR 772  
☐ Is this a Type 1 project? ☐ Yes ☒ No (skip this section.)  
☐ Future noise levels with project either approach or exceed NAC or result in a substantial increase.  
 If yes, ☐ Abatement is reasonable and feasible ☐ Abatement is not reasonable or feasible

#### Waters, Wetlands

- **Section 404 of the Clean Water Act**  
 Impacts to Waters of the U.S.: ☐ Yes ☒ No; If yes, approval anticipated:  
☐ Nationwide Permit ☐ Individual Permit ☐ Regional General Permit ☐ Letter of Permission
- **Section 401 of the Clean Water Act**  
☐ Exemption ☐ Certification ☒ Not Applicable
- **Wetland Protection (Executive Order #11990)**  
☒ No Wetland Impact  
☐ Permanent Wetland Impact; Only Practicable Alternative Finding is included in a separate document in the project file


#### Biology

- **USFWS, Species List Date: 3/20/2019 (must be < 180 days old)**  
☒ No Effect Section 7 (Federal Endangered Species Act)  
 Consultation with USFWS Findings (Effect determination):  
☐ Not Likely to Adversely Affect with USFWS Concurrence. Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ Likely to Adversely Affect with Biological Opinion Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- **NOAA Fisheries, Species List Date: \_\_\_\_\_ (must be < 180 days old)** ☒ N/A: Project outside of NOAA jurisdiction  
☐ No Effect Section 7 (Federal Endangered Species Act)  
 Consultation with NOAA Fisheries Findings (Effect determination):  
☐ Not Likely to Adversely Affect with NOAA Fisheries Concurrence. Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ Likely to Adversely Affect with Biological Opinion Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- **Essential Fish Habitat (Magnuson-Stevens Act) Findings (Effect determination):**  
☒ Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act does not apply  
☐ No Adverse Effect ☐ Adverse Effect and consultation with NOAA Fisheries

<sup>5</sup> Please consult the SER for a complete list of applicable laws, statutes, regulations, and executive orders that must be considered before completing the CE.



### Categorical Exclusion Checklist

<b>Floodplains</b>	
Floodplains (Executive Order #11988) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Floodplains <input type="checkbox"/> No Significant Encroachment <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Encroachment	
<b>Section 4(f) Transportation Act (23 CFR 774)</b>	
Section 4(f) regulation was considered as a part of the review for this project and a determination was made: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section 4(f) does not apply <i>(Project file includes documentation that property is not a Section 4(f) property, that project does not use a Section 4(f) property, or that the project meets the criteria for the temporary occupancy exception.)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Section 4(f) applies <input type="checkbox"/> De Minimis <input type="checkbox"/> Programmatic: Type _____ (List one of the five appropriate categories as defined in 23 CFR 774.3) <input type="checkbox"/> Individual: <input type="checkbox"/> Legal Sufficiency Review complete <input type="checkbox"/> HQ Coordinator Review Complete	
<b>Section 6(f) – Properties Acquired with Land and Water Conservation Fund grants</b>	
Was the above property purchased with grant funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, Section 6(f) does not apply. No additional documentation required. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation of approval from National Park Service Director (through California State Parks) has been received for the conversion/and replacement of 6(f) property.	
<b>Coastal Zone</b>	
Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not in Coastal Zone <input type="checkbox"/> Qualifies for Exemptions <input type="checkbox"/> Qualifies for Waiver <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Permit Required <input type="checkbox"/> Consistent with Federal State and Local Coastal Plans <input type="checkbox"/> Federal Consistency	
<b>Coast Guard – Bridge Over Navigable Waters of the U.S.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/> 23 USC 144(c) USCG Bridge Permit Exception <input type="checkbox"/> 33 CFR 115.70 Advance Approval <input type="checkbox"/> USCG Bridge Permit	
<b>Relocation and Right of Way</b>	
<b>• Relocations</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Relocations <input type="checkbox"/> Project involves _____ (#) relocations and will follow the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Act. <b>• Right of Way Acquisitions/Easements</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No right of way acquisitions or easements <input type="checkbox"/> Project involves _____ (#) acquisitions and _____ (#) easements.	
<b>Hazardous Waste and Materials</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are hazardous materials or contamination exceeding regulatory thresholds (as set by U.S. EPA, Cal EPA, County Environmental Health, etc.) present?    <input type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</li> <li>• If yes, is the nature and extent of the hazardous materials or contamination fully known?    <input type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input type="checkbox"/> No</li> </ul> If no, briefly discuss the plan for securing information:	
<b>SECTION C: Certification</b>	
Based on the information obtained during environmental review process and included in this checklist, the project is determined to be a Categorical Exclusion pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act and is in compliance with all other applicable environmental laws, regulations, and Executive Orders.	
Prepared by (print name):	Bradley Bowers
Title:	Associate Environmental Planner
Signature:	 Date: 8/14/2019

# National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Categorical Exclusion

## CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION/CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DETERMINATION FORM

09-MNO-395/06	Various	09-36660	0916000008
Dist.-Co.-Rte. (or Local Agency)	P.M./P.M.	E A/Project No.	Federal-Aid Project No. (Local Project)/Project No.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** (Briefly describe project including need, purpose, location, limits, right-of-way requirements, and activities involved in this box. Use Continuation Sheet, if necessary.)

The CA Department of Transportation (Caltrans) intends to make improvements to ten existing chain control turnouts on US 395 and build two new chain control turnouts; one on US 395 and one on US 6. Due to increased traffic during winter weekends and holidays, existing chain control areas can become crowded during peak times. Improvements include new chain control signage with flashing beacons, expanded pavement areas and the addition of twenty-three solar or conventionally-powered lights.

**CALTRANS CEQA DETERMINATION** (Check one)

☐ Not Applicable – Caltrans is not the CEQA Lead Agency ☒ Not Applicable – Caltrans has prepared an Initial Study or Environmental Impact Report under CEQA

Based on an examination of this proposal, supporting information, and the above statements, the project is:

☐ Exempt by Statute. (PRC 21080(b); 14 CCR 15260 et seq.)

☐ Categorically Exempt. Class (PRC 21084; 14 CCR 15300 et seq.)

Based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the following statements are true and exceptions do not apply:

- If this project falls within exempt class 3, 4, 5, 6 or 11, it does not impact an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law.
- There will not be a significant cumulative effect by this project and successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time.
- There is not a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.
- This project does not damage a scenic resource within an officially designated state scenic highway.
- This project is not located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Govt. Code § 65962.5 ("Cortese List").
- This project does not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

☐ Common Sense Exemption. [This project does not fall within an exempt class, but it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment (14 CCR 15061(b)(3).)]

<p><b>Angela Calloway</b></p> <p>Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief</p>	<p><b>Dennee Alcalá</b></p> <p>Print Name: Project Manager</p>
Signature _____ Date _____	Signature _____ Date _____

**NEPA COMPLIANCE**

In accordance with 23 CFR 771.117, and based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that this project:

- does not individually or cumulatively have a significant impact on the environment as defined by NEPA, and is excluded from the requirements to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and
- has considered unusual circumstances pursuant to 23 CFR 771.117(b).

**CALTRANS NEPA DETERMINATION** (Check one)

☒ **23 USC 326:** The State has determined that this project has no significant impacts on the environment as defined by NEPA, and that there are no unusual circumstances as described in 23 CFR 771.117(b). As such, the project is categorically excluded from the requirements to prepare an EA or EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act. The State has been assigned, and hereby certifies that it has carried out the responsibility to make this determination pursuant to Chapter 3 of Title 23, United States Code, Section 326 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated May 31, 2016, executed between the FHWA and the State. The State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under:

☒ 23 CFR 771.117(c): activity (c) (27)

☐ 23 CFR 771.117(d): activity (d) ( )

☐ Activity        listed in Appendix A of the MOU between FHWA and the State

☐ **23 USC 327:** Based on an examination of this proposal and supporting information, the State has determined that the project is a Categorical Exclusion under 23 USC 327. The environmental review, consultation, and any other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by Caltrans pursuant to 23 USC 327 and the Memorandum of Understanding dated December 23, 2016 and executed by FHWA and Caltrans.

<p><b>Angela Calloway</b></p> <p>Print Name: Senior Environmental Planner or Environmental Branch Chief</p>	<p><b>Dennee Alcalá</b></p> <p>Print Name: Project Manager/DLA Engineer</p>
 Signature _____ Date <u>10-23-19</u>	 Signature _____ Date <u>10-23-19</u>

Date of Categorical Exclusion Checklist completion: 10/22/2019      Date of ECR or equivalent : 10/22/2019

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

**CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION/CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DETERMINATION FORM**  
**Continuation Sheet**

<b>09-MNO-395/06</b>	<b>Various</b>	<b>09-36660</b>	<b>0916000008</b>
Dist.-Co.-Rte. (or Local Agency)	P.M./P.M.	E.A/Project No.	Federal-Aid Project No. (Local Project)/Project No.

Continued from page 1:

**Biological Resources:**

- Preconstruction species surveys for nesting birds, cliff swallow nests, special-status plant and animal species
- Cliff swallow nests will be removed at box culvert (US 395; PM 69.8) outside of nesting bird season. Nest building will be monitored at least once per week starting February 15, 2020 and continuing throughout construction; any nests being built will be removed before nests are established
- NSSP 14-6.05 for invasive plant spread reduction measures

**Visual/Aesthetics:**

- All new solar and conventionally-powered lights at chain up areas will only be activated (illuminated) during events when the chain up area could be in use and deactivated after the event ends

## **Appendix J. Public Comments and Responses**

The public comment period for the “Draft” Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration circulated via internet, newspaper, and physical locations near the project from August 20, 2019 through September 18, 2019. One comment was received during this period.

- I. State of California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit – Acknowledgement of State Clearinghouse review requirements met pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
- II. State Clearinghouse – Notice of Completion and Distribution List
- III. Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board – Comment Letter
- IV. Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board – Caltrans’ Response to Comments

## I. State Clearinghouse Acknowledgement Letter



Gavin Newsom  
Governor

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Governor's Office of Planning and Research  
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit



Kate Gordon  
Director

September 19, 2019

Bradley Bowers  
Caltrans 9 (Bishop)  
500 South Main Street  
Bishop, CA 93514

Subject: Mono Chain Up Areas  
SCH#: 2019089060

Dear Bradley Bowers:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named MND to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on 9/18/2019, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) available on the CEQA database for your retrieval and use. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project's ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

"A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."

**Check the CEQA database for submitted comments for use in preparing your final environmental document: <https://ceqanet.opr.ca.gov/2019089060/2>.** Should you need more information or clarification of the comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan  
Director, State Clearinghouse

cc: Resources Agency

CALTRANS DIST 9  
2019 SEP 23 PM 4:26

1400 TENTH STREET P.O. BOX 3044 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812-3044  
TEL 1-916-445-0613 state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov www.opr.ca.gov

## II. State Clearinghouse Notice of Completion and Distribution List

### Mono Chain Up Areas

#### Summary

**SCH Number** 2019089060  
**Lead Agency** Caltrans 9 (Bishop) (California Department of Transportation, District 9)  
**Document Title** Mono Chain Up Areas  
**Document Type** MND - Mitigated Negative Declaration  
**Received** 8/20/2019  
**Project Applicant** CA Department of Transportation  
**Present Land Use** Highway Facility

**Document Description** The CA Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is proposing to make improvements to ten existing chain control turnouts on U.S. 395 and build two new chain control turnouts; one on U.S. 395 near the SR 203 intersection (Mammoth Lakes) and the other on U.S. 6 near Slim Princess Road. Due to increased traffic during winter weekends and holidays, existing chain control turnouts can become crowded during peak times. Improvements to existing turnouts include new chain control signs with attached flashing beacons, expanded pavement areas, and the addition of twenty-three solar or conventionally-powered lights. Additional lights at chain control turnouts are proposed on future Caltrans projects, and cumulative impacts are discussed in this document.

**Contact Information** Bradley Bowers  
CA Department of Transportation  
500 South Main Street  
Bishop, CA 93514  
Phone : (760) 872-2331

#### Location

**Cities** Bishop  
**Counties** Inyo  
**Cross Streets** U.S. 395 - Various locations, U.S. 6 and Slim Princess Road  
**State Highways** 395, 6, 270, 203, 158  
**Airports** Mammoth Yosemite, Lee Vining  
**Waterways** Rock Creek, Lake Crowley, Hot Creek, Mono Lake, Virginia Creek

#### Notice of Completion

**Review Period Start** 8/20/2019  
**Review Period End** 9/18/2019  
**Development Type** Transportation (Create and expand chain control areas)  
**Project Issues** Aesthetic/Visual Biological Resources Cumulative Effects  
**Reviewing Agencies** Air Resources Board, Transportation Projects California Department of Parks and Recreation California Energy Commission California Highway Patrol  
California Public Utilities Commission Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics Department of Conservation Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 6 (Inyo & Mono Region)  
Department of Water Resources Native American Heritage Commission Office of Emergency Services, California Office of Historic Preservation Resources Agency  
Regional Water Quality Control No. 1, Region 6 (Victorville)

#### Attachments

**Environmental Document** Executive Summary for Clearinghouse DEC Mono Chain Up Areas PDF 345 K Initial Study, MND, Mono Chain Up Areas PDF 7197 K  
**Final Document(s)** 2019089060\_RWQCB\_Caltrans Mono Chain Up\_ISMND PDF 251 K  
**NOC** NOC PDF 2072 K

**Disclaimer:** The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) accepts no responsibility for the content or accessibility of these documents. To obtain an attachment in a different format, please contact the lead agency at the contact information listed above. You may also contact the OPR via email at [state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov](mailto:state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov) or via phone at (916) 445-0613. For more information, please visit OPR's Accessibility Site.



### III. Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board – Comment Letter



Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Governor's Office of Planning & Research

September 16, 2019

SEP 16 2019

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

File: Environmental Doc Review  
Mono County

Bradley Bowers  
California Department of Transportation  
500 South Main Street  
Bishop, CA 93514  
Bradley.Bowers@dot.ca.gov

#### Comments on the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, Mono Chain Up Areas, Mono County, State Clearinghouse Number 2019089060

The Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) staff received an Initial Study with Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the above-referenced Project (Project) on August 23, 2019. The IS/MND was prepared by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and submitted in compliance with provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Water Board staff, acting as a responsible agency, is providing these comments to specify the scope and content of the environmental information germane to our statutory responsibilities pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 15096. Based on our review of the IS/MND, we recommend Caltrans incorporate into the Project low impact development (LID) strategies, including design considerations, to treat increased storm water runoff from paved surfaces and to reduce the effects of hydromodification as a result of Project implementation. Additionally, Water Board approval will be required prior to any work within a waterway (i.e. dredge, fill, and/or culvert extension etc.).

#### WATER BOARD'S AUTHORITY

All groundwater and surface waters are considered waters of the State. All waters of the State are protected under California law. State law assigns responsibility for protection of water quality in the Lahontan Region to the Lahontan Water Board. Some waters of the State are also waters of the United States. The Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) provides additional protection for those waters of the State that are also waters of the United States.

The *Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region* (Basin Plan) contains policies that the Water Board uses with other laws and regulations to protect the quality of waters of the State within the Lahontan Region. The Basin Plan sets forth water quality standards for surface water and groundwater of the Region, which include designated beneficial uses as well as narrative and numerical objectives which must be maintained

PETER C. PUMPHREY, CHAIR | PATTY Z. KOUYOUMDJIAN, EXECUTIVE OFFICER

2501 Lake Tahoe Blvd., So. Lake Tahoe, CA 96150 | 15095 Amargosa Road, Bldg 2, Ste 210, Victorville CA 92394  
e-mail Lahontan@waterboards.ca.gov | website www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan





or attained to protect those uses. The Basin Plan can be accessed via the Water Board's web site at [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lafrontan/water\\_issues/programs/basin\\_plan/references.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lafrontan/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/references.shtml).

## **WATER QUALITY CONCERNS**

Our comments are outlined below.

1. All surface waters are waters of the State. Project implementation requires extension of existing culverts beneath Highway 395 resulting in excavation in, discharge of fill to, and physical alteration of waterways within the Project area. Prior to any work within a waterway, Caltrans will be required to obtain either a (1) CWA, section 401 water quality certification for impacts to federal waters, or (2) dredge and fill waste discharge requirements for impacts to non-federal waters of the State, both of which are issued by the Lahontan Water Board. As part of that permitting process, Caltrans will need to show how impacts to surface water resources have been avoided and minimized, to the extent possible. Compensatory mitigation may be required for all unavoidable, permanent impacts to waters of the State. Early consultation with Water Board staff is highly encouraged.
2. Storm water control measures that are compatible with LID are preferred over more traditional methods to help reduce the effects of hydromodification. Examples include the use of bioretention swales, pervious pavement, and vegetated infiltration basins, all of which can effectively treat post-construction storm water runoff, help sustain watershed processes, protect receiving waters, and maintain healthy watersheds. Any particular one of these control measures may not be suitable, effective, or even feasible on every site, but the right combination, in the right places, can successfully achieve these goals. We encourage Caltrans to establish a suite of LID implementation strategies and to incorporate these strategies into their projects.
3. We request that the IS/MND include a mitigation measure that requires buffer areas to be identified and exclusion fencing to be used to protect water resources outside the Project area and to prevent unauthorized vehicles or equipment from entering or otherwise disturbing surface waters outside the Project.

## **PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS**

A number of activities associated with the proposed Project may have the potential to impact waters of the State and, therefore, may require permits issued by either the State Water Board or Lahontan Water Board. The required permits may include the following.

4. Streambed alteration and/or discharge of fill material to a surface water may require a CWA, section 401 water quality certification for impacts to federal waters (waters of the U.S.), or dredge and fill waste discharge requirements for impacts to non-federal waters, both issued by the Lahontan Water Board. All unavoidable permanent impacts to waters of the State must be mitigated to ensure no net loss of beneficial use and wetland function and value. Water Board staff coordinate mitigation requirements with staff from federal and other state regulatory agencies. In determining appropriate mitigation ratios for impacts to waters of the State, we consider Basin Plan requirements (minimum 1.5 to 1 mitigation ratio for impacts to wetlands) and utilize 12501-SPD Regulatory Program Standard Operating Procedure for Determination of Mitigation Ratios, published December 2012 by the US Army Corps of Engineers, South Pacific Division.
5. Land disturbance of more than 1 acre may require a CWA, section 402(p) storm water permit, including a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Storm Water Permit, Water Quality Order (WQO) 2009-0009-DWQ, obtained from the State Water Board, or individual storm water permit obtained from the Lahontan Water Board.

We request that the IS/MND recognize the potential permits that may be required for the Project, as outlined above, and identify the specific activities that may trigger these permitting actions in the appropriate sections of the environmental document. Information regarding these permits, including application forms, can be downloaded from our website at <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/>. Early consultation with Water Board staff regarding potential permitting is recommended.

Thank you for requesting our consultation. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at (760) 241-7376 ([jan.zimmerman@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:jan.zimmerman@waterboards.ca.gov)). Please send all future correspondence regarding this Project to the Water Board's email address at [Lahontan@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Lahontan@waterboards.ca.gov) and be sure to include the Project name in the subject line.



Jan Zimmerman, PG 8392  
Senior Engineering Geologist

cc: Heidi Calvert, CA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife ([heidi.calvert@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:heidi.calvert@wildlife.ca.gov))  
State Clearinghouse (SCH 2019089060) ([state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov](mailto:state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov))

R:\RB6\RB6\Victorville\Shared\Units\JAN's UNIT\Jan\CEQA Review\Caltrans Mono Chain Up\_ISMND.docx

#### **IV. Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board – Caltrans' Response to Comments**

\*The following responses correspond to the numbers used by Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board in their comment letter (above).

1. As noted throughout the document, Caltrans does not anticipate any impacts to surface waters of any type, including Waters of the State. The project design will avoid impacts to surface waters to the greatest feasible extent, however, if unavoidable impacts become apparent then consultation with the water board and any other appropriate regulatory agency will occur and permits will be obtained.
2. Low Impact Discharge (LID) stormwater control measures are anticipated to be implemented on this project. For soil disturbance areas over one acre, Clean Water Act section 402(p) is applicable. Per the associated Caltrans Stormwater Management Plan and Project Planning Design Guide, the water quality volume generated from the new impervious surface areas will be demonstrated to be infiltrated through a combination of best management practices. The preservation of existing vegetation is of high importance in protecting receiving waters.
3. It is anticipated that the construction best management practice (BMP) features required in the contractor's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (i.e. silt fencing and fiber rolls) will adequately address the preservation of existing vegetation and protect adjacent resources from sediment. Additional exclusion fencing would create additional ground disturbance adjacent to resources and in some cases be redundant to construction BMPs. Caltrans requests that the Water Board consider placement of construction BMPs without additional fencing sufficient to protect resources.
4. Please see response #1
5. Please see response #2.

## **List of Technical Studies**

Air, Noise, Water and Hazardous Waste Project Study. July 2019. Caltrans Environmental Engineer Matthew Goike

Natural Environment Study (Minimal Impacts) “NESMI”. July 2019. Caltrans Biologist Stephen Pfeiler

Natural Environment Study (Minimal Impacts) Addendum. August 2019. Caltrans Biologist Stephen Pfeiler

Section 106 and CEQA Compliance – Screened Undertaking for the Mono Chain Up Areas Project in Mono County. July 2019. Caltrans Archaeologist Katelyn Mohr

Scenic Resource Evaluation and Visual Impact Assessment. July 2019. Caltrans Landscape Architect Jim Hibbert

Visual Impact Assessment Questionnaire. July 2019. Caltrans Landscape Architect Jim Hibbert