This section discusses cultural resources in the area of the proposed Program as well as potential impacts and mitigation measures. The following information is from the cultural resources technical reports prepared for the Program, *Archaeological Survey Report for the Lake Tahoe Basin Environmental Improvement Program* (Condor Country Consulting 2006) (ASR) and *Historical Resources Evaluation Report for the Lake Tahoe Basin Environmental Improvement Program* (JRP Historical Consulting 2006) (HRER).

3.6.1 Environmental Setting

The following summarizes the cultural resources setting of the Program vicinity. Ethnographic occupation of the area is associated with the Washoe Indian Tribe. Historic land uses along US 50 and SR 89 reflect patterns of development influenced by logging; tourism; and land management by local, state, and federal agencies.

3.6.1.1 Site History

Prehistory

Prehistoric archaeological sites have been documented within the Program regional area. Information obtained from sites in the South Lake Tahoe area show occupation from about 5,000 years ago to the 1900s. However, only a few sites in the project vicinity have actually been identified and studied, and researchers have had to rely primarily on lithic assemblages[6] to evaluate occupation and use of the area. Within the project area, existing sites have been identified during previous studies in the vicinity of some segments of SR 89.

Ethnography

The Washoe Indian Tribe of Nevada and California is the government of the present-day Native American people that occupy the study area. Prior to the Gold Rush, the Washoe occupied the entire study area as well as a large “nuclear area” surrounding Lake Tahoe from the crest of the Sierra Nevada Mountains eastward to the crest of the Pine Nut Mountains, the Pah Rah Range, and the Virginia Range. This nuclear territory extended from Honey Lake southward to the headwaters of the Mokelumne River. A larger area surrounding the nuclear area extended in all directions and was used by the ethnographic Washoe as a collection area for a wide variety of resources during the seasonal round. The extent of the peripheral area has been debated, but Price (1962, 1980) suggests that it was rather fluid through time and was not defended by the Washoe.

The Washoe culture revolved around a pattern of seasonal movement (shepherding) of livestock between mountain and lowland pastures (Downs 1966), and the Washoe people generally wintered in the lower-elevation Carson, Eagle, Antelope, and Long Valleys and in the Truckee Meadows. During the warmer months, the Washoe moved to the higher elevations around the Lake Tahoe Basin and over the Sierran crest to fish, hunt game, and gather valuable plant resources (Turner 1993:50). Some of the winter villages may have been year-round occupation

[6] Lithic materials are ground and chipped stone tools and the debris from making them. An assemblage is a collection of these materials found or recovered from a site or associated sites.

sites, at least for a portion of the population (Price 1962:40), and it is possible some groups may have overwintered along the shores of Lake Tahoe (Freed 1966). Whatever the exact seasonal ground was, it appears there were at least three and maybe four or five distinct subgroups of the Washoe.

Evidence for use of stone tools can also be found in the ethnographic record. The Washoe made a poison from rattlesnake venom, which was applied to arrowheads (Lowie 1939:325). Knives for various uses were also made from "various lithic materials" (d'Azevedo 1986:477), although information from modern Washoe informants for an investigation at the north end of Lake Tahoe indicates that basalt was not used as a source for tools (Bloomer et al. 1997:III-24). Only obsidian is viewed as a proper toolstone.

History

Nineteenth Century Immigration, Logging, and Agriculture

John C. Fremont and Charles Preuss are credited with the first sighting of Lake Tahoe by Euroamericans during their 1843–1844 congressionally sponsored expedition to California. However, American/European settlement did not occur at Lake Tahoe until after the discovery of gold in California in 1848. From the 1840s through the mid-1860s, the emigrant trails and roads between Placerville and Carson City and the wagon routes through Donner Pass to the north of the project area were critically important for the development of the region. When the Central Pacific Railroad completed its rail line over the Sierra Nevada from Sacramento to Reno in 1868, it lessened the importance of these early trails, roads, and wagon routes.

The California Gold Rush, which began in 1849 and continued through the 1850s, brought many hundreds of emigrants from the east over the Johnson Trail. Although most travelers sought to continue on to the California gold fields, a few established way stations in Lake Valley (now part of South Lake Tahoe), providing a place for travelers to rest and obtain supplies along the busy travel corridor that pioneers carved through the Lake Tahoe Basin.

The discovery of silver near Virginia City in the Nevada Territory in 1859, later known as the Comstock Lode, initiated a lumber boom in the Tahoe Basin that peaked in the 1870s and lasted into the 1880s. Timber was needed to shore up mine tunnels and for construction in the boomtowns of Virginia City, Gold Hill, and Silver City. During the 1860s, numerous lumber companies opened in the Lake Tahoe Basin, but by the mid-1870s, the Carson and Tahoe Lumber and Fluming Company controlled much of the logging around the Lake. Much of the southern and western shore and canyon timber was logged out by the mid-1880s.

From the 1850s to the 1870s, enterprising men harvested wild hay growing in the valleys and meadows around Lake Tahoe and sold it to way stations as forage for the draft animals pulling wagons over the mountains into California, and later, ascending the Sierra Nevada eastward to the Comstock Mines. Several hay harvesters operated along the southern and western margins of Lake Tahoe. Lake Valley became Lake Tahoe's hay production center during the 1870s.

Beginning in the 1860s, foothill and valley cattlemen seasonally drove their livestock to higher elevations to pasture in the cooler mountain valleys west and south of Lake Tahoe. Early landowners in the southern Lake Tahoe area established dairy operations and by the early 1870s, a thriving summer dairy industry was established, supplying dairy products to the Comstock miners and early Lake Tahoe communities. The acquisition of land for 19th century timber and

dairy operations had long-reaching effects on land development around the Lake, which is reflected in the pattern of ownership and land use within the study area.

Early Tourism and Resort Development

Lake Tahoe was a vacation/recreation destination as early as the 1860s. Resort development increased throughout the late 19th century as urban populations became aware of the Lake's many attributes. As early as 1864, Lake Tahoe resort owners were publicizing their establishments in San Francisco, Sacramento, and Virginia City newspapers, advertising Lake Tahoe as a superior destination and comparable to Santa Cruz or Calistoga, other popular California vacation spots during the period. Early in the next century, clientele of more modest means could access the lake via the automobile, thus encouraging the growth of facilities with simpler accommodations.

Tourism and Development, 1900 to World War II

The California State Legislature designated the old Placerville Road as a state highway, called the Lake Tahoe Wagon Road, in 1895. The highway's route from Placerville followed the old Johnson Trail and the Kingsbury-McDonald Road (roughly along the present-day Pioneer Trail) to the Nevada state line. The state's new highway department began work to improve the road around 1900, making it mostly passable by motor vehicles during the summer. The legislature designated other state highways in the southern area of Lake Tahoe starting approximately in 1910. Federal funding for highways at Lake Tahoe was secured during the 1910s and 1920s, in part through the Forest Service and in part through the federal government's designation of the Lake Tahoe Wagon Road as part of US 50 in 1924.

Year-round motor vehicle access to and around Lake Tahoe and expansion of the roadway network around the Lake did not occur until the 1930s. In the meantime, some of the large resort hotels that had catered to a wealthy clientele were forced to close or modify their properties in response to the growing number of auto travelers and popularity of new forms of travel accommodations and roadside services. Lake Tahoe and other resort areas in California were at the forefront of the growing auto-vacation industry catering to middle-income families. The auto camps and cabin resort facilities evolved into cottages and motels that became popular in the mid-20th century.

Auto access to Lake Tahoe also contributed to the development of vacation homes and rental properties. The construction of modest summer vacation cottages and cabins at the Lake began to increase in the 1920s and 1930s. This trend expanded greatly after World War II due to improved highway access to the Lake. The following vacation properties opened during this period:

- Meeks Bay Resort (1921) offered tent camping with cabins and associated buildings.
- Meadow Park Resort (circa 1921) was originally a silver fox farm. Lodging consisted of cabins with associated buildings and an entertainment area.
- Camp Richardson (1923) serves as the best remaining example of Lake Tahoe's evolution into a popular, family-style resort area. Lodging consisted of several cabins and a tent camping area with associated buildings and facilities.

- Multiple summer home construction developments included the Meeks Bay Vista subdivision, the personal summer cabins for the Murphy and Morgan families, and numerous modest summer cabins in the Al Tahoe and Bijou areas.
- Bayview Resort and Campground (circa late 1920s/early 1930s) offered lodging and cabins and had a gas station and general store. It was destroyed in the mid-1960s and has not been rebuilt. A small campground—Bay View Campground—is located immediately south of the original site.
- D.L. Bliss State Park (1930s) was private land until 66 ha (162 acres) were acquired for establishment as a state park. The park offered camping facilities with associated features and buildings.

Tourism and Development After World War II

Following World War II and into the 1960s, a general nationwide prosperity led to an upsurge of recreational development at Lake Tahoe. Tourism was boosted by planned summer events including rodeos and speedboat races, and lakeside summer resorts thrived. Gambling and casino development in the South Lake Tahoe area provided tremendous impetus for development in the post–World War II years, and cabin resorts and motels were built to accommodate the visitors. Land values escalated and contributed to the division of many large, family-owned tracts, and former summer-season communities in the southern portions of the Lake expanded into year-round communities. Through the 1940s, El Dorado County approved plans for several mixed-use and residential subdivisions for the South Lake Tahoe area and along the Lake's western shore. Subdivisions developed through the 1950s to meet continuing demand. Beginning in the 1960s, more restricted land use controls came into effect within the region, although there continues to be a high demand to live in and visit the Tahoe Basin, with associated development pressures.

3.6.1.2 Records Search and Field Survey

Study areas were defined for the Program for both archaeological and historical resource inventory and evaluation. The archaeological study area was defined to extend outside of the existing right-of-way along both US 50 and SR 89 for the purpose of allowing flexibility in designing the locations and areas for proposed water quality and roadway improvements within each project segment. The historic resource study area generally conformed to the archaeological resources study area except in locations where the boundary cut across existing parcels. Where this occurred in urbanized areas (lot sizes less than about 0.4 ha [1 acre]), the study area was expanded to include the entire parcel. Some large parcels outside of the urbanized areas were included in the historic resource study area if the Program had a potential to affect historic resources. The historic resource study area was not expanded within large rural, State Park, or Forest Service land parcels where there was no potential to affect historic resources.

Records Search

Several sources were consulted in preparation of the archaeological inventory:

- Caltrans District 3 Office (NCIC Record Search ELD-99-59) – PSRs for US 50 and SR 89 (Caltrans 2003c, 2003d) delineated the archaeological study area and depicted potential locations for proposed infiltration basins. Caltrans also provided files related to the Program

including a complete records search for the five SR 89 segments (KP 0.0 to 44.1 [PM 0.0 to 27.4]).

- North Central Information Center (NCIC) at California State University, Sacramento, Record Search ELD-05-151 – A records search was performed for each of the three US 50 project segments (#ELD-05-151). The search included a review of all recorded archaeological sites, historic structures, and other known cultural resources within the Program study area and the surrounding 0.8-km (0.5-mile) radius, as well as a review of reports for all known cultural resources studies conducted within the 0.8-km (0.5-mile) search radius.
- LTBMU Supervisor's Office – An in-person record search was conducted with the archaeological records housed at the LTBMU in South Lake Tahoe. This search included a review of all recorded archaeological sites, historic structures, and other known cultural resources within the Program study area and the surrounding 0.8-km (0.5-mile) radius, as well as a review of reports for all known cultural resources studies conducted within the 0.8-km (0.5-mile) search radius.
- California State Parks – Sierra District State Parks Office – An in-person record search was also performed with the archaeological records housed at the Sierra District State Parks Office in Tahoma. This search included a review of all recorded archaeological sites, historic structures, and other known cultural resources on State Parks lands within the Program study area and the surrounding 0.8-km (0.5-mile) radius, as well as a review of reports for all known cultural resources studies conducted within the 0.8-km (0.5-mile) search radius.

Standard sources of information that list or cite known or potential historic properties and historical resources were also reviewed. These sources included the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the Office of Historic Preservation Determinations of Eligibility for the NRHP, the California Inventory of Historic Resources, the California Historical Landmarks, and the California Points of Historical Interest. Previous studies conducted in and around the study area were obtained and reviewed.

Background research for historical resources was also conducted at the following locations:

- California State Library in Sacramento
- Caltrans Transportation Library in Sacramento
- Shield Library at the University of California, Davis
- El Dorado County Offices in South Lake Tahoe
- South Lake Tahoe Historical Society Museum in South Lake Tahoe
- North Lake Tahoe Historical Society in Tahoe City
- El Dorado County Public Library – South Lake Tahoe Branch
- Lake Tahoe Community College Library

Field Surveys

The field survey for archaeological resources was conducted during several visits in September and October 2005 and September 2006. The survey for historic properties was performed during various periods between September 2005 and May 2006.

Native American Consultation

A letter was sent to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on February 6, 2006, requesting a search of the Sacred Lands File. A records search of the Sacred Lands File was conducted on February 8, 2006. According to the NAHC, there are no Sacred Lands within the immediate project area. The NAHC provided a list of seven Native American individuals and organizations that might have information pertinent to the Program or concerns regarding the proposed Program activities. Letters and maps were sent to the NAHC-identified individuals on February 24, 2006. Copies of the letters, maps, and telephone conversations are included in the ASR.

3.6.1.3 Identified Resources

Background research identified 44 previously recorded cultural resources within the study area. Additional archaeological and historic sites, features, and structures were identified as a result of Program-related research and surveys. Resources that will be impacted by proposed project activities are discussed in Section 3.6.3 and are categorized as to their eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP.

3.6.2 Regulatory Setting

3.6.2.1 Federal

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) sets forth the national policy and procedures regarding historic properties. Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their undertakings on such properties, following guidelines issued by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Caltrans complies with Section 106 requirements in accordance with its Programmatic Agreement with FHWA, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Other federal agencies whose lands are crossed by project segments and who may require permits or easements, such as the Forest Service, may also fulfill their Section 106 responsibilities through coordination with Caltrans.

3.6.2.2 State

In considering impact significance under CEQA, the significance of the resource is determined first. At the state level, consideration of significance is measured by cultural resource provisions considered under CEQA Sections 15064.5 and 15126.4 and the draft criteria regarding resource eligibility to the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The eligibility criteria for the CRHR are very similar to those that qualify a property to the NRHP. Essentially, a property that is eligible for the NRHP is also eligible for the CRHR.

Generally, under CEQA, a historical resource (including built environment, historic and prehistoric archaeological resources) is considered significant if it meets the criteria for listing on the CRHR. Resources meeting these criteria may also be referred to as being "potentially eligible" for listing the CRHR. These criteria are set forth in CEQA Section 15064.5 and defined as any resource that:

- Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage
- Is associated with lives of persons important in our past
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represents the work of an important creative individual; or possesses high artistic values
- Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history

The determination of eligibility must be based on the above. For example, for the last criterion, the judgment on eligibility hinges on the nature of intact archaeological deposits or features in a particular resource and the ability of those deposits or features to contain information that is useful for answering scientifically valid research questions. A historic structure or site must meet at least one of the criteria and retain enough historic character or appearance to be recognizable as a historic resource and convey the reasons for its significance, and/or retain the potential to yield significant scientific, historic information or specific data.

Section 15064.5 of CEQA also assigns special importance to human remains and specifies procedures to be used when Native American remains are discovered. These procedures are detailed under California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

Impacts to "unique archaeological resources" and "unique paleontological resources" are also considered under CEQA, as described under California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. A unique archaeological resource implies an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that – without merely adding to the current body of knowledge – there is a high probability that it meets one of the following criteria:

- The archaeological artifact, object, or site contains information needed to answer important scientific questions, and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information
- The archaeological artifact, object, or site has a special and particular quality, such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type
- The archaeological artifact, object, or site is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person

A non-unique archaeological resource indicates an archaeological artifact, object, or site that does not meet the above criteria. Impacts to non-unique archaeological resources and resources that do not qualify for listing on the CRHR receive no further consideration under CEQA.

Under CEQA Section 15064.5, a project would potentially have significant impacts if it would cause substantial adverse change in the significance of one of the following:

- A historical resource (i.e., a cultural resource eligible for the CRHR)
- An archaeological resource (defined as a unique archaeological resource that meets CRHR criteria as listed in Section 21083.2)

- A unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature (i.e., where the project would directly or indirectly destroy a site)
- Human remains (i.e., where the project would disturb or destroy burials)

A non-unique resource is given no further consideration other than the simple recording of its existence by the CEQA lead agency.

Potentially substantial changes (impacts) in the significance of a historic resource (e.g., archaeological site or historic structure) may involve demolition, destruction, relocation or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the resource is materially impaired with regard to the attributes that make it significant (CEQA Section 15064.5[b]). No mitigation measures are required unless there is a potential for an impact to a significant or potentially significant resource, or previously undiscovered cultural resources are detected during construction. Mitigation under CEQA must address impacts to the values for which a cultural resource is considered important. To mitigate adequately, it must therefore be determined what elements make a site eligible for the CRHR. The preferred treatment is complete avoidance, when feasible, of all cultural resources.

Impact Significance Criteria

A proposed project may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource if it would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries

3.6.2.3 Regional

TRPA Thresholds

Although the TRPA does not include specific thresholds for archaeological resources, the TRPA Code of Ordinances includes provisions that offer procedures for the identification, evaluation, and protection of cultural resources, including sites of archaeological and historic significance. A potential loss of archaeological or historic resources would result in a significant impact on cultural resources. The TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist identifies issues that may be considered significant pursuant to the Code of Ordinances. These questions include:

- Will the proposal result in an alteration of or adverse physical or aesthetic effect to a significant archaeological or historical site, structure, object or building?

- Is the proposed project located on a property with any known cultural, historical, and/or archaeological resources, including resources on TRPA or other regulatory official maps or records?
- Is the property associated with any historically significant events and/or sites or persons?
- Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?
- Will the proposal restrict historic or prehistoric religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?

3.6.3 Impacts

3.6.3.1 CEQA and TRPA Considerations

Table 3.6-1 summarizes the 16 NRHP-listed and NRHP-eligible properties (archaeological and historic), for which significance has already been determined, that would be affected by proposed Program activities.[7] The table lists the status of each property and indicates in the Project Component column whether the site is only within the overall the study area (but is *not* overlapped by any project feature, such as a proposed drainage basin), or if it could be potentially affected by the preliminary locations of the various components of the Program in the future.

Table 3.6-2 identifies the 48 resources that will need additional research in the future, should proposed Program activities affect the resources themselves. As with Table 3.6-1, the Project Component column indicates whether the resource was only identified within the Program study area or if it could also be affected by the preliminary locations of proposed project features. If the Program could potentially affect one of the resources listed in Table 3.6-2, the eligibility of the resource for inclusion in the NRHP and/or CRHR will need to be determined.

[7] Properties listed in or determined eligible for listing in the NRHP are automatically listed in the CRHR and considered historic resources under CEQA.

Table 3.6-1
Potentially Affected Cultural Resources/Historic Properties Within the Study Area (Previously Evaluated)

Property Identifier	Property Name	Location	NRHP Status	Project Component
USFS 05-19-0786	Old Alpine State Highway, Segment 1	SR 89 Segment 1	Determined Eligible	Proposed Basin
CA-ELD-2413H, USFS 05-19-786	Old Alpine Highway, Segment 9	SR 89 Segment 1	Determined Eligible	Within Study Area Only
USFS 05-19-0777	Abandoned Road Segment	SR 89, Segment 1	Determined Eligible	Within Study Area Only
CA-ELD-0179	Washoe Trail Site	SR 89 Segment 2	Determined Eligible	Within Study Area Only
CA-ELD-0180H	Taylor Creek Site	SR 89 Segment 2	Determined Eligible	Within Study Area Only
USFS 05-19-0045	Pope or Tevis Estate / FS 05-03-54-45	SR 89 Segment 2	NRHP-listed	Within Study Area Only
USFS 05-19-0043	Camp Richardson Resort	SR 89 Segment 2	Determined Eligible	Proposed Basin
USFS 05-19-0044	Valhalla Estate	SR 89 Segment 2	NRHP-listed	Within Study Area Only
USFS 05-19-0047	Tallac Historic Site (Baldwin, Pope and Heller Estates)	SR 89 Segment 2	NRHP-listed	Within Study Area Only
USFS 05-19-0417	Fallen Leaf Dam water & electrical transmission	SR 89 Segment 2	Determined Eligible	Within Study Area Only
USFS 05-19-0795	Visitor Center Site	SR 89 Segment 2	Determined Eligible	Within Study Area Only
-	SR 89 Masonry Features at Emerald Bay – Masonry Features 1-4	SR 89, Segment 3	Listed	Within the Study Area Only
-	Vikingsholm Estate	SR 89 Segment 3	NRHP-listed	Within Study Area Only
-	D.L. Bliss State Park Custodian's Cottage	SR 89 Segment 4	Determined Eligible	Within Study Area Only
-	Sugar Pine Point State Park	SR 89 Segment 5	NRHP-listed	Within Study Area Only
-	Murphy Family Summer Cabins Historic District	SR 89 Segment 5	Determined Eligible	Within Study Area Only

Table 3.6-2
Potentially Affected Cultural Resources/Historic Properties Within the Study Area (Not Previously Evaluated)

Property Identifier	Property Name	Location	Project Component
CA-ELD-2208 / P-09-003398	BRM 1	US 50 Segment 1	Within Study Area Only
P-09-003394	Foundation Site 2	US 50 Segment 1	Within Study Area Only
USFS 05-19-0481	Lake Valley Utility (or Telephone) Line	US 50 Segment 1 & SR 89, Segment 2	Within Study Area Only & Proposed Basin
CA-ELD-2206H	Foundation Site 1	US 50 Segment 2	Proposed Basin
USFS 05-19-0021	Lakeside House / Stateline Hotel Site	US 50 Segment 3	Within Study Area Only
CA-ELD-0070H / P-09-00158H / USFS 05-19-0118	"*Dabayé po'ewe*" Lithic scatters	SR 89 Segment 1	Proposed Basin
CA-ELD-2414H / P-09-003691 / USFS 05-19-1131	Temp Site Aspen 4	SR 89 Segment 1	Proposed Basin
CA-ELD-2415H / P-09-003693 / USFS 05-19-1128	Temp Site Aspen 1 (formerly Isolate 98-1 / Aspen Grove 2 and Isolate 98-2 / Aspen Grove 3)	SR 89, Segment 1	Within Study Area Only
CA-ELD-2416H / P-09-003694 / USFS 05-19-1129	Temp Site Aspen 2	SR 89, Segment 1	Proposed Basin
CA-ELD-2417H / P-09-003695 / USFS 05-19-1130	Temp Site Aspen 3	SR 89, Segment 1	Proposed Basin
USFS 05-19-0909	Aspen Grove	SR 89 Segment 1	Within Study Area Only
USGS 05-19-0132	TRT 1A Aspens	SR 89, Segment1	Within Study Area Only
USFS 05-19-0423	Ethnographic site "*Tsee Gah Bah*"	SR 89 Segment 1	Proposed Basin
USFS 05-19-0426	LESS	SR 89 Segment 1	Within Study Area Only
USFS 05-19-1015	Highway 89 Spring Site	SR 89 Segment 1	Proposed Basin
USFS 05-19-1020	Santa Claus Site	SR 89 Segment 1	Within Study Area Only
CA-ELD-0029 / P-09-000177 / USFS 05-19-0114	One site composed of two sites; CA-ELD-179 &-180 (not shown on maps as two)	SR 89, Segment 2	Within Study Area Only
CA-ELD-0183 / P-09-000271 / USFS 05-19-0071	Basalt Flakes	SR 89, Segment2	Within Study Area Only
USFS 05-19-0007	Permanent Washoe Camp Site (05-03-54-007)	SR 89 Segment 2	Within Study Area Only
USFS 05-19-0111	Tallac Ditch	SR 89 Segment 2	Within Study Area Only

Table 3.6-2 (Concluded)
Potentially Affected Cultural Resources/Historic Properties Within the Study Area (Not Previously Evaluated)

Property Identifier	Property Name	Location	Project Component
USFS 05-19-0456	Rich Ditch	SR 89 Segment 2	Within Study Area Only
-	73x (no record at NCIC, shown only on maps)	SR 89 Segment 2	Within Study Area Only
CA-ELD-2209	Lithic Scatter 1	SR 89 Segment 3	Proposed Basin
-	Bayview Resort & Campground	SR 89, Segment 3	Proposed Basin
P-09-003401	Historic SR 89, Segment 1	SR 89 Segment 4	Proposed Basin
P-09-003401	Historic SR 89, Segment 2	SR 89 Segment 4	Proposed Basin
P-09-003401	Historic SR 89, Segment 3	SR 89 Segment 4	Proposed Basin
P-09-003401	Historic SR 89, Segment 4	SR 89 Segment 4	Within Study Area Only
P-09-003401	Historic SR 89, Segment 5	SR 89 Segment 4	Proposed Basin
P-09-003401	Historic SR 89, Segment 6	SR 89 Segment 4	Proposed Basin
P-09-003401	Historic SR 89, Segment 7	SR 89 Segment 4	Within Study Area Only
P-09-003401	Historic SR 89, Segment 8	SR 89 Segment 4	Within Study Area Only
P-09-003408	Road 1	SR 89 Segment 4	Proposed Basin
P-09-003409	Road 2	SR 89 Segment 4	Proposed Basin
P-09-003410	Road 3	SR 89 Segment 4	Proposed Basin
P-09-003411	Road 4	SR 89 Segment 4	Proposed Basin
P-09-003412	Road 5	SR 89 Segment 4	Within Study Area Only
P-09-003413	Road 6	SR 89 Segment 4	Within Study Area Only
P-09-003414	Road 7	SR 89 Segment 4	Proposed Basin
P-09-003415	Ditch 1	SR 89 Segment 4	Proposed Basin
P-09-003416	Telegraph Line	SR 89 Segment 4	Proposed Basin
-	Bliss Rock Wall / Green THP-Site 7	SR 89 Segment 5	Within Study Area Only
-	Erhman Ditch	SR 89 Segment 5	Within Study Area Only
-	State Park Linear Feature 9	SR 89 Segment 5	Proposed Basin
-	State Park Linear Feature 10	SR 89 Segment 5	Proposed Basin
-	State Park Linear Feature 11	SR 89 Segment 5	Proposed Basin
-	State Park Site A8	SR 89 Segment 5	Proposed Basin
-	Yellow Jacket Dump Site	SR 89 Segment 5	Within Study Area Only

3.6.3.2 No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative would consist of not implementing the EIP projects for which Caltrans is the lead agency; therefore, there would be no impacts to archaeological or historic resources.

3.6.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation

Locations of Program facilities such as drainage basins and roadway pullouts have been conceptually identified but may change as detailed project design is carried out. Mitigation will ultimately need to be defined for each resource affected. The following defines categories of mitigation measures that could be applied as each project segment advances to design.

Three classes of resources could potentially be affected by Program activities:

- Built-environment resources (buildings, structures, and other aboveground built features)
- Archaeological sites (prehistoric, historic, or mixed component)
- Traditional cultural properties (traditional use areas such as plant gathering areas that still retain significance for living populations)

The following kinds of activities could potentially affect these resource classes:

- Ground-disturbing activity caused by construction, maintenance, or stormwater runoff erosion
- Vandalism and/or looting of archaeological or built-environment resources as a result of increased use and/or access

Typical avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures in addition to project BMPs may include the following:

- Before any specific proposed undertaking that would have the potential to affect cultural resources, the information presented in this section and in the ASR and HRER will be reviewed against the specific area of potential effect for the undertaking. Parcels that were inaccessible for the archaeological resources study may require access and survey. This effort would take place in conjunction with consultation with members of the local Native American community and consultation with other interested members of the public as appropriate.
- In the event that a significant cultural resource (as defined by the NRHP and CRHR criteria) is identified and has the potential to be adversely affected, measures will be taken to avoid the resource. In the event the resource cannot be avoided, it will be subject to data recovery, further study, enhanced recordation, interpretation, physical protection, or some combination of these measures to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.
- In the future, if previously disturbed cultural materials are unearthed during the course of construction for any Program-related facilities, it is Caltrans' policy that work be halted in that area until a professionally qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find. Additional archaeological survey will be needed if the project limits are extended beyond the present survey limits. If human remains are encountered during the course of construction, all work in that area must halt and the El Dorado County Coroner must be contacted, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Sections 5097.94, 5097.98, and 5097.99.

This page intentionally left blank.