

Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613
For Hand Delivery/Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SCH #

Project Title: Land Management Plan for River Spring Lakes Ecological Reserve

Lead Agency: California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Bishop Field Office Contact Person: Alisa Ellsworth
Mailing Address: 787 N. Main Street, Suite 220 Phone: (760) 872-1171
City: Bishop Zip: CA County: Inyo

Project Location: County: Mono City/Nearest Community: Benton, CA
Cross Streets: Highway 120/ River Springs Road (nearest intersection) Zip Code: 93512
Longitude/Latitude (degrees, minutes and seconds): 37 ° 56 ' 1.68 " N / 118 ° 36 ' 37.1 " W Total Acres: 638
Assessor's Parcel No.: 18-260-001, 18-320-006 Section: 24 Twp.: 1N Range: 30E Base: MDBM
Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: None Waterways: None
Airports: None Railways: None Schools: None

Document Type:

CEQA: [ ] NOP [ ] Draft EIR [ ] Supplemental/Subsequent EIR [ ] Neg Dec [ ] Mit Neg Dec
NEPA: [ ] NOI [ ] EA [ ] Draft EIS [ ] FONSI
Other: [ ] Joint Document [ ] Final Document [ ] Other:

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE
Governor's Office of Planning & Research
MAY 11 2016

Local Action Type:

[ ] General Plan Update [ ] Specific Plan [ ] Rezone [ ] Annexation
[ ] General Plan Amendment [ ] Master Plan [ ] Prezone [ ] Redevelopment
[ ] General Plan Element [ ] Planned Unit Development [ ] Use Permit [ ] Coastal Permit
[ ] Community Plan [ ] Site Plan [ ] Land Division (Subdivision, etc.) [ ] Other: Mngmt Plan

Development Type:

[ ] Residential: Units \_\_\_\_\_ Acres \_\_\_\_\_
[ ] Office: Sq.ft. \_\_\_\_\_ Acres \_\_\_\_\_ Employees \_\_\_\_\_
[ ] Commercial: Sq.ft. \_\_\_\_\_ Acres \_\_\_\_\_ Employees \_\_\_\_\_
[ ] Industrial: Sq.ft. \_\_\_\_\_ Acres \_\_\_\_\_ Employees \_\_\_\_\_
[ ] Educational: \_\_\_\_\_
[ ] Recreational: \_\_\_\_\_
[ ] Water Facilities: Type \_\_\_\_\_ MGD \_\_\_\_\_
[ ] Transportation: Type \_\_\_\_\_
[ ] Mining: Mineral \_\_\_\_\_
[ ] Power: Type \_\_\_\_\_ MW \_\_\_\_\_
[ ] Waste Treatment: Type \_\_\_\_\_ MGD \_\_\_\_\_
[ ] Hazardous Waste: Type \_\_\_\_\_
[ ] Other: Resources Management/ non-development

Project Issues Discussed in Document:

[x] Aesthetic/Visual [ ] Fiscal [x] Recreation/Parks [x] Vegetation
[x] Agricultural Land [x] Flood Plain/Flooding [ ] Schools/Universities [x] Water Quality
[x] Air Quality [x] Forest Land/Fire Hazard [ ] Septic Systems [x] Water Supply/Groundwater
[x] Archeological/Historical [x] Geologic/Seismic [ ] Sewer Capacity [x] Wetland/Riparian
[x] Biological Resources [x] Minerals [x] Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading [ ] Growth Inducement
[ ] Coastal Zone [x] Noise [x] Solid Waste [x] Land Use
[ ] Drainage/Absorption [x] Population/Housing Balance [x] Toxic/Hazardous [x] Cumulative Effects
[ ] Economic/Jobs [x] Public Services/Facilities [x] Traffic/Circulation [ ] Other:

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

Resource Management

Project Description: (please use a separate page if necessary)

The River Spring Lakes Ecological Reserve (RSLER) Land Management Plan (LMP) will guide the adaptive management of habitats, species, and programs on the 638-acre property and intends to protect and enhance fish and wildlife values; serve as a guide for appropriate public uses of RSLER; serve as a descriptive inventory of fish, wildlife, and native and nonnative plants and vegetation communities that occur within RSLER; and provide an overview of the property's planned operation and maintenance activities and of the personnel requirements to implement management goals.

Note: The State Clearinghouse will assign identification numbers for all new projects. If a SCH number already exists for a project (e.g. Notice of Preparation or previous draft document) please fill in.

**Reviewing Agencies Checklist**

Lead Agencies may recommend State Clearinghouse distribution by marking agencies below with an "X".  
If you have already sent your document to the agency please denote that with an "S".

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Resources Board                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Office of Historic Preservation                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Boating & Waterways, Department of          | <input type="checkbox"/> Office of Public School Construction                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Emergency Management Agency      | <input type="checkbox"/> Parks & Recreation, Department of                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Highway Patrol                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Pesticide Regulation, Department of                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans District # _____                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utilities Commission                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Division of Aeronautics            | <input type="checkbox"/> Regional WQCB # _____                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Planning                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Agency                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Central Valley Flood Protection Board       | <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Recycling and Recovery, Department of     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coachella Valley Mtns. Conservancy          | <input type="checkbox"/> S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Comm.           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Commission                          | <input type="checkbox"/> San Gabriel & Lower L.A. Rivers & Mtns. Conservancy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Colorado River Board                        | <input type="checkbox"/> San Joaquin River Conservancy                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conservation, Department of                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mtns. Conservancy                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Corrections, Department of                  | <input type="checkbox"/> State Lands Commission                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Delta Protection Commission                 | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Clean Water Grants                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education, Department of                    | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Water Quality                                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy Commission                           | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Water Rights                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fish & Game Region # _____                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food & Agriculture, Department of           | <input type="checkbox"/> Toxic Substances Control, Department of             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry and Fire Protection, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Water Resources, Department of                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Services, Department of             | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health Services, Department of              | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing & Community Development             |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Native American Heritage Commission         |  |

-----  
**Local Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)**

Starting Date May 12, 2016 Ending Date June 16, 2016

-----  
**Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):**

Consulting Firm: _____	Applicant: _____
Address: _____	Address: _____
City/State/Zip: _____	City/State/Zip: _____
Contact: _____	Phone: _____
Phone: _____	

-----  
**Signature of Lead Agency Representative:** Spence Lunnery, EPM **Date:** 4/19/16

Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 21161, Public Resources Code.

MAY 11 2016

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

PROJECT INFORMATION	
1. Project title:	River Spring Lakes Ecological Reserve, Land Management Plan
2. Lead agency name and address:	California Department of Fish and Wildlife Region 6- Inland Deserts 3602 Inland Empire Blvd. Suite C-220 Ontario, CA 91764
3. Contact person and phone number:	Alisa Ellsworth, Senior Environmental Scientist (760) 872-1173
4. Project location:	Mono County
5. Project sponsor's name and address:	Same as above
6. General plan designation:	Resource Management
7. Zoning:	N/A
8. Description of project:	<p>The project is the Land Management Plan (LMP) for the River Spring Lakes Ecological Reserve (RSLER). The purpose of the RSLER is to maintain and enhance wetland habitat values, provide a potential refuge for endangered Owens pupfish, maintain quality habitat for waterfowl and shorebirds, and provide public access for hunting and nature study. The purposes of the LMP are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To guide the adaptive management of habitats, species, and programs described herein to achieve the Department's mission to protect and enhance wildlife values</li> <li>• To guide compatible public uses of the property</li> <li>• To serve as a descriptive inventory of fish, wildlife, plants, and habitats that occur on or use this property</li> <li>• To provide an overview of the property's operations, maintenance, and personnel needed to implement management goals and serve as an aid for annual regional budget preparation and work planning</li> <li>• To provide a description of potential and actual environmental impacts and subsequent mitigation that may occur during management</li> <li>• To provide the environmental documentation necessary to comply with state and federal statutes and regulation</li> </ul> <p>The LMP consists of the following chapters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Introduction</li> <li>II. Property Description</li> <li>III. Habitat and Species Descriptions</li> <li>IV. Management Goals and Environmental Impacts</li> <li>V. Operations and Maintenance Summary</li> <li>VI. Climate Change Strategies</li> <li>VII. Future Revisions to Land Management Plans</li> <li>VIII. References</li> </ul>

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):  
The River Spring Lakes Ecological Reserve appears on the River Spring 7.5 minute U.S.G.S. quadrangle map. It comprises 637.65 acres at an elevation of 6,480 ft. The area occurs within the Great Basin Physiographic Province and is surrounded by arid brushlands. It is located in Adobe Valley, Mono County, approximately 10 miles northwest of the town of Benton, and 3.5 miles northeast of State Highway 120. Access to the reserve is via the River Spring Lakes Road. RSLER is bordered by Bureau of Land Management (BLM) property on all but the northeast side where it is bordered by the Inyo National Forest (INF). The legal description of the property boundaries are housed at the Department's Inland Deserts Region (Region 6), Bishop Field Office, and in the Lands Inventory files in Sacramento.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)  
None

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics               | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources     | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials      | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning      | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing     | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic   | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems        | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None          |   |   |

**DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

*Bruce Kinney, EPM*  
Signature

4/19/16  
Date

Bruce Kinney  
Printed Name

Environmental Program Manager  
Title

California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Agency

Inland Deserts - 6  
Region

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

<b>I. AESTHETICS</b>				
<b>Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
<b>DISCUSSION</b>				
<p><b>a), b), d) No Impact.</b> Adoption and implementation of the proposed LMP would preserve existing native vegetation and natural visual resources, and would not involve the construction of any new buildings or outdoor lighting. Therefore, adoption of the LMP would not adversely affect scenic vistas, views, visual character, or scenic resources, nor would it create light or glare effects.</p> <p><b>c) Less than Significant Impact.</b> Some LMP management tasks would involve minor modifications to the existing landscape (e.g., signage and fencing maintenance and repair). However, LMP adoption and task implementation would improve the overall aesthetic conditions of the RSLER by incorporating protection, management, and enhancement strategies for its natural habitats.</p>				

**II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.**

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California 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 Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

<b>Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
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))?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
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?				X

**DISCUSSION**

**a), b), c), d), and e) No Impact.** The RSLER does not contain lands designated as Prime Farmland or Unique Farmland. None of the RSLER contains Williamson Act contracts. The adoption of the proposed LMP does not prohibit managed grazing for ecological benefit.



**III. 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.

<b>Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
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)?			X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

**DISCUSSION**

a), d), e) **No Impact.** The project site is located in a remote area far from substantial populations or potentially sensitive receptors. No long term operational emissions are anticipated, no net increase in automobile trips to and from RSLER are expected, nor are objectionable odors expected to affect a substantial number of people as a result of implementing the proposed LMP. Some of the proposed LMP management tasks may involve the temporary use of construction equipment (e.g., installation of signs, habitat revegetation/restoration projects), and therefore may result in the temporary increase of equipment emissions. These would be short-term impacts involving a limited number of construction machines and would not contribute to a cumulative net increase in any pollutants.

b), c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The LMP suggests evaluating the benefits of prescribed fire as an enhancement/restoration technique. If prescribed burns are implemented, registering with the statewide Prescribed Fire Information Reporting System, coordinating burns with the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District, and preparing and implementing an associated Local Smoke Management Plan would be sufficient to prevent air pollutant emissions from contributing to an air quality violation. As a result, this potential impact of the proposed LMP on air quality would be less than significant.

In addition, prior to implementation of any projects that are consistent with the LMP, CDFW would subject them to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, in light of the information contained in this document, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. The type of CEQA review completed would be determined based on CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant 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?			X	
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?			X	
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?			X	
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?			X	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
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?				X
<b>DISCUSSION</b>				
<p><b>a), b), c), d) Less Than Significant Impact.</b> Although implementation of some of the management tasks described in the proposed LMP would have the potential for temporary construction impacts to wildlife and sensitive habitats such as wetlands (e.g., restoration or enhancement activities), it is anticipated that these impacts would not be substantial and that these projects would have a net benefit to wildlife and habitat. Any of these types of activities would be implemented in conformance with regulatory requirements such as CDFW regulations, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regulations, State Water Quality Control board regulations, Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and any applicable plans or ordinances protecting biological resources.</p> <p>The LMP includes habitat preservation and enhancement as primary goals for the protection of both wildlife and their habitat. It also ensures that all actions comply with federal and state Endangered Species Acts (ESA and CESA).</p> <p>In addition, prior to implementation of any projects that are consistent with the LMP, CDFW would subject them to further CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, in light of the information contained in this document, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. The type of additional CEQA review completed would be determined based on CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164.</p> <p><b>e), f) No Impact.</b> There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other local policies that conflict with the adoption and implementation of the plan.</p>				

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

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

**DISCUSSION**

**a) Less Than Significant Impact.** Although implementation of some of the management tasks described in the proposed LMP would involve minimal land disturbance (e.g., installation of signs, restoration activities), the goals and tasks in the LMP include maintaining the historic cabin onsite to preserve its historic value.

**b), c), d) No Impact.** Implementing the LMP will not adversely affect archaeological or paleontological resources, or disturb any human remains.

On September 30, 2015, in compliance with PRC § 21080.3.1 and the CDFW Tribal Communication and Consultation Policy, the Department requested a list of Tribes potentially affected by the LMP from the Native American Heritage Commission. Upon receipt of the listed Tribes and their contacts, the Department provided official notification of the LMP to those Tribal contacts, which resulted in no requests for formal consultation on the LMP.

In addition, prior to implementation of any projects that are consistent with the LMP, CDFW would subject them to further CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, in light of the information contained in this document, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. The type of additional CEQA review completed would be determined based on CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant 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:				X
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.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
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?				X
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?				X
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?				X
<b>DISCUSSION</b>				
<p><b>a), c), d), e) No Impact.</b> LMP implementation will not change the current exposure risk to geologic hazards or expansive soils nor create a substantial risk to lives or property. The LMP does not specifically authorize or make a precommitment to any substantive changes to the Ecological Reserve. With the exception of ongoing restoration and enhancement, and operations and maintenance activities, any substantive physical changes that are not currently approved will require subsequent authorizations.</p> <p>The LMP does not include construction of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems nor would any be required as a result of the implementation of any of the LMP goals or tasks; therefore, implementation of the LMP would result in no impact.</p> <p><b>b) Less Than Significant Impact.</b> Implementation of some of the management tasks described in the proposed LMP could involve minimal ground disturbance (e.g., habitat restoration, enhancement or maintenance activities). These activities would be implemented using best management practices designed to minimize soil erosion and/or topsoil loss, and would be conducted in conformance with regulatory requirements regarding soil erosion.</p>				

**VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

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

**DISCUSSION**

**a), b) Less Than Significant Impact.** The RSLER is located in the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District. The LMP suggests evaluating the benefits of prescribed fire as an enhancement/restoration technique. If prescribed burns are implemented, they will generate greenhouse gas emissions, but the duration and extent of the burns would be limited and localized, and would be implemented in compliance with conditions enforced by the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District. Therefore, implementing the LMP would not generate greenhouse gas emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Further, implementing the goals and tasks of the LMP will most likely lead to an overall reduction in greenhouse gases through habitat preservation, wetland restoration, and subsequent carbon sequestration.

**VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

<b>Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
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?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
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?				X
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?				X
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?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X	

**DISCUSSION**

**a), b), c), d), e), f), g) No Impact.** The LMP does not require the routine use, transport or disposal of hazardous materials. Herbicide or pesticide treatments, if needed to control invasive species, would be targeted to avoid unnecessary impacts to sensitive biological resources and conducted by a certified applicator using appropriate safety precautions. The RSLER is not located within a quarter mile of a school; therefore, children will not be exposed to any hazardous materials. There are no public or private airports within two miles of the RSLER; therefore, LMP adoption will not pose any safety hazards to aircraft or people residing or working in the project area. The RSLER is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5. Implementation of the LMP would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

**h) Less Than Significant Impact.** The LMP suggests evaluating the benefits of prescribed fire as an enhancement/restoration technique; however, no specific prescribed burn project has been identified in the proposed LMP. Such a plan that would be consistent with the LMP would be subject to CEQA review in light of the information in this document. The type of additional CEQA review completed would be determined based on CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164.

<b>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>				
<b>Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
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)?				X
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?			X	
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?			X	
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?				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
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?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
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?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
<b>DISCUSSION</b>				
<p>a), c), d) <b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> Implementation of some of the management tasks described in the proposed plan (e.g., restoration or enhancement activities) would involve a potential for the discharge of sediments or pollutants and alteration of drainage patterns. However, these projects would be conducted in conformance with regulatory requirements regarding erosion and sediment control, flooding, and water quality protection, and would be implemented with a goal of a net improvement in water quality. In addition, prior to implementation of any projects that are consistent with the LMP, CDFW would subject them to further CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, in light of the information contained in this document, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. The type of additional CEQA review completed</p>				

would be determined based on CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164.

b), e), f), g), h), i), j) **No Impact.** Adoption of the proposed plan would not utilize additional surface or groundwater resources, create or contribute stormwater runoff, construct new buildings or impervious surfaces, or alter existing risks of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. In addition, prior to implementation of any projects that are consistent with the LMP, CDFW would subject them to further CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, in light of the information contained in this document, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. The type of additional CEQA review completed would be determined based on CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164.



**X. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

<b>Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
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?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

**DISCUSSION**

**a), b), c) No Impact.** The proposed LMP would not require any physical changes to an established community, nor would implementation of any activity following LMP adoption physically divide an established community. The goals of the LMP provide for natural resource protection and preservation and require that any projects implemented following adoption of the proposed LMP conform to any habitat conservation plans and natural community conservation plans that may be applicable at that time.

**XI. MINERAL RESOURCES**

<b>Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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?				X
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?				X
<p align="center"><b>DISCUSSION</b></p> <p>a), b) <b>No Impact.</b> Implementation of the LMP would not result in resource extraction. The RSLER is not located within a mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan; therefore, the proposed LMP would not 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 or conflict with mineral resource protection plans or result in the loss of a known mineral resource.</p>				

<b>XII. NOISE</b>				
<b>Would the project result in:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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?				X
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
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?				X
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?				X
<b>DISCUSSION</b>				
<p><b>a), b), c), d), e), f) No Impact.</b> Although implementation of some of the management tasks described in the proposed LMP could involve the intermittent use of construction equipment (e.g., restoration, enhancement, or maintenance activities) thus temporarily increasing ambient noise, these activities would not result in a substantial increase in ambient noise or groundborne vibration levels above those generated by existing management practices or public uses. Since any increase in ambient noise will be temporary, and due to the isolated nature of the area, people in the vicinity will not be exposed to excessive noise levels or significantly impacted. The RSLER is not located within 2 miles of an airport land use plan or a public airport, or in the vicinity of a private airport. No impact is anticipated to occur.</p>				

**XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

<b>Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<p><b>DISCUSSION</b></p> <p>a), b), c) <b>No Impact.</b> The proposed LMP would not involve any change in housing nor would it induce growth by the provision of new infrastructure or by the removal of any barriers to growth. Implementation of some of the management goals and tasks may require additional staff hours, but this would not be anticipated to induce a population growth that would require additional housing.</p>				

**XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?				X
b) Police protection?				X
c) Schools?				X
d) Parks?				X
e) Other public facilities?				X

**DISCUSSION**

**a), b), c), d), e) No Impact.** Proposed LMP adoption would not require substantial changes to existing public service levels. Implementation of public use and facilities could require minimal increase in staff hours per year by CDFW, but these potential minimal increases do not create the need for new or altered facilities.

**XV. RECREATION**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>Would the project:</b> 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?				X
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				X

**DISCUSSION**

a), b) **No Impact.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed LMP would not significantly increase the levels of wildlife-dependent recreational use the RSLER area. The number of these recreational users would not exceed the carrying capacity of the natural resources or degrade existing natural features. The proposed LMP does not require construction of any recreational facilities.

<b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</b>				
<b>Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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?				X
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?				X
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?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				X
<b>DISCUSSION</b>				
<p><b>a), b), c), d), e), f), g) No Impact.</b> There are no predicted increases in RSLER use levels following LMP adoption. No design changes are proposed for current road access, nor are any changes anticipated with traffic patterns; therefore, no traffic hazards are anticipated. Since changes to current traffic levels or patterns are not anticipated, no changes to emergency access or parking would result from plant adoption, and the plan would not interfere with alternative transportation.</p>				

<b>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>				
<b>Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
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?				X
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?				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
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?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
<b>DISCUSSION</b>				
<p><b>a), b), c), d), e), f), g) No Impact.</b> The LMP does not include a proposal for additional storm drain facilities, additional water supplies, additional wastewater treatment, or additional solid waste disposal. Adoption of the proposed LMP and implementation of the goals and tasks contained therein would not require the construction of new residences or service-related facilities; therefore, adoption of the proposed LMP would generate no changes to storm drain facilities, additional water supplies, or additional wastewater treatment.</p>				



**XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

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

**DISCUSSION**

**a) Less Than Significant Impact.** Adoption of the proposed LMP and implementation of the goals and tasks therein would help preserve and enhance natural resources. Some activities that could be implemented as a result of adoption of the proposed LMP would have a potential for impacts to biological and cultural resources (e.g., restoration or enhancement activities), as described in Sections IV and V above. However, because activities would be conducted following all applicable regulatory requirements, because many of the goals and tasks are designed to have a net benefit to these resources, and because no large scale projects are anticipated which could threaten entire populations or communities, adoption of the proposed LMP would not be anticipated to cause a significant impact to these biological or cultural resources. In addition, prior to implementation of any projects that are consistent with the LMP, CDFW would subject them to further CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, in light of the information contained in this document, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. The type of additional CEQA review completed would be determined based on CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164.

**b) No Impact.** Adoption of the proposed LMP and implementation of the goals and tasks contained therein would not require any substantial infrastructure improvements or new construction, and any implementation activities would be conducted following all applicable regulatory requirements. In addition, most of the proposed goals and tasks are designed to encourage a net benefit to environmental conditions. Therefore, although there is a potential for some temporary and less than significant impacts to the environment as described above, none of these impacts are anticipated to be cumulatively considerable. In addition, prior to implementation of any projects that are consistent with the LMP, CDFW would subject them to further CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, in light of the information contained in this document, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. The type of additional CEQA review completed would be determined based on CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164.

**c) No Impact.** The proposed project is a LMP, with no construction or substantive physical changes proposed. Implementation of the LMP would comply with all applicable laws and regulations. As a result, adoption of the proposed LMP and implementation of the goals and tasks contained therein is not anticipated to have any direct or indirect environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080(e), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095, and 21151, Public Resources Code; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino*, (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors*, (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.