

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

1. Project Title:	By-Day Creek Ecological Reserve (BDCER) Land Management Plan (LMP)
2. Lead agency name and address:	California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) 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:	By-Day Creek Ecological Reserve consists of 460-acres of undeveloped land located 5-miles northwest of the community of Bridgeport, County of Mono. The property is located in portions of Sections 21, 22, and 28, in Township 5 North, Range 24 East, Mount Diablo Base Meridian. It is mapped on the Mount Jackson 7.5 Minute USGS topographic quadrangle. The approximate geographic coordinates of the project are: 38.2719, - 119.3278.
5. Project sponsor's name and address:	Same as above
6. General plan description:	Resource Management (RM)
7. Zoning:	N/A
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.)	CDFW has prepared an LMP for the BDCER. The LMP establishes management goals and tasks that will ensure the long-term conservation of wildlife (invertebrates, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals), special-status plants and plant communities, and their habitats on the BDCER. The LMP also describes appropriate public uses of the BDCER and provides environmental analysis of land management tasks and public uses.

<p>9. Surrounding land uses and setting; briefly describe the project's surroundings:</p>	<p>The BDCER is located along By-Day Creek in Mono County. The area is composed of montane aquatic and riparian habitat, aspen groves, meadows, sagebrush scrub, and forested hillsides. Public Land (US Forest Service) surrounds most of the property, except for a 20-acre private property adjacent to the southern boundary of the Ecological Reserve. Surrounding land uses include livestock grazing, passive recreation, hunting, and motorized use of the access road which is gated at the Ecological Reserve boundary.</p>
<p>10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?</p> <p>Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.</p>	<p>In compliance with PRC §21080.3.1 and the CDFW Tribal Communication and Consultation Policy, on April 5, 2019, CDFW requested a list of Tribes potentially affected by the LMP from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). On April 25, 2019, upon receipt of the NAHC list of Tribes and contacts, CDFW provided official notification of the LMP by mail to those contacts as well as to those Tribes that had requested CEQA notification from CDFW for the region. The notification resulted in one request for consultation from which resulted in staff level communication and a review of the draft LMP. The resulting comments were integrated into the current document.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project. Please see the checklist beginning on page 3 for additional information.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture and Forestry	<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 and 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"/>	Tribal Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance				

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.

Leslie MacNair
Signature

2/20/2020
Date

Leslie MacNair
Printed Name

Regional 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

This initial study was prepared in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines to identify and evaluate the potential environmental impacts of operating the BDCER under the provisions of the BDCER LMP. This initial study concludes that adoption and implementation of the LMP would result in “less-than-significant impacts” or “no impacts” on the environment.

The LMP provides the environmental and regulatory setting description, as well as the project description, used for this CEQA analysis. Sections 1 through 3 serve as the environmental setting: Section 1 provides the purpose of the management plan and the BDCER and gives an overview of the planning process; Section 2 describes the physical and cultural characteristics and features of the BDCER, including the history of its acquisition by CDFW, current and past land uses, the geological and hydrological setting, and the area’s prehistoric and historical context; and Section 3 presents an inventory of plant communities and species that are found on or that may use the BDCER. Sections 4 serves as the project description and defines the elements, goals, and objectives of the LMP; outlines the tasks that will be undertaken to meet these goals and objectives; and summarizes the environmental impacts expected to result from land management tasks; Section 5 summarizes the operations and maintenance tasks, and personnel needed to meet the goals of the plan.

With the exception of minor operations, maintenance activities, and stewardship activities, any physical changes that are not currently approved will require subsequent authorizations and approvals. Because any such possible changes will be a part of projects, which have not yet been conceived, designed or funded, it is not possible to reasonably evaluate the impacts of any such subsequent projects. Any such subsequent projects not included within the scope of this project will require analysis pursuant to CEQA when such projects are conceived and proposed.

Aesthetics

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS:				
Would the project:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a), b), d) No Impact. Adopting and implementing the BDCER LMP would preserve or enhance 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.

c) Less than Significant Impact. Some LMP management tasks would involve minor modifications to the existing landscape (e.g., signage and fencing). However, these improvements would be small in scale and designed to be in keeping with rural character and natural environment of the Ecological Reserve. Therefore, LMP adoption would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Agriculture and Forest Resources

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California 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. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<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"/>

Discussion

a), b), c), d), and e) No Impact. Adoption and implementation of the BDCER LMP would conserve existing land resources and does not prohibit managed grazing for ecological benefit. It would not result in construction of new structures or impervious surfaces, beyond the installation of signs, kiosks, fencing, and, potentially, small devices needed for scientific research. The BDCER does not contain lands designated as Prime Farmland or Unique Farmland. There are not any Williamson Act contracts. There would be no impact.

Air Quality

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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. Would the project:</p>				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

Discussion

a), d), e) No Impact. The BDCER 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 BDCER 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 heavy equipment (e.g., road maintenance, 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, CDFW would register with the statewide Prescribed Fire Information Reporting System, coordinate burns with the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District and prepare and implement an associated Local Smoke Management Plan. These measures 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.

Biological Resources

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

Discussion

a), b), c), d) Less Than Significant Impact. The BDCER LMP was developed with the primary purpose of managing the property to achieve CDFW's mission to protect and enhance wildlife values. Implementation of the LMP would maintain the Ecological Reserve in a natural state and allow only compatible uses to occur.

One species that has been listed as federally threatened, Lahontan cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki henshawi*), occurs on the property in By-Day Creek. One wildlife species designated by CDFW as a bird species of special concern is known to occur in riparian vegetation at BDCER, the yellow warbler (*Setophaga petechia*). Other special status species that are likely to occur at BDCER are the northern goshawk (*Accipiter gentiles*) (CA species of special concern, willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii*) (CA endangered), American badger (*Taxidea taxus*) (CA species of special concern), and Sierra marten (*Martes caurina sierra*) (CA Species of Greatest Conservation Need). No rare plant species have been identified at BDCER.

Although the purpose of the LMP is to protect and enhance wildlife values in the BDCER, some LMP tasks could temporarily disturb natural habitats and species, including sensitive natural communities such as the stream, aspen groves, and meadows. Tasks that may result in limited

ground disturbance (i.e., typically 1 acre or less) or in short-term increases in dust, noise, vibrations, human activity, and erosion would include minor thinning of conifer encroachment in meadows and aspen stands, weed control, installation of fences and signs, road maintenance, and performance of scientific research tasks.

For these tasks, the LMP requires appropriate measures to avoid or minimize adverse effects on biological resources. These measures include directing the public away from sensitive habitats (e.g. fishing and road closures), implementing erosion and sedimentation control measures, preventing the spread of weeds, and avoiding direct impacts on biological resources (e.g., permanent loss or alteration of habitat, mortality, or injury). Implementation of these measures alongside other LMP tasks would ensure that any adverse effects on special-status species or sensitive natural communities, including wetlands, are less than significant.

Furthermore, several federal and state agencies potentially have regulatory authority over LMP tasks that could adversely affect special-status species and sensitive natural communities (See LMP Section 1.D). The LMP requires appropriate agency coordination and compliance with the terms and conditions of any permits or other authorizations issued by these agencies to protect biological resources, further ensuring that any adverse effects on special-status species or sensitive natural communities would be less than significant.

Despite the potential for temporary, small-scale impacts on special-status species and sensitive natural communities because of some LMP tasks, the primary purpose of the LMP is to protect and enhance wildlife values in the BDCER. CDFW would manage, enhance, or restore biological resources in the BDCER consistent with the LMP, with the long-term goal of improving habitat conditions and enhancing special-status plant and animal populations at the Ecological Reserve. Because the LMP incorporates specific minimization and avoidance measures, the temporary and small-scale impacts on special-status species or sensitive natural communities that could result from LMP implementation would be less than significant, and, overall, implementation of the LMP is expected to have a net beneficial effect on biological resources over the long term.

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.

e), f) No Impact. The BDCER LMP is consistent with the Mono County General Plan, Conservation-Open Space Element (2015). There are no other applicable regional, local, or state plans addressing biological resources, nor do any adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans apply to the Ecological Reserve. There would be no impact.

Cultural Resources

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

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"/>

Discussion

a), b), c), d) No Impact. Implementing the BDCER LMP will not adversely affect historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, or disturb any human remains. The goals and tasks in the LMP include inventory and protection of cultural resources.

In compliance with PRC §21080.3.1 and the CDFW Tribal Communication and Consultation Policy, on April 5, 2019, CDFW requested a list of Tribes potentially affected by the LMP from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). On April 25, 2019, upon receipt of the NAHC list of Tribes and contacts, CDFW provided official notification of the LMP by mail to those contacts as well as to those Tribes that had requested CEQA notification from CDFW for the region. Notification letters were sent to the Utu Utu Gwaitu Tribe of the Benton Paiute Reservation, Bishop Paiute Tribe, Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley, Bridgeport Paiute Indian Colony, Walker River Reservation (Nevada), and the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California. The notification resulted in one request for consultation from the Bridgeport Indian Colony which resulted in staff level communication and a review of the draft LMP. The resulting comments were integrated into the current document.

In addition, prior to implementation of any projects that are consistent with the LMP, the CDFW Tribal Consultation Policy, and 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.

Geology and Soils

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:

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

Discussion

a), c), d), e) No Impact. 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 pre-commitment 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.

The LMP does not include construction of buildings, 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.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of some of the management tasks described in the proposed LMP could involve ground disturbance, which could lead to soil erosion or loss of topsoil. These tasks include small-scale restoration or enhancement of creeks and meadows, minor thinning of conifer encroachment in meadows and aspen stands, weed control, installation of fences and signs, road maintenance, and performance of scientific research tasks. Although these activities have potential to temporarily cause erosion, over the long term they would achieve a net decrease in soil loss, by supporting and protecting healthy native plant and animal communities and habitats. Additionally, the LMP requires that measures be implemented using best practices to minimize adverse erosion effects during management activities. Furthermore, all management activities would conform to regulatory requirements regarding soil erosion. Therefore, implementation of the LMP would have a less-than significant short-term effect as a result of erosion and loss of topsoil, and a net beneficial effect over the long term.

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.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a), b) Less Than Significant Impact. The BDCER LMP would not generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment. The activities required to implement the LMP mostly would continue the current BDCER operations and level of public use, and so would not result in a measurable net increase in GHG emissions emanating from the BDCER or in off-site emissions related to its management and use. 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. Furthermore, small management fires would be implemented in part to prevent much larger catastrophic fires and the significant GHG emissions associated with such events. 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 carbon sequestration.

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.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a), 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 BDCER 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 BDCER; therefore, LMP adoption will not pose any safety hazards to aircraft or people residing or working in the project area. The BDCER 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.

b) Less Than Significant Impact: Some LMP tasks could involve the use of heavy equipment and vehicles, which require small amounts of hazardous materials such as oils, fuels, and other fluids. Also, weed control may employ herbicides that could be toxic to some organisms at certain concentrations. However, implementation of the LMP would not result in an increase in the size or frequency of activities requiring equipment, vehicle use, or potentially toxic chemicals relative to current conditions. Furthermore, the LMP requires the use of spill prevention and control best management practices (BMPs) during equipment use, to avoid or minimize potential adverse effects from spills or leaks. The LMP also specifies that herbicides be applied safely and effectively, in compliance with herbicide label instructions, California and federal law, and CDFW rules that aim to protect the environment. With implementation of these measures, this impact would be less than significant.

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. If proposed in a Forest Management Plan or similar document, such a plan would be consistent with the LMP and would be subject 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.

Hydrology and Water Quality

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

Discussion

a), f) Less Than Significant Impact. The BDCER is located in the planning area for, and consistent with the objectives of, the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board's Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region (Basin Plan 1995). The Basin Plan establishes water quality standards for surface and ground waters, identifies beneficial uses, water quality problems, and provides control measures. Under implementation of the LMP, the BDCER will remain largely undeveloped and in a natural or semi-natural state. The proposed LMP would not require any substantial construction or excavation, so management tasks would not contribute any pollutants that might degrade the beneficial uses of downstream waters. Instead, the area will be managed for conservation of natural resources and compatible public uses. Goals and tasks in the LMP require that measures be implemented to abate erosion and protect aquatic habitats and water quality from impacts that could result from routine operations. Spill prevention and control BMPs would be implemented to prevent and contain any leaks or spills of fluids used for equipment and vehicles. These measures would reduce potential temporary adverse effects of management activities to less than significant levels. Furthermore, the LMP prescribes tasks that will ultimately enhance water quality; for example, the LMP calls for actions to restore watersheds, maintain healthy wildlife and plant populations, control invasive weeds, achieve sustainable fire regimes, and support biodiversity. Net project results on hydrology and water quality would be beneficial over the long term. LMP tasks will comply with all applicable water quality requirements adopted by the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. If applicable, this includes compliance with the conditions of general waste discharge requirements (GWDR) and waste discharge requirement waivers for timber and vegetation management.

In addition, LMP goals and tasks require that all management actions meet applicable regulatory requirements protecting aquatic habitats and water quality. Requirements include CDFW regulations, applicable sections of the Clean Water Act, and relevant county policies and ordinances. Actions necessary to comply with these regulatory requirements would further protect water resources. Also, before implementing 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), c), d), e), g), h), i), j) No Impact. Implementation of the LMP would require no new wells or drilling; therefore, it would cause no decrease in aquifer volumes. The BDCER would remain largely undeveloped and managed for conservation of natural resources; thus, there would be no impacts on groundwater recharge, elevations, or volumes. The LMP does not call for the use of storm drain systems, the construction of structures or new sources of surface runoff, the use of a dam, or the redirection of stream courses or drainage patterns. Therefore, adoption and implementation of the LMP would not threaten storm drain capacity, increase 100-year flood hazards, add to surface runoff, create the potential for failure of a levee or dam, or cause substantial erosion or siltation. Restoration and monitoring activities, if implemented, would abate erosion and likely would reduce the risk of mudflows and landslides. Lastly, LMP implementation would not involve the construction of new housing or the exposure of more people to hazards involving floods, impaired water quality, or mudflows. There would be no impact.

Land Use and Planning

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:				
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"/>

Discussion

a), b), c) No Impact. Under implementation of the LMP, the BDCER will remain largely undeveloped and in a natural or semi-natural state. The area will continue to be managed for conservation of natural resources and compatible public uses. 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 LMP is consistent with all applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations. Applicable regional plans and rules consist of the Mono County General Plan (2015), related county ordinances, and the Lahontan RWQCB's Basin Plan (1995). No adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans apply to the Ecological Reserve. There would be no impact.

Mineral Resources

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<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"/>

Discussion

a), b) No Impact. Implementation of the LMP would not result in resource extraction. The BDCER 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. There would be no impact.

Noise

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

Discussion

a), b), d) Less Than Significant Impact. Visitors to the BDCER and surrounding public lands may occasionally be exposed to temporary noises and ground vibrations resulting from management tasks that require construction equipment or vehicles or power tools such as chainsaws. For example, road and parking area maintenance, fence installation, scientific research tasks, and vegetation and weed management activities could require the temporary use of loud machinery or vehicles and could cause ground vibrations. However, the remote BDCER is surrounded by undeveloped open space with no schools, hospitals, libraries, housing developments, or other sensitive noise receptors nearby. Therefore, there is not potential for a conflict with noise policies or standards. The LMP supports continued use of the property by hunters, who generate noise by discharging firearms. However, any occasional and transient changes in noise levels or ground vibrations would not represent an increase over current conditions. Management tasks would not increase in size or frequency, nor would hunting increase in a manner that prolongs or worsens related noises. Public uses, including

hunting, would be managed to avoid crowding and be compatible with the natural character of the Ecological Reserve. Thus, this impact would be less than significant.

c), e), f) No Impact. Adoption and implementation of the LMP would involve no changes that would result in permanent increases in ambient noise, expose additional workers or residents to excessive noise levels, or an increase in the size or frequency of management activities in the area. The BDCER is not located within 2 miles of an airport land use plan or a public airport, or in the vicinity of a private airport. There would be no impact.

Population and Housing

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:				
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"/>

Discussion

a), b), c) No Impact. The 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. There would be no impact on population and housing.

Public Services

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. 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:				

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"/>

Discussion

a), b), c), d), e) No Impact. Implementation of the LMP 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. No adverse environmental effects would result from alterations in public services or efforts to maintain service standards; thus, there would be no impact.

Recreation

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. RECREATION:				
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"/>

Discussion

a), b) No Impact. Adoption and implementation of the proposed LMP would not significantly increase the levels of recreational use the BDCER 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. There would be no impact related to changes in recreational resources.

Transportation/ Traffic

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:				
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"/>

Discussion

a), b), c), d), e), f), g) No Impact. There are no predicted increases in BDCER 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 plan adoption, and the plan would not interfere with alternative transportation.

Tribal Cultural Resources

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>XVII. 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:</p>				
<p>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</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>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.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a), b) Less Than Significant Impact. Implementing the BDCER LMP will not adversely affect the significance of a tribal cultural resource.

In compliance with PRC §21080.3.1 and the CDFW Tribal Communication and Consultation Policy, on April 5, 2019, CDFW requested a list of Tribes potentially affected by the LMP from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). On April 25, 2019, upon receipt of the NAHC list of Tribes and contacts, CDFW provided official notification of the LMP by mail to those contacts as well as to those Tribes that had requested CEQA notification from CDFW for the region. Notification letters were sent to the Utu Utu Gwaitu Tribe of the Benton Paiute Reservation, Bishop Paiute Tribe, Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley, Bridgeport Paiute Indian Colony, Walker River Reservation (Nevada), and the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California. The notification resulted in one request for consultation from the Bridgeport Indian Colony which resulted in staff level communication and a review of the draft LMP. The resulting comments were integrated into the current document. No potential for significant impacts to tribal cultural resources have been identified.

In addition, prior to implementation of any projects that are consistent with the LMP, the CDFW Tribal Consultation Policy, and 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.

Utilities and Service Systems

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:				
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"/>

Discussion

a), b), c), d), e), f), g) No Impact. Implementation of the LMP would involve no changes in wastewater generation or treatment, use of storm drain facilities, or solid waste disposal, and would create no demand for additional water supplies or entitlements. Small-scale restoration or enhancement projects would make use of existing available water supplies. There would be no impact.

Mandatory Findings of Significance

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

Discussion

a) No Impact. The LMP was developed to document management actions that will be undertaken with the purpose of protecting natural and cultural resources in the BDCER. Some activities that may be conducted under the LMP (e.g., hunting and restoration or enhancement activities) could affect the resources listed in the criterion. However, goals and tasks in the LMP include protection measures for these resources that would eliminate or minimize potential impacts. Ultimately, adoption of the LMP and implementation of the goals and tasks contained therein would have a net benefit in protecting and enhancing the environment, including biological and cultural resources.

b) Less Than Significant 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 LMP related activities would be conducted following all applicable regulatory requirements. In addition, implementation of the LMP is anticipated to result in a net benefit to environmental conditions. Therefore, although there is a potential that some temporary and less-than-significant impacts on the environment could occur, none of these impacts would be cumulatively considerable.

c) No Impact. The proposed project is adoption and implementation of a land management plan that generally continues the existing uses of the Ecological Reserve, with improvements to operations and protection and enhancement of the environment. 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 would not have any direct or indirect environmental effects that 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(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095, and 21151, Public Resources

Initial Study/Negative Declaration for the By-Day Creek Ecological Reserve Land Management Plan

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.

Revised 2016

Authority: Public Resources Code sections 21083 and 21083.09

Reference: Public Resources Code sections 21073, 21074, 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3/ 21084.2 and 21084.3