## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

- 1. Project Title: The 2020 Fisheries Habitat Restoration Project in Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Santa Barbara, Siskiyou, and Sonoma Counties.
- 2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

State of California Department of Fish and Wildlife Watershed Restoration Grants Branch P.O. Box 944209 Sacramento, CA 94244-2090

3. Contact People and Phone Numbers:

Timothy Chorey (916) 327-8842 Watershed Restoration Grants Branch, Fisheries Restoration Grant Program 1416 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Room 1266 Sacramento, CA 95814

Mary Larson (562) 342-7186 South Coast Region 4665 Lampson Ave. Los Alamitos, CA 90720 Trevor Tollefson (707) 725-1072 Northern Region 1455 Sandy Prairie Ct. Suite J Fortuna, CA 95540 Manfred Kittel (707) 576-2813 Bay Delta Region 2825 Cordelia Road, Suite 200 Fairfield, CA 94534

- 4. Project Location: Various sites in Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Santa Barbara, Siskiyou, and Sonoma Counties (Appendix A).
- 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife Fisheries Restoration Grant Program Headquarters Watershed Restoration Grants Branch P.O. Box 944209 Sacramento, CA 94244-2090

- 6. General Plan Designation: Various
- 7. Zoning: Various
- 8. Description of Project: Implementation of 28 action items for restoration of anadromous salmonid habitat (Appendix A). These action items include measures to improve anadromous fish passage, reduce erosion and

sedimentation, enhance instream habitat, improve water quality, and improve juvenile survival.

- 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings: Action items will be surrounded by lands consisting of agriculture, private holdings, forests used for timber production as well as national, state, and county parks.
- 10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required: U.S Army Corps of Engineers, North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- 11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.? CDFW reached out to traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes, if consultation is requested FRGP staff will begin consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1 immediately.

## 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.

Aesthetics	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Energy
Geology / Soils	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Hazards & Hazardous Materials
Hydrology/Water Quality	Land Use / Planning	Mineral Resources
Noise	Population / Housing	Public Services
Recreation	Transportation	Tribal Cultural Resources
Utilities / Service Systems	Wildfire	Mandatory Findings of Significance

This project will not have a "Potential Significant Impact" on any of the environmental factors listed above; therefore, no boxes are checked.

## **DETERMINATION:**

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
measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is

X Matt Wells

Matt Wells Branch Chief, WRGB, CDFW

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact			
I.A	I.AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:							
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				~			
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>			
c)	In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				<b>~</b>			
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				~			
	AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timber to information compiled by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timber to information compiled by the California Department of Forestr including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Foremethodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California	a Agricultural La I model to use ir erland, are signifi y and Fire Prote est Legacy Asses	and Evaluation and a assessing impacts cant environmental action regarding the sement project; and	Site Assessment on agriculture ar effects, lead ager state's inventory forest carbon mea	t Model (1997) nd farmland. In ncies may refer of forest land,			
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?				~			
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				<b>~</b>			
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))?				~			
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				<b>~</b>			
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?				<b>~</b>			
III.	AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria establish control district may be relied upon to make the following determin			agement district o	r air pollution			
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				~			
b)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			<b>v</b>				
c)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				~			
d)	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				~			

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		~		
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			<b>v</b>	
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			•	
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?				<b>v</b>
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				•
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?				<b>~</b>
V. (	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?		~		
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?		~		
c)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?		~		
VI.	ENERGY. Would the project:				
a)	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			•	
b)	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			<b>v</b>	
VII.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a)	Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				~

- 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.
- ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
- iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
- iv) Landslides?
- b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

V

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?				~
e) H	lave 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?				•
f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		~		
VIII.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			<b>~</b>	
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			<b>v</b>	
IX. I	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the proj	ect:			
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?		<b>v</b>		
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?		<b>v</b>		
C)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				~
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				•
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the				<b>v</b>
f)	project area? Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			<b>~</b>	
g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?		~		
X. F	IYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?		<b>~</b>		
b)	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			~	
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				~

				Less Than Significant		
		Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	i)	result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	,		, ,	
	ii)	substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or offsite;				<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>
	iii)	create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or				<b>~</b>
	iv)	impede or redirect flood flows?				~
d)	pollu	bod hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of utants due to project inundation?				<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>
e)		flict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality trol plan or sustainable groundwater managementplan?				~
XI.	LAN	D USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a)	Phy	sically divide an established community?				~
b)	any	se a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the pose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				<b>v</b>
XII.		ERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a)		ult in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource would be a value to the region and the residents of the e?				<b>~</b>
b)	reso	ult in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral purce recovery site delineated on a local general plan, cific plan or other land use plan?				<b>v</b>
XIII	. NOI	SE. Would the project resultin:				
a) b)	in ar of st ordir	eration of a substantial temporary or permanent increase mbient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess andards established in the local general plan or noise nance, or applicable standards of other agencies? eration of excessive groundborne vibration or		~		
D)	grou	Indborne noise levels?				~
c)	an a adoj airpo	a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or hirport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been pted, within two miles of a public airport or public use ort, would the project expose people residing or working in project area to excessive noise levels?				~
XIV	. Poi	PULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a)	eithe busi	ice substantial unplanned population growth in an area, er directly (for example, by proposing new homes and nesses) or indirectly (forexample, through extension of Is or other infrastructure)?				<b>v</b>
b)	nece	blace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, essitating the construction of replacement housing where?				<b>v</b>
XV.		LIC SERVICES. Would the project:				
a)	the   facil facil envi serv	ult in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with provision of new or physically altered governmental ities, need for new or physically altered governmental ities, the construction of which could cause significant ronmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable rice ratios, response times, or other performance actives for any of the public services:			~	

	Issues Fire protection? Police protection? Schools? Parks? Other public facilities?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI	. 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 occuror be accelerated?				<b>v</b>
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?				•
XVI	I. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:				
a)	Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?				<b>v</b>
b)	Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?				~
C)	Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				<ul> <li></li> </ul>
d)	Result in inadequate emergency access?				<b>~</b>
XVI	II. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.				
a)	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, 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:		~		
	<ul> <li>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</li> </ul>		<b>v</b>		
	<ul> <li>A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</li> </ul>		~		
	. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a)	Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, ortelecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				~

b)	Issues Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	normal, dry and multiple dry years?				
c)	Result in a determination by the waste water 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?				~
d)	Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				<b>~</b>
e)	Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				<b>~</b>
XX.	WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or land project:	ds classified as ve	ery high fire hazard	severity zones, w	ould the
a)	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				~
b)	Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				~
c)	Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergencywater sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				~
d)	Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				~
XXI	. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a)	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		<b>v</b>		
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.)				~
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				~