

California Fish and Game Commission

Draft Negative Declaration For
Proposed Amendments to Title 14, CCR:
White Sturgeon Catch-and-Release Fishing

Prepared by:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife Fisheries Branch

January 2025

This Report Has Been Prepared Pursuant to the
California Environmental Quality Act of 1970

State Clearinghouse #

Project Summary and Findings

Project

Unless otherwise specified, all section references in this document are to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR).

The California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) proposes to amend regulations related to white sturgeon sport fishing for the 2026 season and onward. Since 2007, white sturgeon sport fish regulations have allowed the harvest of three fish annually within a slot limit of 40 to 60 inches fork length (FL; measurement of the fish from the front of its head to the fork in its tail), but a 2022 species mortality event triggered a series of emergency regulation amendments aimed to limit harvest. In October 2023, the Commission passed emergency regulations that reduced the fishery to one white sturgeon per year within a slot limit of 42 to 48 inches, plus restricted fishing in migration and spawning habitat during critical months. These regulations went into effect on November 16, 2023 and were readopted in May 2024.

In June 2024, the Commission accepted for further consideration a petition to list white sturgeon as a threatened species under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). As a result of that determination, white sturgeon became a candidate species pursuant to provisions within CESA. CESA requires that the Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department/CDFW) initiate a status review of the species. During this review and until the Commission makes a final decision on whether to list white sturgeon under CESA, the take, possession, importation and purchase or sale protections afforded to threatened and endangered species also apply to white sturgeon as a candidate species. This prohibition of take includes non-harvest “catch-and-release” angling; however, Fish and Game Code Section 2084 permits the Commission to authorize the take of candidate species of fish by hook and line for sport based on the best available scientific information. At the August 2024 Commission meeting, the Department presented an emergency regulation package pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 2084 that would allow for a recreational catch-and-release fishery during the candidacy period. The Commission voted to approve the emergency regulation pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 2084, and it went into effect on September 6, 2024.

The proposed amendments to the white sturgeon sport fishing regulations will continue the emergency regulation that authorizes recreational catch-and-release fishing. The existing emergency regulation will expire in September 2025 following the extension of the emergency regulations in December 2024 (readopt 1) and May 2025 (readopt 2). The proposed amendment is necessary to continue the recreational catch-and-release fishery through candidacy and after the Commission decision on the CESA listing status of white sturgeon. This action also revises the Sturgeon Fishing Report Card from a year-long season (January 1 through December 31) to match the sturgeon fishing season established by the emergency action (October 1 through June 30).

Findings

The initial study and the Commission’s review of the project showed that permitting catch-and-release angling will not have any significant or potentially significant effects on the environment, and therefore no alternatives or mitigation measures are proposed to avoid or reduce any significant effects on the environment. The project will not have a significant effect

on aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, tribal cultural resources, utilities and service systems, and wildfire.

Basis of the Findings

Based on the initial study, implementing the project will not have any significant or potentially significant effects on the environment. Therefore, the Commission is filing this negative declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21080, subdivision (c).

This proposed negative declaration consists of the following:

- Introduction – Project Description and Background Information
- Initial Study Environmental Checklist Form
- Explanation of the Response to the Initial Study Environmental Checklist Form

Project Description and Background Information For Proposed Amendments to White Sturgeon Catch and Release Fishing

Introduction

The proposed amendments to the white sturgeon sport fishing regulations will continue the catch-and-release fishing regulations established by emergency regulatory action under Fish and Game Code Section 2084 on September 6, 2024. The proposed amendments are considered and evaluated by the Commission during three or more regularly scheduled meetings. The Commission makes the final determination on what amendments to the regulations should be adopted at the Commission's adoption meeting. The Commission received the Department's recommended amendments to the white sturgeon recreational fishing regulations at the February 12-13, 2025 meeting (notice meeting) and will consider adopting the amendments at the August 13-14, 2025, meeting (adoption meeting). The Commission is the lead agency for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for this project. Under Fish and Game Code Section 200, the Commission has the authority to regulate the taking or possession of fish for the purpose of sport fishing.

Project Goals and Objectives

The goal of this project is to amend the white sturgeon sport fishing regulations in furtherance of the state's conservation policy as set forth in Section 1700 of the Fish and Game Code. The conservation policy includes the following objectives:

- (a) The maintenance of sufficient populations of all species;
- (b) The recognition of the importance of recreational uses;
- (c) The maintenance of a sufficient resource to support a reasonable sport use;
- (d) The growth of local commercial fisheries; and
- (e) The management of the fisheries under the state's jurisdiction.

Background

White sturgeon (*Acipenser transmontanus*) are an anadromous species of fish that reside primarily in the San Francisco Bay and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and migrate as adults into the major rivers of the Central Valley to spawn. Most spawning occurs in the Sacramento River between Verona and Colusa (Schaffter 1997), with a lesser amount of spawning on the lower San Joaquin River (Jackson et al. 2015). Some additional spawning may occur in tributaries such as the Feather, Bear, and Yuba rivers. White sturgeon are long lived, potentially in excess of 100 years, with most reaching maturity by approximately 14 to 19 years, spawning every two to four years once mature (Chapman et al. 1996; Hildebrand et al. 2016). Successful recruitment of juveniles is infrequent, occurring approximately every six to seven years, highly correlated with above normal water years as measured by high mean daily Delta outflow (CDFW 2023; Fish 2010). Considerable declines in both relative and absolute abundance have been measured by the Department (CDFW 2023; Danos et al. 2019). The most recent Department estimate was approximately 33,000 legal sized catchable fish, whereas estimates of 150,000—200,000 legal sized fish were typical in past decades (CDFW 2023).

White sturgeon have been the focus of a recreational fishery since 1954. Until recently, recreational anglers could keep one white sturgeon per day, and a combined total of three per year with a slot limit of 40 to 60 inches fork length. The season was open year-round, with some limited regional and/or seasonal closures. In 2022, a harmful algal bloom (HAB) of the marine phytoflagellate *Heterosigma akashiwo* resulted in the largest fish kill in the recorded history of the region. Many species were impacted during this event including white sturgeon. Over 850 white sturgeon carcasses were found during monitoring, but the full magnitude of the fish kill is unknown as only approximately 20% of the shoreline was able to be surveyed. A HAB of the same species occurred again in 2023, though of lower intensity, leading to 15 recorded white sturgeon carcasses. Due to cessation of funding for the historical abundance monitoring program, it has not been possible to make a white sturgeon abundance estimate since the HAB events.

As a result of long-term declines in the population, the impacts of the HAB, and the unknown current status of the population, the Department proposed an emergency regulation shifting the recreational fishery to catch-and-release only, as well as protection of the migrating and spawning grounds in October 2023. The goal of the 2023 emergency regulation recommendation was to protect the species from over-exploitation while long term fishing regulations could be revised that would offer harvest opportunities at levels that would not threaten the long-term success of the population. During the Commission meeting considering the emergency regulation, the industry expressed concerns about the effect closure of harvest would have on their business and livelihoods, particularly in light of a recent closure of the salmon fishery and changes to other popular fisheries such as halibut and rockfish. In response, the Commission adopted an emergency regulation to reduce fishing pressure on white sturgeon while retaining harvest. Under emergency regulations enacted on November 16, 2023, anglers with a Sturgeon Report Card were permitted to take one white sturgeon a year between 42 and 48 inches fork length, with a maximum of two fish harvested per boat per day. Fishing was prohibited from January 1 through June 30 upstream of the Highway 50 bridge on the Sacramento River and the I-5 bridge on the San Joaquin River.

California Endangered Species Act Candidacy

On November 29, 2023, the Commission received a petition from San Francisco Baykeeper, The Bay Institute, Restore the Delta, and California Sportfishing Protection Alliance to list white sturgeon as threatened under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). The petitioners argued that long-term declines in the abundance of white sturgeon are due to (1) Central Valley water management infrastructure and operations, (2) overharvest in the recreational fishery, (3) harmful algal blooms, and (4) other factors such as poaching, pollution, vessel strikes, and climate change. On March 15, 2024, the Department submitted an evaluation to the Commission, determining that the petition provided sufficient scientific information to indicate that the petitioned action may be warranted. On June 19, the Commission accepted the petition for further consideration, designated white sturgeon as a candidate species under CESA, and directed the Department to initiate a status review of the species.

Under CESA, during the status review of candidate species, the protections against take, possession, importation, purchase, and sale afforded to threatened and endangered species also apply to candidate species. This prohibition of take includes non-harvest “catch-and-

release” angling; however, Fish and Game Code Section 2084 permits the Commission to authorize the take of candidate species of fish by hook and line for sport, based on the best available scientific information.

On May 28, 2024, the NorCal Guides and Sportsmen’s Association (NCGASA) submitted a written letter to the Commission stating that candidacy “has the potential to cause irreparable damage to the business and recreational anglers who fish for white sturgeon in California’s coastal, Delta, and inland waters” (NCGASA 2024) noting impacts to guides, charter boat captains, and angling-associated businesses. Industry representatives requested an exemption to permit a recreational sturgeon fishery that includes harvest to continue to operate; however, the letter did not propose any specific regulatory options, such as seasons, geographic range, or harvest bag and size range limits.

At its June 19-20, 2024 meeting, the Commission heard testimony from members of the sturgeon angling and business community requesting that the fishery remain open with some level of take. The concern expressed was that a complete closure of the fishery during CESA candidacy created substantial economic harm to businesses that rely on the white sturgeon fishery, including charter captains, guides, bait and tackle stores and suppliers, marinas, and related services. Such factors may be considered in authorizing some form of take under Section 2084 of the Fish and Game Code, which allows the Commission, based on the best available scientific information, to authorize the taking of any fish by hook and line for sport that is listed as an endangered, threatened, or candidate species. The potential for economic harm, coupled with the sudden nature of the protections that candidate species receive, constituted an emergency that authorized the Commission to address the matter through regulation. The Commission requested that the Department explore potential changes to the take prohibition granted with the June 19, 2024 decision on candidacy for the purpose of identifying potential fishing regulations that would mitigate economic impacts, while still providing adequate protective regulatory measures to white sturgeon.

At its August 14-15, 2024 meeting, the Commission adopted an emergency regulation that permits a catch-and-release fishery for white sturgeon during the CESA candidacy/ status review period since it is expected to have minimal impact on the population, while providing recreational opportunities for anglers and mitigating adverse economic impacts to businesses that serve sturgeon angling. At its December 11-12, 2024 meeting, the Commission adopted an extension of the emergency regulations with minimal changes to the regulatory language.

Emergency Regulations in Effect

The emergency regulations under Fish and Game Code Section 2084, effective on September 6, 2024, created two new sections under Title 14, CCR, that supersede but do not replace four existing sections addressing white sturgeon fishing and report card requirements. Section 5.78 combines most elements of existing sections 5.79 and 5.80, and defines seasons, closed areas, gear and handling restrictions, and report card requirements for catch-and-release fishing in inland waters. Section 27.93 combines sections 27.90 and 29.72 in the same manner for ocean waters. Regulations in sections 5.78 and 27.93 supersede sections 5.79, 5.80, 27.90 and 27.92, making the latter four sections inoperative until the emergency regulations expire in September of 2025. The emergency action added a sentence at the

beginning of sections 5.79, 5.80, 27.90 and 27.92 with a cross-reference to new sections 5.78 and 27.93.

The regulatory language for the first readoption of the Fish and Game Code Section 2084 emergency was the same as the original Fish and Game Code Section 2084 emergency regulation with the exception of a minor clarification on fish handling in sections 5.78(e) and 27.93(e) where the words “solely by the” was added to read:

(e) Handling and removal from water: Any sturgeon greater than 60 inches fork length may not be removed from the water and shall be released immediately. Sturgeon of any size shall not be held out of water suspended by the gills, gill plates, mouth, or solely by the tail, and shall not be dragged across the ground, boat decks, or piers.

This added language was necessary because it clarified the new regulatory amendments regarding handling sturgeon. To minimize risk of injury to white sturgeon in a catch-and-release fishery, regulatory amendments were made to restrict holding sturgeon in ways that could damage their gills, mouth, or spine.

The goal of the current emergency regulations under Fish and Game Code Section 2084 are to permit a catch-and-release fishery for white sturgeon during the CESA status review process since it is expected to have minimal impact on the population, while providing recreational opportunities for anglers and mitigating adverse economic impacts to businesses that serve sturgeon angling. The emergency regulations contain the following major changes from the previous regulations:

- Removal of all language related to harvest, including bag limits, annual limits, and size limits.
- Prior to candidacy, white sturgeon could be fished all year in the San Francisco Estuary and the Delta. As per the emergency regulations adopted on November 16, 2023, fishing was not permitted between January 1 and May 31 on the Sacramento River (upstream of the Highway 50 bridge) and the San Joaquin River (upstream of the I-5 bridge) in order to protect the sturgeon migration path, spawning habitat, and spawning white sturgeon. Additional existing regional closures also remained in effect (e.g., Yolo Bypass, North Coast District, Special Sierra and Valley District Sturgeon Closure).
- The emergency regulations instituted a fishing season of October 1 through June 30 in all waters downstream of the confluence of the Feather River on the Sacramento River and the I-5 Bridge on the San Joaquin River. No sturgeon fishing would be permitted in these areas between July 1 and September 30. These months experience the warmest air and water temperatures and pose the greatest risk of physiological stress to fish caught, played, and handled by anglers during that time. These months are also the least popular sturgeon fishing months based on both CDFW Sturgeon Report Card data and data collected by the fishing industry.
- Fishing upstream of the confluence of the Feather River (Sacramento River) and the I-5 bridge (San Joaquin River) is restricted to October 1 through December 31 to protect migration and spawning. This action expands the existing closure to include the warm summer months, as described above.

- Fishing for sturgeon is not permitted in tributaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers (including tributaries of those tributaries). The only reason white sturgeon enter these smaller rivers is to spawn and they do not reside there unless stranded by dropping flows. Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) protected southern Distinct Population Segment (DPS) green sturgeon also enter these rivers and routinely stay over the summer or longer. Further, sturgeon in these rivers are restricted to small, deep holes and are more easily targeted by anglers. Any sturgeon present in these rivers would either be a spawning migrant or a protected green sturgeon and should not be the target of anglers.
- Addition of language describing permitted handling.
 - Due to their mouth shape and foraging habits, sturgeon rarely swallow tackle or suffer the types of deep hooking injuries that are common in other species. The most significant potential source of injury for sturgeon in a catch-and-release fishery will be related to how the fish are handled after catch. Sturgeon lack a rigid, bony skeleton and their skeletal frame mostly consists of cartilage with the exception of some heavy bones in the skull and pectoral girdle. Their structure has not evolved to support their heavy mass against gravity when in air and some care must be taken when handling them.
 - Prior to candidacy, the regulations required that fish greater than 68 inch FL could not be taken out of the water and had to be released immediately. This limit was set when the legal size for harvest was up to 60 inches FL and was designed to protect the largest, heaviest fish. Reducing this maximum out of water size to 60 inches protects most of the mature population but still allows catch-and-release anglers to take a trophy picture of their catch. Fish less than 60 inches FL are light enough that they are not likely to be injured due to gravity.
 - The most likely sources of injury come from anglers that attempt to 1) lift the fish off the ground by grabbing the gills or gill plates or by dangling them by their tail, or 2) drag fish over the ground or boat/pier surfaces. These handling restrictions are intended to limit the effects of rough handling on sturgeon survival.

Environmental Setting

The current catch-and-release angling regime, embodied by the presently operative emergency regulations, together with the closures and handling provisions, represents the environmental baseline for this CEQA analysis. While the Commission acknowledges the regulatory setting is highly dynamic given the string of recent regulatory amendments and the uncertainty of the future CESA listing determination, the Commission respects the direction in the CEQA guidelines that the environmental setting will normally constitute the baseline physical conditions by which a lead agency determines whether an impact is significant and the Commission does not see a clear alternative that merits deviating from that norm.

Proposed Regulatory Amendments

The proposed amendments to the white sturgeon sport fishing regulations addressed by the initial study/negative declaration will continue catch-and-release fishing regulations established

by the emergency regulatory action. The existing emergency regulations would expire in September 2025 following proposed extensions of the emergency regulations in December 2024 (extension 1) and May 2025 (extension 2).

After the Department's status report on white sturgeon is delivered to the Commission, the Commission will hold a hearing to determine whether listing white sturgeon under CESA may be warranted. If the Commission determines that listing is warranted, white sturgeon will cease to be a candidate species and will be listed under CESA as either threatened or endangered. If the Commission determines that listing is not warranted, white sturgeon will cease to be a candidate species and will return to its pre-candidacy status. It is the Commission's intent that this regulation be in force under either circumstance. In the case of listing, it would remain effective under the authority of Fish and Game Code Section 2084 (among others). In the case of not listing, it would remain effective under the Commission's general authority to regulate the taking of fish under Fish and Game Code Section 200 (and others).

The proposed amendment is necessary to continue the catch-and-release fishery through candidacy and after the Commission decides on the CESA listing status of white sturgeon. This action also revises the Sturgeon Fishing Report Card from a year-long season (January 1 through December 31) to match the sturgeon fishing season established by the emergency action (October 1 through June 30) and alters reporting requirements.

Project Location

The white sturgeon sport fishing regulation amendments addressed by the initial study/negative declaration occur throughout the inland and ocean waters of California.

Schedule

If adopted by the Commission at its August 13-14, 2025 meeting, and approved by the Office of Administrative Law, the proposed regulatory amendments described below will go into effect on or around October 1, 2025.

Environmental Checklist Form

1. Project Title:
White Sturgeon Catch and Release Sport Fishing Regulations
Title 14, California Code of Regulations
2. Lead Agency Name and Address:
California Fish and Game Commission
715 P Street, 16th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
3. Contact Person and Phone Number:
Melissa Miller-Henson, (916) 653-4899
4. Project Location:
Inland and ocean waters of California.
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Fisheries Branch
1010 Riverside Parkway
West Sacramento, CA 95605
6. General Plan designation:
N/A (statewide)
7. Zoning:
N/A (statewide)
8. Description of Project:
The California Fish and Game Commission proposes to amend selected sport fishing regulations for white sturgeon. This action permits a catch-and-release fishery for white sturgeon during the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) status review process and after a listing decision is reached. It also revises the Sturgeon Fishing Report Card from a year-long season (January 1 through December 31) to match the sturgeon fishing season established by the emergency action (October 1 through June 30).
9. Surrounding land uses and setting:
N/A
10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required:
None.
11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.31?
In July and September 2024, the Commission mailed a tribal notification to Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area. One tribe requested and received consultation. Additionally, the Department held two tribal listening sessions in January 2025.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <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 | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input type="checkbox"/> 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.

_____ *Melissa A. Miller-Henson* _____

Melissa Miller-Henson, Executive Director

June 5, 2025

Date

Responses to Initial Study Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
I. Aesthetics. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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"/>	NI
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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"/>	NI
II. Agriculture And Forestry Resources. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest 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:				

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
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"/>	NI
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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"/>	NI
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"/>	NI
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"/>	NI
III. Air Quality. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
d) Result in any other emissions (such as those leading to odors) affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	LTS	<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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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 type="checkbox"/>	NI
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"/>	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
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"/>	NI
V. Cultural Resources. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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"/>	NI
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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 operations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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:				

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
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"/>	NI
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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"/>	NI
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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"/>	NI
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
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 type="checkbox"/>	NI
IX. 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"/>	NI
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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"/>	NI
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"/>	NI
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 project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
f) 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"/>	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
X. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of pollution runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
XI. Land Use and Planning. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
XII. 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"/>	NI
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"/>	NI
XIII. Noise. Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
XIV. Population and Housing.				
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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"/>	NI
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
XV. 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"/>	NI
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
XVI. Recreation.				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	LTS	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				
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"/>	NI
XVII. Transportation. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric 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"/>	NI
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
XVIII. 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 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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or				
ii) 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 Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
XIX. 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, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
XX. Wildfire. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
XXI. Mandatory Findings Of Significance.				

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NI
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 type="checkbox"/>	NI
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"/>	NI

Explanation of Responses to Initial Study Environmental Checklist

I. Aesthetics

- a) The project will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or modification of any buildings or structures.
- b) The project will not damage scenic resources such as trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or modification of any buildings or structures.
- c) The project will not substantially degrade, in nonurbanized areas, the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or modification of any buildings or structures.
- d) The project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

- a) The project will not 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 (FMMP) of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- b) The project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- c) The project will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timber zoned Timberland Production. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- d) There will be no loss of forest land and the project will not result in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- e) The project will not involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

III. Air Quality

- a) The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- b) The project will not 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. Such an impact will not occur because the project involves no ongoing sources of air pollution.
- c) The project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not increase pollutant concentrations.
- d) The project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

IV. Biological Resources

- a) The project may have a Less Than Significant Impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on certain species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the project will have a significant effect on these biological resources as explained below.

The Commission concluded that any impacts would be Less Than Significant because this project proposes to continue the emergency regulations under Fish and Game Code Section 2084 that allow for catch-and-release fishing of white sturgeon during CESA candidacy and after a listing determination is made. The current catch-and-release regulations constitutes the environmental baseline for purposes of CEQA. The proposed regulatory amendments will have a beneficial effect on white sturgeon by limiting population loss.

Scientific studies of the effects of angling on white sturgeon in other populations indicate that the species is robust and tolerates catch-and-release angling well.

- Studies from Idaho found that adult sturgeon in the C.J. Strike reservoir are hooked an average of 7.7 times, and landed 3.5 times, in a year (Kozfkay and Dillon 2010). These sturgeon experience a high level of catch-and-release every year without long term negative consequences.
- In studies of gear effects, it has been observed that metal tackle that has been ingested is processed and expelled quickly (Lamansky et al. 2018; Bowersox et al. 2016).

- Mortality as a result of angling was examined in the lower Fraser River, BC (Robichaud et al. 2006). Out of 25,219 angling events, no mortality was observed immediately upon capture and release. A subset of 96 angled fish were held in net pens for three days to evaluate delayed mortality. Two fish died by the end of the third day of the study (2.6% mortality); however, the authors indicated that the mortality was likely influenced by unsuitable conditions in the floating net pens (Robichaud et al. 2006).
- The CESA petitioners stated that “a catch-and-release fishery for California white sturgeon is consistent with conserving and restoring these fish as hooking mortality is extremely low” (CESA Petition, p. 40). This recommendation is in line with the position of the Department during the 2023 emergency fishing regulation process.
- The maximum size of 60 inches for removing sturgeon from the water protects most of the mature population but still allows catch-and-release anglers to take a trophy picture of their catch. Fish less than 60 inches FL are light enough that they are not likely to be injured due to gravity.
- Restrictions on sturgeon handling (see the *Emergency Regulations in Effect* section above) will avoid and minimize any harm to sturgeon from angling or post-catch handling, such that there should be no adverse effects to sturgeon that are caught and released.

The best available science indicates that white sturgeon tolerate catch-and-release angling well. The level of angling activity examined in these studies is consistent with the level of activity that could be expected under the project. The Commission is not aware of any harm done to any individual sturgeon resulting from the catch-and-release fishery instituted by the current emergency regulation.

Because catch-and-release angling is not expected to have significant adverse effects to individuals, the Commission concludes this activity can occur without placing the remaining population at risk and would have a negligible impact, even in light of its candidate status under CESA.

- b) The project will not have an adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies and regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the USFWS. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- c) The project will not 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. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- d) The project will not substantially interfere 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. Such an impact

will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

- e) The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not result in any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- f) The project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

V. Cultural Resources

- a) The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5. The project does not involve ground disturbing work or work permanently modifying any existing structure or resource and thus has no potential to affect historical resources.
- b) The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5. The project does not involve ground disturbing work and thus has no potential to affect archaeological resources.
- c) The project will not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. The project does not involve ground disturbing work and thus has no potential to affect human remains.

VI. Energy

- a) The project would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operations. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not use energy resources.
- b) The project will not affect nor obstruct any state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

VII. Geology and Soils

- a i) The project will not 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. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not create any structures for human habitation.

- ii) The project will not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not create any structures for human habitation.
- iii) The project will not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not create any structures for human habitation.
- iv) The project will not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not create any structures for human habitation.
- b) The project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve ground disturbing work.
- c) The project will not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable and potentially result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve ground disturbing work.
- d) The project will not 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. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve ground disturbing work.
- e) The project will not create any sources of waste water requiring a septic system.
- f) The project will not indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- a) The project will not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. The project will not involve construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- b) The project will not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The project would result in the production of very low greenhouse gas emissions.

IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- a) The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The project will not involve the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

- b) The project will not 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. The project will not involve the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
- c) The project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The project will not involve the transport, use, or emission of any hazardous materials.
- d) The project will not be located on any site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.
- e) The project will not be located within an airport land use plan area.
- f) The project will not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- g) The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

X. Hydrology and Water Quality

- a) The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, water use, or water discharge.
- b) The project will not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or groundwater use.
- c i) The project will not 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 result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site because the project will not involve any construction or land alteration.
- ii) The project will not 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 result in flooding on- or off-site because the project will not involve any construction or land alteration.
- iii) The project will not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm-water drainage systems, or provide substantial

additional sources of polluted runoff because the project will not involve any construction or land alteration.

- iv) The project will not impede or redirect flood flows because the project will not involve any construction or land alteration.
- d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, the project would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation because the project would not involve any construction or land alteration.
- e) The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or groundwater use.

XI. Land Use and Planning

- a) The project will not physically divide an established community. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- b) The project will not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

XII. Mineral Resources

- a) The project will 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. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- b) The project will not 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. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

XIII. Noise

- a) The project will not result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. The project will not involve construction or physical alteration of land, and its implementation will not generate noise levels in excess of agency standards.
- b) The project will not result in generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. The project will not involve construction or physical alteration of land.

- c) The project will not be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

XIV. Population and Housing

- a) The project will not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not construct any new homes, businesses, roads, or other human infrastructure.
- b) The project will not displace any existing people or housing and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

XV. Public Services

- a) The project will not have any significant environmental impacts associated with new or physically altered governmental facilities. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

XVI. Recreation

- a) The project will not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or would be accelerated.

The Commission concluded that any impacts would be Less than Significant because this proposed regulation amendment will likely not result in any change in angler/visitor trips. There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the project will have a significant effect on the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities.

- b) The project does not require construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

XVII. Transportation

- a) The project will not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The project involves no land use or transportation system modifications.
- b) The project will not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b), which pertains to vehicle miles traveled. The amount and distance of vehicle miles traveled by recreational anglers should not change substantially under the proposed regulations.
- c) The project will not increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses with equipment. There will be no land use or transportation system modifications.

- d) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The project involves no land use or transportation system modifications.

XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources

- a) The project would not 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. Furthermore,
 - i) The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is 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). The project does not involve ground disturbing work and thus has no potential to affect tribal cultural resources.
 - ii) The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is 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. The project does not involve ground disturbing work and thus has no potential to affect tribal cultural resources.

XIX. Utilities and Service Systems

- a) The project will not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities. The project does not involve construction or land alteration.
- b) The project requires no new water supplies.
- c) The project will not produce wastewater.
- d) The project will not generate solid waste. Thus, the project will be in compliance with state and local standards for solid waste.
- e) The project will not create solid waste. Thus, the project will be in compliance with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XX. Wildfire

- a) The project will not impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- b) The project will not exacerbate wildfire risks due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors.

- c) The project will not require the installation or maintenance of any infrastructure.
- d) The project will not 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) The project does not 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) The project does not have adverse impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Cumulative adverse impacts will not occur because there are no potential adverse impacts due to project implementation.
- c) The project does not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on humans, either directly or indirectly. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or the creation of new infrastructure.

References

- Bowersox, B. J., J. M. DuPont, R. Tucker, L. Barrett, and J. A. Lamansky. 2016. Determining the presence of hooks inside white sturgeon using metal detector and portable X-ray technology. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 36(5):1045-052.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2023. White Sturgeon 2023 Emergency Regulation Change: Supporting Material. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Fisheries Branch, West Sacramento, California. Available at <https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2023-New-and-Proposed#WS-E>
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2023. White Sturgeon 2023 Emergency Regulation Change: Supporting Material. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Fisheries Branch, West Sacramento, California. Available at: <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=216457&inline>
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2024. White Sturgeon Catch and Release Fishing Emergency Regulation Change: Supporting Material. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Fisheries Branch, West Sacramento, California. Available at <https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2024-New-and-Proposed#5.78>
- Chapman, F. A., J. P. Van Eenennaam, and S. I. Doroshov. 1996. The reproductive condition of white sturgeon, *Acipenser transmontanus*, in San Francisco Bay,

- California. Fishery Bulletin 94:628–634. Available at <https://spo.nmfs.noaa.gov/sites/default/files/pdf-content/1996/944/chapman.pdf>
- Danos, A., J. DuBois, R. Baxter, J. T. Kelly, and M. L. Gingras. 2019. White Sturgeon, *Acipenser transmontanus*, Enhanced Status Report. California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Available at <https://marinespecies.wildlife.ca.gov/white-sturgeon/>
- Fish, M. A. 2010. White Sturgeon Year-Class Index for the San Francisco Estuary and its Relation to Delta Outflow. IEP Newsletter 23(2):80–84. Available at <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentId=26542>
- Hildebrand, L. R., A. Drauch Schreier, K. Lepla, S. O. McAdam, J. McLellan, M. J. Parsley, V. L. Paragamian, and S. P. Young. 2016. Status of White Sturgeon (*Acipenser transmontanus* Richardson, 1863) throughout the species range, threats to survival, and prognosis for the future. Journal of Applied Ichthyology 32:261–312.
- Jackson, Z. J., J. J. Gruber, and J. P. Van Eenennaam. 2015. White Sturgeon Spawning in the San Joaquin River, California, and Effects of Water Management. Journal of Fish and Wildlife Management 7(1):171–180. Available at https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/petitioners_exhibit/dwr/part2/DWR-1122%20Jackson_et_al_2016_white_sturgeon_spawning_SJR.pdf
- Kozfkay, J. R., and J. C. Dillon. 2010. Creel Survey Methods to Assess Catch, Loss, and Capture Frequency of White Sturgeon in the Snake River, Idaho. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 30(1):221–229.
- Lamansky, J. A., K. A. Meyer, B. J. Bowersox, J. M. DuPont, B. Bentz, and K. B. Lepla. 2018. Incidence, Types, and Shedding and Ingestion Times of Metallic Fishing Tackle in the Digestive Systems of White Sturgeon. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 38(5):1152–1159.
- Robichaud, D., K. K. English, R. C. Bocking, and T. C. Nelson. 2006. Direct and delayed mortality of white sturgeon caught in three gear-types in the lower Fraser River. Sidney, BC.
- Schaffter, R. G. 1997. White sturgeon spawning migrations and location of spawning habitat in the Sacramento River, California. California Fish and Game 83(1):1–20.