

CALIFORNIA PESH & FESH WILDLIFE

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY AND INTENT TO ADOPT THE INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE DECLARATION

for

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO FRESHWATER SPORT FISHING REGULATIONS, TITLE 14, CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS

As required by the California Environmental Quality Act, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife is providing Public Notice of the completion of an Initial Study/ Negative Declaration (IS/ND) for a proposed project to amend selected freshwater sport fishing regulations in furtherance of the Department's public trust responsibility to protect and conserve California's natural resources.

Project Location: Inland waters of the State of California.

Project Description: The Department of Fish and Wildlife proposes to amend a variety of freshwater sport fishing regulations as set forth in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. As compared to existing regulations, the proposed project would amend regulations to allow filleting of Chinook salmon, increase fishing opportunities for bass and other warm water species, minimize potential take of adult steelhead and native Paiute cutthroat trout, create and extend low-flow restrictions due to ongoing drought conditions, and make clarifications to other regulatory sections to reduce public confusion and improve regulatory enforcement.

The IS/ND is available for review at:

The Department of Fish and Wildlife Fisheries Branch 830 S Street Sacramento, CA 95811

Comment Period: Comments on the IS/ND may be provided through **November 13**, **2014 at 5:00 pm**. Please mail comments to the address listed above; made attention to Ms. Karen Mitchell. Comments must be postmarked by November 13, 2014. For additional information, please contact Karen Mitchell at (916) 445-0826 or at <u>karen.mitchell@wildlife.ca.gov</u>.

Conserving California's Wildlife Since 1870

INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO FRESHWATER SPORT FISHING REGULATIONS TITLE 14, CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS

The Project

The Department of Fish and Wildlife proposes to amend a variety of freshwater sport fishing regulations as set forth in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. As compared to existing regulations, the proposed project would amend regulations to allow filleting of Chinook salmon, increase fishing opportunities for bass and other warm water species, minimize potential take of adult steelhead and native Paiute cutthroat trout, create and extend low-flow restrictions due to ongoing drought conditions, and make clarifications to other regulatory sections to reduce public confusion and improve regulatory enforcement.

The Findings

The project will have a less than significant impact on biological resources, greenhouse gas emissions, recreation, and transportation/traffic. The project will have no impact to aesthetics, agriculture and forest resources, air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, and utilities and service systems.

Basis of the Findings

Based on the initial study, the Department finds that implementing the proposed project will have a less than significant to no impact on the environment. Therefore, a negative declaration is filed pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resource Code Section 21080 (c2).

This proposed negative declaration consists of the following:

- Introduction Project Description and Background Information on the Proposed Amendments to Freshwater Sport Fishing Regulations
- 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 FRESHWATER SPORT FISHING REGULATIONS TITLE 14, CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS

Introduction

Annually, the Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) recommends sport fishing regulations to the Fish and Game Commission (Commission). Both the Department and the Commission have the authority to regulate fisheries (Fish and Game Code, Section 1700) in addition to the Department's public trust responsibility to protect and conserve California's natural resources.

Project goals and objectives

The goal of this project is to amend selected freshwater sport fishing regulations in furtherance of the Department's mission to manage California's diverse fisheries resources for their ecological value, their use and for the public's enjoyment.

Fish and Game Code, Section 1700 declares the state's policy is to encourage the conservation, maintenance and utilization of California's aquatic resources. This section includes the following objectives:

- 1. Maintain sufficient populations of all aquatic species to ensure their continued existence.
- 2. Maintain sufficient resources to support a reasonable sport use.
- 3. Manage using best available science and public input.

Background

Annually, the Department considers amendments to sport fishing regulations. Recommendations for changes come from Department staff, the public, the Commission, Fish and Game Advisory Commissions, and local governments. Recommendations are evaluated within the appropriate Department Region and by the statewide Fisheries Management Committee. If the proposed regulation change passes evaluation, the Department prepares a regulation change recommendation for the Commission to consider. Through a series of Commission meetings, the public has the opportunity to comment on the proposed regulation change. At the end of this public process, the Commission may approve the regulation change. The Commission most recently approved amendments to the regulations in December 2013.

Project Location

Sport fishing addressed by this environmental document occurs in the inland waters of California. The inland waters of California are divided into seven regulation districts, the North Coast, North Central, South Central, Southern, Valley, Sierra, and Colorado River districts. These districts are shown in the map below.

CALIFORNIA SPORT FISHING DISTRICTS



Schedule

If authorized by the Commission, the proposed regulatory amendments described below will go into effect January 1, 2015.

Project Description

The proposed project includes both Department and public recommendations for amendments to freshwater sport fishing regulations set forth in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR). The proposed amendments would modify existing sport fishing regulations as follows:

Filleting of Salmonids in Inland Waters

In 2013, the Department imposed a filleting requirement for all salmonids taken in inland waters. The existing regulation requires that all salmon and steelhead taken in inland waters where a sport fishing license is required, must be kept in such a condition that species and size can be determined until placed at the angler's permanent residence, a commercial preservation facility or being prepared for immediate consumption. The purpose of this regulation is to protect federally and state-listed salmonids by giving the Department the ability to determine the origin (wild or hatchery), the species (Coho, Chinook or steelhead), and the size (jack or adult) of salmon and steelhead taken, possessed and transported.

The fillet rule is enforced statewide in anadromous waters for all designated angling seasons. Along the California Coast, there are two salmon species (Coho and Chinook) that have overlapping run timings. Chinook salmon can be harvested but Coho salmon are protected and are illegal to harvest. Because of their run timing overlap, the enforcement of the fillet rule is necessary to minimize illegal harvest of Coho salmon. In the Central Valley there are four runs of Chinook salmon: winter, spring, fall and latefall, however Coho salmon are not present. Winter and spring-run Chinook salmon are illegal to harvest and are protected through seasonal angling closures on the Sacramento River and its tributaries. Because there is no overlap of protected Chinook runs during the open harvest season (July-December), the fillet rule is not critical for the enforcement of illegal harvest.

Prior to the fillet rule, a large portion of anglers in the Central Valley would fillet their salmon prior to departure from the river for ease of transport and disposal of carcasses. Since the establishment of the rule, many anglers have expressed their disappointment and have asked the Department to provide a compromise to the rule. Based on these reasons, the Department is proposing an exception in the Central Valley to the current fillet rule to allow anglers to fillet their Chinook salmon on site during the Chinook salmon angling season. The exception would allow the filleting of Chinook salmon from July through December on the Sacramento, American and Feather rivers. In addition, the Department is adding the definition of a Commercial Preservation Facility to the regulation. The definition encompasses licensed fishing guides which will allow licensed guides to legally fillet salmon and steelhead for their clients.

Modify Dip Net Size Restriction for Landing Nets

Current regulatory language in Section 2.09, Possession of Illegal Gear, restricts the size of landing-type dip nets to 36 inches in greatest dimension. As worded, this regulation restricts the dip net opening and net bag length/depth to 36 inches. This restriction is a hindrance to freshwater anglers trying to land large species such as salmon, striped bass, and sturgeon, and does not effectuate the intent of the 36-inch size restriction, which was to limit bait fish harvest. Therefore, the Department is proposing to amend the regulation to allow standard landing-type dip nets to be up to 36 inches in diameter across the net opening and up to 60 inches in net length/depth.

Add Dip Net Size Restriction for Bait Fish

To reduce public confusion and enforcement issues, the Department proposes to amend Section 4.05, Bait Fish Capture Methods, to clarify that dip nets, in addition to traps, may not be over 36 inches in greatest dimension.

Black Bass - Lake Castaic

The current regulation for black bass at Lake Castaic is outdated, and was enacted to protect a "trophy" black bass fishery. Lake Castaic has limiting factors that are not conducive to maintaining a large population of "trophy" black bass. Habitat for juvenile bass and sunfish is limited as shorelines are generally steep in both arms and contain a few small coves. Within these coves aquatic vegetation is lacking due to water level fluctuations. There is also a large healthy population of striped bass. The proposal is to amend the black bass regulation at Lake Castaic from 2 fish at 18 inches to 5 fish at 15 inches. This proposed amendment is the same or similar to other state waters; including but not limited to Lake Hodges, Diamond Valley, Lake Perris and Isabella Lake.

Black Bass - El Capitan Reservoir

The current regulation for black bass at El Capitan reservoir is outdated. There is a healthy population of black bass within the reservoir, and virtually no harvest for consumption. The Department proposes to amend the black bass regulation at El Capitan Reservoir from 5 fish at 15 inches to 5 fish at 12 inches; changing the lake to the statewide minimum for black bass.

White Sturgeon - Method of Take

Sections 5.80(d) and 27.90(d) are currently written using the word, "landing." "Landing" is not defined in the Fish and Game Code. This creates confusion amongst anglers as to what the regulation means by "landing." It also has the potential to create a legal challenge by defendants during the prosecution of an arrest. The proposal is to replace "landing" with "take" which is defined in Title 14, Section 1.80.

White Sturgeon - Angling Boundary

Section 5.80(i) is currently written in conflict with Section 5.80(i)(1)(A) through (C). This conflict creates confusion amongst anglers as to whether or not it is legal to fish for sturgeon on the eastern bank of the Sacramento River in Butte County. This also has

the potential to create a legal challenge by defendants during the prosecution of an arrest.

Under the current regulation (Section 5.80(i)(1)(A) through (C)), it is unlawful take any sturgeon, use wire leaders, or use lamprey or shrimp as bait, between Keswick Dam and the Highway 162 Bridge. The Sacramento River flows through Shasta, Tehama, Glenn and Butte counties, between these two landmarks. Section 5.80(i) states the closure is from January 1 to December 31 in Shasta, Tehama and Glenn counties. Butte County has been unintentionally omitted from the regulation.

Big Sur River

Under current regulations, the harvest of hatchery trout and steelhead is allowed on the Big Sur River and tributaries above the upstream end of the gorge pool at the boundary of Pfeiffer Big Sur State Park with the Ventana Wilderness Area. However, this section of the Big Sur River is above a fish barrier and not reachable by anadromous salmonids. Therefore, the Department is proposing to remove the current regulatory language authorizing the harvest of hatchery trout and steelhead and return this section of the Big Sur River to catch and release angling. In addition, this proposal will remove the reference to Section 8.00, Low-Flow Restrictions, from Section (b)(23) as neither subsection of the Big Sur River, (b)(23)(A) or (b)(23)(b), is subject to low flow closures as defined in Section 8.00(c).

Calleguas Creek

The Southern California Steelhead DPS was listed as endangered under the Federal ESA in 1997. The DPS includes all naturally spawned anadromous Oncorhynchus mykiss (steelhead) populations below natural and manmade impassable barriers in streams from the Santa Maria River, Santa Barbara County, California, (inclusive) to the U.S.-Mexico Border.

Despite the location of Calleguas Creek near the center of this endangered DPS, only a single dead adult steelhead trout was collected in Conejo Creek (Calleguas Creek tributary) in April of 2013. The stream is not currently monitored for the presence of steelhead. Very limited steelhead spawning habitat is available in Calleguas Creek and tributaries and all associated creeks are infested with non-native, exotic fish species. Based on the discovery of the adult steelhead in Conejo Creek, the Department is proposing a seasonal closure for Calleguas Creek and tributaries to minimize the potential take of adult steelhead. Because the creek and its tributaries possess very limited steelhead spawning habitat, and the drainage supports a large non-native fish community, we propose a seasonal closure as opposed to a complete closure to protect adult steelhead, while maintaining opportunities for recreational angling.

The current regulations allow year-round angling on Calleguas Creek and tributaries. There is a 5 fish daily bag/possession limit for trout. The regulation change will be consistent with similar drainages within Region 5 with seasonal closures. These streams will be open to angling from the Saturday proceeding Memorial Day through November 30th. Only artificial lures with barbless hooks may be used and the daily bag and possession limit will read: Open to fishing for non-salmonids only. Closed to the take of trout and steelhead.

Diaz Lake

Diaz Lake is located within the boundary of the Inyo County, Southwestern portion regulation. The Inyo County regulation specifically calls attention to the Cottonwood Creek restrictions as they are within its boundary and have different seasons and bag limits. However, it does not call attention to the Diaz Lake regulation even though it has a second season and bag limit that is different from the Inyo County, Southwestern portion regulation. The proposed regulation change will reference the Diaz Lake restrictions in the Inyo County regulations. Additionally, the Department often receives calls as to whether or not Independence Creek, which is part of the boundary, is included in the regulation. To clarify, the Department proposes adding a statement that Independence Creek is open to fishing.

Las Garzas Creek

Las Garzas Creek is misspelled as Las Gazas Creek in Title 14 and in the Sport Fishing Regulations Booklet. The proposal is to correct the spelling of the word Garzas.

Navarro River, Noyo River, and Ten Mile River

The proposed regulation change is to remove "and tributaries" from the Navarro River, Noyo River, and Ten Mile River fishing regulations. Fishing is currently only allowed in the main stems of the Navarro River, Noyo River, Ten Mile River, and North Fork Ten Mile River. The reference to "and tributaries" in the regulations leads to confusion and requests for clarification from the public. The recommended regulation change clearly identifies the main stems of the Navarro River, Noyo River, Ten Mile River, and North Fork Ten Mile River as the sections open to fishing.

Pit River

The proposed regulation change is for a section of the Pit River within Modoc County running from the Highway 395 bridge/South Fork Pit River crossing downstream to the Highway 299 (Canby) bridge/ Pit River crossing. This proposal would make this section of river open to fishing all year to increase angling opportunities for warm water fish. Currently this section of river is covered under the Sierra District General Regulations for trout, which is open the last Saturday in April through November 15.

Recent and historical surveys indicate that trout are not present within this section of river. Surveys conducted by United States Fish and Wildlife Service, duplicating historic sampling locations, did not find evidence of trout present (USFWS 2003), nor were trout present in the historic samples for the river reach proposed to be opened all year (USFWS 2003 and Vestra 2004). Moreover, many warm water species, such as catfish, green sunfish, blue gill, and possibly bass are present.

Silver King Creek

The Department is proposing to close Silver King Creek and tributaries below the confluence of Tamarack Lake Creek (below Llewellyn Falls) downstream to the

confluence with Snodgrass Creek to fishing all year. The proposed regulation change is necessary to protect native Paiute cutthroat trout, which are listed as threatened pursuant to the federal Endangered Species Act, by prohibiting angling in a portion of its historic range below Llewellyn Falls down to Snodgrass Creek. This segment of the stream will be restocked with Paiute cutthroat trout as part of a restoration project. Existing regulations prohibit fishing all year in Silver King Creek and tributaries including lakes above Llewellyn Falls in existing Paiute cutthroat trout habitat.

Trinity River

In 2014, approximately 14 miles of the upper Trinity River were opened to winter angling and the new regulation was added to the Special Fishing Regulations. The same section of the upper Trinity River is also open to angling from the last Saturday in April through November 15 under the North Coast District General Regulations. To avoid public confusion, the Department is proposing to add the April through Nov. 15 angling season to the upper Trinity River Special Fishing Regulations.

Central Coast Low-Flow Closures

Low flow closures for sport angling on 5 streams in Marin and Sonoma County and 12 streams on the Mendocino coast are triggered when streamflow of the Russian River at the Guerneville gauge is less than 500 cfs. The 5 streams in Marin and Sonoma County are: Gualala River, Russian Gulch Creek, Salmon Creek, Walker Creek, and Sonoma Creek. The 12 streams in Mendocino County are: Usal Creek, Cottaneva Creek, Ten Mile River, Noyo River, Big River, Albion River, Navarro River, Greenwood Creek, Elk Creek, Alder Creek, Brush Creek, and Garcia River. All of these streams are relatively small and unregulated compared to the Russian River. As a result, the 17 streams are often open to fishing when flows are low and fish are excessively vulnerable.

The gauge on the lower Gualala River is a better indicator for the 5 streams in Marin and Sonoma counties and the Navarro River is a better indicator of streamflow conditions in the 12 Mendocino streams than the Russian River gauge. This proposal would change the low flow closure reference for 4 of the 5 streams in Marin and Sonoma counties to the lower Gualala River gauge. This regulatory proposal will also change the low flow closure reference for the 12 streams in Mendocino County to the Navarro gauge. The proposed minimum flow requirement at the Gualala River gauge and at the Navarro River gauge is 150 cfs and 200 cfs, respectively.

The proposed regulation change will also establish a low flow closure for the Russian River in Sonoma County. Presently, although the Russian River flow at the Guerneville gauge is used to regulate the low flow closures on the coastal streams in Marin, Sonoma, and Mendocino County, as well as for Sonoma Creek, in Sonoma County, a low flow closure regulation for the Russian River has not been promulgated. Without a low flow regulation, the Russian River is open to fishing during times when minimal flows are being released and fish are excessively vulnerable. The proposed minimum flow requirement for the Russian River is 300 cfs at the gauging station located on the main stem Russian River near Guerneville in Sonoma County.

The proposal will not include any changes to open seasons, gear, or limits.

Sonoma Creek

The current sport fishing regulations provide for fishing on a section Sonoma Creek from the last Saturday in April through November 15. The intent of this open season for fishing is to allow for resident trout fishing in Sugarloaf Ridge State Park. The current open area to fishing within the park includes an anadromous portion of Sonoma Creek. While spawning adult steelhead typically migrate back to sea before the open season there are conditions when adult steelhead may still be in the area and subject to angling pressure and capture. CDFW environmental scientists and NOAA Fisheries fishery biologists have expressed concern over fishing on adult steelhead and juveniles (listed as federally threatened) in this anadromous section of Sonoma Creek. The Department proposes to remediate this situation by restricting the fishing area to the nonanadromous portion of Sonoma Creek which is upstream of the natural barrier to anadromy, a 25-ft waterfall located within Sugar Loaf State Park.

The proposal will add approximately 0.5 mile of stream to the closed portion of Sonoma Creek but will not otherwise include any changes to fishing season, gear, or limits for the open portion of Sonoma Creek.

Low-Flow Restrictions References and Contact Information

Section 8.00, Low-Flow Restrictions, is referenced throughout the Special Fishing Regulations in Section 7.50. This proposal will add the Section 8.00 title and appropriate subsection to the existing references so the reader knows what Section 8.00 is and which subsection to refer to. In addition, this proposal will add the reference to Section 8.00 more frequently where the regulation applies. Adding this information will make it easier for anglers to understand and follow the regulations and makes the wording consistent with other references in Section 7.50. In addition, this proposal will correct the phone number error in subsection 8.00(a).

Minor Editorial Corrections for Clarity

Additional minor corrections are proposed to correct typographical errors and to improve regulation clarity.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title:

Proposed Amendments to Freshwater Sport Fishing Regulations, Title 14, California Code of Regulations

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife Fisheries Branch 830 S Street Sacramento, CA 95811

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Karen Mitchell, (916) 445-0826

4. Project Location:

Inland waters of the State of California

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife Fisheries Branch 830 S Street Sacramento, CA 95811

- 6. General Plan designation: N/A (statewide)
- 7. Zoning: N/A (statewide)
- 8. Description of Project: Amend selected freshwater sport fishing regulations to maintain consistency with the Department's mission to manage California's diverse fisheries resources for their ecological value, their use and for the public's enjoyment.
- 9. Surrounding land uses and setting: N/A
- 10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required: None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

| Aesthetics | Agriculture and | Air Quality |
|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| | Forestry | |
| Biological Resources | Cultural Resources | Geology/Soils |
| Greenhouse Gas | Hazards and | Hydrology/Water |
| Emissions | Hazardous Materials | Quality |
| Land Use/Planning | Mineral Resources | Noise |
| Population/Housing | Public Services | Recreation |
| Transportation/Traffic | Utilities/Service | Mandatory Findings |
| | Systems | 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:

| \square | 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 |

Stafford Lehr, Chief, Fisheries Branch

Date

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------|
| I. AESTHETICS: Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista | | | | \square |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway | | | | |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | | | | \square |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | | | | |
| II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project: | | | | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------|
| 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? | | | | |
| 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? | | | | |
| 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? | | | | |
| III. AIR QUALITY : Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?b) Violate any air quality standard or | | | | |
| contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | | | | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------|
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non- attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | | | | |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | | | | \boxtimes |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | | | | \square |
| 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service? | | | | |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | | | | |

| | 1 | [| | 1 |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------|
| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| 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? | | | | |
| 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? | | | | |
| V. CULTURAL RESOURCES : Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in | | | | \square |
| the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | | | | |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | | | | |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | | | | \square |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | | | | \square |
| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Expose people or structures to potential | | | | \square |
| substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| 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? | | | | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------|
| | Sic Po | Mit Mit | Sig Imp | No |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | | | \Box | \square |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including | | | | \square |
| liquefaction? | | | | |
| iv) Landslides? | | | | \square |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the | | | | \square |
| loss of topsoil? | | | | |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that | | | | \square |
| 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 | | | \Box | \square |
| in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building | | | | |
| Code (1994), creating substantial risks to | | | | |
| life or property? | | | | |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately | | | | \square |
| supporting the use of septic tanks or | | | | |
| alternative waste water disposal systems | | | | |
| where sewers are not available for the | | | | |
| disposal of waste water? | | | | |
| VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: | | | | |
| Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a | | | | |
| significant impact on the environment? | | | | |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy | | | | \square |
| or regulation adopted for the purpose of | | | | |
| reducing the emissions of greenhouse | | | | |
| gases? | | | | |
| VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS | | | | |
| MATERIALS: Would the project: | | | | <u> </u> |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public | | | | \square |
| or the environment through the routine | | | | |
| transport, use, or disposal of hazardous | | | | |
| materials? | | | | |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably | | | | \square |
| foreseeable upset and accident conditions | | | | |
| involving the release of hazardous | | | | |
| materials into the environment? | | | | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------|
| 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 Section 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 for people residing or working in the project area? | | | | |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | | | | |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | | | | |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | | | | |
| IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | | | | \square |

| | | [| | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------|
| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre- existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | | | | |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | | | | |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | | | | |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | | | | |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | | | | \boxtimes |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | | | | |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | | | | |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a | | | | \boxtimes |

| result of the failure of a levee or dam? j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--|--|------------------------------------|-----------|
| the project: a) Physically divide an established | | | | \square |
| community? | | | | |
| b)Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | | | | |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | | | | \square |
| XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | | | | |
| 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? XII. NOISE: Would the project result in: | | | | |
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | | | | |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | | | | |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------|
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | | \boxtimes |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | |
| XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: | | | | |
| Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | | | | |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | \boxtimes |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | |
| XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES: | | | | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | act |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------|
| | ntia ific: ict | Th ific: atic | tt Th | No Impact |
| | otel gni | ess gni ith itig | ess gnj npa | olr |
| | a io F | ⊠ ∝ Si | ы ю Е | Ž |
| 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? | | | | |
| Police protection? | | | | |
| Schools? | | | | |
| Parks? | | | | |
| Other public facilities? | | | | |
| XV. RECREATION: | | | | |
| AV. RECREATION. | | | | |
| a) Would the project increase the use of | | | \boxtimes | |
| existing neighborhood and regional parks | | | | |
| or other recreational facilities such that | | | | |
| substantial physical deterioration of the | | | | |
| facility would occur or be accelerated? | | | | |
| b) Does the project include recreational | | | | \square |
| facilities or require the construction or | | | | |
| expansion of recreational facilities which | | | | |
| might have an adverse physical effect on | | | | |
| the environment? | | | | |
| XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: | | | | |
| Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, | | | \bowtie | |
| ordinance or policy establishing measures | | | | |
| of effectiveness for the performance of the | | | | |
| circulation system, taking into account all | | | | |
| modes of transportation including mass | | | | |
| transit and non-motorized travel and | | | | |
| relevant components of the circulation | | | | |
| system, including but not limited to | | | | |
| intersections, streets, highways and | | | | |
| freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | | | | |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | 1 |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------|
| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | | | | |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | | | | |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | | | | |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | | | | \boxtimes |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | | | | |
| XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | | | | |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | | |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | | |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | | | | |
| e) Result in a determination by the | | | | \square |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------|
| wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | | | | |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | | | | |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | | | | |
| XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE | | | | |
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | | | | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------|
| 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? | | | | |

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 alternation, 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 the existing visual character or quality of the work sites and their surroundings. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alternation, 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. Anglers will drive vehicles to and from the upper Pit River during the new winter angling season. Some of this traffic may occasionally occur before sunrise or after sunset. However, this transient traffic is in a sparsely populated area and will not constitute a new source of substantial light or glare that will affect day or nighttime views in the area.

II. AGRICULTURE 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 alternation, 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 alternation, 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 alternation, 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 alternation, 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 alternation, 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 alternation, or land use changes.
- b) The project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alternation, or land use changes.
- c) 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 (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors). Such an impact will not occur because the project involves no ongoing sources of air pollution.
- d) 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.
- e) The project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

a) The project will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

The proposal to open the upper Pit River to winter angling will not directly or indirectly affect candidate, sensitive, or special status species. No listed fish species are known to occur within this reach of the Pit River. There is potential for hardhead, a species of special concern (SSC), to be in this reach which could be incidentally caught. However, increasing the length of the angling season will not have any significant impact on hardhead as fishing pressure in this area is relatively lite. Also anglers will be targeting catfish, bass and sunfish which may decrease their chance of catching hardhead due to differing habitat preferences and bait or tackle being used.

Pit roach (aka Northern roach), another SSC, may also be present but is a very small minnow and would not be able to be caught by hook and line.

- 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 CDFW or the USFWS. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alternation, or land use changes.
- c) The project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. 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 as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. There is no ground disturbing work and thus 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 CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. There is not ground disturbing work and thus no potential to affect archaeological resources.
- c) The project will not directly or indirectly destroy any unique paleontological resources or sites, or unique geologic features. There is no ground disturbing work and thus no potential to affect paleontological resources.

d) The project will not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. There is no ground disturbing work and thus no potential to affect human remains.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

- a i) The project will not expose people or structures to 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 involve ground disturbing work.
- a ii) The project will not expose people or structures to 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 involve ground disturbing work.
- a iii) The project will not expose people or structures to 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 involve ground disturbing work.
- a iv) The project will not expose people or structures to 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 involve ground disturbing work.
- 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 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 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

VII. 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 any construction, land alternation, or land use changes. Vehicles that use fuel will

be used to access the upper Pit River during the winter angling season, and their internal combustion engines will produce some emissions. However, fishing pressure in this area is relatively light and sporadic. Although the number of anglers that may take advantage of recreational angling opportunities in the Pit River during an open winter season is unknown, because of its relative remoteness, distance from major living areas, inclement weather, and low densities of fish altogether, angling pressure will most likely be minimal and sporadic. As a result, the number of angler trips will most likely be low. Thus, the impact of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions produced by the use of vehicles will be negligible.

b. The project will not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG. The impacts of GHG produced by the use of vehicles to and from the Pit River during the winter angling season will be negligible.

VIII. 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 disposal of 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 be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.
- g) 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.
- h) The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wild land fires. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- a) The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, water use, or water discharge.
- b) The project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or groundwater use.
- c) The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the work sites in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site because the project will not involve any construction or land alteration.
- d) The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the work sites, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site because the project will not involve any construction or land alteration.
- e) 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.
- f) The project will not substantially degrade water quality. The project will not involve any construction or land alteration, and thus will not have any adverse impacts on water quality.
- g) The project will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on any flood hazard delineation map. No housing will be created as part of this project.
- h) The project will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would significantly impede or redirect flood flows. No new structures will be associated with this project.
- The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- j) The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

X. 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 does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- c) The project will not conflict with any Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation plan. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

XI. 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.

XII. NOISE

- a) The project will not result in exposure of persons to, or generation of noise levels in excess of, standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. 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 exposure of persons to, or 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 result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project will not involve construction or physical alteration of land, or the creation of any permanent noise sources.
- d) The project will not result in a substantial temporary, or periodic, increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. The project will not involve construction or physical alteration of land.

- e) The project will not be located within an airport use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.
- f) The project will not be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

- a) The project will not induce substantial 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 housing and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- c) The project will not displace any people and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

XIV. 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.

XV. RECREATION

- a) The increase of the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, or other recreational facilities will be less than significant due to project implementation. The project will provide a winter angling season on the upper Pit River. There are no recreational facilities in the area other than the Modoc Wildlife Refuge. A section of the Pit River does go through the Modoc Wildlife Refuge, but the Refuge is closed to the public with the exception of waterfowl and pheasant hunting permits and Dorris Reservoir. The only fishing access on the Refuge is Dorris Reservoir and it is not on this section of river.
- b) The project will not involve any construction, land alternation, or land use changes. There will be no construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

a) The project may increase transportation to the Pit River due to the opening of a winter angling season; however, the project will have a less than significant impact on any applicable plans, ordinances or policies that establish measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation systems. The number of anglers that may take advantage of recreational angling opportunities in the upper Pit River during an open winter season is unknown, but because of its relative remoteness,

distance from major living areas, inclement weather, and low densities of fish altogether, angling pressure would most likely be minimal and sporadic. Thus, the project will not produce a significant amount of traffic.

- b) The project will not conflict, either individually or cumulatively, with any applicable congestion program established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. Such an impact will not occur because the proposed winter angling season on the Pit River will not result in a significant amount of traffic in the project area.
- c) The project will not result in any change in air traffic patterns.
- d) The project will not alter terrestrial features or is incompatible with uses of equipment.
- e) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The project does not involve construction.
- f) The project will not significantly affect parking capacity or demand for parking.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- a) The project will not produce wastewater.
- b) The project will not require, or result in the construction of, new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not produce wastewater.
- c) The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.
- d) The project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources.
- e) The project will not produce wastewater.
- f) The project will not generate solid waste requiring disposal in a landfill.
- g) The project will not create solid waste. Thus, the project will be in compliance with federal, state, and local statutes related to solid waste.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) The project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or

animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The project is consistent with the Department's mission to manage California's diverse fisheries resources for their ecological value, their use and for the public's enjoyment.

- 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.