

Chinook Salmon Coastal Release: Monterey Harbor

CEQA: INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE, FISHERIES BRANCH

Chinook Salmon Coastal Release: Monterey Harbor

Initial Study and Negative Declaration for Fall-Run Chinook Salmon Coastal Release Project in Monterey Harbor

Introduction

This document describes and evaluates the Chinook Salmon Coastal Release at Monterey Harbor (Project). The Monterey Bay Salmon and Trout Project (MBSTP) is a membership-based nonprofit 501c3 organization dedicated to the recovery of native salmon and steelhead populations of the greater Monterey Bay region. MBSTP has conducted coastal salmon releases from the 1990s through 2021 and in Monterey Harbor most recently in 2020 and 2021. MBSTP proposes to release 160,000 juvenile hatchery-origin (HO) Central Valley fall-run Chinook Salmon (CV FRCS) *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* into Monterey Harbor annually, in 2022, 2023 and 2024. The 2022, 2023 and 2024 releases are the Project as described and evaluated in this Initial Study and Negative Declaration. Under the direction of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), MBSTP would be responsible each spring for the release of 160,000 CV FRCS smolts from the Mokelumne River Fish Hatchery. The Project's objective is to increase the number of ocean Chinook Salmon landings in California enhancing local sport and commercial fisheries. Released smolts would feed and grow along the coast and be available for harvest as adults in one to three years.

The Findings

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife finds that the Project would not have a significant effect on the environment.

The completed Initial Study, attached to this negative declaration, documents the basis for this finding, and CDFW's determination that no significant effect on the environment would occur as a result of Project implementation, and there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before CDFW, that the Project may have a significant effect on the environment (see Initial Study and environmental checklist). Therefore, a Negative Declaration has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resource Code Section 21080, subd. (c)(1).

The Initial Study concluded that the Project would have less than significant impacts to biological resources, greenhouse gas emissions, and public services. The Project would have no impacts to aesthetics, agriculture and forestry, air quality, cultural resources, energy, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning,

mineral resources, noise, population/housing, recreation, transportation, tribal cultural resources, utilities/service systems, and wildfire.

Basis of the Findings

The proposed Negative Declaration consists of the following:

- Project Description and Background Information for Fall-Run Chinook Salmon Coastal Release Project in Monterey Harbor
- Initial Study Environmental Checklist: CEQA Appendix G
- Exhibit A: Statement of Work
- Exhibit B: City of Monterey Zoning Review Letter
- Exhibit C: City of Monterey Harbor and Marina Division Letter
- Exhibit D: Project Location and Quadrants Identification Map
- Exhibit E: CNDDDB Elements Report

Project Description and Background Information for Fall-Run Chinook Salmon Coastal Release Project in Monterey Harbor

Introduction

The Chinook Salmon Coastal Release Project in Monterey Harbor is a project within the meaning of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resource Code, § 21000 et seq). CDFW is serving as lead agency for the Project because it has discretionary approval over the Project. Specifically, CDFW would provide juvenile salmon (smolts) necessary for the Project implementation from the Mokelumne River Hatchery (MOK) and would deliver those fish to the Monterey Harbor for their release.

The Commercial Salmon Trollers Advisory Committee (Salmon Stamp Committee) and CDFW support this Project. The cost for raising, marking and tagging, and delivery of CV FRCS smolts to Monterey Harbor will be covered by the Commercial Salmon Trollers Enhancement and Restoration Program fund and a matching share contributed by CDFW. MBSTP would provide any additional funding needed for program operations.

This Initial Study and Negative Declaration analyze the environmental impacts that may result from the implementation of the proposed Project.

Project Objective

The Project's objective is to enhance local sport and commercial salmon fisheries. Released smolts will feed and grow along the coast and be available for harvest as adults in one to three years.

Background

Adult returns of CV FRCS have fluctuated over the past 30 years (CDFW 2018). Record high numbers occurred between 2000 and 2003 with an estimated 872,699 adult salmon returning to the Central Valley (CV) during the 2002 spawning season. In contrast, between 2003 and 2009, returns declined significantly to record low levels. During the 2007 spawning season, an estimated 97,168 adults returned to the Central Valley. Return estimates dipped further during the 2008 season to 71,291 adults. Adult return estimates increased slowly over the next few years and reached a high of 447,621 in 2013. However, California's recent drought significantly affected survival of juvenile salmon migrating to the ocean. In 2017, only 101,222 adults returned to the CV. In addition to the drought, other factors such as loss of habitat, poor ocean conditions, low river flows, water diversions, pollution, and predation contributed to the population declines.

To improve survival to adulthood by avoiding the hazards associated with migration, CDFW transports juvenile CV FRCS downstream and releases them in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, San Pablo Bay, or along the Central California coast. It has been found that hatchery salmon released along the coast or in the Bay have higher survival rates and higher ocean recovery rates than hatchery salmon released in the river (Palmer-Zwahlen, et al., 2019, Leet, W.S. et al. 1986).

The MBSTP has intermittently conducted coastal releases within Monterey Bay since 1992. Beginning in 2009, 100% of fish released were adipose fin-clipped and tagged with a coded-wire tag (CWT). The first three years of CWT recovery data shows a consistent trend that salmon from coastal and Bay releases have higher ocean fishery recovery rates than in-basin (natal stream, near the hatchery) releases, and this can mean better survival (Palmer-Zwahlen and Kormos 2015). However, adult salmon from coastal and Bay releases exhibited higher stray proportions than adult salmon from in-basin releases (Palmer-Zwahlen, et al. 2019).

"Homing" and "straying" are well-known behavioral traits in the ecology and life-history of Pacific Salmon (Quinn 2005). Homing may be defined as the instinctual ability of an adult Pacific Salmon to return to its natal stream to spawn. In contrast, straying may be defined as an adult migrating to a non-natal stream of origin. Studies have shown that salmon imprint as they migrate downstream and individuals that are released further downstream may show increased straying as compared to upriver releases (Quinn 2018, 127). Adult Chinook have been observed straying into several streams along the Central Coast as well as San Francisco Bay streams for the past two decades, although historically these streams did not have native runs of Chinook Salmon (Neillands et al. 2015). In 2014, CDFW began annual observation monitoring for straying CV FRCS into a few Central Coast streams. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife recovered and received heads from adult Chinook salmon having an adipose fin-clip and CWT

with the cooperation from agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that monitor select San Francisco Bay and coastal streams. The observation monitoring and CWT recovery data for salmon released in Monterey Bay area indicate that adult salmon stray in relatively small numbers into coastal and San Francisco Bay streams between their release point and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Neillands et al. 2015, 2016, 2018 and 2019).

Project Location

The Project will use Municipal Wharf 2 in Monterey Harbor (36.605514°, -121.889288°) 2022, 2023 and 2024 for direct release of salmon near the interior of the harbor.

Schedule

CDFW would deliver MOK CV FRCS smolts to Monterey Harbor in spring of 2022, 2023 and 2024. Exact dates and times would be scheduled as the time draws near and are dependent on fish size, growth rates, and environmental conditions in Monterey Harbor and Monterey Bay.

Project Description

The MBSTP proposes to release 160,000 juvenile hatchery-origin Central Valley fall-run Chinook Salmon into Monterey Harbor in 2022, 2023 and 2024. All Project fish would be evaluated by a CDFW Fish Health pathologist and certified to be disease-free prior to leaving the hatchery. Hatchery staff would tag 100% of Project fish with Coded-Wire Tags (CWT) and marked with an adipose fin-clip to allow for evaluation of potential benefits and impacts of the Project. All smolts would be transported from MOK to Monterey Harbor in a single trip each year, using 2-4 fish transport trucks. Trucks would be loaded, and fish transported according to MOK established standard operating procedures for transportation of salmon. Water in the trucks would be salted prior to adding fish at the hatchery.

MBSTP, in anticipation of fish delivery from MOK to the Monterey Harbor, has secured necessary equipment. MBSTP would release smolts from the trucks directly into Monterey Harbor, via a gravity-fed pipe (10 inches in diameter). MBSTP would provide both staffing and logistical support to facilitate release of fish at the Project location. This includes a 'tender' vessel provided and operated by MBSTP to assist in release of smolts from the height of the wharf to the water surface.

No active predator deterrent for marine mammals or seabirds is planned as part of the Project. Past predation events were attributed to net pen acclimation as well as the nearness of the release location to the largest numbers of sea lions in the harbor (Ben Harris, personal communication, December 9, 2019). The proposed location is on the opposite side of the harbor of these prior releases, and the elimination of net pen acclimation will prevent predators from adjusting to smolts as potential food sources. Past enhancement program

operations in Monterey Bay have indicated that releases timed to coincide with a large outgoing tide have produced positive results by helping smolts avoid post-release predation and mortality. Dusk or night-time releases have also been proposed as a method for reducing post-release predation, particularly by seabirds. MBSTP will adapt the schedule and release timing with CDFW and the Salmon Stamp Committee to work within these optimal tidal and timing windows.

The Project is contingent upon CDFW approval after completion of CEQA. Project results would be assessed using data acquired from CDFW landings, carcass surveys, and salmonid monitoring programs. The Regional Mark Information System (RMIS) will provide information associated with each tagged release group and CWT recovery data (RMIS online database). In addition, some coastal monitoring programs may provide data about the presence of hatchery-origin salmon based on the adipose fin clip status of adults and juvenile Chinook salmon production. Some data regarding coastal seasonal sandbar closures and stream flow may be utilized to provide information about the temporal access to spawning habitat.

Environmental Assessment

CDFW staff have reviewed the Project. It was determined that the Project would have less than significant impact to Biological Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Public Services at Monterey Harbor and surrounding areas, as set forth in detail in the following environmental checklist, and no impacts to other resource areas. Due to lack of in harbor acclimation time, CDFW does not anticipate adults will return to Monterey Harbor as has been seen in some previous coastal release projects. CDFW's California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) was reviewed to identify potential impacts to animals identified in the four Quadrants in the surrounding area.

References

Bartley, D.M., G.A.E. Gall, and B. Bentley. 1990. Biochemical genetic detection of natural and artificial hybridization of Chinook and Coho Salmon in Northern California. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 119: 431-437, 1990

Buttars, B. 2018. Central Valley Salmon and Steelhead Marking/Coded-wire Tagging Program fall-run Chinook Salmon, spring-run Chinook Salmon, and Steelhead, 2018 Marking Season, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission Administrative Report.

Hazard Severity (FHSZ) Map. http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fhsz_maps_santacruz

California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). 2019. Rare Find 5 [Internet]. California Department of Fish and Wildlife [November 2, 2019].

CDFW. 2018. Grand Tab, California Dept of Fish and Wildlife Anadromous Assessment.

Chevassus, B. 1979. Hybridization in salmonids: results and perspectives. *Aquaculture* 17:113-128.

Clemento, A.J., E.D. Crandall, J.C. Garza, and E.C. Anderson. 2014. Evaluation of a single nucleotide polymorphism baseline for genetic stock identification of Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) in the California Current large marine ecosystem. *Fisheries Bulletin* 112:112-130 (2014).

Leet, S. L., Green, R.E., and Ralph, D. 1986. Pen Rearing Pacific Salmon, *Oncorhynchus* spp., in San Francisco Bay. *Marine Fisheries Review*, 48(1), 24-31.

Lily, N. R. 1982. Chemical communication in fish. *Canadian Journal Fisheries Aquatic Science* 39: 22-35.

MBARD. 2012. Monterey Bay Air Resources District, 2012-2015 Air Quality Management Plan, adopted by the Board of Directors March 15, 2017, 24580 Silver Cloud Ct. Monterey, CA 93940. <http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/home/showdocument?id=62318>

Moyle, P.B. 2002. *Inland Fishes of California*, University of California Press.

Neillands, G., J. Nelson, and E. Larson. 2015. Annual Report 2014, Chinook Salmon Observation Monitoring Central California Coastal Streams. CDFW Bay Delta Region.

Neillands, G., J. Nelson, and E. Larson. 2016. Annual Report 2015, Chinook Salmon Observation Monitoring Central California Coastal Streams. CDFW Bay Delta Region.

Neillands, G., J. Nelson, A. Persau, and E. Larson. 2018. Annual Report 2016, Chinook Salmon Observation Monitoring Central California Coastal Streams. CDFW Bay Delta Region.

Neillands, G., J. Nelson, M. Michie, M. Stuhldreher, and E. Larson. 2019. Annual Report 2017, Chinook Salmon Observation Monitoring Central California Coastal Streams. CDFW Bay Delta Region.

Palmer-Zwahlen M. and Kormos. B. 2015. Recovery of Coded-Wire Tags from Chinook Salmon in California's Central Valley Escapement, Inland Harvest, and Ocean Harvest in 2012. California Department of Fish and Wildlife Fisheries Administrative Report 2015-4. November 2015.

Palmer-Zwahlen M., Gusman, V and Kormos, B. 2019. Recovery of Coded-Wire Tags from Chinook Salmon in California's Central Valley Escapement, Inland Harvest, and Ocean Harvest in 2014. California Department of Fish and Wildlife and Pacific States Marine Fisheries.

Quinn TP. 2005. The behavior and ecology of Pacific salmon and trout. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, pp 85–104.

Quinn, Thomas P. 2018. The Behavior and Ecology of Pacific Salmon and Trout. Second. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

Regional Mark Information System Database [online database]. Continuously since 1977. Portland (OR): Regional Mark Processing Center, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission. URL: <<http://www.rmpc.org/>>

Initial Study Environmental Checklist: CEQA Appendix G

Project Title:

Chinook Salmon Coastal Release in Monterey Harbor

Lead Agency Name and Address:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Fisheries Branch
P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 92444-2090

Contact Person and Phone Number:

Robyn Bilski, Fisheries Branch
916-206-3758
Robyn.Bilski@wildlife.ca.gov

Project Location:

Monterey County
Monterey Harbor (36.605514°, -121.889288°)

Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Monterey Bay Salmon and Trout Project
101 Cooper St.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

General Plan Designation:

Plans are consistent with coastal zone designation

Zoning:

Coastal

Description of Project:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (CDFW) Mokelumne River Hatchery (MOK) would deliver 160,000 Central Valley fall-run Chinook Salmon (CV FRCS) smolts to the Project location for direct release at the end of Municipal Wharf #2 in Monterey Harbor in spring of 2022, 2023 and 2024. CDFW would deliver MOK CV FRCS smolts to Monterey Harbor in mid-May of each year of the Project. Exact dates and times would be scheduled as the time draws near and are dependent on fish size, growth rates, and environmental conditions in Monterey Harbor and Monterey Bay. All smolts would be transported in a single trip each year, using 2-4 fish transport trucks (dependent upon loading density/fish size). Water in transport trucks would be salted prior to on-loading fish to initiate smoltification and aid in acclimation to the marine environment. MBSTP is implementing the Project. MBSTP would provide a 'tender' vessel (12-20' in length, outboard) on the water at the discharge point to assist with the discharge hose and any other operational logistics. The Project's objective is to enhance the commercial and recreational salmon ocean fishery.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

Monterey Harbor is located on the southwest end of Monterey Bay within the City of Monterey. Municipal Wharf #2 is the eastern most structure in Monterey Harbor which houses wholesale fish companies, restaurants, a boat hoist, private docks, public restrooms and a 700-foot fishing promenade open to public sport fishing. Foot-traffic issues have been discussed with Monterey Harbor personnel and is expected to be minimal. Any traffic or crowd control will be organized by MBSTP and Monterey Harbor (Ben Harris, personal communication, December 9, 2019). Total release time of salmon smolts is expected to be less than one hour.

Monterey Bay is a 25-mile crescent-shaped Bay, which allows marine air at low levels to penetrate the interior. The Salinas Valley is coastal valley that opens out on Monterey Bay and extends southeastward with mountain ranges of two to three thousand feet in elevation on either side. Monterey Bay is within the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, a federally protected marine area, established for the purpose of resource protection, research, education and public use. Commercial and recreational fishing are permitted within the sanctuary. Release locations are fully within the boundary of the Monterey Harbor and outside of the boundary of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (Sophie De Beukelaer, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, personal communication, March 9, 2020).

The Pajaro River, Elkhorn Slough, and Salinas River flow into Monterey Bay near Moss Landing, approximately 13 miles north of Monterey Harbor.

Approvals Needed from Other Public Agencies:

The California Coastal Commission (CCC) issued a Coastal Development Permit waiver (3-18-0156-W) for the Project on July 13, 2018. The California Coastal Commission considers coastal releases of Chinook Salmon smolts exempt from future permits contingent on continuation of current release methods.

City of Monterey Planning office determined the Project meets all zoning requirements and needs no local permits other than building permits and considered it “Not a Project under CEQA Art. 20 Section 15378 and Art. 5 Section 15061” (June 4, 2018, Exhibit B: City of Monterey Zoning Review Letter).

Tribal:

Notification letters describing the Project were mailed to all federally recognized California tribes and California tribes specifically requesting to be notified for all CEQA projects on December 14, 2021. CDFW received no responses. No tribes requested consultation.

Initial Study (cont): Environmental Factors, Determination, Evaluation of Environmental Impacts and Explanations

CEQA Guidelines Appendices

Association of Environmental Professionals 2021

APPENDIX G: ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

NOTE: The following is a sample form that may be tailored to satisfy individual agencies' needs and project circumstances. It may be used to meet the requirements for an initial study when the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines have been met. Substantial evidence of potential impacts that are not listed on this form must also be considered. The sample questions in this form are intended to encourage thoughtful assessment of impacts, and do not necessarily represent thresholds of significance.

1. Project title: Chinook Salmon Coastal Release: Monterey Harbor
2. Lead agency name and address:
California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Fisheries Branch, 1010 Riverside Parkway
West Sacramento, CA 95605
3. Contact person and phone number: Robyn Bilski, 916-206-3758, Robyn.Bilski@wildlife.ca.gov
4. Project location: Monterey County, Monterey Harbor, 36.605413, -121.889953
5. Project sponsor's name and address:
Monterey Bay Salmon and Trout Project
101 Cooper St., Santa Cruz, CA 95060
6. General plan designation: CDP Waiver 3-18-0156-W 7. Zoning: Coastal
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

California Dept of Fish and Wildlife's Mokelumne River Hatchery would deliver 160,000 Central Valley fall-run Chinook Salmon (CV FR) smolts for release at the Project location each spring for 2022, 2023 and 2024. Monterey Bay Salmon and Trout Project is implementing the project. Exact dates and times would be scheduled as the time draws near and are dependent on fish size, growth rates, and environmental conditions in Monterey Harbor and Monterey Bay.
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

Municipal Wharf #2 is in Monterey Harbor and located on the south west end of Monterey Bay within the City of Monterey.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

The Coastal Commission issued Coastal Development Permit waiver 3-18-0156-W for this project.
City of Monterey Planning office deemed this Project meets all zoning requirements and needs no local permits.
11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.? No

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic

Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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

Jay Rowan
Signature

2/28/2022
Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

SAMPLE QUESTION

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized 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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Less Than Significant			
	Potentially Significant Impact	with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

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 forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Less Than Significant			
	Potentially Significant Impact	with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

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"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:
Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. ENERGY. Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
not available for the disposal of waste water?				
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) 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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 project expose people residing or working in the project area to	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XVI. RECREATION.				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	---	---	----------------------

environment?

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"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources.

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public 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"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Potentially Significant Impact			

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"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Revised 2016

Authority: Public Resources Code sections 21083 and 21083.09

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

I. Aesthetics a. – d.: No impact

Discussion: Any additional equipment or lighting that may be used for this project (i.e., vessels) will be temporary and removed after use. There would be no other changes to scenic or urban landscapes.

II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources a.– e.: No impact

Discussion: Activities proposed by the Project would not occur in any Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program designated farmland, or area zoned for agricultural use, nor would the Project affect other resources related to agriculture, farmland or forest land.

III. Air Quality a.– e.: No impact

Discussion: Potential of air quality effects would be from hatchery trucks and boats used for offloading the smolts. This is not an ongoing project and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any air quality control plan. Any diesel fuel odors when delivering fish would be temporary and would not adversely affect a substantial number of people. Significance criteria is established through Monterey Bay Air Resources District and adopted by the District Board of Directors on March 15, 2017. Project emissions generated by hatchery trucks and boat are accounted for in the Daily Emissions Inventory in the air quality management plan adopted by the Monterey Bay Air Resources District (David Frisbey, Monterey Bay Air Resources District, personal communication, November 22, 2019).

IV. Biological Resources a.: Less Than Significant Impact

Discussion: The Monterey Harbor and Monterey Bay area quadrants examined for this study include Santa Cruz, Soquel, Watsonville West, Moss Landing, Marina, Seaside and Monterey. The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) Rare Find was used to report presence and status of all animals within these seven quadrants (Attachment 2, Exhibit E: CNDDDB Elements Report).

This Project would have less than significant impact on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

Fishes

Based on a query of CNDDDB Rare Find, this analysis considers whether any fish species that is documented to have occurred in the vicinity of the Project could be adversely affected by the presence of hatchery origin CV FRCS juveniles or returning adults.

The Project would result in less than significant impacts to California state and federally endangered Central California Coast Evolutionarily Significant Unit Coho Salmon *Oncorhynchus kisutch* (CC Coho ESU), federally threatened Central California Coast Distinct Population Segment Steelhead (CCC Steelhead DPS) and South-Central Coast Steelhead (SCC Steelhead DPS) *Oncorhynchus mykiss*, and California Coastal Chinook Salmon (CC Chinook ESU) *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*. Possible impacts to these species include: 1) competition for resources with CC Coho ESU, CCC and SCC steelhead DPSs *Oncorhynchus mykiss*, and California Coastal Chinook Salmon (CC Chinook ESU) *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*, 2) stock hybridization with CC Chinook ESU and CC Coho ESU, or 3) the establishment of an out-of-basin spawning population for CV FRCS in coastal streams where the species does not naturally occur. It is unlikely that these three concerns would result in any significant effects, either directly or indirectly. The three potential impacts above are addressed in turn, below.

1. If CV FRCS adults stray into coastal streams, some competition for resources with salmonids native to the area may occur. CDFW monitoring observations on select streams show that CV FRCS adults have strayed mainly into three coastal streams within and outside the Project area: Lagunitas Creek (Marin), Arana Gulch, and San Lorenzo River (Neillands et al. 2015, 2016, 2018 and 2019). Of these observations, only three CWT marked fish were recovered in Lagunitas Creek and later identified as returns from a Half Moon Bay coastal release. The remainder of the observations consisted of adipose fin-clipped live fish, carcasses, and redd counts that cannot be attributed to a particular release location. The mouth of Lagunitas Creek is open all year when the mouths of most coastal streams are blocked by sediment until fall rains begin and high flows flush open the mouth. This may be a reason more CV FRCS migrate into Lagunitas Creek to spawn. Migration timing in smaller coastal streams can be affected by timing of stream mouth openings and rain events, and there can be overlap in migration timing. However, in a typical year, CV FRCS adults migrate earlier than Coho Salmon or steelhead. Therefore, CV FRCS are unlikely to compete directly with adult Coho Salmon and steelhead for spawning habitat in most years. Furthermore, expert opinion suggests that Lagunitas Creek is not reliable habitat for Chinook Salmon (E. Ettinger personal communication, 2019). The small releases of CV FRCS planned for 2022, 2023 and 2024 would likely not cause significant impacts through competition with listed anadromous salmonid stocks in coastal streams.
2. CV FRCS are genetically different from CC Chinook ESU but the two are of the same species and genetic hybridization is possible. What keeps different populations genetically distinct is the tendency to migrate back to their natal streams (spatial), and the timing of those migrations (temporal). The genetic distinctiveness illustrated in Clemento et al. (2014) strongly suggests that Russian River and Eel River Chinook Salmon, both are part of the CC

Chinook ESU and are more similar to the CC Chinook ESU than the CV FRCS. In other words, if hybridization was occurring in the Russian or Eel Rivers, genetic samples would likely be more similar to CV FRCS. Video monitoring at Mirabel Dam on the Russian River has reported low numbers of adipose fin-clipped fish entering the basin, and due to proximity, it is more likely these fish originated from the San Pablo Bay hatchery releases.

Hybridization with Coho Salmon has been documented although it is extremely rare (Chevassus 1979 (cited in Bartley et al 1990)). It is unlikely for this to occur in or near the Project area due to the difference in timing of the two migrations. CC Coho Salmon return to spawn later than CV FRCS, usually late November to early February and peaking in December and January. However, this is depending on stream access and flow and there can be overlap and competition in some coastal streams when access delays CV FRCS migration or significant early rains change Coho Salmon migration timing. Adult CV FRCS returning to their natal streams typically migrate during the early-fall and spawn almost immediately (Moyle 2002). Migration timing in coastal streams depends on access and early rain and there may be migration timing overlap between species in those instances. Recognition of the same species through olfactory senses is also thought to be an important mechanism maintaining reproductive isolation in salmonids (Lily 1982). Despite potential overlap, it is unlikely that the small releases planned for 2022, 2023 and 2024 would significantly impact listed anadromous salmon stocks due to hybridization with CV FRCS in coastal streams.

3. Hatchery fish have been transported and released into the San Francisco Bay for decades and more specifically, MBSTP has conducted coastal releases in the Santa Cruz Harbor since 2010 and no out-of-basin spawning population has been observed. It is very unlikely that the small releases planned for 2022, 2023 and 2024 would establish an out-of-basin spawning population of CV FRCS.

The Project would result in no impacts to federally threatened Eulachon *Thaleichthys pacificus*. In California, Eulachon are historically found in the Klamath River as well as some smaller coastal rivers including the Mad River and Redwood Creek. The CNDDDB Soquel Quadrant details one Eulachon collected around 1911 near the mouth of Soquel Creek. This was a rare occurrence; it is extremely unlikely for Eulachon to be present or adversely affected by the Project.

The Project would result in no impacts to federal and state protected Longfin Smelt *Spirinchus thaleichthys*. The CNDDDB finding in Moss Landing Quadrant describes specimens of this species collected offshore in 1890, 1980, and 1993. However, Longfin Smelt do not spawn in this area

and these specimens may have been strays from the San Francisco/Bay Delta population. It is extremely unlikely for Longfin Smelt to be present or adversely affected by the Project.

The Project would result in no impacts to the federally endangered Tidewater Goby *Eucyclogobius newberryi*. Tidewater Goby is a small fish endemic to the California coast. Multiple occurrences in the Santa Cruz Quadrant are shown in the CNDBB. However, Tidewater Goby is found in shallow lagoons, brackish marshes and lower stream reaches. Salmonids migrate through this stream reach but do not spawn in the habitat used by Tidewater Goby, and thus Tidewater Goby would not be adversely affected by the Project.

Birds, Amphibians, Reptiles, and Insects

Several special status birds occur in the Project area, including the federally and state endangered California Ridgway's rail *Rallus obsoletus obsoletus*, the state threatened bank swallow *Riparia riparia*, the federally threatened California black rail *Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus*, the state threatened tricolored blackbird *Eucyclogobius newberry*, and the federally threatened and state species of special concern western snowy plover *Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*. Because the Project would occur within the developed Monterey Harbor and given the short duration of the delivery and release there would be no potential for the Project to disrupt nesting, feeding, or other activities of these birds. In addition, any adult CV FRCS straying into coastal streams would be minimal and would not significantly affect these species.

Similarly, special status amphibians, reptiles, and insects have been documented to occur within the quadrants analyzed for this review (Exhibit E), but the Project would not significantly impact these species because it would occur within the developed Monterey Harbor over a short time.

Marine Mammals

Based on a query of CNDDDB Rare Find, this analysis considers whether any marine mammal that is documented to have occurred in the vicinity of the Project could be adversely affected by the presence of hatchery origin CV FRCS juveniles or returning adults. No marine mammals were listed in the CNDDDB for the quadrants selected.

b – f.: No impact

Discussion: The Project involves no changes to terrestrial habitats or wetlands and involves no activities that would impede movement within migratory corridors, or conflict with local ordinances or adopted conservation plans.

V. Cultural Resources a – c.: No impact

Discussion: The Project does not include usage of historical or archaeological resources, nor does it include any ground modifying activity.

VI. Energy a– b.: No impact

Discussion: The Project would be complete in a short amount of time and does not require local energy use or impact local energy plans. The extent of energy resources used would be hatchery trucks and boat fuel use covered in previous sections.

VII. Geology and Soils a– f.: No impact

Discussion: The Project does not include any ground disturbing work.

VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions a.: Less Than Significant Impact

Discussion: The Project would emit greenhouse gases (GHG) due to the use of fuel to transport the Chinook Salmon smolts from the MOK to Monterey Harbor and the use of a boat to assist in the release of the smolts. Project emissions generated by hatchery trucks and boat are accounted for in the daily emissions Daily Emissions Inventory outlined on pages 20 and 21 of the 2012-2015 Air Quality Management Plan released by the Monterey Bay Air Resources District and adopted by the District Board of Directors on March 15, 2017. (David Frisbey, Monterey Bay Air Resources District, personal communication, November 22, 2019).

b: No impact

Discussion: The very low levels of GHG emissions from the Project will not conflict with plans for reducing GHG.

IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials a– g.: No impact

Discussion: The Project will not be transporting hazardous materials, located in areas with hazardous materials, or blocking hazards.

X. Hydrology and Water Quality a– e.: No impact

Discussion: Juvenile salmon will be acclimated to saltwater in hatchery trucks and will not be fed on site. Any fecal matter produced on site will be minimal with direct release of smolts into the Project site. No local groundwater, existing drainage, tidal or river flow, or alteration of management plans would be affected or changed due to this Project and no pollutants will be released.

XI. Land Use and Planning a– b.: No impact

Discussion: There is no land use anticipated for this Project.

XII. Mineral Resources a– b.: No impact

Discussion: No mineral resources will be used in the Project.

XIII. Noise a– c.: No impact

Discussion: The Project will not produce substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels and hatchery trucks and boats are within expected noise levels for Monterey Harbor and nearby communities.

XIV. Population and Housing a– b.: No impact

Discussion: The Project does not include any construction or alterations to local housing or population.

XV. Public Services a: Less Than Significant Impact

Discussion: Due to direct release, adult salmon are not expected to return to Monterey Harbor as has been seen in previous coastal release projects. Previous impacts took place when acclimation times were longer and adults returned to the release site, bringing traffic from recreational anglers. Given the lack of acclimation time, it is unlikely that significant numbers of CV FRCS adults would return to Monterey Harbor and lead to fishing in the area. If some adult salmon return to the harbor, their numbers are expected to be low, resulting in no significant increase in anglers or demand for public services. The Project does not include any construction or alterations to facilities.

XVI. Recreation a– b.: No impact

Discussion: The Project would not be in a regional park area and all aspects of potential additional public use would be centralized to Municipal Wharf or the nearby launch ramp where public facilities are present and capable of covering traffic. No additional facilities are likely to be needed.

XVII. Transportation a– d.: No impact

Discussion: The Project does not involve alterations to public transportation facilities. The low number of vehicle miles associated with the hatchery trucks from the MOK to Monterey Harbor would not have an appreciable impact to roadways or pedestrian facilities or block any emergency access.

XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources a–b: No impact

Discussion: Notification letters describing the Project were mailed to all federally recognized tribes in California and California tribes specifically requesting to be notified for all CEQA projects on December 14, 2021. CDFW received no responses; no tribes requested consultation.

XIX. Utilities and Service Systems a– e.: No impact

Discussion: The Project would not rely on utilities or service systems nor generate liquid or solid waste processed by utilities. The small amount of solid waste produced by juvenile salmon in hatchery trucks is not expected to be significant or have an impact due to the short release period and location in the harbor.

XX. Wildfire a– d.: No impact

Discussion: The Project would not block emergency vehicles or evacuations. There would be no increased wildfire or exposure to risks and the Project uses infrastructure already in existence with no additional infrastructure needed.

Mandatory Findings of Significance

a.: No impact

Discussion: The Project would not degrade the environment or species. Salmon smolts used for the Project would grow into adults in the nearby ocean environment and become available for harvest in commercial and recreational fisheries. Unharvested adults may stray or return to the MOK, but this would not impact habitat of other native species or substantially reduce the number of species or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

b.: No impact

Discussion: Adult salmon that were released along the Central California coast as juveniles were generally recovered at a higher rate in the ocean fisheries than salmon that were released in the river, but they also exhibit higher stray rates (Kormos and Palmer-Zwahlen 2015). There are concerns that adult strays (from coastal releases) may adversely affect native salmonid stocks within coastal streams. However, this has yet to be shown to impact native fishes. Features of the Project serve to reduce the potential for Project fish to stray into coastal streams and minimize any impact in the event straying occurs. In addition, this Project has taken steps to reduce potential for straying through elimination of acclimation times. Based on the available data, there will be no cumulative impacts.

c.: No impact

Discussion: The Project does not have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on humans either directly or indirectly.

Exhibit A: Statement of Work

Under the direction of the Grantor, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and under the following conditions and terms, the Monterey Bay Salmon and Trout Project (MBSTP) would fulfill the following:

1. MBSTP is responsible for releasing 160,000 Chinook Salmon smolts each spring provided by the Mokelumne River Fish Hatchery in 2022, 2023 and 2024. CDFW would deliver fish directly to Municipal Wharf 2 within Monterey Harbor.

Hatchery salmon will be delivered at the same time in 2-4 hatchery trucks. The Project has been reviewed and accepted by California Coastal Commission, City of Monterey, Monterey Harbor and Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (see Exhibits B and C). MBSTP has engaged with the public and local communities on previous iterations of this Project including a public meeting on August 21, 2019. The public meeting was widely broadcast and had staff from Monterey Bay Aquarium, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, Monterey Harbor and Monterey Bay Fisheries Trust in attendance with over 25 members of the public (Ben Harris, personal communication, December 9, 2019).

2. MBSTP understands the availability of salmon for this Project may be reduced based on availability. CDFW would mark and tag the juvenile salmon with a coded-wire tag (CWT) and adipose fin clip. Salmon would be healthy and disease free when delivered to Monterey Harbor. All fish would be delivered, acclimated, and released within the same day. Fish are scheduled to be delivered mid-May depending on fish size, growth rates, and environmental conditions in Monterey Harbor and Monterey Bay.

3. MBSTP agrees to provide a written report on all salmon releases to CDFW and Commercial Salmon Trollers Advisory Committee (CSTAC) by August 15, of each year of release. The report will include the following information:

- Estimated number of fish, mortalities, and condition upon delivery
- Estimated number of fish mortalities and condition upon release
- Environmental conditions; water temperature, air temperature
- Estimated number and species of avian and marine predators present at release
- Location (latitude/longitude) of release site and time

4. MBSTP would provide a hard copy and an electronic copy of the final report in MS Word or PDF format.

5. MBSTP would obtain permits or exemption required by the Coastal Commission, local planners, and any other permits that may be needed to implement the project.

6. MBSTP would acknowledge the participation of the CDFW and Commercial Salmon Stamp on any signs, flyers, or other types of written communication or notice to advertise or explain the Chinook Salmon Coastal Release Project in Monterey Harbor.

Exhibit B: City of Monterey Zoning Review Letter

APPENDIX B

LOCAL AGENCY REVIEW FORM

SECTION A (TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT)

Applicant Benjamin Harris

Project Description MBSTP Chinook Net Pen Release Program

Location Monterey Harbor, Monterey, CA

Assessor's Parcel Number Not Applicable

SECTION B (TO BE COMPLETED BY LOCAL PLANNING OR BUILDING INSPECTION DEPARTMENT)

Zoning Designation PC-W (Planned Community - Waterfront) N/A du/ac

General or Community Plan Designation Public/Semi-Public N/A du/ac

Local Discretionary Approvals

Proposed development meets all zoning requirements and needs no local permits other than building permits.

Proposed development needs local discretionary approvals noted below.

Needed Received

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Design/Architectural review |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Variance for _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Rezone from _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Tentative Subdivision/Parcel Map No. _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grading/Land Development Permit No. _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Planned Residential/Commercial Development Approval |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Site Plan Review |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Condominium Conversion Permit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Conditional, Special, or Major Use Permit No. _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other _____ |


CEQA Status

- Categorically Exempt Class _____ Item _____
- Negative Declaration Granted (Date) _____
- Environmental Impact Report Required, Final Report Certified (Date) _____
- Other Not a Project under CEQA Art. 20 S. 15378 + Art. 5 S. 15061

Prepared for the City County of Monterey by Fernanda Roveri, AICP

Date 6/4/2018 Title Associate Planner

Exhibit C: City of Monterey Harbor and Marina Division Letter



February 22, 2022

HARBOR/MARINA DIVISION

Ben Harris
101 Cooper St.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Mr. Harris:

Thank you for helping in the efforts to bring a salmon release fishery enhancement program to the Monterey Harbor. We recognize that such a program would bring a social and economic benefit Monterey Bay by helping to sustain fishing opportunities for future generations.

In the past, Monterey Harbor Staff worked with the Monterey Bay Salmon and Trout Project to release salmon smelt into the wild but the program was discontinued for various reasons. Recently, through the acceptance of the City of Monterey's Fishing Community Sustainability Plan, the City Council of Monterey has expressed a desire to work with interested parties to reinstate a salmon release program.

We welcome the opportunity to support interested parties in releasing up to 250,000 salmon smelt at Monterey. The City of Monterey will permit and grant access to the Waterfront Facilities in Monterey to the Monterey Bay Salmon and Trout Project Personnel for the duration of a salmon release fishery enhancement project.

Sincerely,


A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brian Nelson".

Captain Brian Nelson, FSO
Harbor Operations, Acting Harbormaster
Public Works, Harbor Division

Exhibit D: Project Location and Quadrants Identification Map



Attachment 1: Monterey Harbor release locations. Red circles indicate approximate potential release sites. All releases will be interior to Municipal Wharf #2.



Attachment 2: CNDDB Grids included in species review.

Exhibit E: CNDDDB Elements Report



Selected Elements by Scientific Name California Department of Fish and Wildlife California Natural Diversity Database



Query Criteria: Quad (Montara Mountain (3712254) OR Half Moon Bay (3712244) OR San Gregorio (3712234) OR Pigeon Point (3712224))

Species	Element Code	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
<i>Agrostis blasdalei</i> Blasdale's bent grass	PMPOA04060	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
<i>Allium peninsulare</i> var. <i>franciscanum</i> Franciscan onion	PMLIL021R1	None	None	G5T2	S2	1B.2
<i>Antrozous pallidus</i> pallid bat	AMACC10010	None	None	G4	S3	SSC
<i>Arctostaphylos montaraensis</i> Montara manzanita	PDERI042W0	None	None	G1	S1	1B.2
<i>Arctostaphylos regismontana</i> Kings Mountain manzanita	PDERI041C0	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
<i>Ardea herodias</i> great blue heron	ABNGA04010	None	None	G5	S4	
<i>Astragalus pycnostachyus</i> var. <i>pycnostachyus</i> coastal marsh milk-vetch	PDFAB0F7B2	None	None	G2T2	S2	1B.2
<i>Athene cunicularia</i> burrowing owl	ABNSB10010	None	None	G4	S3	SSC
<i>Bombus caliginosus</i> obscure bumble bee	IIHYM24380	None	None	G4?	S1S2	
<i>Bombus occidentalis</i> western bumble bee	IIHYM24250	None	None	G2G3	S1	
<i>Brachyramphus marmoratus</i> marbled murrelet	ABNNN06010	Threatened	Endangered	G3	S2	
<i>Callophrys mossii bayensis</i> San Bruno elfin butterfly	IILEPE2202	Endangered	None	G4T1	S3	
<i>Centromadia parryi</i> ssp. <i>parryi</i> pappose tarplant	PDAST4R0P2	None	None	G3T2	S2	1B.2
<i>Charadrius nivosus nivosus</i> western snowy plover	ABNNB03031	Threatened	None	G3T3	S2	SSC
<i>Chorizanthe cuspidata</i> var. <i>cuspidata</i> San Francisco Bay spineflower	PDPGN04081	None	None	G2T1	S1	1B.2
<i>Cirsium andrewsii</i> Franciscan thistle	PDAST2E050	None	None	G3	S3	1B.2
<i>Collinsia multicolor</i> San Francisco collinsia	PDSCR0H0B0	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
<i>Corynorhinus townsendii</i> Townsend's big-eared bat	AMACC08010	None	None	G4	S2	SSC
<i>Danaus plexippus</i> pop. 1 monarch - California overwintering population	IILEPP2012	Candidate	None	G4T2T3	S2S3	



Selected Elements by Scientific Name
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
California Natural Diversity Database



Species	Element Code	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
<i>Dicamptodon ensatus</i> California giant salamander	AAAAH01020	None	None	G3	S2S3	SSC
<i>Dirca occidentalis</i> western leatherwood	PDTHY03010	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
<i>Emys marmorata</i> western pond turtle	ARAAD02030	None	None	G3G4	S3	SSC
<i>Eriophyllum latilobum</i> San Mateo woolly sunflower	PDAST3N060	Endangered	Endangered	G1	S1	1B.1
<i>Eucyclogobius newberryi</i> tidewater goby	AFCQN04010	Endangered	None	G3	S3	
<i>Eumetopias jubatus</i> Steller sea lion	AMAJC03010	Delisted	None	G3	S2	
<i>Falco columbarius</i> merlin	ABNKD06030	None	None	G5	S3S4	WL
<i>Fritillaria biflora</i> var. <i>ineziana</i> Hillsborough chocolate lily	PMLIL0V0M1	None	None	G3G4T1	S1	1B.1
<i>Fritillaria liliacea</i> fragrant fritillary	PMLIL0V0C0	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
<i>Geothlypis trichas sinuosa</i> saltmarsh common yellowthroat	ABPBX1201A	None	None	G5T3	S3	SSC
<i>Grindelia hirsutula</i> var. <i>maritima</i> San Francisco gumplant	PDAST470D3	None	None	G5T1Q	S1	3.2
<i>Horkelia cuneata</i> var. <i>sericea</i> Kellogg's horkelia	PDROS0W043	None	None	G4T1?	S1?	1B.1
<i>Horkelia marinensis</i> Point Reyes horkelia	PDROS0W0B0	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
<i>Hypogymnia schizidiata</i> island tube lichen	NLT0032640	None	None	G2G3	S2	1B.3
<i>Icaricia icarioides missionensis</i> Mission blue butterfly	IILEPG801A	Endangered	None	G5T1	S1	
<i>Ischnura gemina</i> San Francisco fork-tail damselfly	IIODO72010	None	None	G2	S2	
<i>Lasiurus cinereus</i> hoary bat	AMACC05030	None	None	G3G4	S4	
<i>Lasthenia californica</i> ssp. <i>macrantha</i> perennial goldfields	PDAST5L0C5	None	None	G3T2	S2	1B.2
<i>Leptosiphon croceus</i> coast yellow leptosiphon	PDPLM09170	None	Endangered	G1	S1	1B.1
<i>Leptosiphon rosaceus</i> rose leptosiphon	PDPLM09180	None	None	G1	S1	1B.1
<i>Lessingia arachnoidea</i> Crystal Springs lessingia	PDAST5S0C0	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2



Selected Elements by Scientific Name
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
California Natural Diversity Database



Species	Element Code	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
<i>Lichnanthe ursina</i> bumblebee scarab beetle	IICOL67020	None	None	G2	S2	
<i>Limnanthes douglasii ssp. ornduffii</i> Ornduff's meadowfoam	PDLIM02039	None	None	G4T1	S1	1B.1
<i>Malacothamnus arcuatus</i> arcuate bush-mallow	PDMAL0Q0E0	None	None	G2Q	S2	1B.2
<i>Melospiza melodia pusillula</i> Alameda song sparrow	ABPBXA301S	None	None	G5T2?	S2S3	SSC
<i>Microseris paludosa</i> marsh microseris	PDAST6E0D0	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
<i>Monolopia gracilens</i> woodland woollythreads	PDAST6G010	None	None	G3	S3	1B.2
<i>Myotis thysanodes</i> fringed myotis	AMACC01090	None	None	G4	S3	
N. Central Coast Calif. Roach/Stickleback/Steelhead Stream N. Central Coast Calif. Roach/Stickleback/Steelhead Stream	CARA2633CA	None	None	GNR	SNR	
<i>Neotoma fuscipes annectens</i> San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat	AMAFF08082	None	None	G5T2T3	S2S3	SSC
North Central Coast Steelhead/Sculpin Stream North Central Coast Steelhead/Sculpin Stream	CARA2637CA	None	None	GNR	SNR	
Northern Coastal Salt Marsh Northern Coastal Salt Marsh	CTT52110CA	None	None	G3	S3.2	
Northern Maritime Chaparral Northern Maritime Chaparral	CTT37C10CA	None	None	G1	S1.2	
<i>Nyctinomops macrotis</i> big free-tailed bat	AMACD04020	None	None	G5	S3	SSC
<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus pop. 8</i> steelhead - central California coast DPS	AFCHA0209G	Threatened	None	G5T2T3Q	S2S3	
<i>Pentachaeta bellidiflora</i> white-rayed pentachaeta	PDAST6X030	Endangered	Endangered	G1	S1	1B.1
<i>Plagiobothrys chorisianus var. chorisianus</i> Choris' popcornflower	PDBOR0V061	None	None	G3T1Q	S1	1B.2
<i>Polemonium carneum</i> Oregon polemonium	PDPLM0E050	None	None	G3G4	S2	2B.2
<i>Potentilla hickmanii</i> Hickman's cinquefoil	PDROS1B370	Endangered	Endangered	G1	S1	1B.1
<i>Rallus obsoletus obsoletus</i> California Ridgway's rail	ABNME05011	Endangered	Endangered	G3T1	S1	FP
<i>Rana boylei</i> foothill yellow-legged frog	AAABH01050	None	Endangered	G3	S3	SSC
<i>Rana draytonii</i> California red-legged frog	AAABH01022	Threatened	None	G2G3	S2S3	SSC



Selected Elements by Scientific Name
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
California Natural Diversity Database



Species	Element Code	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
<i>Riparia riparia</i> bank swallow	ABPAU08010	None	Threatened	G5	S2	
<i>Sacramento-San Joaquin Coastal Lagoon</i> Sacramento-San Joaquin Coastal Lagoon	CALA1360CA	None	None	GNR	SNR	
<i>Serpentine Bunchgrass</i> Serpentine Bunchgrass	CTT42130CA	None	None	G2	S2.2	
<i>Silene scouleri ssp. scouleri</i> Scouler's catchfly	PDCAR0U1MC	None	None	G5T4T5	S2S3	2B.2
<i>Silene verecunda ssp. verecunda</i> San Francisco campion	PDCAR0U213	None	None	G5T1	S1	1B.2
<i>Speyeria zerene myrtleae</i> Myrtle's silverspot butterfly	IILEPJ608C	Endangered	None	G5T1	S1	
<i>Spirinchus thaleichthys</i> longfin smelt	AFCHB03010	Candidate	Threatened	G5	S1	
<i>Taxidea taxus</i> American badger	AMAJF04010	None	None	G5	S3	SSC
<i>Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia</i> San Francisco gartersnake	ARADB3613B	Endangered	Endangered	G5T2Q	S2	FP
<i>Triphysaria floribunda</i> San Francisco owl's-clover	PDSCR2T010	None	None	G2?	S2?	1B.2
<i>Triquetrella californica</i> coastal triquetrella	NBMUS7S010	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
<i>Tryonia imitator</i> mimic tryonia (=California brackishwater snail)	IMGASJ7040	None	None	G2	S2	
<i>Valley Needlegrass Grassland</i> Valley Needlegrass Grassland	CTT42110CA	None	None	G3	S3.1	

Record Count: 74