Docusign Envelope ID: 474E0C7E-94FC-88F1-8398-09B1C8B967D5

Resolution 09-2026
Adopted by the
CALIFORNIA STATE PARK AND RECREATION COMMISION
At its regular meeting in Scotts Valley, California
July 2, 2026

Final Environmental Impact Report
For Big Basin Redwoods State Park

WHEREAS, the existing General Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report for Big Basin Redwoods State Park was approved by the California State Park and Recreation Commission (Commission) on May 17, 2013; and

WHEREAS, in August of 2020, the CZU Lightning Complex Fire burned 97 percent of Big Basin Redwoods State Park and destroyed all the historic and recreational facilities in the park; and

WHEREAS, Department of Parks and Recreations (California State Parks) staff and consultants, in response to the losses from the fire, prepared the Reimagining Big Basin Vision Summary in 2022 to guide future park management, and prepared the Reimagining Big Basin Redwoods State Park Facilities Management Plan in 2026 to guide rebuilding park facilities according to the vision; and

WHEREAS, California State Parks staff and consultants have prepared a proposed General Plan Amendment to update the existing park General Plan to ensure consistency with the Reimagining Big Basin Redwoods State Park Facilities Management Plan for the plan's proposed park improvements at Lower Sky Meadow, Saddle Mountain and Little Basin and to add acquisition parcels around Saddle Mountain to the General Plan area; and

WHEREAS, the proposed General Plan Amendment and the Final Reimagining Big Basin Redwoods State Park Facilities Management Plan together are considered a "Project" under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); approval of the Project is a discretionary decision that is subject to environmental review under CEQA; and a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared concurrent with the Project, pursuant to Public Resource Code Section 5002.2 and the California Code of Regulations Section 15166 (CEQA Guidelines), providing a discussion of the potential environmental impacts of implementing the Project and addressing all requirements of an EIR, and circulated to the public for the appropriate timeframe; and

WHEREAS, the Director of California State Parks has presented to the California State Parks and Recreation Commission (Commission), as the lead agency for certification of Environmental Impact Reports for California State Parks, the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") for the

Docusign Envelope ID: 474E0C7E-94FC-88F1-8398-09B1C8B967D5

Reimagining Big Basin Redwoods State Park Facilities Management Plan and General Plan Amendment; and

WHEREAS the Project and Supplemental EIR function as a "tiered EIR" pursuant to PRC 21093, covering general goals and objectives of the Project, and that the appropriate level of CEQA compliance will be conducted for each future implementation project relying on the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Project is consistent with environmental protection measures in the 2013 General Plan's goals and guidelines to avoid significant environmental impacts; and

WHEREAS, as stated in Section 3.4, Project Impact Analysis of the Draft Supplemental EIR, the management of Big Basin Redwoods State Park as envisioned in the Project, even with the implementation of goals, guidelines, and standard project requirements, would have significant and unavoidable impacts associated with Biological Resources; and

WHEREAS the findings set forth in the attached Findings of Fact (Exhibit A) represent the Department's findings under CEQA (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.), and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.) relating to the project.

WHEREAS, the Project and the management of Big Basin Redwoods State Park include conditions listed in the attached Statement of Overriding Considerations (Exhibit B) that render acceptable the significant and unavoidable effects related to Biological Resources; and

WHEREAS, the Commission toured Big Basin Redwoods State Park on July 1, 2026; and

WHEREAS, the Commission met in Scotts Valley, California, on July 2, 2026, and considered the Project and related environmental documents for Big Basin Redwoods State Park for approval.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: that this Commission has reviewed and considered the information and analysis in the Supplemental EIR prior to approving the Project, and this Commission finds and certifies that the Supplemental EIR prepared for the Project reflects the independent judgment and analysis of this Commission and has been completed in accordance with CEQA; and be it

RESOLVED: in connection with its review of the Project prior to approval, this Commission independently finds that the environmental conclusions contained in the Supplemental EIR are supported by facts therein and that each fact in support of the findings is true and is based on substantial evidence in the record and that goals and guidelines have been incorporated into the Project

Docusign Envelope ID: 474E0C7E-94FC-88F1-8398-09B1C8B967D5

that will avoid significant or potentially significant impacts, with the exception of impacts associated with Biological Resources; and be it

RESOLVED: The location and custodian of the Project and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the Commission's decision is based with the Department of Parks and Recreation, located in the Natural Resources Agency building, Sacramento, California; and be it

RESOLVED: The California Park and Recreation Commission hereby certifies the Environmental Impact Report prepared for the Reimagining Big Basin Redwoods State Park Facilities Management Plan dated May 2026, and General Plan Amendment dated July 2, 2026; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: A Notice of Determination will be filed with the Office of Planning and Research within five days of this approval.

Attest: This Resolution was duly adopted by the California Park and Recreation Commission on July 2, 2026, at the Commission's duly noticed public meeting.

DocuSigned by:
By: Prasanna Hankins 149B6E046A4541B... Date: 7/2/2026

Prasanna Hankins
Assistant to the Commission
For Armando Quintero, Director
California State Parks
Secretary to the Commission

Exhibit A: CEQA Findings of Fact
Exhibit B: Statement of Overriding Considerations

Docusign Envelope ID: 474E0C7E-94FC-88F1-8398-09B1C8B967D5

EXHIBIT A

CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT

CALIFORNIA STATE PARK AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Certification of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the Reimagining Big Basin Redwoods State Park Facilities Management Plan and General Plan Amendments

July 2, 2026

The California Department of Parks and Recreation (Department, State Parks) prepared a Draft and a Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (collectively, the "Supplemental EIR") to the 2013 General Plan Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse No. 2001112104) for the Reimagining Big Basin Redwoods State Park Facilities Management Plan and General Plan Amendments (together, the "project").

The Supplemental EIR addresses the potential environmental effects associated with the project. The findings set forth below are adopted by the California State Park and Recreation Commission (Commission) as the Department's findings of fact under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.), and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.) relating to the project based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding (administrative record). Specifically, these findings address the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081 and 21081.6 and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15090 and 15091. Through these findings, the Department exercises its duty to minimize environmental damage, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines 15021.

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the Department has already prepared a Statement of Overriding Considerations (see Exhibit B).

Procedural Background

Pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, the Department determined that a Supplemental EIR would be required for the project. The 2013 Big Basin Redwoods State Park Final General Plan (2013 General Plan) has been the guiding document for Big Basin Redwoods State Park (BBRSP) since 2013. The Supplemental EIR was prepared due to the change in circumstance at BBRSP caused by the 2020 CZU Lightning Complex fire (CZU fire). The Supplemental EIR focuses specifically on a portion of the BBRSP along Highway 236 and Sky Meadow Road encompassing approximately 5,500 acres of eastern BBRSP; this area is herein referred to as the Focus Area.

On June 16, 2025, the Department issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study for the Supplemental EIR that was circulated to responsible agencies, interested groups, individuals, and the State Clearinghouse for review and comment. Comments received by the

Docusign Envelope ID: 474E0C7E-94FC-88F1-8398-09B1C8B967D5

Department during the NOP scoping period were taken into account during the preparation of the Draft Supplemental EIR. The NOP and Initial Study are included in Appendix A, *Notice of Preparation and Initial Study*, of the Draft Supplemental EIR.

The Draft Supplemental EIR was published for public review and comment on October 17, 2025, and was filed with the California Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Initiative under State Clearinghouse No. 2001112104. The Draft Supplemental EIR was made available for review and comment by interested persons and public agencies from October 17, 2025, to December 1, 2025.

Comments received on the Draft Supplemental EIR during the public review period are included in Appendix E, *Draft Supplemental EIR Comment Letters*, of the Final Supplemental EIR. The Department prepared the Final Supplemental EIR with revisions to the Draft Supplemental EIR. The Final Supplemental EIR was made available for public review in May 2026.

On July 2, 2026, the Department will hold a public hearing to consider the project and associated Supplemental EIR, CEQA Findings of Fact, and Statement of Overriding Considerations.

General Findings

Record of Proceedings and Custodian of Record

Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(2) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e) require the lead agency to specify the location and custodian of documents or other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which its decision to certify the EIR is based. The record upon which all findings and determinations related to the approval of the project are based includes the following:

1. The Supplemental EIR and all documents referenced in or relied upon by the Supplemental EIR.

2. All information (including written evidence and testimony) provided by Department staff to the Commission relating to the Supplemental EIR, the approvals, and the project.

3. All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the Department by environmental consultants who prepared the Supplemental EIR or incorporated into reports presented to the Department.

4. All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the Department from other public agencies related to the project or the Supplemental EIR.

5. All applications, letters, testimony and presentations relating to the project.

Docusign Envelope ID: 474E0C7E-94FC-88F1-8398-09B1C8B967D5

EXHIBIT A

6. All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented at any public Department hearing or workshop related to the project and the Supplemental EIR.

7. All Department-adopted or Department-prepared plans, regulations, and standards, together with environmental review documents, findings, mitigation monitoring programs, and other documents relevant to the planning and management of BBRSP.

8. All other documents composing the record pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e).

The custodian of the documents and other materials that constitute the record of the proceedings upon which the Department's decisions are based is Will Fourt, Senior Park and Recreation Specialist, Santa Cruz District (District) or his designee. Such documents and other material are located at Santa Cruz District Headquarters, 303 N Big Trees Road, Felton, CA 95018.

Incorporation by Reference

These findings incorporate the text of the Supplemental EIR for the project, including Department staff reports relating to the project and other documents relating to public hearings on the project, by reference, in their entirety. Without limitation, this incorporation is intended to elaborate on the scope and nature of mitigation measures, project and cumulative impacts, the basis for determining the significance of impacts, the comparison of the alternatives to the project, the determination of the environmentally superior alternative, and the reasons for approving the project.

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15163(e), the Commission has considered the previous EIR as revised by the Supplemental EIR.

Consideration and Certification of the Supplemental EIR

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15090, the Commission certifies that the Supplemental EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA. The Commission has independently reviewed the record and the Supplemental EIR prior to certifying the Supplemental EIR and approving the project. By these findings, the Commission confirms, ratifies, and adopts the findings and conclusions of the Supplemental EIR as supplemented and modified by these findings. The Supplemental EIR and these findings represent the independent judgment and analysis of the Department and the Commission. The Commission recognizes the Supplemental EIR may contain clerical errors. The Commission reviewed the entirety of the Supplemental EIR and bases its determination on the substance of the information it contains. The Commission certifies that the Supplemental EIR is adequate to support the Department's decisions regarding the project.

The Commission certifies that the Supplemental EIR is adequate to support approval of the project described in the Supplemental EIR.

Docusign Envelope ID: 474E0C7E-94FC-88F1-8398-09B1C8B967D5

EXHIBIT A

Significant Irreversible Changes

Section 21100(b)(2)(B) of CEQA requires that an EIR identify any significant effect on the environment that would be irreversible if the project were implemented. Section 15126.2(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines identifies irreversible environmental changes as those involving a large commitment of nonrenewable resources, secondary impacts that would commit future generations, or irreversible damage resulting from environmental accidents.

Significant irreversible effects are addressed on page 5-44 of the 2013 General Plan EIR. The project would not result in a large commitment of nonrenewable resources, secondary impacts that would commit future generations, or irreversible damage resulting from environmental accidents. In addition, although the construction and operation of the project would involve the use of nonrenewable resources, through the inclusion of energy-conserving project features and compliance with applicable standards and regulations, the project would not represent a large commitment of nonrenewable resources.

Growth-Inducing Impacts

Section 15126.2(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines states that an EIR should discuss "…the ways in which the project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment." Growth can be induced in a number of ways, including through elimination of obstacles to growth, through the stimulation of economic activity within the region, or through precedent-setting action.

Growth-inducing impacts are addressed on page 5-45 of the 2013 General Plan EIR. The project is not expected to increase visitation levels compared to pre-fire visitation potential. Accordingly, the construction and operation of the project would not directly or indirectly induce growth.

No Significant New Information

The Commission recognizes that the Final Supplemental EIR has been prepared in compliance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088; incorporates information obtained and produced after the Draft Supplemental EIR was completed; and contains additions, corrections, and modifications that clarify or amplify the analysis included in the Draft Supplemental EIR. The Commission has reviewed and considered the Final Supplemental EIR and all of this information, and it finds that the information added in the Final Supplemental EIR clarifies and makes insignificant changes to an adequate Draft Supplemental EIR. The new information added to the Supplemental EIR does not involve a new significant environmental impact, a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental impact, or a feasible mitigation measure or alternative considerably different from others previously considered that the project applicant declines to adopt and that would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project. No information indicates that the Draft Supplemental EIR was inadequate or conclusory or that the public was deprived of a meaningful opportunity to review and comment on the Supplemental EIR. Therefore, the Final

Docusign Envelope ID: 474E0C7E-94FC-88F1-8398-09B1C8B967D5

EXHIBIT A

Supplemental EIR does not include any changes or add any new significant information to the Draft Supplemental EIR that would require recirculation of the Supplemental EIR under State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

Findings Regarding Significant Impacts

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 states that the lead agency shall not approve a project for which an EIR has been certified that identifies one or more significant effects unless the lead agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief rationale for each finding. As indicated in the Supplemental EIR, the project would result in two significant impacts. These impacts cannot be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of mitigation measures, because it remains unclear whether habitat modifications associated with the project would have a substantial adverse effect on marbled murrelet. Due to the uncertainty in the scientific understanding of marbled murrelet and its status in the project area, even with the Department's Standard Project Requirements (SPR), potential impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

Impact BIO-1: Given the uncertain nature of marbled murrelet research, a conclusive determination on the effects the proposed project on the marbled murrelet species cannot be made and is thus assumed to be significant.

Mitigation Measure: None available.

Finding

The Department finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the EIR.

Rationale for Finding

The District employs a number of measures to protect marbled murrelet and its habitat, and to reduce predator presence in BBRSP, through implementation of and adherence to 2013 General Plan guidelines, requirements of the 2014 settlement agreement between the Center for Biological Diversity and the Department, the *Marbled Murrelet Landscape Management Plan for Zone 6*, and the District's SPRs. Further, the project has been designed to generally avoid and restore the areas of BBRSP most likely to provide habitat for marbled murrelet. Future development from implementation of the proposed project would generally be sited in locations that have previously been disturbed, were developed before the CZU fire, or are otherwise appropriate for new development. Continued implementation of supportive measures, along with habitat regrowth following the CZU fire, is expected to aid in stabilizing and improving marbled murrelet habitat in BBRSP concurrent with implementation of the project. Nevertheless, due to the uncertainty in the scientific understanding of marbled murrelet and its status in the project area, it cannot be determined at this time whether the project's

Docusign Envelope ID: 474E0C7E-94FC-88F1-8398-09B1C8B967D5

impact can be considered less than significant. See “Findings Regarding Project Alternatives” for a discussion of the project alternatives that were evaluated, but found to be infeasible, to avoid this significant impact. The Department finds, consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), that this impact remains significant and unavoidable due to the infeasibility of mitigation measures and project alternatives to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Impact BIO-2: The proposed project, together with cumulative projects, has the potential to contribute to a significant cumulative impact on marbled murrelet in Zone 6.

Mitigation Measure: None available.

Finding

The Department finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the EIR.

Rationale for Finding

The District employs a number of measures to protect marbled murrelet and its habitat, and to reduce predator presence in BBRSP. Additionally, the project has been designed to avoid the areas of BBRSP that are most likely to provide habitat for marbled murrelet. Nevertheless, due to the uncertainty in the scientific understanding of marbled murrelet and its status in the project area, it cannot be determined at this time whether these factors can be considered to reduce the project’s contribution to this significant cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level. See “Findings Regarding Project Alternatives” for a discussion of the project alternatives that were evaluated, but found to be infeasible, to avoid this significant impact. The Department finds, consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), that this cumulative impact is considered significant and unavoidable due to the infeasibility of mitigation measures and project alternatives to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Findings Regarding Project Alternatives

CEQA requires that EIRs assess feasible alternatives or mitigation measures that may substantially lessen the significant effects of projects prior to approval (Public Resources Code Section 21002). With the exception of the “no project” alternative, the specific alternatives or types of alternatives that must be assessed are not specified. CEQA “establishes no categorical legal imperative as to the scope of alternatives to be analyzed in an EIR. Each case must be evaluated on its own facts, which in turn must be reviewed in light of the statutory purpose (Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1990) 52 Cal.3d. 553, 556).

Docusign Envelope ID: 474E0C7E-94FC-88F1-8398-09B1C8B967D5

EXHIBIT A

The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(d)(2) states that the "range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic purposes of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one of more of the significant effects" of the project. Thus, an evaluation of the project objectives is key to determining which alternatives should be assessed in the Supplemental EIR.

The project's objectives include the following:

- Prioritize Forest Health
- Provide Equitable, Diverse, and Evocative Visitor Experiences
- Diversify Transportation and Access Opportunities
- Practice Land Stewardship
- Include Indigenous Perspectives
- Promote Landscape Connectivity
- Design with Reverence and Resilience
- Engage the Park Community and Build Partnerships

Alternatives Analyzed in EIR

The State CEQA Guidelines state that the "range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic purposes of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects" of the project. The Supplemental EIR analyzes three alternatives, examining the environmental impacts and feasibility of each alternative, as well as the ability of the alternatives to meet project objectives summarized above. Each of the alternatives is described in detail starting on page 4-5 of the Draft Supplemental EIR. Summaries of the alternatives are provided below, and a brief discussion of the Environmentally Superior Alternative follows the summaries of the alternatives. The findings in this section are based on the Supplemental EIR, the discussion and analysis of which are hereby incorporated in full by this reference.

Alternative A: No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the project would not be approved. The Department would use the existing 2013 General Plan as its guiding document for BBRSP. Under this alternative, BBRSP would be rebuilt to pre-fire conditions, without a Facilities Management Plan or General Plan amendments (or any other new governing document). This alternative would include rebuilding or restoring the facilities described in Section 2.1.3, *Existing Site Conditions and Site History*, of Chapter 2, *Project Description*, of the Draft Supplemental EIR.

<u>Finding</u>

The Department finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible Alternative A.

Docusign Envelope ID: 474E0C7E-94FC-88F1-8398-09B1C8B967D5

EXHIBIT A

Rationale for Finding

Alternative A: No Project Alternative would result in mostly similar impacts when compared to the project. Air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, GHG emissions, hydrology and water quality, and transportation impacts would all be greater than the project, and no impacts would be reduced.

The No Project Alternative would not fully meet any of the project objectives. It would partially meet the objectives to prioritize forest health; provide equitable, diverse, and evocative visitor experiences; practice land stewardship; promote landscape connectivity; design with reverence and resilience; and engage the park community and build partnerships. The No Project Alternative would not meet the other two project objectives.

The Department finds Alternative A to be infeasible as it would fail to fully meet any of the project objectives.

Alternative B: Natural Preserve Alternative

Under the Natural Preserve Alternative, the Focus Area within BBRSP would be reclassified as a Natural Preserve and all existing facilities would be removed from the Focus Area. There would be no day-use, overnight facilities, or parking infrastructure provided at BBRSP. Therefore, this alternative would result in reduced visitation when compared to the project. Trails would be provided in the Natural Preserve only to connect BBRSP to the existing trail system, thus improvements to only existing trails would be included. Publicly accessible trailheads for these trails would be outside of the Focus Area, because trailhead parking would not be included in this alternative. The ecological restoration efforts included in the project would be included in this alternative. Under this alternative, the 2013 General Plan would need to be amended to include a subclassification for the Focus Area as a Natural Preserve.

Finding

The Department finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible Alternative B.

Rationale for Finding

When compared to the project, Alternative B: Natural Preserve Alternative would result in similar impacts related to agriculture and forestry resources, land use and planning, and mineral resources. The Natural Preserve Alternative would result in greater impacts related to parks and recreation and population and housing. All other impacts would be reduced when compared to the project.

The Natural Preserve Alternative would meet the project objectives to prioritize forest health and practice land stewardship. It would partially meet the objectives to promote landscape connectivity. The Natural Preserve Alternative would not meet the other project objectives.

Docusign Envelope ID: 474E0C7E-94FC-88F1-8398-09B1C8B967D5

EXHIBIT A

The Department finds Alternative B infeasible as it would not meet the recreational objectives and needs envisioned for BBRSP.

Alternative C: Old Growth Redwoods Avoidance Alternative

The Old Growth Redwoods Avoidance Alternative would not incorporate development in areas with old growth redwood habitat. Under this alternative, development at the following sites would be limited: Sequoia, Main Day-use Area, Sempervirens Campground, Bloom Creek and Jay Camp Campgrounds, Lower Sky Meadow, and Huckleberry and Wastahi Campgrounds. Thus, the Redwood Ecology Interpretation Center, the campfire center, approximately 170 campsites and 38 cabins, and approximately 250 parking stalls would not be included in this alternative. Additional campsites, parking areas, and the interpretation and campfire centers could be provided at Saddle Mountain or the Upper Sky Meadow Area. Even with the increase in facilities at alternate locations, this alternative would provide a significant reduction in campsites and other amenities, including parking facilities, when compared to the project. Therefore, visitation is expected to be reduced when compared to the project. The ecological restoration efforts and General Plan amendments included in the project would be included in this alternative.

Finding

The Department finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible Alternative C.

Rationale for Finding

The Old Growth Redwoods Avoidance Alternative would result in mostly similar impacts when compared to the project. Air quality, biological resources, GHG emissions, and noise impacts would all be reduced when compared to the project. No impacts would be greater under this alternative.

The Old Growth Redwoods Avoidance Alternative would meet or partially meet all the project objectives.

The Department finds Alternative C infeasible as it would significantly reduce the recreational opportunities available at BBRSP.

Docusign Envelope ID: 474E0C7E-94FC-88F1-8398-09B1C8B967D5

EXHIBIT B

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CALIFORNIA STATE PARK AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Certification of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the Reimagining Big Basin Redwoods State Park Facilities Management Plan and General Plan Amendments

July 2, 2026

The California State Park and Recreation Commission (Commission) adopts and makes the following Statement of Overriding Considerations regarding the significant, unavoidable impacts of the Reimagining Big Basin Redwoods State Park Facilities Management Plan and General Plan Amendments (project).

General

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.) require decision-makers to balance the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable impacts when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific benefits of a project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, those effects may be considered acceptable, and the agency must state the specific reasons to support the action in a “statement of overriding considerations” supported by substantial evidence in the record (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15903, Statement of Overriding Considerations). Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(b) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the Commission must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the significant and unavoidable impacts of the project in connection with approval of the project. The Commission finds that implementation of the project carries with it significant and unavoidable environmental effects, as identified in the Supplemental EIR and summarized below.

Approval of the project would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts:

Impact BIO-1: Given the uncertain nature of marbled murrelet research, a conclusive determination on the effects the proposed project on the marbled murrelet species cannot be made and is thus assumed to be significant.

Impact BIO-2: The proposed project, together with cumulative projects, has the potential to contribute to a significant cumulative impact on marbled murrelet in Zone 6.

Overriding Considerations

The Commission has carefully considered the project’s significant and unavoidable impacts in

Docusign Envelope ID: 474E0C7E-94FC-88F1-8398-09B1C8B967D5

reaching its decision to approve the project. Even with the Standard Project Requirements (SPRs), the Commission recognizes that implementation of the project could carry with it unavoidable adverse environmental effects, as identified in the Draft and Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (collectively, the "Supplemental EIR").

The Commission specifically finds that, to the extent that the identified significant adverse impacts for the project have not been reduced to acceptable levels through feasible mitigation or alternatives, there are specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits that outweigh the project's significant unavoidable impact and support approval of the proposed project. Any one of these benefits, as set forth below, is sufficient to justify approval of the project. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits is in the record as a whole.

The following statements identify the reasons why, in the Commission's judgment, specific benefits of the project outweigh the possibility of the significant and unavoidable effect. The Commission finds that each of the project benefits discussed below is a separate and independent basis for these findings. The reasons set forth below are based on the Supplemental EIR and other information in the administrative record.

Social Benefits

1. The project would provide recreational opportunities for the region and greater community.

2. The project would improve the visitor experience for park users.

3. The project would showcase historic and tribally significant facilities.

Environmental Benefits

4. The project would reduce the area of developed structures, parking and camping within the most sensitive old growth area, as compared to pre-fire development.

5. The project would enhance site access and circulation, providing a shuttle service that would reduce single-occupancy travel.

6. The project would rebuild facilities using sustainable design principles, would include renewable energy generation, and would reduce green-house-gas emissions associated with operating the park as compared to pre-fire.

7. The project would provide a framework for continued stewardship, management, and protection of the natural resources at the park.

Economic Benefits

8. The project would re-open the park to pre-fire capacity, allowing pre-fire levels of tourism to the park to resume, resulting in economic activity in the region.