State of California
Natural Resources Agency

California Fish and Game Commission

Draft Negative Declaration for Proposed Amendments to Recreational Fishing Regulations for Rockfish, Cabezon, Greenling (RCG) and Lingcod Title 14, California Code of Regulations Sections 1.91, 27.25, 27.30, 27.35, 27.40 and 28.55

Prepared by:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Marine Region

October 2025

This report has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970

State Clearinghouse #

Project Summary and Findings

The Project

The California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) proposes to use regular rulemaking authority to incorporate emergency regulations it adopted in August 2025 to amend the recreational rockfish, cabezon, greenling (RCG) and lingcod season structure regulations as set forth in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Project). The amendments adopted through emergency rulemaking restored fishing access to all depths in state waters through the end of 2025, implemented a 2-fish sub-bag limit for canary rockfish, added sunset rockfish to the list of federal groundfish species, specified that the vermilion rockfish sub-bag limits apply to the vermilion/sunset rockfish species-unit in aggregate, not to each species separately, and retained the existing 0-fish sub-bag limit for quillback rockfish. Any proposed changes to recreational RCG and lingcod season structure regulations are presented to the Commission for consideration.

The Findings

The Commission finds that the Project would not have a significant effect on the environment.

The completed initial study, attached to this negative declaration, documents the bases for this finding and the Commission's determination that the Project will not have any significant or potentially significant effects on the environment, and that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the Commission, that the Project may have significant effects on the environment. Therefore, no alternatives or mitigation measures are proposed to avoid or reduce any significant effects on the environment.

The initial study concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, tribal cultural resources, utilities and service systems, and wildfire.

Therefore, this negative declaration has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code Section 21080, subdivision (c).

Basis of the Findings

This proposed negative declaration consists of:

- Project Description and Background Information on the Proposed Amendments to Recreational Fishing Regulations for Rockfish, Cabezon, Greenling (RCG) and Lingcod
- Initial Study Environmental Checklist Form and Responses
- Explanation of the Responses to the Initial Study Environmental Checklist Form

Project Description and Background Information on the Proposed Amendments to Recreational Fishing Regulations for Rockfish, Cabezon, Greenling (RCG) and Lingcod

Regulatory authority for the rockfish, cabezon, greenling (RCG), and lingcod fisheries is shared by state and federal governments. Current regulations establish season dates, depth restrictions, and recreational bag limits for these "federal" groundfish species that vary by species/groups and groundfish management area, and are designed to keep harvests within federally-established limits. Under California Fish and Game Code sections 200 and 205, the Commission has the authority to adopt recreational fishing regulations.

Project Goals and Objectives

The goal of this project is for recreational fishing regulations in state waters to align with and be complementary to recreational fishing regulations in federal waters, keep catches of canary rockfish and vermilion/sunset rockfish within federally established harvest limits, restore access to distribute recreational fishing effort more broadly, and preserve the general welfare.

Background

Current regulations establish season dates and depth restrictions, and recreational bag limits for federal groundfish species that vary by species or species groups, and are designed to keep harvest within federally established allowable limits. Section 1.91, Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR) defines the species considered federal groundfish. Sections 27.25, 27.30, 27.35 and 27.40, Title 14, CCR, currently set forth season dates, and depth constraints for the four Groundfish Management Areas north of Point Conception (34°27' N. lat.). Section 28.55, Title 14, CCR, currently sets forth the bag limits, and methods of take for all rockfish (Genus *Sebastes*) species.

Recent Regulatory Amendments and Conservation Efforts

Results of a 2021 federal stock assessment for quillback rockfish in California indicated the stock was in severe decline. While the stock assessment was considered "data-moderate," relying on limited data sources and proxy data incorporated from other states, the results prompted a conservation emergency. In line with federal actions taken in federal waters (3 to 200 miles from shore) between 2021 and 2024, several in-season and/or emergency actions were taken by the State of California in state waters (0 to 3 miles from shore):

- Late 2021: The Commission implemented a new quillback rockfish sub-bag limit of one fish within the 10-fish daily RCG bag limit to limit catch and mortality of quillback rockfish in response to the newly available science.
- October 2022: The Commission modified season structures for the 2023 season to shift fishing effort away from nearshore waters — where quillback rockfish are primarily found — to deep water only.

- August 2023: Under authority in subsection 27.20(e), Title 14, CCR, inseason action was taken by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) to prohibit the retention of quillback rockfish statewide and limit fishing in all areas north of Point Conception to waters shallower than 20 fathoms (fm) only after catches of quillback rockfish had exceeded the federally established limits.
- March 2024: The Commission continued the prohibition of quillback rockfish retention. Additionally, season structures north of Point Lopez were revised to prohibit fishing between 20 fm and 50 fm, while allowing fishing either shoreward of the 20 fm boundary line or seaward of the 50 fm boundary line during specified months.

Closing the 20 to 50 fm depth range to RCG and lingcod fishing was necessary to minimize quillback and yelloweye rockfish catch, while maximizing harvest of healthy stocks as much as possible; however, the closure significantly impacted fishing access to other healthy, highly targeted rockfish species that co-occur with quillback, though the depth range remained open for other federal groundfish species like sablefish and sanddabs.

This year, a new quillback stock assessment was completed, and a provisional, pre-decisional version was released by the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) in June 2025. This “full” or “benchmark” assessment used more extensive available data sources, including new California-specific life history information, and re-examined assumptions from the previous 2021 assessment. The new findings conclude that the California quillback stock is healthy and not overfished. As a result, the depth-based fishery restrictions are no longer warranted.

Following formal review and approval of the 2025 stock assessment for use in federal management, which occurred between July and September 2025, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) took an in-season regulatory action to remove the federal fishery depth restrictions in place since October 2023. The federal action, effective September 18, 2025, replaced the depths and season structure for boat-based RCG and lingcod fishing with all-depth fishing in federal waters from Point Conception to the California/Oregon border. The change renews access to other healthy, highly targeted rockfish species that co-occur with quillback rockfish. Despite the improved stock health and scale of the stock, the expected harvest limits are not large enough to allow for quillback rockfish to be retained. NMFS is also expected to take action in late 2025 to implement a 2-fish sub-bag limit for canary rockfish within the 10-fish RCG daily limit to keep catches within the California recreational harvest guideline. Additionally, vermilion rockfish and sunset rockfish are cryptic species — nearly identical in appearance and only reliably differentiated by DNA analysis. While they are assessed and managed as a single species unit in federal regulations, current state regulations do not include sunset rockfish.

The proposed regulatory amendments for the recreational RCG and lingcod fisheries through a regular rulemaking, *will*:

1. modify the RCG and lingcod season structure regulations to restore access to all depths in state waters north of Point Conception (34°27’ N lat.) from April 1 through December 31.
2. implement a 2-fish sub-bag limit for canary rockfish.

3. add sunset rockfish to the list of federal groundfish species and specify that the vermilion rockfish sub-bag limits apply to the vermilion/sunset rockfish species-unit in aggregate, not to each species separately.

Project Location

The recreational fishing addressed by this environmental document occurs in California state waters in five groundfish management areas:

1. ***Northern:*** Oregon-California border (42º 00') to the Cape Mendocino Area (40º 10')
2. ***Mendocino:*** Cape Mendocino Area (40º 10') to Point Arena (38º 57.5')
3. ***San Francisco:*** Point Arena (38º 57.5') to Pigeon Point (37º 11')
4. ***Central:*** Pigeon Point (37º 11') to Point Conception (34º 27')
5. ***Southern:*** Point Conception (34º 27') to the United States-Mexico border

Environmental Setting

Regulatory authority for the rockfish, cabezon, greenling (RCG) complex and lingcod are shared jointly between state and federal governments. Federal regulations are developed through the PFMC process and promulgated by NMFS; state regulations are developed by the Department and promulgated by the Commission. Management of RCG and lingcod species is on a biennial cycle, with in-season modifications within a cycle if new information becomes available and warrants changes.

RCG and lingcod species occur in state and federal waters, with mortality for most species occurring in both jurisdictional water areas. Due to the trans-boundary nature of these stocks, complementary state and federal regulations are necessary for comprehensive fishery management.

Project Description

The proposed regulations would continue to restore access to fishing depths that have been closed since 2023 to recreational fishing for RCG and lingcod to avoid encounters with quillback rockfish. To maintain catch of certain species within federally set allowable take levels, a sub-bag limit for canary rockfish, and inclusion of the cryptic-species sunset rockfish continue to be necessary to limit conservation risk. The Commission routinely adopts regulations for recreational RCG and lingcod for consistency with federal regulations, including those designed to keep catches within harvest limits.

The purpose of the proposed project is to restore access to fishing grounds based upon updated scientific stock assessment information for the quillback rockfish stock off California. The current unwarranted restrictions highly constrain and concentrate recreational fishing access and efforts to a limited area of the state's waters. The proposed regulations would continue to remove these unneeded constraints, thereby alleviating this risk of redirection of recreational fishing efforts and pressure on RCG and lingcod stock in both federal and state waters. Additionally, adoption of scientifically based seasons, depth constraints, and other management measures provides for the protection of quillback rockfish and other RCG species and lingcod to ensure their continued existence. The proposed certificate of

compliance action will also continue to implement a sub-bag limit for canary rockfish and maintain sunset rockfish limits which also serve to protect these rockfish species.

Schedule

If adopted by the Commission and approved by the Office of Administrative Law (OAL), the proposed regulatory amendments will become effective upon OAL approval after the Commission adopts the amendments, currently scheduled for February 11-12, 2026.

Proposed Changes

Previously adopted as emergency regulations that will expire in 2026, the proposed regulations would amend sections 27.25, 27.30, 27.35 and 27.40 of Title 14, CCR, through a regular rulemaking to authorize the take of RCG species and lingcod in all depths within state waters (0 to 3 miles from shore) north of Point Conception during the open season, April 1 through December 31. The current, unwarranted restrictions highly constrain and concentrate recreational fishing access and efforts to a limited area of the state's waters. The proposed regulations would remove the unneeded constraints, thereby alleviating this risk of redirection of recreational fishing efforts and pressure on RCG and lingcod stocks in both federal and state waters.

The canary rockfish California recreational harvest guideline (HG) for 2025 is 46.7 metric tons. Canary rockfish catch in 2024 was 40.6 metric tons. Present regulations (Section 28.55, Title 14, CCR) authorize up to 10 canary rockfish within the 10-fish RCG daily bag limit. The proposed regulations described above would allow anglers more access to the depth range where canary rockfish are commonly found, and the canary rockfish catch would exceed the HG. Thus, the proposed regulations would also implement a recreational canary rockfish sub-bag limit of 2 fish within the 10-fish RCG daily bag limit. This sub-bag limit is necessary to prevent catches of canary rockfish from exceeding the federally established California recreational HG.

In addition, the proposed regulations address an inconsistency between state regulations and federal groundfish regulations. For consistency with current federal regulations, the proposed regulations would amend Section 1.91, Title 14, CCR, to add sunset rockfish (*Sebastes crocotulus*) to the list of federal groundfish species. Vermilion rockfish (*S. miniatus*) and sunset rockfish are cryptic species that are nearly identical in appearance, reliably differentiated only by DNA analysis; as such, they are assessed and managed as a single species-unit in federal regulations.

Catches of vermilion/sunset rockfish have met or exceeded federally set harvest limits in recent years. The 2021 stock assessment treated the vermilion/sunset rockfish stock as a single-species complex, and federal harvest limits and management measures reflect this. Proposed amendments to state regulations would modify Section 28.55, Title 14, CCR, for consistency with federal regulations to specify that the vermilion rockfish sub-bag limits apply to the vermilion/sunset rockfish species-unit in aggregate, not to each cryptic species separately. This change addresses enforcement concerns about anglers attempting to "double-up" on sub-bag limits and will help prevent excessive catches of vermilion/sunset rockfish, which would pose an immediate conservation risk.

Initial Study Environmental Checklist Form

1. **Project Title:** Proposed Amendments to Recreational Fishing Regulations for Rockfish, Cabezon, Greenling (RCG) and Lingcod, Title 14, California Code of Regulations

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** California Fish and Game Commission
PO Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Melissa Miller-Henson, (916) 653-4899

4. **Project Location:** California State Waters in California Groundfish Management Areas

    - ***Northern:*** Oregon-California border (42º 00') to Cape Mendocino Area (40º 10')
    - ***Mendocino:*** Cape Mendocino Area (40º 10') to Point Arena (38º 57.5')
    - ***San Francisco:*** Point Arena (38º 57.5') to Pigeon Point (37º 11')
    - ***Central:*** Pigeon Point (37º 11') to Point Conception (34º 27')
    - ***Southern:*** Point Conception (34º 27') to the United States-Mexico border

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**
California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Marine Region
20 Lower Ragsdale Dr., Suite 100
Monterey, CA 93940

6. **General Plan designation:** N/A (statewide)

7. **Zoning:** N/A (statewide)

8. **Description of Project:** Continue to restore access to fishing depths that have been closed since 2023 to recreational fishing for rockfish, cabezon and greenling (RCG) and lingcod to avoid encounters with quillback rockfish. Maintain catch of certain species within federally set allowable take levels, a sub-bag limit for canary rockfish, and inclusion of the cryptic-species sunset rockfish to limit conservation risk.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** N/A

10. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required**: None

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.31?

    No.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project.

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

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

Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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

Melissa A. Miller-Henson

Melissa Miller-Henson, Executive Director

December 24, 2025

Date

Responses to Initial Study Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTS)	No Impact (NI)
I. Aesthetics. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	NI
c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☐	NI
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	NI
II. Agriculture And Forestry Resources. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	NI
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTS)	No Impact (NI)
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	NI
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	NI
III. Air Quality. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☐	☐	☐	NI
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	NI
d) Result in any other emissions (such as those leading to odors) affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	NI
IV. Biological Resources. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	LTS	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	NI
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTS)	No Impact (NI)
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	NI
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	NI
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	NI
V. Cultural Resources. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	NI
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	NI
VI. Energy. Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operations?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☐	NI
VII. Geology and Soils. Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	NI
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTS)	No Impact (NI)
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	NI
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	NI
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	NI
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	NI
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	NI
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	NI
VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	NI
IX. Hazards And Hazardous Materials. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	NI
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTS)	No Impact (NI)
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	NI
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	NI
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	NI
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☐	NI
X. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☐	NI
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	☐	☐	☐	NI
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☐	NI
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	☐	☐	☐	NI
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of pollution runoff; or	☐	☐	☐	NI
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTS)	No Impact (NI)
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	NI
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☐	NI
XI. Land Use and Planning. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	NI
XII. Mineral Resources. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	NI
XIII. Noise. Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	NI
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	NI
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)?	☐	☐	☐	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTS)	No Impact (NI)
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	NI
XV. Public Services.				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	NI
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	NI
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	NI
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	NI
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	NI
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?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	NI
XVII. Transportation. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☐	NI
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	NI
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTS)	No Impact (NI)
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources.				
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	☐	☐	☐	NI
i) 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	☐	☐	☐	NI
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☐	☐	NI
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☐	NI
c) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	NI
d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☐	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTS)	No Impact (NI)
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	NI
XX. Wildfire. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☐	NI
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.	☐	☐	☐	NI
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☐	NI
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?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	☐	☐	☐	NI
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	NI

Explanation of Responses to Initial Study Environmental Checklist

I. Aesthetics

a) The project will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alternation, or modification of any buildings or structures.

b) The project will not damage scenic resources such as trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or modification of any buildings or structures.

c) The project will not substantially degrade, in nonurbanized areas, the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alternation, or modification of any buildings or structures.

d) The project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or modification of any buildings or structures.

II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

a) The project will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alternation, or land use changes and occurs in marine waters.

b) The project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alternation, or land use changes and occurs in marine waters.

c) The project will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timber zoned Timberland Production. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alternation, or land use changes and occurs in marine waters.

d) There will be no loss of forest land and the project will not result in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alternation, or land use changes and occurs in marine waters.

e) The project will not involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural

use. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alternation, or land use changes and occurs in marine waters.

III. Air Quality

a) The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alternation, or land use changes.

b) The project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. Such an impact will not occur because the project involves no ongoing sources of air pollution.

c) The project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not increase pollutant concentrations.

d) The project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

IV. Biological Resources

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

Less than Significant: The proposed recreational RCG and lingcod regulations would:

(1) remove depth constraints north of Point Conception (34° 27' N lat.) for the boat-based RCG and lingcod fishery;

(2) implement a statewide sub-bag limit of two-fish for canary rockfish within the 10-fish RCG complex daily bag limit; and,

(3) add sunset rockfish to the regulations, such that vermilion and sunset rockfishes are defined and managed as a cryptic species pair (e.g., sunset/vermilion rockfish).

RCG and lingcod are managed jointly, both by the state and federal governments biennially. The PFMC and NMFS only have the authority to implement fishery management regulations in federal waters, and the State of California has discretion to implement management complementary to federal action, or other management actions, in its state waters. The PFMC/NMFS analysis of the effects of RCG and lingcod management measures incorporates cumulative mortality in both federal and state waters from all sources of fishing mortality. Impacts for the adopted biennial management measures as analyzed in the PFMC/NMFS process must remain within the federally established harvest specifications to meet Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation Act requirements. All impacts associated with this Project are evaluated in

the federal Environmental Assessment (EA) of Amendment 33 to the Pacific Coast Groundfish Management Plan, 2025-26 Harvest Specifications, and Management Measures.

The project is not expected to adversely affect Federal threatened or endangered species and/or their critical habitat beyond those effects considered in current Biological Opinions for the Pacific Coast groundfish fishery. Potential effects to species listed under the Endangered Species Act are discussed in Sections 4.2 and 5.3.2 of the EA.

Future groundfish harvest associated with the project is not expected to be appreciably different than those analyzed during the biennial process. The proposed regulatory changes under this project have been analyzed and are projected to keep mortality of groundfish species within allowable limits. The project is therefore anticipated to have an overall negligible net effect on managed fish over the period the rules are expected to be in effect.

b) The project will not have an adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies and regulations, or by the Department or the USFWS. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alternation, or land use changes.

c) The project will not have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

d) The project will not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

e) The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not result in any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

f) The project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

V. Cultural Resources

a) The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5. There is no ground disturbing work

or work permanently modifying any existing structure or resource and thus no potential to affect historical resources.

b) The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5. There is no ground disturbing work and thus no potential to affect archaeological resources.

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

VI. Energy

a) The project would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operations. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not use energy resources.

b) The project will not affect nor obstruct any state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. There is no activity in any plan areas for renewable energy or energy efficiency and thus no potential impact.

VII. Geology and Soils

a i) The project will not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the state geologist for the area, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction or create any structures for human habitation.

a ii) The project will not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction or create any structures for human habitation.

a iii) The project will not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction or create any structures for human habitation.

a iv) The project will not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, ground disturbing work, or the creation of any structures for human habitation.

b) The project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve ground disturbing work.

c) The project will not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable and potentially result in on- or off- site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve ground disturbing work.

d) The project will not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve ground disturbing work.

e) The project will not create any sources of waste water requiring a septic system. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve ground disturbing work.

f) The project will not indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve or indirectly result in any ground disturbing work.

VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

a) The project will not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. Vessel trips and vessel types fluctuate from year to year. It is speculative to know if there will be any potential increases in vessel trips or what vessel types would be used. However, by returning to pre-2024 standards, the project would be consistent with historical averages to date and as such would have no impact with respect to generation of greenhouse gas emissions. Additionally, the project will not involve construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

   Estimating effect is difficult, as data on individual vessel trips and types of vessels are not available. There is some information on fishing effort (in angler trips, which is different from vessel trips) that indicates effort decreased during the period the current regulations were in place compared to the prior regulations (pre-2024 baseline), but it is unclear whether anglers ceased fishing altogether or shifted to other available species as a result of groundfish depth restrictions enacted in 2023 since the groundfish depth restrictions coincided with closures to the recreational salmon fishery and new limitations in other fisheries, further complicating an impact analysis.

   This project would be returning to pre-2024 baseline standards and therefore not expected to generate greenhouse gas emissions that will have a significant impact on the environment.

b) The project will not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG. The Project is expected to result in a small amount of GHG via the use of fuel in vehicles used to transport anglers to and from the designated fishing areas, but does not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation reducing the emissions of GHG.

IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

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

b) The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The project will not involve the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

c) The project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The project will not involve the transport, use, or emission of any hazardous materials.

d) The project will not be located on any site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

e) The project will not be located within an airport land use plan area.

f) The project will not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

g) The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

X. Hydrology and Water Quality

a) The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, water use, or water discharge.

b) The project will not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or groundwater use.

c i) The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site because the project will not involve any construction or land alteration.

c ii) The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site because the project will not involve any construction or land alteration.

c iii) The project will not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm-water drainage systems, or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff because the project will not involve any construction or land alteration.

c iv) The project will not impede or redirect flood flows because the project will not involve any construction or land alteration.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, the project would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation because the project would not involve any construction or land alteration.

e) The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or groundwater use.

XI. Land Use and Planning

a) The project will not physically divide an established community. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

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

XII. Mineral Resources

a) The project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

b) The project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

XIII. Noise

a) The project will not result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of

other agencies. The project will not involve construction or physical alteration of land, and its implementation will not generate noise levels in excess of agency standards.

b) The project will not result in generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. The project will not involve construction or physical alteration of land.

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

XIV. Population and Housing

a) The project will not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not construct any new homes, businesses, roads, or other human infrastructure.

b) The project will not displace any existing people or housing and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

XV. Public Services

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

XVI. Recreation

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

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

XVII. Transportation

a) The project will not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The project involves no land use or transportation system modifications.

b) The project will not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 subdivision (b), which pertains to vehicle miles traveled. The amount and distance of vehicle miles traveled by recreational anglers should not change substantially under the proposed regulations.

c) The project will not increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses with equipment. The project involves no land use or transportation system modifications.

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

XVIII. Tribal and Cultural Resources

a) The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe. Further:

a i) The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k). The project does not involve ground disturbing work and does not have the potential to affect tribal cultural resources.

a ii) The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. The project does not involve ground disturbing work and does not have the potential to affect tribal cultural resources.

XIX. Utilities and Service Systems

a) The project will not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities. The project does not involve any construction or land alteration.

b) The project requires no new water supplies.

c) The project will not produce wastewater.

d) The project will not generate solid waste. Thus, the project will be in compliance with state and local standards for solid waste.

e) The project will not create solid waste. Thus, the project will be in compliance with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XX. Wildfire

a) The project will not impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

b) The project will not exacerbate wildfire risks due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors.

c) The project will not require the installation or maintenance of any infrastructure.

d) The project will not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fir slope instability, or drainage changes.

XXI. Mandatory Findings and Significance

a) The project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The project is consistent with the Department's mission to manage California's diverse fisheries resources for their ecological value, their use and for the public's enjoyment.

b) The project does not have adverse impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Cumulative adverse impacts will not occur because there are no potential adverse impacts due to project implementation.

c) The project does not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on humans, either directly or indirectly. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or the creation of new infrastructure.