

**State of California
Natural Resources Agency**

California Fish and Game Commission

**Draft Negative Declaration for
Proposed Amendments to 2026 Sport Fishing Regulations
(Inland and Marine)
Title 14, California Code of Regulations**

Prepared by:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife Fisheries Branch
for consideration by the California Fish and Game Commission

April 2026

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

State Clearinghouse #

Project Summary and Findings

The Project

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

The California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) proposes to amend Sections 1.62, 1.73, 1.74, 2.10, 2.11, 4.20, 5.00, 5.65, 5.85, 5.88, 6.34, 6.35, 7.00, 7.40, 7.50, 8.00, 8.10, 28.25, 28.30, 28.32, 28.35, 230 and 701 related to sport fishing for the 2026 sport fishing regulatory cycle (Project). This proposal contains multiple amendments that would clarify sport fishing regulations, increase angler opportunities, change gear requirements, change fish measurement and sampling protocols, improve steelhead report card and low-flow regulations, and protect vulnerable fish populations. The proposed amendments are needed to effectively manage California's sport fisheries, and correct errors and inaccuracies in the existing regulations to reduce public confusion and improve regulatory enforcement. The Department has evaluated the proposed amendments and presented its findings to the Commission for consideration.

The proposed amendments fall into two major categories, those that have no effect on fishing restrictions and are primarily administrative in nature, and those that affect restrictions on fishing including seasons, size limits, boundaries, and/or gear restrictions.

1. Amendments with no effect to fishing restrictions and are necessary to enhance clarity, consistency, or fix errors; they do not alter the application or enforcement of the regulations. These amendments include:
 - Section 2.11, Special Fishing Methods – Lake County: In 2014, Clear Lake hitch was listed under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) as threatened and can no longer be taken without a CESA incidental take permit or MOU. The language in Section 2.11 conflicts with take prohibitions for Clear Lake hitch and needs to be removed from Title 14, CCR.
 - Section 5.65, Shad, American: In 2025 there was a regulatory amendment in Section 2.30 to allow spearfishing as a method of take for American shad in the Valley District. The proposed amendment to Section 5.65 would add spearfishing as a method of take allowable for American shad in the Valley District, making Section 5.65 consistent with Section 2.30.
 - Section 5.85, subsection (a)(2), Trout: The proposed amendment would add Section 7.00, which lists general regulations in each District, to the list of sections excepted from general statewide trout regulations. The change would remove ambiguities associated with wildlife officers enforcing fishing regulation violations.
 - Section 6.34, Southern District Definition: The current definition of the “Southern District” in Section 6.34 erroneously copies the Sierra District definition. The proposed amendment would correct the language to the as-intended definition of the Southern District.

- Section 7.40: Renumber subsections (b)(28) through (b)(124) to account for the addition of multiple special waters to this section. Section 7.40, like Section 7.50, are listed by special water in alphabetical order to help anglers find the water they search for in this regulation. Amendments to other regulation sections have been made in this proposal to revise or remove unnecessary references to 7.40(b) and 7.50(b) due to the continual changes in the numbering of these sections when waters are added or removed. There are minor edits to text to align subsections 7.40(b) and 7.50(b) language with the Section 8.00 language that is part of this proposal, which will clarify boundaries in both sections where descriptions are unclear, provide consistent placement of text, and update subsection references between Section 8.00 and subsection 7.40(b), where needed. Subsection (b)(43)(D)(1) has been consolidated into subsection 7.40(b)(43)(D) to provide clarification and removal of the additional box and subsection (1). In subsection 7.40(b)(72)(C), the boundary feature has a name change from “Sonoma/Mendicino Boy Scout Council Camp” to “Camp Noyo” to reflect the name change of the property. For the Smith River, subsection 7.40(b)(108)(A) was added to match the language in proposed subsection 8.00(a)(4) describing the Smith River from the mouth to the confluence with Rowdy Creek; this amendment is proposed to align with the Smith River sections described in subsections 7.40(b)(108)(B) and (C).
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(90), McCloud River and Tributaries: This amendment would clean up, reorganize, and group streams with similar regulations in subsection 7.50(b)(90) for the McCloud River and tributaries; this would simplify the regulation, making it easier to understand by grouping waters with similar regulations.
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(146), Sq. Valley Creek: The name of Sq. Valley Creek was changed by federal legislation through the U.S. Department of Interior’s Order 3404 on September 8, 2022 to Yét Atwam Creek. The amendment would make the regulation text consistent with federal legislation.
- Section 230, subsection (g)(2): Issuance of Permits for Contests Offering Prize for the Taking of Game Fish: There is a minor grammar error in subsection 230(g)(2); the word “changes” would become “change.”

2. Amendments with effects to restrictions on sport fishing including seasons, size limits, and/or gear restrictions are discussed individually in this document. There is no substantial evidence that any of the proposed amendments will result in a significant effect on the environment.

- Sections 1.62, 28.25, 28.30, 28.32, and 28.35, Minimum and Maximum Size and Alternate Length and Species Specific Regulations: This proposed amendment would revise Section 1.62 to more clearly define the method to determine total length of fin fish. The change would clarify that total length is measured with the fish’s mouth closed, lying flat on a horizontal surface, and that the tail may be pinched, fanned, or naturally swung (see Figures 1-3 for a photograph of the tail positions). Fanning and swinging of a fish’s tail is expressly allowed for salmon and halibut but not specified in the general maximum length in Section 1.62. It has been a long-time practice for law enforcement officers to allow the fanning and swinging technique, but it is not consistently understood

by anglers. Importantly, crew onboard commercial passenger fishing vessels (CPFVs) have requested clarification, to ensure they are measuring passengers' fish correctly.

- The proposed amendment also includes revising the phrase “fish, mollusks or crustaceans” to “fin fish or invertebrates” and clarifies that measurement of invertebrate species is specified within the individual invertebrate regulations. The proposed amendment also includes revising existing language that refers to “mollusks, or crustaceans” to the term “invertebrates,” which is more inclusive and encompasses other groups like echinoderms. It clarifies that methods to determine length for invertebrates are found in the individual subsections for those species. Recreational fishing groups including American Sportfishing Association, Sportfishing Association of California, and Coastal Conservation Association of California were contacted and support these changes.
- The proposed amendment removes alternate length measurements from Section 1.62, and from the sections for barracuda, kelp and sand basses, and white sea bass (sections 28.25, 28.30, and 28.35, respectively). Alternate length is proposed to be removed as it causes unnecessary confusion and concerns with law enforcement. The allowance of retaining filleted fish (i.e., Section 27.65), with associated minimum fillet lengths provided for these species, makes the use of an alternate length unnecessary.
- Section 1.73, Salmon: This proposed amendment would require any person in possession of a recreationally taken salmon in which an adipose fin is present to provide the Department a tissue sample upon request. This includes the additional requirement of all persons fishing for salmon to provide a tissue sample from unmarked (i.e., adipose fin present) salmon upon request by an authorized agent or employee of the Department. Amending biological sample collection requirements allows for the use of Parentage-Based Tagging (PBT) in fisheries surveys advances fisheries monitoring in a number of ways. PBT is highly efficient, as the tagging process requires only genotyping the parents to produce a 100% tag rate of offspring, which can lead to higher tag recovery rates and improved statistical precision of estimates. Additionally, there is no physical tag loss or handling mortality associated with PBT; parentage assignments can be obtained non-lethally via a small tissue sample, and large-scale tagging can occur at a much lower cost compared to physical marking and tagging methods. This proposal would allow the Department to integrate PBT recovery data into the current salmon management framework, allowing tissue samples to be collected from unmarked salmon contacted in monitoring programs.
- Sections 1.74, 5.88, and 701, Steelhead Fishing Report and Restoration Card Changes: To better align with seasonal adult steelhead run timing, improve data management, and assess non-compliant reporting, the Commission proposes to amend the Steelhead Fishing Report and Restoration Card (Card; steelhead report card) reporting period from a 12-month calendar period to a 9-month reporting period. The adjusted Card reporting period would be August 1 through April 30 the following year, and required to be returned or reported to the Department by May 31. The Card would be required for anglers targeting any steelhead or Rainbow Trout in anadromous waters during this 9-month period. Anglers would be able to obtain the subsequent Card starting July 1 to

allow time for the Department to process the previous season's Cards returned by May 31. Any Card holder who fails to return or report by the May 31 deadline shall be subject to a non-refundable non-return fee, and will not be able to obtain the subsequent Card until that fee is paid. From May 1 through July 31 of each year, anglers would not need a Card to fish for steelhead or rainbow trout in anadromous waters.

- The amendments are necessary because there is currently lack of data collection and inability to analyze data in a timely fashion. Shifting the reporting months to mirror the 9-month period run timing of steelhead would allow the Department to process Cards more efficiently and have data readily available to inform management strategies for the steelhead fishery statewide. By shifting the reporting period to 9 months, the Department will have time between seasons to assess non-compliance and the opportunity to implement penalties prior to the issuance of the subsequent year's Card, including fees and prohibitions for non-compliant report card holders. This amendment is expected to increase reporting and therefore increase data quality.
- Section 2.10, Hook and Weight Restrictions: This proposed amendment would allow for the usage of a small lightweight weight directly attached below a hook and expansion of fishable waters with treble hooks on non-buoyant lures. The amendment of subsections 2.10(b)(3) and (4) would clarify regulations for the public and wildlife officers. The change to weights being allowed below a hook would not apply to lakes and reservoirs, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, or the Colorado River as outlined in subsection 2.10(b). The change to the use of treble hooks on non-buoyant lures would have an expanded boundary within the Valley District. The use of treble hooks on non-buoyant lures would be permissive in portions of the mainstem Sacramento, American, Feather, and Yuba rivers. The gear type allowed in the newly permissive sections would be limited to lures made of soft or hard plastics, or wood, which would reduce snagging risk to salmonid species while creating more opportunity for non-salmonid angling.
- Section 4.20, subsection (d), Bait Fish Use in the Sacramento River: The proposed amendment would move the upper boundary for bait fish on the Sacramento River from the Highway 32 Bridge upstream to Deschutes Road Bridge. Generally, declining fish populations associated with drought and climate change have limited many fishing opportunities. At the same time, Striped bass populations have expanded into more areas of the Sacramento River, especially after the Red Bluff Diversion Dam was permanently opened. This proposed change would allow live fin fish to be used further up the Sacramento River, which would increase fishing opportunities for striped bass and other non-native fishes that are currently limited to use of lures and other methods. It may also increase harvest of these non-native species, which could have a potential benefit on vulnerable salmonid populations.
- Section 5.00, subsection (b), Black Bass (Lassen and Modoc Co): The proposed amendment would remove the black bass minimum size requirement from waters in Lassen and Modoc counties, except for Mountain Meadows Reservoir where the minimum size would remain at 12 inches. Growth rates of largemouth bass are typically slow within Lassen and Modoc counties due to the shorter growing season in the region, attributable to the high elevation. Additionally, reservoirs containing large bass

populations are often overrun with stunted bass, and few bass are able to reach the 12-inch minimum size requirement for harvest. The 12-inch minimum size requirement reduces the number of harvested bass, which could affect the bass populations by further stunting their growth. Removing the minimum size requirement in these locations would increase the harvest of smaller bass and improve the size class structure within the bass populations. Mountain Meadows Reservoir is still recovering from being drained in 2015 and has the potential to grow trophy class bass as it has in the past. The 12-inch minimum size requirement at Mountain Meadows Reservoir would be maintained under the General Statewide Restrictions regulations allowing the bass population to grow, and allow more young bass to grow to the 12-inch size minimum and larger. Subsection numbers (b)(3) through (b)(14) have been re-numbered to allow for the two counties added into this section.

- Section 6.35 and subsection 7.00(b)(2), Sierra District Definition and District General Regulations: This proposed amendment would modify the Sierra district boundary in Section 6.35 to include a small section of Yuba County (“Yuba County east of New Bullards Bar Dam;”) to protect experimentally reintroduced Chinook salmon. This change would also close Chinook salmon fishing in the North Fork Feather River above Chester Diversion Dam, and on the North Yuba River above New Bullards Bar Dam all year in subsection 7.00(b)(2). This proposal also adds two specific subsections in Section 7.00, the Sierra District (adding (b)(3) and (b)(4), the North Fork Feather River above Chester Diversion Dam, and on the North Yuba River above New Bullards Bar Dam, which will be closed to Chinook salmon fishing all year). Scientific studies are currently being implemented within the North Fork Feather River, led by the California Department of Water Resources, and in the North Yuba River, led by the Department, evaluating Spring-Run Chinook salmon reintroduction to these historical habitats. Changing the regulation to close fishing of Chinook salmon at all times of the year in these waterways will allow for study fish through various developmental stages (eggs, alevin, fry, parr, smolt, adult) to remain in the study area informing study results and reintroduction efforts.
- Section 7.00, subsection (b)(2), District General Regulations—Sierra District (Shasta and Tehama Co.): This proposed amendment would increase fishing opportunity by allowing the use of bait during summer months within anadromous streams in Shasta and Tehama counties when anadromous fish are not present.
- Sections 7.00, 7.40(b), 7.50(b), and 8.00, Low-Flow Regulation Changes: This proposed amendment would reorganize, condense, and clean up the language in the low-flow regulations, standardize the identification of stream gauges, and remove streams from 8.00 that lack low-flow criteria.
 - Section 7.00, District General Regulations: This amendment would add Section 8.00, which lists low-flow restrictions to the paragraph about existing restrictions (such as methods, gear, fishing hours, and use of bait) when angling in District waters. This amendment would remove ambiguities associated with anglers following regulations for low flow conditions, as well as wildlife officers enforcing fishing regulation violations.

- Section 7.40, subsection (b) and 7.50 subsection (b), Updates to Special Water Bodies regarding Low-Flow: Proposed amendments throughout the special waters tables in subsections 7.40(b) and 7.50(b) serve to better align subsection 7.40(b) language with the updated Section 8.00 language that is part of this proposal. Organizational changes, such as moving the text “...Also see Section 8.00(a, b, or c) Low Flow Restrictions” to the end of the “Body of Water” description improves consistency informing the angler to be aware of low-flow considerations for the re-organized subsections 8.00(a), (b), or (c). These amendments are necessary to clarify boundaries in both sections where descriptions are unclear, provide consistent placement of text, and update subsection references between 8.00, 7.40(b), and 7.50(b) as needed. In subsection (b) for Arroyo Seco Corralitos Creek, Llagas Creek, Pajaro River, Salinas River and tributaries, Uvas or Carnadero Creek references to Section 8.00 are removed, as these waters are proposed to be removed from the Low Flow restrictions due to lack of low flow threshold.
- Section 8.00, Low-Flow Restrictions: A new website for low-flow fishing restrictions was launched in early 2025, which brought more attention to the language and content in Section 8.00. Subsections 8.00(a) and (b), which previously directed anglers to different regional phone lines, may now be combined and condensed into the revised subsection 8.00(a) now that there is an online platform during the time period of September 1 through April 30. Subsection 8.00(c) for the San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and Monterey county water bodies is restructured to the revised subsection 8.00(b). These amendments will make the regulations easier to understand, thereby reducing angler confusion.
 - New subsection 8.00(a): consolidate and update the low-flow conditions for river and stream closures including those water bodies listed from north to south within Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma, Napa, and Marin counties.
 - New subsection 8.00(b): consolidate and update the low-flow conditions for river and stream closures including those water bodies listed from north to south within San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and Monterey counties.
- The proposed amendments to subsections 8.00(a)(1) through (3) and (b)(1) through (3), would allow the ability to make split block decisions instead of solid block decisions. Allowing split block decisions has the potential to provide additional opportunity by adding angling days and reduce angler frustration. Split block decisions will allow the Department to be more flexible and precise in applying closures only to days when flows are predicted to fall below minimum thresholds.
- Arroyo Seco Corralitos Creek, Llagas Creek, Pajaro River, Salinas River and tributaries, Uvas or Carnadero Creek are proposed to be removed from Section 8.00 as these waters currently lack low flow thresholds. Until the Department

determines the appropriate low flow thresholds, these waters do not need to be listed in the restricted list. Additionally, some waters in Section 7.40 reference Section 8.00 even though these waters are not, and have not been, proposed to be added to Section 8.00. For clarity, the proposed amendments to subsections would also remove the waters that were listed in error (see proposed subsections 7.40(b)(108)(C)(2) and (D)(3)).

- The proposed amendments includes language and grammar clean-up, as well as some changes to standardize the naming of stream gauges and consistency in boundaries between 7.40 and 8.00, update to location names (Usal Road and correcting spelling of George Tryon Bridge) and a property name change (Camp Noyo).
- Section 7.40
 - Subsection (b)(11), Battle Creek (Shasta and Tehama Co.): Re-open lower Battle Creek from 1,250 feet below Coleman Fish Hatchery weir to its confluence with the Sacramento June 30 to December 31, with the restriction “Only artificial lures with barbless hooks may be used.” This amendment would provide recreational angling opportunity for native and non-native warmwater fish species and hatchery-origin trout and steelhead.
 - Lower Battle Creek from the mouth to Coleman Fish Hatchery weir is currently closed to angling year-round. Allowing angler access to lower Battle Creek beginning June 30 will increase fishing opportunities on striped and black bass. Battle Creek was historically a popular steelhead fishery but was closed to angling in the early 1990’s to ensure that Coleman National Fish Hatchery would annually secure sufficient adult steelhead broodstock.
 - Returns of hatchery-origin steelhead to Coleman National Fish Hatchery are now routinely in excess of broodstock collection targets. Presently, these fish are only available to recreational anglers in the mainstem Sacramento River. However, due to a variety of factors, contact with these fish in the mainstem Sacramento River is extremely low. Furthermore, the mainstem Sacramento River steelhead fishery is primarily boat-based. Shore-based steelhead fishing on lower Battle Creek would provide opportunity to much broader angling interest groups.
 - The harvest of Coleman Hatchery steelhead is expected to be minimal based on observed creel data from neighboring hatchery steelhead fisheries on the American and Feather Rivers due to angler preference for catch and release angling.
 - Subsections (b)(28), (35),(37), (74): Addition of Creeks with Special Regulations: This proposed amendment would add new special regulation sections for Clear Creek (added as subsection (b)(28)), Cow Creek (added as subsection (b)(37)), Cottonwood Creek (added as subsection (b)(35)), and Paynes Creek (added as subsection (b)(74)). This amendment would also change the Antelope Creek

- boundary under (b)(5) from the confluence with the North Fork downstream to Ponderosa Way crossing on the North Fork and South Fork to make angling more protective for Central Valley steelhead in this subsection. Local fishing opportunities are currently very limited due to a variety of overlapping regulations, some of which are not necessary. Allowing the public, especially children, to catch warm water fish with bait in anadromous streams in the middle of the summer when anadromous fish species are not present would be very beneficial to the public and the Department's Recruit, Retain, Reactivate (R3) goals. With the exception of Clear Creek, Cow Creek, Cottonwood Creek, and Paynes Creek, the majority anadromous tributaries have specific protective regulations already present in 7.40; adding Clear Creek, Cow Creek, Cottonwood Creek, and Paynes Creek will complete this protective set of regulations. These additions result in renumbering most of subsection 7.40(b) bodies of water to maintain the alphabetical listing.
- Subsection (b)(40)(A)1. and 2., Eel River: This proposed amendment would update the gear restriction boundary to align with more recognizable features, providing clarity for both anglers and law enforcement. The boundary line would change from the mouth of the Eel River to Fulmor Road, and instead be the mouth to Cock Robin Island, resulting in a slight shift downstream (~.5 miles).
 - Subsection (b)(50), Klamath River Basin Regulations: This proposed amendment would increase fishing opportunity in the Klamath River by allowing catch and release fishing within anadromous sections of the mainstem Klamath River from the Copco Road bridge at Copco to Lakeview Road bridge near Iron Gate (Siskiyou County). The open season would be a summer season from the fourth Saturday in May through August 31, with a restriction that only artificial lures with barbless hooks may be used. Additional restrictions include a zero harvest limit for hatchery trout and steelhead as well as being closed to the take and possession of Chinook Salmon. This change would provide recreational angling opportunity for freshwater fish during the summer months within the Klamath Dam Removal project area. The proposed summer season regulations would provide consistency with currently open waters adjacent to and upstream of this subsection.
- Section 7.50
 - Subsection (b)(6), Arroyo Seco River (Monterey Co.): On the Arroyo Seco River, above the waterfall located approximately 3.5 miles above the U.S. Forest Service Ranger Station, change the trout bag limit from 5 trout to 5 brown trout and 0 rainbow trout, and add a Special Restriction of "only artificial lures with barbless hooks may be used". The upper Arroyo Seco River contains a population of native coastal rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), offering a unique sport fishing opportunity in the Salinas River watershed in Monterey County. Like other trout populations throughout California, this population of native coastal rainbow trout has likely been negatively impacted by increasingly severe drought conditions. The population has also likely been impacted by degradation of instream habitat conditions due to recent wildfires, such as the

Dolan fire. The current fishing regulations allow for the harvest of 5 trout per person per day above the waterfall on the Arroyo Seco River. The upper Arroyo Seco River is in close proximity to urban areas; thus, with the current 5 trout bag limit, there is the potential for high angler harvest of coastal rainbow trout. The lack of a gear restriction for trout currently allows the potential for high deep-hooking and catch and release mortality rates that can be associated with the use of bait and barbed hooks when angling non-anadromous salmonids. Additionally, the upper Arroyo Seco contains a non-native population of brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) which offers sport fishing opportunities, though they may negatively impact native coastal rainbow trout through competition and predation. Changing the upper Arroyo Seco trout regulations to a 5 brown trout and 0 rainbow trout bag limit, with a restriction of only artificial lures with barbless hooks, will protect the rainbow trout fishery while allowing anglers the option of harvesting non-native brown trout.

- Subsection (b)(47), Fall River Complex (Shasta and Siskiyou Co.): This proposed amendment would remove subsections (47)(L) Fall River Pond and (47)(M) Fall River Lake from subsection 7.50(b)(47) Fall River Complex (Shasta and Siskiyou counties). The removal of these two paragraphs Fall River Pond and Fall River Lake from subsection 7.50(b) means that these stretches of waters would then fall under subsection 5.85(a)(1), which outlines the statewide general trout regulations for take allowances. Owing to the removal of subsections (b)(47)(L) and (b)(47)(M), the language for subsection (b)(47)(A) is shifted from the confluence of the Fall River with the Pit River, to Pit No. 1 PG&E Diversion Dam.
 - The Fall River is a unique river in that it is fed by multiple natural springs (i.e., spring-fed system) and is a prime trout fishing water. The “Fall River Complex” was added to the freshwater sport fishing regulations in 2021. The angling regulation addition coincided with an expansion of the Fall River wild trout designation. Department justified the addition and expansion by citing its unique spring-fed system and genetic differences and life histories among rainbow trout within the Fall River system, which is a research project led by U.C. Davis with assistance from the Department. The regulation was put in place to provide protections for rainbow trout in the Fall River Complex and was the result of litigation by the Fall River Conservancy. Fall River Pond and Fall River Lake were not included in the U.C. Davis research and there is limited data to suggest that rainbow trout from the Fall River Complex mix with rainbow trout in Fall River Lake and Fall River Pond, so the inclusion of these two locations is not necessary. The current regulations have been unpopular with anglers, and research suggests they are not effective in protecting the population of rainbow trout that was intended to be protected by this regulation. CalTrout, Trout Unlimited, and Fall River Conservancy have sent support letters for the proposed change.
- Subsection (b)(90), McCloud River and Tributaries (Shasta and Siskiyou Co.): This proposed amendment would add Trout Creek into subsection 7.50(b)(90),

McCloud River and Tributaries under proposed paragraph (G), to provide angling regulation protections for McCloud River Redband Trout (MRRT), consistent with other streams in the MRRT refugium. Trout Creek is identified as a high priority conservation stream but not included as a “Core Conservation Stream” in MRRT Conservation Agreement (CA) (2017). Confounding genetic results prior to the completion of the CA was the justification for Trout Creek to be excluded as a core conservation stream. However, since the genetics results, the Department has identified a “95% barrier” where MRRT collected upstream of the barrier were shown to be genetically distinct, and rainbow trout collected downstream of the barrier were shown to be slightly introgressed (rainbow trout cross with MRRT). Additionally, non-native brown trout are found downstream of the barrier but not upstream. The Department is currently working with the private landowner to improve the 95% barrier to ensure introgressed and non-native trout are unable to pass upstream at all flows, thence protecting the genetically distinct population upstream. In addition to improving the barrier, angling regulation changes are necessary to provide further protection for this population. Other organizational changes are made to group streams with similar regulations for clarity purposes. Former 7.50(b)(90)(C) Swamp Creek is re-numbered to paragraph (F) to occur below those creeks in the McCloud River watershed that are closed to all fishing all year. With the addition of Trout Creek and all tributaries as proposed paragraph (G), the remaining paragraphs for subsection 7.50(b)(90) are re-numbered.

- Subsection (b)(149), Susan River (Lassen Co.) and Section 8.10, Susan River Youth Derby: This proposed amendment would revert fishing regulations to the previous trout opener (last Saturday in April through November 15) that was updated by previous amendment in 2020 (OAL file #2020-1204-02s). The amendment would also update language to include a special open season for youth participating in the Youth Fishing Derby in Section 8.10 to start prior to the proposed earlier season start. Reverting to the traditional trout season will increase angler opportunity by lengthening the season in the spring and shortening the winter season. During much of the winter the river is typically unfishable (due to ice and snow), so the winter provides little to no opportunity. Water in the Susan River can warm significantly in the late spring and early summer, as releases from McCoy Flat and Hog Flat reservoirs increase. Having the season open earlier will provide more opportunity while angling conditions are good, while not impacting spawning.

The Findings

The Commission subjected the draft negative declaration to its own review and analysis. Based on that review and analysis, the draft reflects the independent judgment of the Commission and fulfills the Commission’s responsibilities. 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 Sport Fishing
- Initial Study Environmental Checklist Form
- Explanation of the Responses to the Initial Study Environmental Checklist Form

Project Description and Background Information For Proposed Amendments to Sport Fishing 2026

Introduction

Annually the Department recommends updates to sport fishing regulations, which the Commission generally notices as the Commission's proposed amendments to its regulations consistent with the California Administrative Procedure Act. The proposed amendments are considered and evaluated by the Commission during three scheduled public hearings. The Commission makes the final determination on what amendments to the regulations should be adopted at the Commission's adoption hearing. The Commission is the lead agency for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for this project. Under California Fish and Game Code Section 200, the Commission has the authority to regulate the taking or possession of fish, including take for the purpose of sport fishing.

Project Goals and Objectives

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

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

Background

The Department recommends amendments to inland sport fishing regulations, generally every year. For the 2025 proposed amendments, the decision was made to postpone a rulemaking due to staff limitations. Therefore, this project includes amendments for two years of recommendations. Additionally, the Department chose to consolidate a marine-inclusive sport fish regulation amendment into this project.

Project Location

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

Schedule

If adopted by the Commission at its August 12-13, 2026, meeting, and approved by the Office of Administrative Law, the proposed regulatory amendments are expected to go into effect on January 1, 2027.

Environmental Checklist Form

1. Project Title:
Sport Fishing Regulations Update
Title 14, California Code of Regulations
2. Lead Agency Name and Address:
California Fish and Game Commission
715 P Street, 16th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
3. Contact Person and Phone Number:
Melissa Miller-Henson, (916) 653-4899
4. Project Location:
Inland and ocean waters of California.
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Fisheries Branch
1010 Riverside Parkway
West Sacramento, CA 95605
6. General Plan designation:
N/A (statewide)
7. Zoning:
N/A (statewide)
8. Description of Project:
The California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) proposes to amend Title 14 sections related to sport fishing for the 2026 sport fishing regulatory cycle. The proposal contains multiple amendments that would clarify sport fishing regulations, increase angler opportunities, change gear requirements, change fish measurement and sampling protocols, improve the steelhead report card and low-flow regulations, and protect vulnerable fish populations. The proposed amendments are needed to effectively manage California's sport fisheries, and correct errors and inaccuracies in the existing regulations to reduce public confusion and improve regulatory enforcement. The amendments are necessary to maintain consistency with the Commission's mission to ensure that California will have abundant, healthy, and diverse fish and wildlife that thrive within dynamic ecosystems, managed with public confidence and participation, through actions that are thoughtful, bold, and visionary in an ever-changing environment.
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? On January 14, 2026, the Commission mailed a tribal notification to Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area. No tribes have requested consultation.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| ☐ Aesthetics | ☐ Agriculture and 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 Miller-Henson, Executive Director

July 13, 2026

Date

Responses to Initial Study Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
I. Aesthetics. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	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

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (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

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (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
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

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (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
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

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (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
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (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?	☐	☐	LTS	☐
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:				

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
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
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:				

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
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
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

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (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	☐	☐	☐	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
XIV. Population and Housing. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	NI
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	NI
XV. Public Services. Would the project:				
a) 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	☐	☐	☐	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	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)?	☐	☐	LTS	☐
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
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	☐	☐	☐	NI

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or				
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☐	☐	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	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.				

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation (LTSM)	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact (NI)
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	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 alteration, or modification of any buildings or structures.
- b) The project will not damage scenic resources such as trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or modification of any buildings or structures.
- c) The project will not substantially degrade, in nonurbanized areas, the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or modification of any buildings or structures.
- d) The project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

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

III. Air Quality

- a) The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- b) The project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. Such an impact will not occur because the project involves no ongoing sources of air pollution.
- c) The project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not increase pollutant concentrations.
- d) The project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

IV. Biological Resources

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

The following amendments are administrative in nature and would have no effect on biological resources:

- Section 2.11, Special Fishing Methods – Lake County.
- Section 5.65, Shad, American.
- Section 5.85, subsection (a)(2), Trout.
- Section 6.34, Southern District Definition.
- Section 7.40, subsection (b):
 - Renumber subsections (b)(28) through (b)(124)
 - Consolidate subsection 7.40(b)(43)(D)
 - (72)(C), boundary feature name change
 - Addition of 7.40(b)(108)(A)
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(146), Sq. Valley Creek.
- Section 230, subsection (g)(2)

Amendments to fishing regulations which would have no impact or a beneficial impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species:

- Sections 1.62, 28.25, 28.30, 28.32, and 28.35, Minimum and Maximum Size and Alternate Length and Species Specific Regulations.
- Section 1.73, Salmon.
- Sections 1.74, 5.88, and 701, Steelhead Fishing Report and Restoration Card Changes. Potential to minimally decrease steelhead fishing effort, no expected impact to species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species.
- Section 5.00, subsection (b), Black Bass (Lassen and Modoc Co.).
- Section 6.35 and subsection 7.00(b)(2), Sierra District Definition and District General Regulations. This change would protect Spring-Run Chinook Salmon.
- Sections 7.00, 7.40(b), 7.50(b), and 8.00, Low-Flow Regulation Changes.
- Section 7.40, subsection (b)(40)(A)1. and 2., Eel River.
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(6), Arroyo Seco River (Monterey County):
 - The project proposes to eliminate harvest of Rainbow Trout in the Arroyo Seco River. The purpose of this amendment is to protect native Coastal Rainbow Trout which has likely been negatively impacted by increasingly severe drought conditions and by degradation of instream habitat conditions due to recent wildfires, such as the Dolan fire. The current fishing regulations allow for the harvest of 5 trout per person per day above the waterfall on the Arroyo Seco River. The upper Arroyo Seco River is in relatively close proximity to urban areas; thus, with the current 5 trout bag limit, there is the potential for high angler harvest of Coastal Rainbow Trout. The lack of a gear restriction for trout currently allows the potential for high deep-hooking and catch and release mortality rates that can be associated with the use of bait and barbed hooks when angling non-anadromous salmonids.
 - Further, Rainbow Trout produced above the Arroyo Seco Gorge are likely capable of travelling downstream of the waterfall (possible total barrier to upstream migration) to the Salinas River, and eventually the Pacific Ocean, possibly supplementing anadromous federally threatened South-Central California Coast steelhead productivity in the Salinas River watershed. This amendment will have a beneficial effect on native Coastal Rainbow Trout and a potential beneficial effect on South-Central California Coast Steelhead Trout.
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(47), Fall River Complex (Shasta and Siskiyou Co.).
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(90), McCloud River and Tributaries:

- The project proposes to add Trout Creek to the Special Fishing Regulations for Trout which would shorten the current fishing season from year-round to the Saturday preceding Memorial Day through the last day in February. The current daily bag and possession limits of 5 fish and 10 fish, respectively, would be reduced to zero (i.e., catch and release only). This amendment will provide angling protections for McCloud River Redband Trout which is a California Species of Special Concern. This amendment will have a beneficial effect on McCloud River Redband Trout.
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(149), Susan River (Lassen Co.) and Section 8.10, Susan River Youth Derby.

Amendments to fishing regulations that would have less than significant impact on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species:

- Section 2.10, Hook and Weight Restrictions: This proposed amendment would allow for the usage of a small lightweight weight directly attached below a hook and expansion of fishable waters with treble hooks on non-buoyant lures. The amendment of subsections 2.10(b)(3) and (4) would clarify regulations for the public and wildlife officers. The change to weights being allowed below a hook would not apply to lakes and reservoirs, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, or the Colorado River as outlined in subsection 2.10(b). The change to the use of treble hooks on non-buoyant lures would have an expanded boundary within the Valley District. The use of treble hooks on non-buoyant lures would be permissive in portions of the mainstem Sacramento, American, Feather, and Yuba rivers. Although listed fish species including Central Valley Steelhead, Central Valley spring-run Chinook Salmon, and Sacramento River winter-run Chinook Salmon occur the project area, these species are unlikely to be present when the use of treble hooks are allowed. The gear type allowed in the newly permissive sections would be limited to lures made of soft or hard plastics, or wood, which would reduce snagging risk to salmonid species while creating more opportunity for non-salmonid angling. It may also increase harvest on non-native predatory fish species, which could have a potential benefit on salmonid populations. Under the proposed project, these listed species will be protected by gear restrictions that reduce fish mortality if one of these listed species is inadvertently caught, and if caught, these fish must be returned to the water immediately. This proposed amendment is expected to have a less than significant effect on listed fish species.
- Section 4.20, subsection (d), Bait Fish Use in the Sacramento River: The proposed amendment would move the upper boundary for bait fish on the Sacramento River from the Highway 32 Bridge upstream to Deschutes Road Bridge. This proposed change would allow live fin fish to be used further up the Sacramento River which would increase fishing opportunities for striped

bass and other non-native fishes that are currently limited to use of lures and other methods. Federally and state listed fish species including Central Valley spring-run Chinook Salmon and Sacramento River winter-run Chinook Salmon occur in the Sacramento River in the region of river where use of live bait is currently allowed. These two listed species are not known to be incidentally taken by anglers using live fin fish for bait in the river sections currently open to use of live bait. Moving the upper boundary for bait fish on the Sacramento River from the Highway 32 Bridge upstream to Deschutes Road Bridge is therefore not expected to result in increased incidental take of these species. The proposed amendment will have a less than significant effect on spring-run and winter-run Chinook Salmon.

- Section 7.00, subsection (b)(2), District General Regulations—Sierra District (Shasta and Tehama Co.): The proposed amendment would allow the use of bait during summer months within anadromous streams in Shasta and Tehama counties when anadromous fish are not present. This change applies to those anadromous streams not listed in the Special Fishing Regulations for Salmon and Steelhead and these streams are closed to salmon fishing year-round. Central Valley spring-run Chinook Salmon which are federally and state-listed as threatened, could occur in anadromous streams in Shasta and Tehama counties but are generally not present during the summer months when the use of bait would be allowed. The majority of Central Valley spring-run Chinook Salmon spawning occurs in Butte, Mill, and Deer creeks which have special fishing regulations to protect spring-run Chinook Salmon. Allowing use of bait within anadromous streams in Shasta and Tehama counties at appropriate times when anadromous fish are not present will increase angling opportunity for non-listed native and non-native warmwater fish species that are present in these streams. It may also increase harvest on non-native predatory fish species, which could have a potential benefit on salmonid populations. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on Central Valley spring-run Chinook Salmon.
- Section 7.40, subsection (b)(11), Battle Creek (Shasta and Tehama Co.): The proposed project would re-open lower Battle Creek from 1,250 feet below Coleman Fish Hatchery weir to its confluence with the Sacramento River from June 30 to December 31, with the restriction that only artificial lures with barbless hooks may be used. This change would provide recreational angling opportunities for native and non-native warmwater fish species and hatchery-origin trout and steelhead. Listed fish species that occur in the project area include endangered winter-run Chinook Salmon, threatened spring-run Chinook Salmon and federally threatened Central Valley Steelhead. Although these listed species could occur in the project area between June and December, Battle Creek is and will remain closed to the take of Chinook Salmon and wild steelhead year-round. Under the proposed project, these listed species will be protected by gear restrictions that reduce fish mortality if

one of these listed species is inadvertently caught during the proposed open fishing season for warmwater fishes and hatchery trout. If caught, these fish must be returned to the water immediately. This proposed amendment is expected to have a less than significant effect on listed fish species.

- Section 7.40(b), Addition of Creeks to the Special Fishing Regulations: Cow Creek, Cottonwood Creek, and Paynes Creek are tributaries to the Sacramento River and are habitat for threatened Central Valley Steelhead. The regulations for these creeks currently fall under the Sierra District Regulations and are open to fishing from the Last Saturday in April through Nov 15th, with a gear restriction of “only artificial lures with barbless hooks may be used.” To increase fishing opportunities, the project would remove the artificial lures only gear restriction between June 16th and September 30th in the lower reaches of these streams to allow the use of bait during the summer months when anadromous fish species are not present. The proposed amendments will have a less than significant effect on Central Valley Steelhead.
 - Section 7.40, subsection (b)(50), Klamath River Basin Regulations: The proposed project would allow catch and release fishing within anadromous sections of the main stem Klamath River from the Copco Road bridge at Copco to Lakeview Road bridge near Iron Gate (Siskiyou County). The open season would be a summer season from the fourth Saturday in May through August 31, with a restriction that only artificial lures with barbless hooks may be used. Additional restrictions include a zero harvest limit for hatchery trout and steelhead as well as being closed to the take and possession of Chinook Salmon. This change would provide recreational angling opportunity for freshwater fish during the summer months within the Klamath Dam Removal project area. Federal and state listed fish species including Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast Coho Salmon and Upper Klamath/Trinity River Spring-Run Chinook Salmon occur in the project area but are generally not present in the summer months when fishing would be allowed. These amendments will have a less than significant effect on Coho Salmon and spring-run Chinook Salmon.
- b) The project will not have an adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies and regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the USFWS. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- c) The project will not have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

- d) The project will not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- e) The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not result in any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- f) The project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

V. Cultural Resources

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

VI. Energy

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

VII. Geology and Soils

- a i) The project will not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area, or based on other substantial evidence

of a known fault. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not create any structures for human habitation.

- ii) The project will not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not create any structures for human habitation.
- iii) The project will not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not create any structures for human habitation.
- iv) The project will not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not create any structures for human habitation.
- b) The project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve ground disturbing work.
- c) The project will not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable and potentially result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve ground disturbing work.
- d) The project will not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve ground disturbing work.
- e) The project will not create any sources of waste water requiring a septic system.
- f) The project will not indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- a) The project will have a less than significant impact on the indirect generation of greenhouse gas emissions and will not have a significant impact on the environment. The project will not involve construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

The following amendments are administrative in nature and would have no effect on GHG emissions:

- Section 2.11, Special Fishing Methods – Lake County.
- Section 5.65, Shad, American.
- Section 5.85, subsection (a)(2), Trout.
- Section 6.34, Southern District Definition.

- Section 7.40, subsection (b):
 - Renumber subsections (b)(28) through (b)(124)
 - Consolidate subsection 7.40(b)(43)(D)
 - (72)(C), boundary feature name change
 - Addition of 7.40(b)(108)(A)
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(146), Sq. Valley Creek.
- Section 230, subsection (g)(2)

Changes to fishing regulations which would have no impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on GHG emissions. The proposed amendments listed below are not expected to increase the number of fishing trips to these waters.

- Sections 1.62, 28.25, 28.30, 28.32, and 28.35, Minimum and Maximum Size and Alternate Length and Species Specific Regulations.
- Section 1.73, Salmon.
- Sections 1.74, 5.88, and 701, Steelhead Fishing Report and Restoration Card Changes.
- Section 2.10, Hook and Weight Restrictions.
- Section 5.00, subsection (b), Black Bass (Lassen and Modoc Counties).
 - The fishing seasons and bag limits on these waters will not change. As a result, the project is not expected to result in additional angler/visitor trips to these waters. Therefore, the project would not have an impact on GHG emissions.
- Section 6.35 and subsection 7.00(b)(2), Sierra District Definition and District General Regulations.
- Sections 7.00, 7.40(b), 7.50(b), and 8.00, Low-Flow Regulation Changes.
- Section 7.40, subsection (b)(40)(A)1. and 2., Eel River.
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(6), Arroyo Seco River (Monterey County).
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(90), McCloud River and Tributaries.

Amendments to fishing regulations that would have less than significant impact on GHG emissions:

- Section 4.20, subsection (d) Bait Fish Use in the Sacramento River: The proposed project would move the upper boundary for bait fish on the Sacramento River from the Highway 32 Bridge upstream to Deschutes Road Bridge. This proposed change would allow live fin fish to be used further up the Sacramento River which would increase fishing opportunities for striped bass and other non-native fishes that are currently limited to use of lures and other methods. This amendment could result in increased angler trips/visits to the Sacramento River because the use of live fin fish would increase angler success. Vehicles that use fuel will be used to access these waters and their internal combustion engines will produce some greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Although the number of anglers that may take advantage of this new recreational fishing opportunity on the Sacramento River is unknown, the number of additional angler trips will most likely be low. Thus, the project's

impact of GHG emissions produced by the use of vehicles will be less than significant.

- Section 7.00, subsection (b)(2), District General Regulations – Sierra District (Shasta and Tehama Counties): The proposed project would allow the use of bait during summer months within anadromous streams in Shasta and Tehama counties when anadromous fish are not present. This amendment could result in increased angler trips/visits to these waters because the use of live fin fish would increase angler success. Vehicles that use fuel will be used to access these waters and their internal combustion engines will produce some GHG emissions. Although the number of anglers that may take advantage of this new recreational fishing opportunity at these waters is unknown, the number of additional angler trips will most likely be low. Thus, the project's impacts on GHG emissions produced by the use of vehicles will be less than significant.
- Section 7.40, subsection (b)(11), Battle Creek (Shasta and Tehama Co.): The proposed project would re-open lower Battle Creek from 1,250 feet below Coleman Fish Hatchery weir to its confluence with the Sacramento River from June 30 to December 31, with the restriction that only artificial lures with barbless hooks may be used. This change would provide recreational angling opportunities for native and non-native warmwater fish species and hatchery-origin trout and steelhead. Vehicles that use fuel will be used to access these waters and their internal combustion engines will produce some GHG emissions. While increased local participation is expected, anglers are not expected to travel from farther away. Therefore, the small amount of GHG emissions resulting from the project would represent a very small increase over emissions occurring under existing regulations and, thus, will have a less than significant impact.
- Section 7.40, subsection (b)(50), Klamath River Basin Regulations: The proposed project would allow catch and release fishing within anadromous sections of the main stem Klamath River from the Copco Road bridge at Copco to Lakeview Road bridge near Iron Gate (Siskiyou County) from the fourth Saturday in May through August 31. Prior to the Klamath Dam Removal project, recreational anglers fished in Iron Gate and Copco reservoirs for warmwater fish species such as largemouth bass, black and white crappie, green sunfish, catfish, and others. With the removal of Iron Gate, Copco 1, and Copco 2 dams, most of the project area has become anadromous waters with a coldwater fisheries including Chinook Salmon and steelhead trout. Although the number of anglers that may take advantage of this new recreational fishing opportunity on the upper Klamath River is unknown, increased participation is expected. Vehicles that use fuel will be used to access these waters during the angling season, and their internal combustion engines will produce some emissions. The project area is located in Siskiyou County, which is a sparsely populated, rural region in Northern California. Due to the remoteness of the project area, the number of

additional angler trips to the project area will most likely be low. Thus, the impact of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions produced by the use of vehicles will be negligible. Additionally, the transition from a warmwater fishery on Iron Gate and Copco reservoirs where powerboats are used year-round to access productive fishing spots to a coldwater fishery on the Klamath River where drift boats are used, will likely result in a negligible or net decrease over emissions occurring under existing regulations and, thus, will have a less than significant impact.

- Section 7.40(b), Addition of Creeks to the Special Fishing Regulations: The proposal to remove the “artificial lure” requirement on Cow Creek, Cottonwood Creek, and Paynes Creek during the summer months could result in additional angler trips to these waters. Vehicles that use fuel will be used to access these waters and their internal combustion engines will produce some GHG emissions. However, the number of additional fishing trips to these waters is anticipated to be low because these waters are located in remote and sparsely populated areas of the state. Therefore, the small amount of GHG emissions resulting from the project would represent a very small increase over emissions occurring under existing regulations and, thus, will a less than significant impact.
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(47), Fall River Complex (Shasta and Siskiyou Co.): The project proposes to increase the daily bag and possession limits for trout on Fall River Lake and Fall River Pond from zero fish to a five fish daily bag limit and a 10 fish possession limit from the last Saturday in April through November 15th. As a result, the project could result in additional angler trips to each water between April and November. Vehicles that use fuel will be used to access these waters and their internal combustion engines will produce some GHG emissions. However, the number of additional fishing trips to these waters is anticipated to be low because these waters are located in remote and sparsely populated areas of the state. Therefore, the small amount of GHG emissions resulting from the project would represent a very small increase over emissions occurring under existing regulations and, thus, will not have a less than significant impact on GHG emissions.
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(149), Susan River (Lassen Co.) and Section 8.10, Susan River Youth Derby: The proposal to revert the fishing regulations to the previous trout opener (Last Saturday in April through November 15th) will increase angler opportunity by lengthening the season in the spring and shortening the winter season. The project will likely result in additional fishing trips to the Susan River because of the extended fishing season. Vehicles that use fuel will be used to access the Susan River and their internal combustion engines will produce some greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Although the number of anglers that may take advantage of this new recreational fishing opportunity at Susan River is unknown, the number of additional angler trips will most likely be low. Thus, the impact of GHG emissions produced by the use of vehicles will be less than significant.

- b) The project will not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The project would result in the production of very low greenhouse gas emissions.

IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

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

X. Hydrology and Water Quality

- a) The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, water use, or water discharge.
- b) The project will not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or groundwater use.
- c i) The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces in a manner which would result in substantial erosion

or siltation on- or off-site because the project will not involve any construction or land alteration.

- ii) The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site because the project will not involve any construction or land alteration.
- iii) The project will not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm-water drainage systems, or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff because the project will not involve any construction or land alteration.
- iv) The project will not impede or redirect flood flows because the project will not involve any construction or land alteration.
- d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, the project would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation because the project would not involve any construction or land alteration.
- e) The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or groundwater use.

XI. Land Use and Planning

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

XII. Mineral Resources

- a) The project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.
- b) The project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Such an impact will not occur because the project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or land use changes.

XIII. Noise

- a) The project will not result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. The project will not involve construction or physical alteration of land, and its implementation will not generate noise levels in excess of agency standards.
- b) The project will not result in generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. The project will not involve construction or physical alteration of land.
- c) The project will not be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

XIV. Population and Housing

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

XV. Public Services

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

XVI. Recreation

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

The following amendments are administrative in nature and would have no effect on recreational facilities:

- Section 2.11, Special Fishing Methods – Lake County.
- Section 5.65, Shad, American.
- Section 5.85, subsection (a)(2), Trout.
- Section 6.34, Southern District Definition.
- Section 7.40, subsection (b):
 - Renumber subsections (b)(28) through (b)(124)

- Consolidate subsection 7.40(b)(43)(D)
- (72)(C), boundary feature name change
- Addition of 7.40(b)(108)(A)
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(146), Sq. Valley Creek.
- Section 230, subsection (g)(2)

Amendments to fishing regulations which would have no impact on recreational facilities. The proposed amendments listed below are not expected to increase the number of fishing trips to these waters.

- Sections 1.62, 28.25, 28.30, 28.32, and 28.35, Minimum and Maximum Size and Alternate Length and Species Specific Regulations.
- Section 1.73, Salmon.
- Sections 1.74, 5.88, and 701, Steelhead Fishing Report and Restoration Card Changes.
- Section 2.10, Hook and Weight Restrictions.
- Section 5.00, subsection (b), Black Bass (Lassen and Modoc Counties):
 - The fishing seasons and bag limits on these waters will not change. As a result, the project is not expected to result in additional angler/visitor trips to these waters. Therefore, the project would not have an impact on recreation.
- Section 6.35 and subsection 7.00(b)(2), Sierra District Definition and District General Regulations.
- Sections 7.00, 7.40(b), 7.50(b), and 8.00, Low-Flow Regulation Changes.
- Section 7.40, subsection (b)(40)(A)1. and 2., Eel River.
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(6), Arroyo Seco River (Monterey County).
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(90), McCloud River and Tributaries.

Amendments to fishing regulations that would have less than significant impact on recreational facilities:

- Section 4.20, subsection (d), Bait Fish Use in the Sacramento River: The proposed project would move the upper boundary for bait fish on the Sacramento River from the Highway 32 Bridge upstream of Deschutes Road. This proposed change would allow live fin fish to be used further up the Sacramento River which would increase fishing opportunities for striped bass and other non-native fishes that are currently limited to use of lures and other methods. This amendment could result in increased angler trips/visits to the Sacramento River because the use of live fin fish would increase angler success. While some anglers will take advantage of the new fishing opportunity, existing facilities on the Sacramento River between the Highway 32 Bridge and Deschutes Road Bridge are adequate to accommodate new or additional anglers. The Sacramento River is primarily a boat-based fishery and there are eight boat ramps on this section of the river. The project will not require any new facilities or repurpose existing facilities. Therefore, the project will not have a significant impact on recreation.

- Section 7.00, subsection (b)(2), District General Regulations—Sierra District: The proposed project would allow the use of bait during summer months within anadromous streams in Shasta and Tehama counties when anadromous fish are not present. Allowing appropriate live fin fish bait to be used further up the Sacramento River would increase fishing opportunities on Striped Bass and other non-native fishes that are currently limited to lures and other methods. Fishing seasons and bag limits on these waters will not change. While some anglers will take advantage of the new fishing opportunities, existing facilities such as boat ramps and parking lots utilized by anglers are designed for such use and no deterioration would occur or be accelerated. Additionally, the project will not require any new facilities or repurpose existing facilities. Therefore, the project will not have a significant impact on recreation.
- Section 7.40, subsection (b)(11), Battle Creek: The proposed project would re-open lower Battle Creek from 1,250 feet below Coleman Fish Hatchery weir to its confluence with the Sacramento River from June 30 to December 31, with the restriction that only artificial lures with barbless hooks may be used. This change would provide recreational angling opportunities for native and non-native warmwater fish species and hatchery-origin trout and steelhead. It is expected that the proposed project will result in more angler trips to the area. Much of this section of lower Battle Creek is within the State Battle Creek Wildlife Area which provides three public access points to the creek with parking. The project will not require any new facilities or repurpose existing facilities. Therefore, the project will not have a significant impact on recreation.
- Section 7.40, subsection (b)(50), Klamath River Basin Regulations: The project would allow catch and release fishing within anadromous sections of the main stem Klamath River from the Copco Road bridge at Copco to Lakeview Road bridge near Iron Gate (Siskiyou County). The open season would be a summer season from the fourth Saturday in May through August 31. This change would provide a new recreational angling opportunity for freshwater fish during the summer months within the Klamath Dam Removal project area. During the dam removal process, three boat ramps were built each with newly constructed parking and a vault toilet. All three sites are open to the public during daylight hours. This is a new fishing area on the Klamath River with new facilities to accommodate anglers. This amendment will not affect existing facilities or require new facilities. Therefore, the project will not have a significant impact on recreation.
- Section 7.40(b), Addition of Creeks to the Special Fishing Regulations: The project proposes to remove the “artificial lure” gear restriction on Cow Creek, Cottonwood Creek, and Paynes Creek during the summer months to increase fishing opportunities for warmwater species. The number of fishing trips to these waters could increase during the summer months. However, because these waters are located in relatively remote and sparsely populated areas of the state, the number of additional anglers/visitors to each water would be

minimal. The amendments are not expected to result in an overall increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, or other recreational facilities, and will have a less than significant impact on recreation.

- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(47), Fall River Complex: The project proposes to increase the daily bag and possession limits for trout on Fall River Lake and Fall River Pond from zero fish to 5 fish per day and 10 fish in possession between April and November. The project will likely result in additional fishing trips to these waters with the new opportunity to harvest fish. While some anglers will take advantage of the new fishing opportunity, existing facilities utilized by anglers are designed for such use and no deterioration would occur or be accelerated. The current facilities were appropriate to accommodate angler use prior to 2021 when the harvest of trout was allowed, and they are still appropriate today. The project will not require any new facilities or repurposing of existing facilities, and will have a less than significant impact on recreation.
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(149), Susan River (Lassen Co.) and Section 8.10, Susan River Youth Derby: This proposal would revert fishing regulations to the previous trout opener (Last Saturday in April through November 15th) that was updated by previous amendment in 2021. The proposed amendment would also update language to include a special open season for youth participating in the Youth Fishing Derby in Section 8.10 to start prior to the proposed earlier season start.
 - Reverting to the traditional trout season will increase angler opportunity by lengthening the season in the spring and shortening the winter season. The project will likely result in additional fishing trips to the Susan River because of the extended fishing seasons. While some anglers will take advantage of the new fishing opportunities, existing facilities utilized by anglers are designed for such use and no deterioration would occur or be accelerated. The current facilities were appropriate to accommodate angler use prior to the regulation change in 2021, and they are still appropriate today. The project will not require any new facilities or repurposing of existing facilities, and will have a less than significant impact on recreation.

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 describes criteria for analyzing a project's transportation impacts. The project will not result in significant impacts to transportation, as the amount and distance of vehicle miles traveled by recreational anglers should not change substantially under the proposed regulations.

The following amendments are administrative in nature and would have no effect on transportation:

- Section 2.11, Special Fishing Methods – Lake County.
- Section 5.65, Shad, American.
- Section 5.85, subsection (a)(2), Trout.
- Section 6.34, Southern District Definition.
- Section 7.40, subsection (b):
 - Renumber subsections (b)(28) through (b)(124)
 - Consolidate subsection 7.40(b)(43)(D)
 - (72)(C), boundary feature name change
 - Addition of 7.40(b)(108)(A)
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(146), Sq. Valley Creek.
- Section 230, subsection (g)(2)

Amendments to fishing regulations which would have no impact on transportation. The proposed amendments listed below are not expected to increase the number of fishing trips to these waters.

- Sections 1.62, 28.25, 28.30, 28.32, and 28.35, Minimum and Maximum Size and Alternate Length and Species Specific Regulations.
- Section 1.73, Salmon.
- Sections 1.74, 5.88, and 701, Steelhead Fishing Report and Restoration Card Changes.
- Section 2.10, Hook and Weight Restrictions.
- Section 5.00, subsection (b), Black Bass (Lassen and Modoc Counties):
 - The fishing seasons and bag limits on these waters will not change. As a result, the project is not expected to result in additional angler/visitor trips to these waters. Thus, the amount of vehicle miles traveled by recreational anglers should not change substantially under the proposed regulations. Therefore, the project would not have an impact on transportation.
- Section 6.35 and subsection 7.00(b)(2), Sierra District Definition and District General Regulations.
- Sections 7.00, 7.40(b), 7.50(b), and 8.00, Low-Flow Regulation Changes.
- Section 7.40, subsection (b)(40)(A)1. and 2., Eel River.
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(6), Arroyo Seco River (Monterey County).
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(90), McCloud River and Tributaries.

Amendments to fishing regulations that would have less than significant impact on transportation:

- Section 4.20, subsection (d), Bait Fish Use in the Sacramento River: The proposed project would move the upper boundary for bait fish on the Sacramento River from the Highway 32 Bridge upstream to Deschutes Road Bridge. This amendment would allow live fin fish to be used further up the

Sacramento River which would increase fishing opportunities for striped bass and other non-native fishes that are currently limited to use of lures and other methods. This amendment could result in increased angler trips/visits to the Sacramento River because the use of live fin fish would increase angler success. Although the number of anglers that may take advantage of this new recreational fishing opportunity at these waters is unknown, the number of additional angler trips will most likely be low. Therefore, the amount of vehicle miles traveled by recreational anglers should not change substantially under the proposed regulations and the impact on transportation will be less than significant.

- Section 7.00, subsection (b)(2), District General Regulations – Sierra District (Shasta and Tehama Counties): The proposed project would allow the use of bait during summer months within anadromous streams in Shasta and Tehama counties when anadromous fish are not present. This amendment could result in increased angler trips/visits to these waters because the use of live fin fish would increase angler success. Although the number of anglers that may take advantage of this new recreational fishing opportunity is unknown, the number of additional angler trips will most likely be low. Thus, the amount of vehicle miles traveled by recreational anglers should not change substantially under the proposed regulations and the impact on transportation will be less than significant.
- Section 7.40, subsection (b)(11), Battle Creek: The proposed project would re-open lower Battle Creek from 1,250 feet below Coleman Fish Hatchery weir to its confluence with the Sacramento River from June 30 to December 31, with the restriction that only artificial lures with barbless hooks may be used. This change would provide recreational angling opportunities for native and non-native warmwater fish species and hatchery-origin trout and steelhead. Although the number of anglers that may take advantage of this new recreational fishing opportunity at these waters is unknown, anglers are expected to be travelling locally. Therefore, the amount of vehicle miles traveled by recreational anglers should not change substantially under the proposed regulations and the impact on transportation will be less than significant.
- Section 7.40, subsection (b)(50), Klamath River Basin: The proposed project would allow catch and release fishing within anadromous sections of the main stem Klamath River from the Copco Road bridge at Copco to Lakeview Road bridge near Iron Gate (Siskiyou County) from the fourth Saturday in May through August 31. Although the number of anglers that may take advantage of this new recreational fishing opportunity on the upper Klamath River is unknown, the area is rural and difficult to access due to the condition of the roads, which will limit the number of trips. Therefore, the amount of vehicle miles traveled by recreational anglers should not change substantially under the proposed regulations and the impact on transportation will be less than significant.

- Section 7.40(b), Addition of Creeks to the Special Fishing Regulations: The proposal to remove the “artificial lure” requirement on Cow Creek, Cottonwood Creek, and Paynes Creek during the summer months could result in additional angler trips to these waters. is not anticipated to result in an increase in new anglers to these waters. However, the number of additional fishing trips to these waters is anticipated to be low because these waters are located in remote and sparsely populated areas of the state. Thus, the amount of vehicle miles traveled by recreational anglers should not change substantially under the proposed regulations and the effect on transportation will be less than significant.
- Section 7.50, subsection (b)(47), Fall River Complex: The project proposes to increase the daily bag and possession limits for trout on Fall River Lake and Fall River Pond from zero fish to a five fish daily bag limit and a 10 fish possession limit from the last Saturday in April through November 15th. As a result, the project could result in additional angler trips to each water between April and November. However, the number of additional fishing trips to these waters is anticipated to be low because these waters are located in remote and sparsely populated areas of the state. Therefore, the amount of vehicle miles traveled by recreational anglers should not change substantially under the proposed regulations and the effect on transportation will be less than significant.

Section 7.50, subsection (b)(149), Susan River (Lassen Co.) and Section 8.10, Susan River: Reverting the fishing regulations to the previous trout opener (Last Saturday in April through November 15th) will increase angler opportunity by lengthening the season in the spring and shortening the winter season. The project will likely result in additional fishing trips to the Susan River because of the extended fishing season. Although the number of anglers that may take advantage of this new recreational fishing opportunity at Susan River is unknown, the number of additional angler trips will most likely be low. Thus, the amount of vehicle miles traveled by recreational anglers should not change substantially under the proposed regulations and the impacts on transportation will be less than significant.

- c) The project will not increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses with equipment. There will be no land use or transportation system modifications.
- d) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The project involves no land use or transportation system modifications.

XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources

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

- i) The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k). The project does not involve ground disturbing work and thus has no potential to affect tribal cultural resources.
- ii) The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. The project does not involve ground disturbing work and thus has no potential to affect tribal cultural resources.

XIX. Utilities and Service Systems

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

XX. Wildfire

- a) The project will not impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- b) The project will not exacerbate wildfire risks due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors.
- c) The project will not require the installation or maintenance of any infrastructure.
- d) The project will not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

XXI. Mandatory Findings 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, and their use 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 in all impact analyses except for one. Where there is a potential adverse impact to certain species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species, that impact is less than significant and the project would not incrementally contribute to a cumulative impact in combination with other projects causing related impacts because establishing an upper HSL at 30 inches will not likely contribute to population level impacts to salmonid and smelt populations.
- c) The project does not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on humans, either directly or indirectly. The project will not involve any construction, land alteration, or the creation of new infrastructure.

References

- CDFW Strategic Management Plan for Trout Management. 2022. Available: <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=213738&inline>
- Clemento, A. J., Anderson, E. C., Boughton, D., Girman, D., & Garza, J. C. 2009. Population genetic structure and ancestry of *Oncorhynchus mykiss* populations above and below dams in south-central California. *Conservation Genetics*, 10, 1321-1336. Available: [\(PDF\) Population genetic structure and ancestry of *Oncorhynchus mykiss* populations above and below dams in South-Central California](#)
- DuBois, R. B., & Kuklinski, K. E. 2004. Effect of hook type on mortality, trauma, and capture efficiency of wild, stream-resident trout caught by active baitfishing. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 24(2):617–623. Available: [\(PDF\) Effect of Hook Type on Mortality, Trauma, and Capture Efficiency of Wild, Stream-Resident Trout Caught by Active Baitfishing](#)
- Upper McCloud River Redband Trout Core Group. Conservation Agreement for Upper McCloud River Redband Trout. 2017.