



State of California – Natural Resources Agency  
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE  
Central Region  
1234 East Shaw Avenue  
Fresno, California 93710  
(559) 243-4005  
[www.wildlife.ca.gov](http://www.wildlife.ca.gov)

**GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor**  
**CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director**



Governor's Office of Planning & Research

July 20, 2020

**Jul 21 2020**

## STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

Julie Nelson, Associate Planner  
City of Merced  
678 West 18<sup>th</sup> Street  
Merced, California 95340  
Nelsonj@cityofmerced.org

**Subject: Yosemite Avenue-Gardner Avenue to Hatch Road Annexation Project  
(Project)  
Notice of Preparation (NOP)  
SCH No. 2016121029**

Dear Ms. Nelson:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) received a NOP for a draft Environmental Impact Report from the City of Merced for the above-referenced Project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines.<sup>1</sup>

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and recommendations regarding those activities involved in the Project that may affect California fish and wildlife. Likewise, CDFW appreciates the opportunity to provide comments regarding those aspects of the Project that CDFW, by law, may be required to carry out or approve through the exercise of its own regulatory authority under Fish and Game Code.

### CDFW ROLE

CDFW is California's **Trustee Agency** for fish and wildlife resources and holds those resources in trust by statute for all the people of the State (Fish & G. Code, §§ 711.7, subd. (a) & 1802; Pub. Resources Code, § 21070; CEQA Guidelines § 15386, subd. (a)). CDFW, in its trustee capacity, has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of fish, wildlife, native plants, and habitat necessary for biologically sustainable populations of those species (*Id.*, § 1802). Similarly, for purposes of CEQA,

---

<sup>1</sup> CEQA is codified in the California Public Resources Code in section 21000 et seq. The "CEQA Guidelines" are found in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, commencing with section 15000.

Julie Nelson, Associate Planner  
City of Merced  
July 20, 2020  
Page 2

CDFW is charged by law to provide, as available, biological expertise during public agency environmental review efforts, focusing specifically on projects and related activities that have the potential to adversely affect fish and wildlife resources.

CDFW is also submitting comments as a **Responsible Agency** under CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21069; CEQA Guidelines, § 15381). CDFW expects that it may need to exercise regulatory authority as provided by the Fish and Game Code. As proposed, for example, the Project may be subject to CDFW's lake and streambed alteration regulatory authority (Fish & G. Code, § 1600 et seq.). Likewise, to the extent implementation of the Project as proposed may result in "take" as defined by State law of any species protected under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (Fish & G. Code, § 2050 et seq.), related authorization as provided by the Fish and Game Code will be required.

**Nesting Birds:** CDFW has jurisdiction over actions with potential to result in the disturbance or destruction of active nest sites or the unauthorized take of birds. Fish and Game Code sections that protect birds, their eggs and nests include sections 3503 (regarding unlawful take, possession or needless destruction of the nest or eggs of any bird), 3503.5 (regarding the take, possession or destruction of any birds-of-prey or their nests or eggs), and 3513 (regarding unlawful take of any migratory nongame bird).

In this role, CDFW is responsible for providing, as available, biological expertise during public agency environmental review efforts (e.g., CEQA), focusing specifically on Project activities that have the potential to adversely affect fish and wildlife resources. CDFW provides recommendations to identify potential impacts and possible measures to avoid or reduce those impacts.

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

**Proponent:** University Village Merced, LLC

**Objective:** The City of Merced proposes to annex a 70-acre site into the City limits. The Project includes The Crossings housing and retail component that proposes to provide multi-family and commercial retail uses on a 30-acre portion of the site. No development is proposed on the remaining 40 acres that surround the 30-acre portion. The City is proposing land use and zoning designations of Urban Transition and Low Density Residential for this land.

University Village Merced, LLC (Project applicant) is requesting entitlements to allow construction of the student housing and retail component of the Project as follows:

- 540 residential units in 20 3-story buildings

Julie Nelson, Associate Planner  
City of Merced  
July 20, 2020  
Page 3

- 111,000 square feet of mixed-use structures (66,000 square feet of retail and 45,000 square feet of residential) in 5 2-story buildings providing 30 additional units (12 apartments and 18 extended stay units)
- 13,700 square foot clubhouse
- 1,223 parking spaces
- Stormwater retention basin

**Location:** The approximately 70-acre Project site is located in Merced County on the north side of East Yosemite Avenue between North Gardner Avenue and Hatch Road. The site is unincorporated land contiguous with the City of Merced and is located approximately three miles from the University of California, Merced campus. The Project site is bounded by the City on two sides and would be annexed into the City to receive full urban services.

**Timeframe:** N/A

## **COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

CDFW offers the following comments and recommendations to assist the City of Merced in adequately identifying and/or mitigating the Project's significant, or potentially significant, direct and indirect impacts on fish and wildlife (biological) resources. Editorial comments or other suggestions may also be included to improve the document.

There are many special-status resources that may utilize the Project site, and these resources may need to be evaluated and addressed prior to any approvals that would allow ground-disturbing activities. CDFW is concerned regarding potential impacts to special-status species including, but not limited to, the State threatened Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), the State threatened California tiger salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*), and the State species of special concern burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*).

### **I. Environmental Setting and Related Impact**

**Would the Project 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 CDFW or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?**

Julie Nelson, Associate Planner  
City of Merced  
July 20, 2020  
Page 4

## **COMMENT 1: Swainson's Hawk (SWHA)**

**Issue:** SWHA have the potential to nest near and forage within the Project site. The proposed Project will involve activities near large trees that may serve as potential nest sites.

**Specific impacts:** Without appropriate avoidance and minimization measures for SWHA, potential significant impacts that may result from Project activities include: nest abandonment, loss of nest trees, loss of foraging habitat that would reduce nesting success (loss or reduced health or vigor of eggs or young), and direct mortality. Any take of SWHA without appropriate incidental take authorization would be a violation of Fish and Game Code.

**Evidence impact is potentially significant:** SWHA exhibit high nest-site fidelity year after year and lack of suitable nesting habitat in the San Joaquin Valley limits their local distribution and abundance (CDFW 2016). Approval of the Project will lead to subsequent ground-disturbing activities that involve noise, groundwork, and movement of workers that could affect nests and has the potential to result in nest abandonment and loss of foraging habitat, significantly impacting local nesting SWHA.

### **Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measure(s)**

To evaluate potential impacts to SWHA associated with the Project, CDFW recommends conducting the following evaluation of the Project site, incorporating the following mitigation measures into the environmental impact report (EIR) prepared for this Project, and that these measures be made conditions of approval for the Project.

#### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 1: SWHA Surveys**

CDFW recommends that a qualified wildlife biologist conduct surveys for nesting SWHA following the survey methods developed by the Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee (SWHA TAC 2000) prior to project implementation. The SWHA TAC recommends a 0.5-mile survey distance from the limits of disturbance. The survey protocol includes early season surveys to assist the project proponent in implementing necessary avoidance and minimization measures, and in identifying active nest sites prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities.

#### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 2: SWHA No-disturbance Buffer**

If ground-disturbing activities are to take place during the normal bird breeding season (March 1 through September 15), CDFW recommends that additional pre-activity surveys for active nests be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 10 days prior to the start of Project implementation to ensure that no SWHA

Julie Nelson, Associate Planner  
City of Merced  
July 20, 2020  
Page 5

have begun nesting activities near the Project site. CDFW recommends a minimum no-disturbance buffer of ½ mile be delineated around active nests until the breeding season has ended or until a qualified biologist has determined that the birds have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival.

### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 3: SWHA Take Authorization**

CDFW recommends that in the event an active SWHA nest is detected during surveys and a ½-mile no-disturbance buffer is not feasible, consultation with CDFW is warranted to discuss how to implement the project and avoid take. If take cannot be avoided, take authorization through the issuance of an ITP, pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2081(b) is necessary to comply with CESA.

### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 4: Loss of SWHA Foraging Habitat**

CDFW recommends compensation for the loss of SWHA foraging habitat as described in CDFW's "Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson's Hawks" (CDFG 1994) to reduce impacts to foraging habitat to less than significant. The Staff Report recommends that mitigation for habitat loss occur within a minimum distance of 10 miles from known nest sites. CDFW has the following recommendations based on the Staff Report:

- For projects within 1 mile of an active nest tree, a minimum of 1 acre of habitat management (HM) land for each acre of development is advised.
- For projects within 5 miles of an active nest but greater than 1 mile, a minimum of ¾ acre of HM land for each acre of development is advised.
- For projects within 10 miles of an active nest tree but greater than 5 miles from an active nest tree, a minimum of ½ acre of HM land for each acre of development is advised.

### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 5: SWHA Nest Trees**

CDFW recommends that the removal of known raptor nest trees, even outside of the nesting season, be replaced with an appropriate native tree species planting at a ratio of 3:1 at or near the Project site or in another area that will be protected in perpetuity to reduce impacts resulting from the loss of nesting habitat.

### **COMMENT 2: California Tiger Salamander (CTS)**

**Issue:** Even though the surrounding area consist of developed land (i.e., homes and neighborhoods), there are remnant habitat to the north and northeast and CTS have the potential to occur in the Project site. Aerial imagery shows that the Project site is within one mile from potential breeding habitat.

Julie Nelson, Associate Planner  
City of Merced  
July 20, 2020  
Page 6

**Specific Impacts:** Aerial imagery shows that the Project site is within one mile from potential breeding habitat. Potential ground- and vegetation-disturbing activities associated with Project activities include: collapse of small mammal burrows, inadvertent entrapment, loss of upland refugia, water quality impacts to breeding sites, reduced reproductive success, reduction in health and vigor of eggs and/or young, and direct mortality of individuals.

**Evidence impact would be significant:** Up to 75% of historic CTS habitat has been lost to urban and agricultural development (Searcy et al. 2013). Loss, degradation, and fragmentation of habitat are the primary threats to CTS in both the Central and San Joaquin valleys. Contaminants and vehicle strikes are also sources of mortality for the species (CDFW 2015, USFWS 2017). The Project site is within the range of CTS and has suitable habitat (i.e., grasslands interspersed with burrows and vernal pools). CTS have been determined to be physiologically capable of dispersing up to approximately 1.5 miles from seasonally flooded wetlands (Searcy and Shaffer 2011) and have been documented to occur near the Project site (CDFW 2020). Given the presence of potential habitat within and near the Project site, ground-disturbing activities have the potential to significantly impact local populations of CTS.

### **Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measure(s)**

To evaluate potential impacts to CTS, CDFW recommends conducting the following evaluation of the Project site, incorporating the following mitigation measures into the EIR prepared for this Project, and that these measures be made conditions of approval for the Project.

### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 6: Focused CTS Protocol-level Surveys**

CDFW recommends that a qualified biologist conduct protocol-level surveys in accordance with the USFWS “Interim Guidance on Site Assessment and Field Surveys for Determining Presence or a Negative Finding of the California Tiger Salamander” (USFWS 2003) at the appropriate time of year to determine the existence and extent of CTS breeding and refugia habitat. The protocol-level surveys for CTS require more than one survey season and are dependent upon sufficient rainfall to complete. As a result, consultation with CDFW and the USFWS is recommended well in advance of beginning the surveys and prior to any planned vegetation- or ground-disturbing activities. CDFW advises that the protocol-level survey include a 100-foot buffer around the Project area in all areas of wetland and upland habitat that could support CTS. Please be advised that protocol-level survey results are viable for two years after the results are reviewed by CDFW.

Julie Nelson, Associate Planner  
City of Merced  
July 20, 2020  
Page 7

### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 7: CTS Avoidance**

If CTS protocol-level surveys as described in the above Mitigation Measure 6 are not conducted, CDFW advises that a minimum 50-foot no-disturbance buffer be delineated around all small mammal burrows in suitable upland refugia habitat within and/or adjacent to the Project site. Further, CDFW recommends potential or known breeding habitat within and/or adjacent to the Project site be delineated with a minimum 250-foot no-disturbance buffer. Both upland burrow and wetland breeding no-disturbance buffers are intended to minimize impacts to CTS habitat and avoid take of individuals. Alternatively, the applicant can assume presence of CTS within the Project site and obtain from CDFW a State Incidental Take Permit (ITP) in accordance with Fish and Game Code section 2081(b).

### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 8: CTS Take Authorization**

If through surveys it is determined that CTS are occupying or have the potential to occupy the Project site, consultation with CDFW is warranted to determine if the Project can avoid take. If take cannot be avoided, take authorization would be warranted prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities to comply with CESA. Take authorization would occur through issuance of an ITP by CDFW, pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2081(b). As stated above, in the absence of protocol surveys, the applicant can assume presence of CTS within the Project site and obtain an ITP from CDFW.

### **COMMENT 3: Burrowing Owl (BUOW)**

**Issue:** BUOW may occur within and/or adjacent to the Project site. BUOW inhabit open grassland containing small mammal burrows, a requisite habitat feature used by BUOW for nesting and cover. Habitat both within and bordering the Project site, supports grassland habitat (CDFW 2020).

**Specific impact:** Potentially significant direct impacts associated with subsequent activities and development include burrow collapse, inadvertent entrapment, nest abandonment, reduced reproductive success, reduction in health and vigor of eggs and/or young, and direct mortality of individuals.

**Evidence impact is potentially significant:** BUOW rely on burrow habitat year-round for their survival and reproduction. Habitat loss and degradation are considered the greatest threats to BUOW in California's Central Valley (Gervais et al. 2008). The Project site contain and is bordered by some of the only remaining undeveloped land in the vicinity. Therefore, subsequent ground-disturbing activities associated with Project approval have the potential to significantly impact local BUOW populations. In addition, and as described in CDFW's "Staff Report on

Julie Nelson, Associate Planner  
 City of Merced  
 July 20, 2020  
 Page 8

Burrowing Owl Mitigation” (CDFG 2012), excluding and/or evicting BUOW from their burrows is considered a potentially significant impact under CEQA.

### **Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measure(s) (Regarding Environmental Setting and Related Impact)**

To evaluate potential impacts to BUOW associated with the Project, CDFW recommends conducting the following evaluation of the Project site, incorporating the following mitigation measures into the EIR prepared for this Project, and that these measures be made conditions of approval for the Project.

#### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 9: BUOW Surveys**

CDFW recommends assessing presence/absence of BUOW by having a qualified biologist conduct surveys following the California Burrowing Owl Consortium’s “Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines” (CBOC 1993) and CDFW’s “Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation” (CDFG 2012). Specifically, CBOC and CDFW’s Staff Report suggest three or more surveillance surveys conducted during daylight with each visit occurring at least three weeks apart during the peak breeding season (April 15 to July 15), when BUOW are most detectable.

#### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 10: BUOW Avoidance**

CDFW recommends no-disturbance buffers, as outlined in the “Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation” (CDFG 2012), be implemented prior to and during any ground-disturbing activities. Specifically, CDFW’s Staff Report recommends that impacts to occupied burrows be avoided in accordance with the following table unless a qualified biologist approved by CDFW verifies through non-invasive methods that either: 1) the birds have not begun egg laying and incubation; or 2) that juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival.

Location	Time of Year	Level of Disturbance		
		Low	Med	High
Nesting sites	April 1-Aug 15	200 m*	500 m	500 m
Nesting sites	Aug 16-Oct 15	200 m	200 m	500 m
Nesting sites	Oct 16-Mar 31	50 m	100 m	500 m

\* meters (m)



Julie Nelson, Associate Planner  
City of Merced  
July 20, 2020  
Page 9

## II. Editorial Comments and/or Suggestions

**Nesting birds:** CDFW encourages that Project implementation occur during the bird non-nesting season; however, if ground-disturbing or vegetation-disturbing activities must occur during the breeding season (February through mid-September), the Project applicant is responsible for ensuring that implementation of the Project does not result in violation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or relevant Fish and Game Codes as referenced above.

To evaluate Project-related impacts on nesting birds, CDFW recommends that a qualified wildlife biologist conduct pre-activity surveys for active nests no more than 10 days prior to the start of ground or vegetation disturbance to maximize the probability that nests that could potentially be impacted are detected. CDFW also recommends that surveys cover a sufficient area around the Project sites to identify nests and determine their status. A sufficient area means any area potentially affected by the Project. In addition to direct impacts (i.e., nest destruction), noise, vibration, and movement of workers or equipment could also affect nests. Prior to initiation of construction activities, CDFW recommends that a qualified biologist conduct a survey to establish a behavioral baseline of all identified nests. Once construction begins, CDFW recommends having a qualified biologist continuously monitor nests to detect behavioral changes resulting from the Project. If behavioral changes occur, CDFW recommends halting the work causing that change and consulting with CDFW for additional avoidance and minimization measures.

If continuous monitoring of identified nests by a qualified wildlife biologist is not feasible, CDFW recommends a minimum no-disturbance buffer of 250 feet around active nests of non-listed bird species and a 500-foot no-disturbance buffer around active nests of non-listed raptors. These buffers are advised to remain in place until the breeding season has ended or until a qualified biologist has determined that the birds have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or on-site parental care for survival. Variance from these no-disturbance buffers is possible when there is compelling biological or ecological reason to do so, such as when the construction areas would be concealed from a nest site by topography. CDFW recommends that a qualified wildlife biologist advise and support any variance from these buffers and notify CDFW in advance of implementing a variance.

## ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

CEQA requires that information developed in environmental impact reports and negative declarations be incorporated into a database which may be used to make subsequent or supplemental environmental determinations (Pub. Resources Code, § 21003, subd. (e)). Accordingly, please report any special-status species and natural communities detected during Project surveys to the California Natural Diversity

Julie Nelson, Associate Planner  
City of Merced  
July 20, 2020  
Page 10

Database (CNDDDB). The CNDDDB field survey form can be found at the following link: <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Submitting-Data>. The completed form can be mailed electronically to CNDDDB at the following email address: [CNDDDB@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:CNDDDB@wildlife.ca.gov). The types of information reported to CNDDDB can be found at the following link: <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Plants-and-Animals>.

## FILING FEES

If it is determined that the Project has the potential to impact biological resources, an assessment of filing fees will be necessary. Fees are payable upon filing of the Notice of Determination by the Lead Agency and serve to help defray the cost of environmental review by CDFW. Payment of the fee is required in order for the underlying project approval to be operative, vested, and final (Cal. Code Regs, tit. 14, § 753.5; Fish & G. Code, § 711.4; Pub. Resources Code, § 21089).

CDFW appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Project to assist the City of Merced in identifying and mitigating the Project's impacts on biological resources.

More information on survey and monitoring protocols for sensitive species can be found at CDFW's website (<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Survey-Protocols>). If you have any questions, please contact Jim Vang, Environmental Scientist, at the address provided on this letterhead, by telephone at (559) 243-4014 extension 254, or by electronic mail at [Jim.Vang@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:Jim.Vang@wildlife.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:  
  
041A77B10D78486...

**for** Julie A. Vance  
Regional Manager

Attachment

Julie Nelson, Associate Planner  
City of Merced  
July 20, 2020  
Page 11

### Literature Cited

- California Burrowing Owl Consortium (CBOC). 1993. Burrowing owl survey protocol and mitigation guidelines. April 1993.
- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 1994. Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson's Hawks (*Buteo Swainsoni*) in the Central Valley of California. California Department of Fish and Game.
- CDFW. 2012. Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. California Department of Fish and Game, March 7, 2012.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2015. California Tiger Salamander Technical Review – Habitat, Impacts and Conservation. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, October 2015.
- CDFW. 2016. Five Year Status Review for Swainson's Hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*). California Department of Fish and Wildlife. April 11, 2016.
- CDFW. 2020. Biogeographic Information and Observation System (BIOS). <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/BIOS>. Accessed 3 July 2020.
- Gervais, J.A., D.D. Rosenberg, and L.A. Comrack. Burrowing Owl (*Athene cunicularia*) in Shuford, W.D. and T. Gardali, editors. 2008. California Bird Species of Special Concern: A ranked assessment of species, subspecies, and distinct populations of birds of immediate conservation concern in California. Studies of Western Birds 1. Western Field Ornithologists, Camarillo, California, and California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, USA.
- Searcy, C.A. and H.B. Shaffer. 2011. Determining the migration distance of a vagile vernal pool specialist: How much land is required for conservation of California tiger salamanders? In Research and Recovery in Vernal Pool Landscapes, D. G. Alexander and R. A. Schlising, Eds. California State University, Chico, California.
- Searcy, C.A., E. Gabbai-Saldate, and H.B. Shaffer. 2013. Microhabitat use and migration distance of an endangered grassland amphibian. Biological Conservation 158: 80-87.
- Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee (SWHA TAC). 2000. Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in California's Central Valley. Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee, May 31, 2000.

Julie Nelson, Associate Planner  
City of Merced  
July 20, 2020  
Page 12

United State Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2003. Interim Guidance on Site Assessment and Field Surveys for Determining Presence or a Negative Finding of the California Tiger Salamander, October 2003.

USFWS. 2017. Recovery Plan for the Central California Distinct Population Segment of the California Tiger Salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*). U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 8, Sacramento, California. June 2017.

**Attachment 1****CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE  
RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM  
(MMRP)****PROJECT: Yosemite Avenue-Gardner Avenue to Hatch Road  
Annexation Project****SCH No.: 2016121029**

<b>RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURE</b>	<b>STATUS/DATE/INITIALS</b>
<i>Before Disturbing Soil or Vegetation</i>	
Mitigation Measure 1: SWHA Surveys	
Mitigation Measure 3: SWHA Take Authorization	
Mitigation Measure 4: Loss of SWHA Foraging Habitat	
Mitigation Measure 6: Focused CTS Protocol-level Surveys	
Mitigation Measure 8: CTS Take Authorization	
Mitigation Measure 9: BUOW Surveys	
<i>During Construction</i>	
Mitigation Measure 2: SWHA No-disturbance Buffer	
Mitigation Measure 5: SWHA Nest Trees	
Mitigation Measure 7: CTS Avoidance	
Mitigation Measure 10: BUOW Avoidance	