



State of California – Natural Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
Inland Deserts Region
3602 Inland Empire Blvd., Suite C-220
Ontario, CA 91764
www.wildlife.ca.gov

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director



Governor's Office of Planning & Research

APR 08 2020

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

April 8, 2020
Sent via email

Mr. Chris Ormsby
Senior Planner
City of Moreno Valley
14177 Frederick Street
Moreno Valley, CA 92553
chriso@moval.org

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report
City of Moreno Valley Comprehensive General Plan Update, Housing
Element Update, and Climate Action Plan Project
State Clearinghouse No. 2020039022

Dear Mr. Ormsby:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) received a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DPEIR) from the City of Moreno Valley (City) for the City of Moreno Valley Comprehensive General Plan Update, Housing Element Update, and Climate Action Plan Project (Project) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines.¹

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, we appreciate 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 the 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

¹ 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.

CEQA, 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.), the Project proponent may seek related take authorization as provided by the Fish and Game Code.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

The Project proposes a comprehensive update to all elements of the General Plan, and the addition of two new elements: Economic Development and Healthy Communities, to reflect City's growth and vision for a future horizon year of 2040.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CDFW offers the comments and recommendations below to assist the City in adequately identifying and/or mitigating the Project's significant, or potentially significant, direct and indirect impacts on fish and wildlife (biological) resources. The comments and recommendations are also offered to enable CDFW to adequately review and comment on the proposed Project with respect to the Project's consistency with the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).

CDFW recognizes that the general plan DPEIR need not be as detailed as CEQA documents prepared for specific projects that may follow (CEQA Guidelines § 15146). CDFW also recognizes that the level of detail should be reflective of the level contained in the plan or plan element being considered (*Rio Vista Farm Bureau Center v. County of Solano* (1992) 5 Cal.App.4th 351). However, please note that the City cannot defer the analysis of significant effects of the general plan to later-tiered CEQA documents (*Stanislaus Natural Heritage Project v. County of Stanislaus* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 182).

CDFW recommends that the forthcoming DPEIR address the following:

Assessment of Biological Resources

Section 15125(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states that knowledge of the regional setting of a project is critical to the assessment of environmental impacts and that special emphasis should be placed on environmental resources that are rare or unique to the region. To enable CDFW staff to adequately review and comment on the Project, the

DPEIR should include a complete assessment of the flora and fauna within and adjacent to the Project footprint, with particular emphasis on identifying rare, threatened, endangered, and other sensitive species and their associated habitats.

CDFW recommends that the DPEIR specifically include:

1. An assessment of the various habitat types located within the Project footprint, and a map that identifies the location of each habitat type. CDFW recommends that floristic, alliance- and/or association-based mapping and assessment be completed following *The Manual of California Vegetation*, second edition (Sawyer et al. 2009²). Adjoining habitat areas should also be included in this assessment where site activities could lead to direct or indirect impacts offsite. Habitat mapping at the alliance level will help establish baseline vegetation conditions.
2. A general biological inventory of the fish, amphibian, reptile, bird, and mammal species that are present or have the potential to be present within each habitat type onsite and within adjacent areas that could be affected by the Project. CDFW's California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) in Sacramento should be contacted at (916) 322-2493 or CNDDDB@wildlife.ca.gov to obtain current information on any previously reported sensitive species and habitat, including Significant Natural Areas identified under Chapter 12 of the Fish and Game Code, in the vicinity of the proposed Project.

Please note that CDFW's CNDDDB is not exhaustive in terms of the data it houses, nor is it an absence database. CDFW recommends that it be used as a starting point in gathering information about the *potential presence* of species within the general area of the Project site.

3. A complete, *recent* inventory of rare, threatened, endangered, and other sensitive species located within the Project footprint and within offsite areas with the potential to be effected, including California Species of Special Concern (CSSC) and California Fully Protected Species (Fish and Game Code § 3511). Species to be addressed should include all those which meet the CEQA definition (CEQA Guidelines § 15380). The inventory should address seasonal variations in use of the Project area and should not be limited to resident species. Focused species-specific surveys, completed by a qualified biologist and conducted at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, are required. Acceptable species-specific survey procedures should be developed in

² Sawyer, J. O., T. Keeler-Wolf, and J. M. Evens. 2009. A manual of California Vegetation, 2nd ed. California Native Plant Society Press, Sacramento, California. <http://vegetation.cnps.org/>

consultation with CDFW and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), where necessary. Note that CDFW generally considers biological field assessments for wildlife to be valid for a one-year period, and assessments for rare plants may be considered valid for a period of up to three years. Some aspects of the proposed Project may warrant periodic updated surveys for certain sensitive taxa, particularly if the Project is proposed to occur over a protracted time frame, or in phases, or if surveys are completed during periods of drought.

4. A thorough, recent, floristic-based assessment of special status plants and natural communities, following CDFW's *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities* (CDFW 2018)³;
5. Information on the regional setting that is critical to an assessment of environmental impacts, with special emphasis on resources that are rare or unique to the region (CEQA Guidelines § 15125[c]).
6. A full accounting of all mitigation/conservation lands within and adjacent to the Project.

Analysis of Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Impacts to Biological Resources

The DPEIR should provide a thorough discussion of the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to affect biological resources as a result of the Project (including the plan's land use designations, policies and programs). To ensure that project impacts to biological resources are fully analyzed, the following information should be included in the DPEIR:

1. A discussion of potential impacts from lighting, noise, human activity (e.g., recreation), defensible space, and wildlife-human interactions created by Project activities adjacent to natural areas, exotic and/or invasive species, and drainage. The latter subject should address Project-related changes on drainage patterns and water quality within, upstream, and downstream of the Project site, including: volume, velocity, and frequency of existing and post-Project surface flows; polluted runoff; soil erosion and/or sedimentation in streams and water bodies; and post-Project fate of runoff from the Project site.

With respect to defensible space: please ensure that the DPEIR fully describes and identifies the location, acreage, and composition of defensible space *within* proposed development land use designations. Please ensure that any graphics and descriptions of defensible space associated with this Project comply with Riverside

³ California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2018. *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plan Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities*. State of California, Natural Resources Agency. Available for download at: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Plants>

County Fire (or other applicable agency) regulations/ requirements. The City, through their planning processes, should be ensuring that defensible space is provided and accounted for *within proposed development land use designated areas*, and not transferred to adjacent open space or conservation lands.

2. A discussion of potential indirect Project impacts on biological resources, including resources in areas adjacent to the Project footprint, such as nearby public lands (e.g. National Forests, State Parks, etc.), open space, adjacent natural habitats, riparian ecosystems, wildlife corridors, and any designated and/or proposed reserve or conservation/mitigation lands (e.g., preserved lands associated with a Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other conserved lands).

Please note that the Project area supports significant biological resources and contains habitat connections, providing for wildlife movement across the broader landscape, sustaining both transitory and permanent wildlife populations. CDFW encourages the City to consider project design that avoids and preserves onsite features that contribute to habitat connectivity. The DPEIR should include a discussion of both direct and indirect impacts to wildlife movement and connectivity, including maintenance of wildlife corridor/movement areas to adjacent undisturbed habitats.

3. An evaluation of impacts to adjacent open space lands from both the Project and long-term operational and maintenance needs.
4. A cumulative effects analysis developed as described under CEQA Guidelines § 15130. CDFW recommends that the DPEIR analyze the cumulative effects of the plan's land use designations, policies and programs on the environment. Please include all potential direct and indirect Project related impacts to riparian areas, wetlands, vernal pools, alluvial fan habitats, wildlife corridors or wildlife movement areas, aquatic habitats, sensitive species and other sensitive habitats, open lands, open space, and adjacent natural habitats in the cumulative effects analysis. General and specific plans, as well as past, present, and anticipated future projects, should be analyzed relative to their impacts on similar plant communities and wildlife habitats.

Alternatives Analysis

CDFW recommends that the DPEIR describe and analyze a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project that are potentially feasible, would "feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project," and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the Project's significant effects (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6[a]). The alternatives analysis should also evaluate a "no project" alternative (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6[e]). The no Project alternative should evaluate how the changing environment, such as climate change and drought, may affect the community if a new or revised general plan were not adopted.

Mitigation Measures for Project Impacts to Biological Resources

CDFW recommends that the DPEIR identify mitigation measures and alternatives that are appropriate and adequate to avoid or minimize potential impacts, to the extent feasible. The City should assess all direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that are expected to occur as a result of the implementation of the Project and its long-term operation and maintenance. When proposing measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts, CDFW recommends consideration of the following:

1. *Fully Protected Species*: Fully protected species may not be taken or possessed at any time. Project activities described in the DPEIR should be designed to completely avoid any fully protected species that have the potential to be present within or adjacent to the Project area. CDFW also recommends that the DPEIR fully analyze potential adverse impacts to fully protected species due to habitat modification, loss of foraging habitat, and/or interruption of migratory and breeding behaviors. CDFW recommends that the Lead Agency include in the analysis how appropriate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures will reduce indirect impacts to fully protected species.
2. *Sensitive Plant Communities*: CDFW considers sensitive plant communities to be imperiled habitats having both local and regional significance. Plant communities, alliances, and associations with a statewide ranking of S-1, S-2, S-3, and S-4 should be considered sensitive and declining at the local and regional level. These ranks can be obtained by querying the CNDDDB and are included in *The Manual of California Vegetation* (Sawyer et al. 2009). The DPEIR should include measures to fully avoid and otherwise protect sensitive plant communities from Project-related direct and indirect impacts.
3. *California Species of Special Concern (CSSC)*: CSSC status applies to animals generally not listed under the federal Endangered Species Act or the CESA, but which nonetheless are declining at a rate that could result in listing, or historically occurred in low numbers and known threats to their persistence currently exist. CSSCs should be considered during the environmental review process.
4. *Mitigation*: CDFW considers adverse Project-related impacts to sensitive species and habitats to be significant to both local and regional ecosystems, and the DPEIR should include mitigation measures for adverse Project-related impacts to these resources. Mitigation measures should emphasize avoidance and reduction of project impacts. For unavoidable impacts, habitat restoration and/or enhancement, and preservation should be evaluated and discussed in detail.

The DPEIR should include measures to perpetually protect the targeted habitat values within mitigation areas from direct and indirect adverse impacts in order to meet mitigation objectives to offset Project-induced qualitative and quantitative

losses of biological values. Specific issues that should be addressed include restrictions on access, proposed land dedications, long-term monitoring and management programs, control of illegal dumping, water pollution, increased human intrusion, etc.

If sensitive species and/or their habitat may be impacted from the Project, CDFW recommends the inclusion of specific mitigation in the DPEIR. CEQA Guidelines §15126.4, subdivision (a)(1)(8) states that formulation of feasible mitigation measures should not be deferred until some future date. The Court of Appeal in *San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center v. County of Merced* (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 645 struck down mitigation measures which required formulating management plans developed in consultation with State and Federal wildlife agencies after Project approval. Courts have also repeatedly not supported conclusions that impacts are mitigable when essential studies, and therefore impact assessments, are incomplete (*Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d. 296; *Gentry v. City of Murrieta* (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1359; *Endangered Habitat League, Inc. v. County of Orange* (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 777).

CDFW recommends that the DPEIR specify mitigation that is roughly proportional to the level of impacts, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4(a)(4)(B), 15064, 15065, and 16355). The mitigation should provide long-term conservation value for the suite of species and habitat being impacted by the Project. Furthermore, for mitigation measures to be effective, they should be specific, enforceable, and feasible actions that will improve environmental conditions.

5. *Habitat Revegetation/Restoration Plans*: Plans for restoration and revegetation should be prepared by persons with expertise in southern California ecosystems and native plant restoration techniques. Plans should identify the assumptions used to develop the proposed restoration strategy. Each plan should include, at a minimum:
 - (a) the location of restoration sites and assessment of appropriate reference sites;
 - (b) the plant species to be used, sources of local propagules, container sizes, and seeding rates;
 - (c) a schematic depicting the mitigation area;
 - (d) a local seed and cuttings and planting schedule;
 - (e) a description of the irrigation methodology;
 - (f) measures to control exotic vegetation on site;
 - (g) specific success criteria;
 - (h) a detailed monitoring program;
 - (i) contingency measures should the success criteria not be met; and
 - (j) identification of the party responsible for meeting the success criteria and providing for conservation of the mitigation site in perpetuity. Monitoring of restoration areas should extend across a sufficient time frame to ensure that the new habitat is established, self-sustaining, and capable of surviving drought.

CDFW recommends that local onsite propagules from the Project area and nearby vicinity be collected and used for restoration purposes. Onsite seed collection should be initiated in the near future in order to accumulate sufficient propagule material for subsequent use in future years. Onsite vegetation mapping at the alliance and/or

association level should be used to develop appropriate restoration goals and local plant palettes. Reference areas should be identified to help guide restoration efforts. Specific restoration plans should be developed for various Project components as appropriate.

Restoration objectives should include protecting special habitat elements or re-creating them in areas affected by the Project; examples could include retention of woody material, logs, snags, rocks, and brush piles.

6. *Nesting Birds and Migratory Bird Treaty Act*: Please note that it is the Project proponent's responsibility to comply with all applicable laws related to nesting birds and birds of prey. Fish and Game Code sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 afford protective measures as follows: Fish and Game Code section 3503 makes it unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird, except as otherwise provided by Fish and Game Code or any regulation made pursuant thereto. Fish and Game Code section 3503.5 makes it unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any birds in the orders Falconiformes or Strigiformes (birds-of-prey) to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any such bird except as otherwise provided by Fish and Game Code or any regulation adopted pursuant thereto. Fish and Game Code section 3513 makes it unlawful to take or possess any migratory nongame bird except as provided by the rules and regulations adopted by the Secretary of the Interior under provisions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 703 et seq.).

CDFW recommends that the DPEIR include specific avoidance and minimization measures to ensure that impacts to nesting birds do not occur. Avoidance and minimization measures may include, but not be limited to: project phasing and timing, monitoring of project-related noise (where applicable), sound walls, and buffers, where appropriate. The DPEIR should also include specific avoidance and minimization measures that will be implemented should a nest be located within the Project site. If pre-construction surveys are proposed in the DPEIR, CDFW recommends that they be required no more than three (3) days prior to vegetation clearing or ground disturbance activities, as instances of nesting could be missed if surveys are conducted sooner.

California Endangered Species Act

CDFW is responsible for ensuring appropriate conservation of fish and wildlife resources including threatened, endangered, and/or candidate plant and animal species, pursuant to CESA. CDFW recommends that a CESA Incidental Take Permit (ITP) be obtained if the Project has the potential to result in "take" (California Fish and Game Code Section 86 defines "take" as "hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill") of State-listed CESA species, either through construction or over the life of the Project; unless this Project is proposed to be

a covered activity under the MSHCP. CESA ITPs are issued to conserve, protect, enhance, and restore State-listed CESA species and their habitats.

CDFW encourages early consultation, as significant modification to the proposed Project and avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures may be necessary to obtain a CESA ITP. The California Fish and Game Code requires that CDFW comply with CEQA for issuance of a CESA ITP. CDFW therefore recommends that the DPEIR addresses all Project impacts to listed species and specifies a mitigation monitoring and reporting program that will meet the requirements of CESA.

Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan

CDFW issued Natural Community Conservation Plan Approval and Take Authorization for the Western Riverside County MSHCP per Section 2800, *et seq.*, of the California Fish and Game Code on June 22, 2004. The MSHCP establishes a multiple species conservation program to minimize and mitigate habitat loss and provides for the incidental take of covered species in association with activities covered under the permit.

Compliance with approved habitat plans, such as the MSHCP, is discussed in CEQA. Specifically, Section 15125(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that the CEQA document discuss any inconsistencies between a proposed Project and applicable general plans and regional plans, including habitat conservation plans and natural community conservation plans. An assessment of the impacts to the MSHCP as a result of this Project is necessary to address CEQA requirements. To obtain additional information regarding the MSHCP please go to: <http://rctlma.org/epd/WR-MSHCP>.

The proposed Project occurs within the MSHCP area and is subject to the provisions and policies of the MSHCP. In order to be considered a covered activity, Permittees need to demonstrate that proposed actions are consistent with the MSHCP and its associated Implementing Agreement. The City is the Lead Agency and is signatory to the Implementing Agreement of the MSHCP. The entirety of the project is located within the MSHCP. The DPEIR should address how individual projects will demonstrate consistency with the policies and procedures of the MSHCP, including: Joint Project Review (JPR) process through the RCA (where relevant), Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools (MSHCP section 6.1.2), Protection of Narrow Endemic Plant Species (MSHCP section 6.1.3), Additional Survey Needs and Procedures for burrowing owl and Criteria Area Species (MSHCP section 6.3.2), and the Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlands Interface (MSHCP section 6.1.4).

Regardless of whether take of threatened and/or endangered species is obtained through the MSHCP or through a CESA ITP, the DPEIR needs to address how the proposed Project will affect the policies and procedures of the MSHCP.

Lake and Streambed Alteration Program

Based on review of aerial photography, the City boundary encompasses a multitude of ephemeral streambeds. CDFW recommends that the City condition the DPEIR to include a mitigation measure for consultation with CDFW to determine if Fish and Game Code section 1600 *et seq.* resources may occur within a proposed project area. Fish and Game Code section 1602 requires an entity to notify CDFW prior to commencing any activity that may do one or more of the following: substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of any river, stream or lake; substantially change or use any material from the bed, channel or bank of any river, stream, or lake; or deposit debris, waste or other materials that could pass into any river, stream or lake. Please note that "any river, stream or lake" includes those that are episodic (i.e., those that are dry for periods of time) as well as those that are perennial (i.e., those that flow year round). This includes ephemeral streams, desert washes, and watercourses with a subsurface flow. It may also apply to work undertaken within the flood plain of a body of water.

Upon receipt of a complete notification, CDFW determines if the proposed Project activities may substantially adversely affect existing fish and wildlife resources and whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement is required. An LSA Agreement includes measures necessary to protect existing fish and wildlife resources. CDFW may suggest ways to modify the project that would eliminate or reduce harmful impacts to fish and wildlife resources.

CDFW's issuance of an LSA Agreement is a "project" subject to CEQA (see Pub. Resources Code 21065). To facilitate issuance of an LSA Agreement, if necessary, the DPEIR should fully identify the potential impacts to the lake, stream, or riparian resources, and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, and monitoring and reporting commitments. Early consultation with CDFW is recommended, since modification of the proposed Project may be required to avoid or reduce impacts to fish and wildlife resources. To obtain a Lake or Streambed Alteration notification package, please go to <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/LSA/Forms>.

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 Database (CNDDDB). The CNDDDB field survey form can be found at the following link: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/pdfs/CNDDDB_FieldSurveyForm.pdf. The completed form can be mailed electronically to CNDDDB at the following email address: CNDDDB@wildlife.ca.gov. The types of information reported to CNDDDB can be found at the following link: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/plants_and_animals.asp.

FILING FEES

The Project, as proposed, would have an impact on fish and/or wildlife, and assessment of filing fees is 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.).

CONCLUSION

CDFW appreciates the opportunity to comment on the NOP of a DPEIR for the City of Moreno Valley Comprehensive General Plan Update, Housing Element Update, and Climate Action Plan Project (SCH No. 202039022) and recommends that City address CDFW's comments and concerns in the forthcoming DPEIR. If you should have any questions pertaining to the comments provided in this letter, please contact Joanna Gibson, Senior Environmental Scientist, Specialist, at (909) 987-7449 or at joanna.gibson@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Scott Wilson
Environmental Program Manager

ec: California Department of Fish and Wildlife
HCPB CEQA Coordinator

Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse
State.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov