



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

January 4, 2021

**Jan 05 2021**

## STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

Jeremy Shaw, Planner  
County of Fresno, Department of Public Works and Planning  
2220 Tulare Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Fresno, California 93721

**Subject: Notice of Preparation – EIR 7869 and CUP 3677 Sonrisa Valley  
Solar/EDPR CA Solar Park VI LLC Project (Project)  
State Clearinghouse No. 2020110008**

Dear Mr. Shaw:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) received a Notice of Preparation (NOP) from the County of Fresno, Department of Public Works and Planning 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.

While the comment period may have ended, CDFW would appreciate if you will still consider our comments and recommendations.

### CDFW ROLE

CDFW is California's **Trustee Agency** for fish and wildlife resources and holds those resources in trust for all the people of the State (Fish and 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, CDFW is charged by law to provide, as available, biological

<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.

Jeremy Shaw  
County of Fresno  
January 4, 2021  
Page 2

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:** Sonrisa Valley Solar/EDPR California Solar Park VI LLC

**Objective:** This project proposes to allow the construction, operation, and ultimate decommission of a 200 megawatts solar photovoltaic facility to include a 60 megawatts battery storage facility with associated on-site substation, inverters, access roads and fencing, to be known as the EDPR CA Solar Park VI LLC. The Project would generate and deliver solar-generated power from the on-site substation to the California electrical grid via Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E) Tranquility Switching Station located near the Project site.

**Location:** The approximately 1,700-acre Project site is located on private land in unincorporated Fresno County, surrounded by Adams, Derrick, Manning and San Mateo Avenues and is approximately 6.6 miles south of the City of Mendota. The

Jeremy Shaw  
County of Fresno  
January 4, 2021  
Page 3

Project site is agricultural and has been periodically dry-farmed for grain crops. (APN: 028-071-17ST. T15S, R15E, Sec16, 17,18, 19, 20, and 21)

**Timeframe:** Construction for the Project is anticipated to commence after September 1, 2021. The anticipated Commercial Operation Date for this Project is December 31, 2022, and the Project is expected to operate for 35 years, though the ability may exist to extend the Project's life by replacing and repowering certain components.

## **COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

CDFW offers the following comments and recommendations to assist Fresno County 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 several 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 federally and State endangered and State fully protected blunt-nosed leopard lizard (*Gambelia sila*), the federally endangered and State threatened San Joaquin kit fox (*Vulpes macrotis mutica*), the State threatened Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), 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)?**

#### **COMMENT 1: San Joaquin Kit Fox (SJKF)**

**Issue:** SJKF have been documented in the project vicinity (CDFW 2020). The Project has the potential to temporarily disturb and permanently alter suitable habitat for SJKF and directly impact individuals if present during construction, recharge, and other activities.

SJKF den in a variety of areas such as agricultural and fallow/ruderal habitat, dry stream channels, and canal levees, and populations can fluctuate over time. SJKF are also capable of occupying urban environments (Cypher and Frost 1999). SJKF may be attracted to Project areas due to the type and level of ground-disturbing

Jeremy Shaw  
County of Fresno  
January 4, 2021  
Page 4

activities and the loose, friable soils resulting from intensive ground disturbance. SJKF will forage in fallow and agricultural fields and utilize streams and canals as dispersal corridors. As a result, there is potential for SJKF to occupy all suitable habitat within the proposed project area and surrounding area.

**Specific impact:** Without appropriate avoidance and minimization measures for SJKF, potential significant impacts associated with construction include habitat loss, den collapse, inadvertent entrapment, reduced reproductive success, reduction in health and vigor of young, and direct mortality of individuals.

**Evidence impact is potentially significant:** Habitat loss resulting from land conversion to agricultural, urban, and industrial development is the primary threat to SJKF (Cypher et al. 2013). The Project area is within highly suitable habitat, and is surrounded by agriculture, which could provide foraging habitat. Therefore, subsequent ground-disturbing activities have the potential to significantly impact local SJKF populations.

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

To evaluate potential impacts to SJKF associated with subsequent land conversion, ground disturbance and construction, CDFW recommends conducting the following evaluation of project areas and implementing the following mitigation measures.

#### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 1: SJKF Habitat Assessment**

For all Project-specific components including construction and land conversion, CDFW recommends that a qualified biologist conduct a habitat assessment in advance of Project implementation, to determine if the Project area or its immediate vicinity contains suitable habitat for SJKF.

#### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 2: SJKF Surveys**

CDFW recommends assessing presence/absence of SJKF by having qualified biologists conducting surveys of Project areas and a 500-foot buffer of Project areas to detect SJKF and their sign. CDFW also recommends following the USFWS “Standardized recommendations for protection of the San Joaquin kit fox prior to or during ground disturbance” (2011).

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

SJKF detection warrants consultation with CDFW to discuss how to avoid take or, if avoidance is not feasible, to acquire an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) prior to ground-disturbing activities, pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2081(b).

Jeremy Shaw  
County of Fresno  
January 4, 2021  
Page 5

## **COMMENT 2: Swainson's Hawk (SWHA)**

**Issue:** SWHA have the potential to nest near the Project site, and forage within the project site and surrounding area.

**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). The Project as proposed will involve noise, groundwork, and movement of workers that could affect nests and has the potential to result in nest abandonment, significantly impacting local nesting SWHA.

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

Because suitable habitat for SWHA is present within and near the Project site, CDFW recommends conducting the following evaluation of the Project site and that the following mitigation measures be made conditions of approval for the Project.

#### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 4: Focused SWHA Surveys**

To evaluate potential impacts, 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 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 5: SWHA Avoidance/No-disturbance Buffer**

If ground-disturbing Project 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. 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

Jeremy Shaw  
County of Fresno  
January 4, 2021  
Page 6

determined that the birds have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival.

### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 6: SWHA Foraging Habitat**

CDFW recommends compensation for the loss of SWHA foraging habitat to reduce impacts to SWHA foraging habitat to less than significant based on CDFW's "Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson's Hawks" (CDFG, 1994), which recommends that mitigation for habitat loss occur within a minimum distance of 10 miles from known nest sites and the amount of habitat compensation is dependent on nest proximity. In addition to fee title acquisition or conservation easement recorded on property with suitable grassland habitat features, mitigation may occur by the purchase of conservation or suitable agricultural easements. Suitable agricultural easements would include areas limited to production of crops such as alfalfa, dry land and irrigated pasture, and cereal grain crops. Vineyards, orchards, cotton fields, and other dense vegetation do not provide adequate foraging habitat.

### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 7: SWHA Take Authorization**

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

### **COMMENT 3: Blunt-nosed Leopard Lizard (BNLL)**

**Issues:** BNLL have been documented in suitable habitat within and adjacent to the Project boundary (CDFW 2020a). Suitable BNLL habitat includes areas of grassland and upland scrub that contain requisite habitat elements such as small mammal burrows. BNLL also use open space patches between suitable habitats, including disturbed sites, unpaved access roadways, fallow agricultural fields, and canals.

**Specific impact:** Without appropriate avoidance and minimization measures for BNLL, potentially significant impacts associated with ground-disturbing activities include habitat loss, burrow collapse, reduced reproductive success, reduced health and vigor of eggs and/or young, and direct mortality.

**Evidence impact is potentially significant:** Habitat loss resulting from agricultural, urban, and industrial development is the primary threat to BNLL (ESRP 2020a). The

Jeremy Shaw  
County of Fresno  
January 4, 2021  
Page 7

range for BNLL now consists of scattered parcels of undeveloped land within the valley floor and the foothills of the Coast Range (USFWS 1998). Some undeveloped areas with suitable BNLL habitat occur within the Project and surrounding area; therefore, ground disturbance and conversion of suitable habitat has the potential to significantly impact local BNLL populations.

### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 8: BNLL Habitat Assessment**

CDFW recommends that a qualified biologist conduct a habitat assessment in advance of project implementation, to determine if the Project area or its immediate vicinity contains suitable habitat for BNLL.

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

If suitable habitat is present, prior to initiating any vegetation- or ground-disturbing activities, CDFW recommends conducting surveys in accordance with the “Approved Survey Methodology for the Blunt-nosed Leopard Lizard” (CDFW 2019). This survey protocol, designed to optimize BNLL detectability, reasonably assures CDFW that ground disturbance will not result in take of this fully protected species.

CDFW advises that BNLL surveys be completed no more than one year prior to initiation of ground disturbance. Please note that protocol-level surveys must be conducted on multiple dates during late spring, summer, and fall of the same calendar year, and that within these time periods, there are specific protocol-level date, temperature, and time parameters that must be adhered to. As a result, protocol-level surveys for BNLL are not synonymous with 30-day “preconstruction surveys” often recommended for other wildlife species. In addition, the BNLL protocol specifies different survey effort requirements based on whether the disturbance results from maintenance activities or if the disturbance results in habitat removal (CDFW 2019).

### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 10: BNLL Take Avoidance**

BNLL is a State fully protected species pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 5050 and CDFW is unable to authorize take of this species for any reason. Therefore, BNLL detection during protocol-level surveys warrant advance consultation with CDFW to discuss whether take of BNLL can be avoided during ground-disturbing Project activities and during operations and maintenance of Project facilities. Therefore, CDFW advises the environmental document prepared for this Project provide information on specific avoidance measure for this species during construction, operations, and maintenance throughout the life of the Project, including but not limited to a 50-foot avoidance radius around all small mammal burrows suitable for use by BNLL.

Jeremy Shaw  
County of Fresno  
January 4, 2021  
Page 8

#### **COMMENT 4: Burrowing Owl (BUOW)**

**Issue:** BUOW may occur near the Project site (CDFW 2020). BUOW inhabit open grassland or adjacent canal banks, right-of-ways, vacant lots, etc., containing small mammal burrows, a requisite habitat feature used by BUOW for nesting and cover. Review of aerial imagery indicates that the Project site mainly contains annual grassland and is surrounded by potentially fallow agricultural fields and orchards.

**Specific impact:** Potentially significant direct impacts associated with subsequent activities 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 is bordered by some of the only remaining undeveloped land in the vicinity, which is otherwise intensively managed for agriculture. Therefore, subsequent ground-disturbing activities associated with the Project have the potential to significantly impact local BUOW populations. In addition, and as described in CDFW's "Staff Report on 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, CDFW recommends conducting the following evaluation of the Project site, and that the following mitigation measures be made conditions of approval for the Project.

#### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 11: BUOW Habitat Assessment**

CDFW recommends that a qualified biologist conduct a habitat assessment in advance of Project implementation, to determine if the Project area or its vicinity contains suitable habitat for BUOW.

#### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 12: 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

Jeremy Shaw  
 County of Fresno  
 January 4, 2021  
 Page 9

CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation" (CDFG 2012). Specifically, the California Burrowing Owl Consortium (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 13: 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)

### **Recommended Mitigation Measure 14: BUOW Passive Relocation and Mitigation**

If BUOW are found within these recommended buffers and avoidance is not possible, it is important to note that according to the Staff Report (CDFG 2012), exclusion is not a take avoidance, minimization, or mitigation method and is considered a potentially significant impact under CEQA. However, if necessary, CDFW recommends that burrow exclusion be conducted by qualified biologists and only during the non-breeding season, before breeding behavior is exhibited and after the burrow is confirmed empty through non-invasive methods, such as surveillance. CDFW recommends replacement of occupied burrows with artificial burrows at a ratio of 1 burrow collapsed to 1 artificial burrow constructed (1:1) as mitigation for the potentially significant impact of evicting BUOW. BUOW may attempt to colonize or re-colonize an area that will be impacted; thus, CDFW recommends ongoing surveillance, at a rate that is sufficient to detect BUOW if they return.

## **II. Editorial Comments and/or Suggestions**

Jeremy Shaw  
County of Fresno  
January 4, 2021  
Page 10

**Nesting Birds:** The Project contains and is adjacent to habitat that provides nesting habitat for 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 sections 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 site to identify nests and determine their status. A sufficient area means any area potentially affected by the Project. Prior to initiation of Project activities, CDFW recommends that a qualified biologist conduct a survey to establish a behavioral baseline of all identified nests. Once Project activities begin, 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 Project site 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 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

Jeremy Shaw  
County of Fresno  
January 4, 2021  
Page 11

address: 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 Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning 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 Kelley Nelson, Environmental Scientist, at the address provided on this letterhead, or by electronic mail at [Kelley.Nelson@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:Kelley.Nelson@wildlife.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:



FA83F09FE08945A...

Julie A. Vance  
Regional Manager

Attachment

ec: Patricia Cole (patricia\_cole@fws.gov)  
United States Fish and Wildlife Service

Jeremy Shaw  
County of Fresno  
January 4, 2021  
Page 12

## Literature Cited

### SJKF Literature Citations

Cypher, B. L., S. E. Phillips, P. A. Kelly, 2013. Quantity and distribution of suitable habitat for endangered San Joaquin kit foxes: conservation implications. *Canid Biology and Conservation* 16(7): 25–31.

USFWS. 2011. Standard recommendations for the protection of the San Joaquin kit fox prior to or during ground disturbance. United States Fish and Wildlife Service, January 2011.

### SWHA Literature Citations

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 December 4, 2020.

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.

### BNLL Literature Citations

United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1998. Blunt-nosed leopard lizard *In* Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California. Region 1, Portland, OR. 319 pp.

CDFW. 2019. Approved Survey Methodology for the Blunt-nosed Leopard Lizard. California Department of Fish and Game, October 2019 (Revised).

### BUOW Literature Citations

California Burrowing Owl Consortium. 1993. Burrowing owl survey protocol and mitigation guidelines. April 1993.

CDFG. 2012. Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. California Department of Fish and Game.

Gervais, J.A., D.D. Rosenberg, and L.A. Comrack. 2008. Burrowing Owl (*Athene cunicularia*) in Shuford, W.D. and T. Gardali, editors.

**Attachment 1**

**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE  
RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM  
(MMRP)**

**PROJECT: Sonrisa Valley Solar/EDPR CA Solar Park VI LLC Project  
(NOP – EIR7869 and CUP3677) SCH#: 2020110008**

<b>RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURE</b>	<b>STATUS/DATE/INITIALS</b>
<i>Before Disturbing Soil or Vegetation</i>	
Mitigation Measure 1: SJKF Habitat Assessment	
Mitigation Measure 2: SJKF Surveys	
Mitigation Measure 3: SJKF Take Authorization	
Mitigation Measure 4: Focused SWHA Surveys	
Mitigation Measure 6: SWHA Foraging Habitat	
Mitigation Measure 7: SWHA Take Authorization	
Mitigation Measure 8: BNLL Habitat Assessment	
Mitigation Measure 9: BNLL Surveys	
Mitigation Measure 11: BUOW Habitat Assessment	
Mitigation Measure 12: BUOW Surveys	
<i>During Construction</i>	
Mitigation Measure 5: SWHA Avoidance/No-disturbance Buffer	
Mitigation Measure 10: BNLL Take Avoidance	
Mitigation Measure 13: BUOW Avoidance	
Mitigation Measure 14: BUOW Passive Relocation and Mitigation	