



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](http://www.wildlife.ca.gov)

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



Governor's Office of Planning & Research

February 22, 2021

**Feb 25 2021**

Alexis Vaughn  
City of Ontario  
303 East B Street  
Ontario, CA 91764

## STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report  
South Ontario Logistics Center Specific Project  
State Clearinghouse No. 2021010318

Dear Alexis Vaughn:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) received a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) from the City of Ontario (City) for the South Ontario Logistics Center Specific Project (Project) pursuant 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, 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 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.

---

<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.

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report  
South Ontario Logistics Center Specific Project  
SCH No. 2021010318  
Page 2 of 13

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 proposed Project includes a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan, Development Agreement, Development Plan(s), and Tentative Parcel Map(s) for the development of 5.4 million square feet (SF) of industrial and business park land uses on a 222.18-acre site in the City of Ontario, San Bernardino County, California. The Project is proposed in two phases, and only Phase I will be evaluated at a project-specific level in the EIR. The EIR will also evaluate, at a "programmatic" level, potential future development of Phase 2, comprised of Planning Areas 3, 4, and 5 (no specific development proposals have been identified for the Phase 2 area). The EIR will evaluate the total maximum allowable development in the Specific Plan, which is 5,412,591 SF of industrial and business park land uses and associated on-site and off-site infrastructure improvements.

Phase I is comprised of Planning Areas 1 and 2 (of 5) and would allow approximately 3,172,780 SF of industrial and business park uses. The Development Plan for Phase I currently proposes the construction of eight industrial concrete tilt-up industrial/warehouse buildings totaling 2,926,955 SF of industrial/warehouse and ancillary office space. Specific details of the proposed Project include:

1. General Plan Amendment to the City's General Plan Land Use Map to change the existing land designations from 159.04 acres of "Low Medium Density Residential" (5.1-11 du/ac) and 63.14 acres of "Business Park" to 181.04 acres of "General Industrial" and 41.14 acres of "Business Park" .
2. Specific Plan to propose a comprehensive land use plan, circulation plan, streetscape plan, infrastructure service plan, grading plan, maintenance plan, phasing plan, design guidelines, development regulations, and implementation measures to guide the development of the five Planning Areas.

The proposed Project is located on a 222.18-acre in the southwest portion of the City of Ontario, within San Bernardino County. The proposed Project site is bound by Eucalyptus Avenue to the north, Campus Avenue to the west, Merrill Avenue to the south, and Grove Avenue to the east. Regional access is available to the Project site via State Route 83 approximately one mile to the west, State Route 60 approximately three

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report  
South Ontario Logistics Center Specific Project  
SCH No. 2021010318  
Page 3 of 13

miles to the north, Interstate 15 approximately five miles to the east, and State Route 91 approximately eight miles to the south.

## 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.

CDFW recommends that the forthcoming DEIR 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 DEIR 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.

The CDFW recommends that the DEIR 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. 2009). 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.

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report  
South Ontario Logistics Center Specific Project  
SCH No. 2021010318  
Page 4 of 13

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 affected, 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 consultation with CDFW and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 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.

Burrowing Owl (*Athene cunicularia*)

The Project site has the potential to provide suitable foraging and nesting habitat for burrowing owl. Take of individual burrowing owls and their nests is defined by Fish and Game Code section 86, and prohibited by sections 3503, 3503.5 and 3513. Take is defined in Fish and Game Code section 86 as “hunt, pursue, catch, capture or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture or kill.”

Burrowing owls are known to use the surrounding area for breeding, wintering, foraging, and/or migration stopovers. Because burrowing owls detected during non-breeding season surveys may be year-round residents, young from the previous breeding season, pre-breeding territorial adults, winter residents, dispersing juveniles, migrants, transients or new colonizers, burrowing owl seasonal residency status can be difficult to ascertain. Burrowing owl surveys should be conducted at various times in the year and the data used to assess the cumulative loss to not only breeding, but wintering and migratory stopover habitat.

CDFW continues to recommend that the Lead Agency analyze new information and the cumulative impacts to burrowing owls. New and updated information should be included in all CEQA documents to ensure the public is not deprived of a meaningful opportunity to review and comment on the environmental effects of a project. In addition, mitigation must be roughly proportional to the level of impacts, including cumulative impacts, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4(a)(4)(B), 15064, 15065, and 16355).

CDFW recommends that the City follow the recommendations and guidelines provided in the 2012 *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (Department of Fish*

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report  
South Ontario Logistics Center Specific Project  
SCH No. 2021010318  
Page 5 of 13

*and Game, March 2012*), available for download from CDFW's website <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/conservation/survey-protocols>. The Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation, specifies three steps for project impact evaluations:

- a. A habitat assessment;
- b. Surveys; and
- c. An impact assessment

As stated in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation, the three progressive steps are effective in evaluating whether a project will result in impacts to burrowing owls, and the information gained from the steps will inform any subsequent avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures. Habitat assessments are conducted to evaluate the likelihood that a site supports burrowing owl. Burrowing owl surveys provide information needed to determine the potential effects of proposed projects and activities on burrowing owls, and to avoid take in accordance with Fish and Game Code sections 86, 3503, and 3503.5. Impact assessments evaluate the extent to which burrowing owls and their habitat may be impacted, directly or indirectly, on and within a reasonable distance of a proposed CEQA project activity or non-CEQA project.

Within the 2012 Staff Report, the minimum habitat replacement recommendation is based on site-specific analysis including natal area, home range, foraging area, and other factors influencing burrowing owls and burrowing owl population persistence in a particular area. Mitigation for permanent impacts to nesting, occupied, and satellite burrows and burrowing owl habitat should be on, adjacent or proximate to the impact site where possible and where habitat is sufficient to support burrowing owls present. If mitigation occurs offsite, it should include (a) permanent conservation of similar vegetation communities (grassland, scrublands, desert, urban, and agriculture) to provide for burrowing owl nesting, foraging, wintering, and dispersal (i.e., during breeding and non-breeding seasons) comparable to or better than that of the impact area, and (b) be sufficiently large acreage with the presence of fossorial mammals. Furthermore, the report noted that suitable mitigation lands should be based on a comparison of the habitat attributes of the impacted and conserved lands, including but not limited to: type and structure of habitat being impacted or conserved; density of burrowing owls in impacted and conserved habitat; and significance of impacted or conserved habitat to the species range-wide.

Ever since the case of *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296, allegations of improper "deferral" – whether of analysis of potential impacts or feasible mitigation measures – have been a staple of CEQA litigation. Resolving the "deferral" dilemma is often decided on a case-by-case basis, balancing between CEQA's requirement that significant environmental impacts and feasible mitigation measures be meaningfully analyzed prior to project approval, and the practical reality that the full extent of project impacts may not be known. CDFW strongly advocates that conserved habitat should not be deferred; rather, habitat should not

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report  
South Ontario Logistics Center Specific Project  
SCH No. 2021010318  
Page 6 of 13

be altered or destroyed, and burrowing owls should not be excluded from burrows, until mitigation lands are available.

Under Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines, cumulative effects refer to “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts”. Physical changes caused by a project can contribute incrementally to cumulative effects that are significant, even if individual changes resulting from a project are limited. The Lead Agency must determine whether the cumulative impact is significant, as well as whether an individual effect is “cumulatively considerable.” This means “the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects” (Guidelines Section 15064(h)(1)). The CEQA Lead agency should be reviewing biological/habitat assessments and surveys, as well as, maintaining an interactive mapping and current inventory of biological resources to determine if project related and cumulative impacts are being adequately analyzed.

Therefore, as the Lead Agency, the City should, but not be limited to:

- Confirm updated burrowing owl surveys are conducted before approving CEQA.
- Ensure that updated information, such as the quantity, quality, location of and burrowing owl conservation land, is included and analyzed as part of the CEQA.
- Evaluate past and current burrowing owl occurrences and the cumulative acreage of suitable habitat that has been removed.
- Consider impacts to burrowing owls and other migratory species when approving CEQA documents.
- Develop criteria for determining acceptable qualifications for individuals who perform burrowing owl habitat assessments, biological surveys, monitoring, and other relevant duties.
- Maintain a list of qualified biologists to cross reference when reviewing and approving CEQA documents.
- If the burrowing owl habitat assessment determines that there is potential habitat for sensitive species, follow-up measures, including, at a minimum, focused protocol surveys, such as breeding or non-breeding surveys, be conducted given the time of year.
- Require that project proponents submit data (e.g., survey reports, field notes, etc.) and survey locations and results (e.g., GIS and kmz shape files) to the City and

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report  
South Ontario Logistics Center Specific Project  
SCH No. 2021010318  
Page 7 of 13

ensure burrowing owl occurrences are entered into a database (e.g., California Natural Diversity Database).

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

The DEIR should provide a thorough discussion of the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources as a result of the Project. To ensure that Project impacts to biological resources are fully analyzed, the following information should be included in the DEIR:

1. A discussion of potential impacts from lighting, noise, human activity (e.g., recreation), defensible space, and wildlife-human interactions created by zoning of development projects or other 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.
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 mitigation lands (e.g., preserved lands associated with a Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other conserved lands).
3. An evaluation of impacts to adjacent open space lands from both the construction of the Project and any long-term operational and maintenance needs.

### **Alternatives Analysis**

CDFW recommends the DEIR 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]).

### **Mitigation Measures for Project Impacts to Biological Resources**

The DEIR should 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:

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report  
South Ontario Logistics Center Specific Project  
SCH No. 2021010318  
Page 8 of 13

1. *Fully Protected Species*: Fully protected species may not be taken or possessed at any time. Project activities described in the DEIR 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 DEIR 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 DEIR 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. CSSC that have the potential or have been documented to occur within or adjacent to the project area, including, but not limited to: burrowing owl, San Bernardino aster.
4. *Mitigation*: CDFW considers adverse project-related impacts to sensitive species and habitats to be significant to both local and regional ecosystems, and the DEIR 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, onsite habitat restoration and/or enhancement, and preservation should be evaluated and discussed in detail. Where habitat preservation is not available onsite, offsite land acquisition, management, and preservation should be evaluated and discussed in detail.

The DEIR 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 DEIR. CEQA Guidelines



Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report  
South Ontario Logistics Center Specific Project  
SCH No. 2021010318  
Page 9 of 13

section 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 DEIR 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, in order for mitigation measures to be effective, they need to 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.

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report  
South Ontario Logistics Center Specific Project  
SCH No. 2021010318  
Page 10 of 13

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 DEIR include the results of avian surveys, as well as specific avoidance and minimization measures to ensure that impacts to nesting birds do not occur. Project-specific 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 DEIR 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 DEIR, the 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.

7. *Moving out of Harm's Way*: To avoid direct mortality, CDFW recommends that the lead agency condition the DEIR to require that a CDFW-approved qualified biologist be retained to be onsite prior to and during all ground- and habitat-disturbing activities to move out of harm's way special status species or other wildlife of low or limited mobility that would otherwise be injured or killed from project-related activities. Movement of wildlife out of harm's way should be limited to only those individuals that would otherwise be injured or killed, and individuals should be moved only as far as necessary to ensure their safety (i.e., CDFW does not recommend relocation to other areas). Furthermore, it should be noted that the temporary relocation of onsite wildlife does not constitute effective mitigation for the purposes of offsetting project impacts associated with habitat loss.
8. *Translocation of Species*: CDFW generally does not support the use of relocation, salvage, and/or transplantation as mitigation for impacts to rare, threatened, or

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report  
South Ontario Logistics Center Specific Project  
SCH No. 2021010318  
Page 11 of 13

endangered species as studies have shown that these efforts are experimental in nature and largely unsuccessful.

### **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. 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 DEIR addresses all Project impacts to listed species and specifies a mitigation monitoring and reporting program that will meet the requirements of CESA.

Based on review of CNDDDB, and/or knowledge of the project site/vicinity/general area, CDFW is aware that the following CESA-listed species have the potential to occur onsite/have previously been reported onsite: California black rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus*), tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*).

### **Lake and Streambed Alteration Program**

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 your Project that would eliminate or reduce harmful impacts to fish and wildlife resources.

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report  
South Ontario Logistics Center Specific Project  
SCH No. 2021010318  
Page 12 of 13

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 DEIR 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>.

### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

To ameliorate the water demands of this Project, CDFW recommends incorporation of water-wise concepts in project landscape design plans. In particular, CDFW recommends xeriscaping with locally native California species, and installing water-efficient and targeted irrigation systems (such as drip irrigation). Local water agencies/districts, and resource conservation districts in your area may be able to provide information on plant nurseries that carry locally native species, and some facilities display drought-tolerant locally native species demonstration gardens (for example the Riverside-Corona Resource Conservation District in Riverside). Information on drought-tolerant landscaping and water-efficient irrigation systems is available on California's Save our Water website: <http://saveourwater.com/what-you-can-do/tips/landscaping/>

### **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). Information can be submitted online or via completion of the CNDDDB field survey form at the following link: <https://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://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Plants-and-Animals>.

### **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.).

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report  
South Ontario Logistics Center Specific Project  
SCH No. 2021010318  
Page 13 of 13

## CONCLUSION

CDFW appreciates the opportunity to comment on the NOP of a DEIR for the South Ontario Logistics Center Specific Project (SCH No. 2021010318) and recommends that the City of Ontario address the CDFW's comments and concerns in the forthcoming DEIR. If you should have any questions pertaining to the comments provided in this letter, please contact Marina Barton, Environmental Scientist, at (909) 948-9632 or at [marina.barton@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:marina.barton@wildlife.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:  
  
6BBFAB19FE504F9...

For Scott Wilson  
Environmental Program Manager

ec: Marina Barton, Environmental Scientist  
Inland Deserts Region  
[marina.barton@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:marina.barton@wildlife.ca.gov)

HCPB CEQA Coordinator  
Habitat Conservation Planning Branch

Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse, Sacramento  
[state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov](mailto:state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov)

## REFERENCES

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