



State of California – Natural Resources Agency

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, CA 92123
(858) 467-4201

www.wildlife.ca.gov

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director



Governor's Office of Planning & Research

May 25, 2021

May 25 2021

Sonya Lui
City of Whittier
13230 Penn Street
Whittier, CA 91709
SLui@cityofwhittier.org

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Program Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan Update and Housing Element Update (2021-2029), SCH #2021040762, City of Whittier, Los Angeles County

Dear Ms. Lui:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has reviewed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) from the City of Whittier (City; Lead Agency) for the General Plan Update and Housing Element Update (2021-2029) (Project). 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's 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, subdivision (a) & 1802; Pub. Resources Code, § 21070; California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, § 15386, subdivision (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 State 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, including 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.*), or CESA-listed rare plant pursuant to the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA; Fish & G. Code, §1900 *et seq.*), CDFW recommends the Project proponent obtain appropriate authorization under the Fish and Game Code.

Conserving California's Wildlife Since 1870

Tina Lui
City of Whittier
May 25, 2021
Page 2 of 14

Project Description and Summary

Objective: The Whittier General Plan and Housing Element contain goals, policies, and programs for long-range planning related to physical development and public services. A comprehensive update of the General Plan and Housing Element would serve as the guide for future growth and development. The 2040 planning horizon for the City of Whittier is estimated to result in increases of approximately 472 single family dwellings, 7,023 multifamily dwellings, 828,448 square feet of office space, 193,819 square feet of industrial space, and a reduction of 300,102 square feet of commercial space. An estimated increase of approximately 20,190 residents and 1,396 jobs is projected for the 2040 horizon year. Planned developments identified in the Land Use Element would accommodate the Regional Housing Needs Allocation goal of 3,439 housing units, which represents a 11.5 percent increase from the existing number of housing units within City of Whittier.

Location: The Project is located within the City of Whittier, located approximately 12 miles southeast of downtown Los Angeles. The Project comprises a total of 21.8 square miles. The City of Whittier encompasses 14.6 square mile, most of which is developed with urban land uses. The remaining 7.2 square miles are with the City of Whittier's unincorporated Sphere of Influence and use City of Whittier's services and community facilities.

Comments and Recommendations

CDFW offers the comments and recommendations below to assist the City in adequately identifying, avoiding, and/or mitigating the Project's significant, or potentially significant, direct, and indirect impacts on fish and wildlife (biological) resources.

Specific Comments

- 1) Open Space and Natural Habitats. According to Exhibit 3 in the NOP and the Land Ownership dataset available in the [California Natural Diversity Database in BIOS](#), the Project area includes open space, natural habitats, and conservation easements (CDFW 2021a). Per the Project's proposed General Plan Designations (Exhibit 4 in the NOP), areas currently designated as open space, primarily around Hellman Park, would be rezoned to Medium High Density Residential, Low Density Residential, or Hillside Residential. The areas proposed for rezoning are potentially a part of the Puente Hills Preserve.
 - a) CDFW recommends the City analyze and discuss the Project's impacts on open space/natural habitats within the Project area. This includes Puente Hills Preserve; Hellman Wilderness Park; Sycamore Canyon Open Space; Turnbull Canyon Open Space; Hacienda Hills Open Space; Arroyo Pescadero; and Arroyo San Miguel Open Space; and lands owned, operated, and/or conservation easements held by CDFW. The Project could result in additional loss of open space/natural due to fuel modifications and introduction of non-native, invasive plants facilitated by the Project. The PEIR should disclose the amount of open space/natural habitats lost as a result of the proposed General Plan Designations, including all areas subject to fuel modifications and grading to accommodate development.

Tina Lui
City of Whittier
May 25, 2021
Page 3 of 14

- b) CDFW recommends the Project avoid developing and encroaching onto open space/natural habitats. Encroachment onto open space/natural habitats creates an abrupt transition between two different land uses. Encroachment onto open space/natural habitats could affect environmental and biological conditions and increase the magnitude of edge effects on biological resources (see Comment #5). CDFW recommends the PEIR provide alternatives to the Project that would not result in conversion of open space/natural habitats into developed areas. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6, an EIR “shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasible attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives.” Furthermore, an EIR “shall include sufficient information about alternatives to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6) (see General Comment #6).
 - c) If avoidance is not feasible, CDFW recommends the PEIR provide measures to mitigate for impacts to open space/natural habitats. There should be no net loss of open space/natural habitats. CDFW recommends the PEIR provide measures where any future development facilitated by the Project mitigates (avoids first if feasible) for project-level impacts on open space/natural habitats not previously identified in the PEIR. CDFW recommends the PEIR provide a measure where any future development facilitated by the Project establishes unobstructed vegetated buffers and setbacks. The PEIR should provide standards for an effective buffer and setback; however, the buffer and setback distance should be increased at a project-level as needed. The PEIR should provide justifications for the effectiveness of all proposed mitigation measures. The PEIR should provide sufficient information and disclosure to facilitate meaningful public review, analysis, and comment on the adequacy of proposed mitigation measures to offset Project-related impacts on open space/natural habitats.
- 2) Fire. The Project proposes to increase development in a ‘Very High’ Fire Severity Zone (County of Los Angeles 2021). Development in the wildland urban interface could increase fire frequency and intensity, thus impacting biological resources. Moreover, fuel modification would need to occur within the footprint of the development site. Fuel modification would increase habitat loss. CDFW recommends the PEIR provide a discussion as to how the Project may impact open space/natural areas with respect to intensifying land use in areas that are highly susceptible to fire.
 - 3) Development and Conservation. CDFW recommends the City modify the Project to maximize development where it already exists in order to protect natural and working lands from development, habitat loss, and climate change. CDFW recommends the City consider regional and State-wide natural resource conservation strategies outlined in the following reports: [Safeguarding California Plan: 2018 Update](#) (CNRA 2018); [California State Wildlife Action Plan: A Conservation Legacy for Californians](#) (CDFW 2015); and, [California 2030 Natural and Working Lands Climate Change Implementation Plan: January 2019 Draft](#) (CalEPA et al. 2019).
 - 4) Impacts on Wildlife Corridors. The Project proposes to increase development into open space/natural habitats part of the Puente-Chino Hills Wildlife Corridor, an unbroken zone of natural habitat extending nearly 31 miles from the Cleveland National Forest in Orange

Tina Lui
City of Whittier
May 25, 2021
Page 4 of 14

County to the west end of the Puente Hills above Whittier Narrows. The Project could impact the ecological integrity and function of the wildlife corridor supporting resident and transient wildlife movement. Moreover, development of Hellman Wilderness Park could add even more barriers to possible wildlife dispersal between the Puente-Chino Hills Wildlife Corridor and Whittier Narrows Recreation Area.

This Puente-Chino Hills corridor provides food, cover, breeding grounds, and refugia to wildlife. The corridor contributes to species diversity, dispersal routes for juveniles, home ranges, and transfer of genetic material which helps maintain healthy populations (LSA 2007). Increased development surrounding and within the Puente-Chino Hills, including those areas adjacent to the Puente Hills Preserve, has increasingly fragmented the area, resulting in isolated islands of habitat (LSA 2007). Habitat fragmentation threatens the viability of remaining natural resources. Maintaining wildlife corridors and habitat continuity is essential for wildlife survival and is increasingly important considering habitat loss and climate change.

- a) CDFW recommends the City analyze whether the Project would impact wildlife corridors (see General Comment #5e). Impacts include (but are not limited to) habitat loss and fragmentation, narrowing of a wildlife corridor, and introduction of barriers to wildlife movement. CDFW recommends such an analysis be supported by studies to document wildlife activity and movement through Project area where development is proposed. Technical detail such as data, maps, diagrams, and similar relevant information should be provided to permit full assessment of significant environmental impacts by reviewing agencies and members of the public (CEQA Guidelines, §15147). "Technical data and analyses shall be readily available for public examination and shall be submitted to the State Clearinghouse" (CEQA Guidelines, §15147).
 - b) CDFW recommends the Project avoid developing and encroaching onto wildlife corridors. If avoidance is not feasible, CDFW recommends the PEIR provide measures to mitigate for the Project's significant impacts on wildlife corridors (see General Comments #10 and #11). CDFW also recommends the PEIR provide measures where any future development facilitated by the Project mitigates (avoids first if feasible) for project-level impacts on wildlife corridors not previously identified in the PEIR.
- 5) Impacts on Wildlife. The Project's proposal to increase development in the wildland urban interface could impact wildlife. Impacts could result from increased human presence, traffic, noise, and artificial lighting. Increased human-wildlife interactions could lead to wildlife injury or mortality. For instance, as human population and communities expand into wildland areas, there has been a commensurate increase in direct and indirect interaction between mountain lions and people (CDFW 2013). As a result, the need to relocate or humanely euthanize mountain lions (depredation kills) may increase for public safety.

CDFW recommends City analyze whether the Project may have direct and indirect impacts on wildlife resulting from increased human presence, traffic, noise, and artificial lighting (also see General Comment #5e). An assessment of impacts on wildlife should also provide a discussion of edge effects, including (but not limited to) introduction and invasion of non-native plant species into natural areas; attraction for wildlife with food or backyard conditions; predation and disease by domestic animals; and habitat fragmentation caused by volunteer trails.

Tina Lui
City of Whittier
May 25, 2021
Page 5 of 14

- 6) Coastal California Gnatcatcher. The Project area contains critical habitat for the coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*), a California Species of Special Concern (SSC) and a species listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act (USFWS 2021). CDFW recommends the PEIR discuss the Project's potential impacts on coastal California gnatcatcher and habitat. The PEIR should provide measures to avoid those impacts or measures to mitigate for impacts if avoidance is not feasible.
- 7) Jurisdictional Waters. Exhibit 2 in the NOP shows multiple rivers, creeks, and water bodies within the Project area.
 - a) CDFW recommends the City identify and delineate all streams within the Project area and provide a thorough discussion of the Project's potential impacts on streams. Modifications to a river, creek, or stream in one area may result in bank erosion, channel incision, or drop in water level along that stream outside of the immediate impact area. Therefore, CDFW recommends the PEIR discuss whether impacts on streams within the Project area would impact those streams immediately outside of the Project area where there is hydrologic connectivity. Potential impacts such as changes to drainage pattern, runoff, and sedimentation should be discussed.
 - b) CDFW recommends the Project avoid impacting streams and associated vegetation. Herbaceous vegetation, woody vegetation, and woodlands adjacent to streams serve to protect the integrity of these resources and help maintain natural sedimentation processes. Where development may occur near a stream but may avoid impacts, the PEIR should provide a justification as to why the chosen setback distance of the proposed development(s) would be effective to avoid impacts on streams and associated vegetation. Furthermore, CDFW recommends the PEIR provide minimum standards for effective unobstructed vegetated buffers and setbacks adjoining streams and associated vegetation for all development facilitated by the Project. The buffer and setback distance should be increased at a project-level as needed. The PEIR should provide justification for the effectiveness of chosen buffer and setback distances.
 - c) If avoidance is not feasible, the PEIR should include measures where future housing development facilitated by the Project provides the following:
 - A stream delineation and analysis of impacts. The delineation should be conducted pursuant to the to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) wetland definition adopted by CDFW (Cowardin et al. 1979). Be advised that some wetland and riparian habitats subject to CDFW's authority may extend beyond the jurisdictional limits of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Section 404 permit and Regional Water Quality Control Board Section 401 Certification;
 - A Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Notification to CDFW pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 1600 *et seq.* if applicable. As a Responsible Agency under CEQA, CDFW has authority over activities in streams and/or lakes that will divert or obstruct the natural flow, or change the bed, channel, or bank (including vegetation associated with the stream or lake) of a river or stream or use material from a streambed. For any such activities, the project applicant (or "entity") must notify CDFW. CDFW's issuance of a LSA Agreement for a project that is subject to CEQA will require CEQA compliance actions by CDFW as a Responsible

Tina Lui
 City of Whittier
 May 25, 2021
 Page 6 of 14

Agency. As a Responsible Agency, CDFW may consider the environmental document of the local jurisdiction (Lead Agency) for the Project. To minimize additional requirements by CDFW pursuant to section 1600 *et seq.* and/or under CEQA, the environmental document should fully identify the potential impacts to the stream or riparian resources and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, monitoring, and reporting commitments for issuance of the LSA Agreement. Please visit CDFW's [Lake and Streambed Alteration Program](#) webpage for more information (CDFW 2021b).

- As part of the LSA Notification process, CDFW requests a hydrological evaluation of the 100-year storm event to provide information on how water and sediment is conveyed through the Project area. Additionally, the hydrological evaluation should assess the 100, 50, 25, 10, 5, and 2-year frequency flood events to evaluate existing and proposed conditions and erosion/scour potential. CDFW recommends the project-level CEQA document discuss the results and address avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures that may be necessary to reduce potential significant impacts.
- 8) Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs). The Project area contains the Puente Hills SEA. [Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Areas](#) are officially designated areas within Los Angeles County identified as having irreplaceable biological resources (LACDRP 2019). These areas represent the wide-ranging biodiversity of Los Angeles County and contain some of Los Angeles County's most important biological resources. Therefore, CDFW recommends the PEIR provide a discussion of Project impacts on the Puente Hills SEA.
- 9) Nesting Birds. The Puente-Chino Hills is an [Important Bird Area in California](#) as identified by the California Audubon Society (Audubon 2021). The Project proposes to develop within or adjacent to the Important Bird Area. Accordingly, the Project may impact nesting birds and raptors. Project activities occurring during the bird and raptor breeding and nesting season could result in the incidental loss of fertile eggs or nestlings, or otherwise lead to nest abandonment.
- a) Migratory nongame native bird species are protected by international treaty under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (Code of Federal Regulations, Title 50, § 10.13). Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibit take of all birds and their active nests including raptors and other migratory nongame birds (as listed under the Federal MBTA). It is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any raptor.
 - b) CDFW recommends that measures be taken to fully avoid impacts to nesting birds and raptors. CDFW recommends the PEIR include a measure where future development facilitated by the Project avoids ground-disturbing activities (e.g., mobilizing, staging, drilling, and excavating) and vegetation removal during the avian breeding season which generally runs from February 15 through September 15 (as early as January 1 for some raptors) to avoid take of birds, raptors, or their eggs.
 - c) If impacts to nesting birds and raptors cannot be avoided, CDFW recommends the PEIR include measures where future development facilitated by the Project mitigates for

Tina Lui
City of Whittier
May 25, 2021
Page 7 of 14

impacts. CDFW recommends surveys by a qualified biologist with experience conducting breeding bird and raptor surveys. Surveys are needed to detect protected native birds and raptors occurring in suitable nesting habitat that may be disturbed and any other such habitat within 300 feet of the Project disturbance area, to the extent allowable and accessible. For raptors, this radius should be expanded to 500 feet and 0.5 mile for special status species, if feasible. Project personnel, including all contractors working on site, should be instructed on the sensitivity of the area. Reductions in the nest buffer distance may be appropriate depending on the avian species involved, ambient levels of human activity, screening vegetation, or possibly other factors.

- 10) Loss of Bird and Raptor Nesting and Breeding Habitat. The Project proposes to develop within or adjacent to the Important Bird Area.
- a) CDFW recommends the PEIR analyze and discuss the Project's impacts on bird and raptor nesting and breeding habitat. Edge effects should also be analyzed and discussed (see Comment #5). CDFW recommends the PEIR disclose the amount of bird and raptor nesting and breeding habitat that would be impact and lost as a result of the proposed Project.
 - b) CDFW recommends the Project avoid developing and encroaching onto the Important Bird Area. If avoidance is not feasible, CDFW recommends the PEIR provide measures to mitigate for impacts on bird and raptor nesting and breeding habitat. Depending on the status of the bird or raptor species impacted, replacement habitat acres should increase with the occurrence of a Species of Special Concern. Replacement habitat acres should further increase with the occurrence of a CESA-listed threatened or endangered species.
 - c) CDFW recommends the PEIR provide measures where future development facilitated by the Project avoids removal of any native trees, large and dense-canopied native and non-native trees, and trees occurring in high density. CDFW also recommends avoiding impacts to understory vegetation (e.g., ground cover, subshrubs, and shrubs). If trees are removed, CDFW recommends future development facilitated by the Project provides replacement to compensate for temporal or permanent loss habitat within a project site. CDFW recommends planting native tree species preferred by birds and are native to the area.
- 11) Bats. Bats, including some SSC, have been documented in the open space/natural areas adjacent to the Project area (Remington 2006). Project construction and activities, including (but not limited to) ground disturbance, vegetation removal, and any activities leading to increased noise levels may have direct and/or indirect impacts on bats and roosts. Accordingly, CDFW recommends the PEIR provide measures where future development facilitated by the Project avoids potential impacts on bats.
- a) Bats are considered non-game mammals and are afforded protection by state law from take and/or harassment (Fish & G. Code, § 4150; Cal. Code of Regs., § 251.1). Additionally, some bats are SSC. CEQA provides protection not only for CESA-listed species, but for any species including but not limited to SSC which can be shown to meet the criteria for State listing. These SSC meet the CEQA definition of endangered, rare, or threatened species (CEQA Guidelines, § 15380). Take of SSC could require a

Tina Lui
City of Whittier
May 25, 2021
Page 8 of 14

mandatory finding of significance (CEQA Guidelines, § 15065).

- b) CDFW recommends the PEIR provide measures where future development facilitated by the Project provides surveys for bats and roosts. The project-level environmental document should disclose and discuss potential impacts on bats/roosts. If necessary, to reduce impacts to less than significant, the project-level environmental document should provide bat-specific avoidance and/or mitigation measures [CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.4(a)(1)].

General Comments

- 1) Disclosure. An environmental document should provide an adequate, complete, and detailed disclosure about the effect which a proposed project is likely to have on the environment (Pub. Resources Code, § 20161; CEQA Guidelines, §15151). Adequate disclosure is necessary so CDFW may provide comments on the adequacy of proposed avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures, as well as to assess the significance of the specific impact relative to plant and wildlife species impacted (e.g., current range, distribution, population trends, and connectivity).
- 2) Mitigation Measures. Public agencies have a duty under CEQA to prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures [CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15002(a)(3), 15021]. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4, an environmental document “shall describe feasible measures which could mitigate for impacts below a significant level under CEQA.”
 - a) Level of Detail. Mitigation measures must be feasible, effective, implemented, and fully enforceable/imposed by the lead agency through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally binding instruments (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.6(b); CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.4). A public agency “shall provide the measures that are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures” (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.6). CDFW recommends that the City provide mitigation measures that are specific, detailed (i.e., responsible party, timing, specific actions, location), and clear in order for a measure to be fully enforceable and implemented successfully via a mitigation monitoring and/or reporting program (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.6; CEQA Guidelines, § 15097). Adequate disclosure is necessary so CDFW may provide comments on the adequacy and feasibility of proposed mitigation measures.
 - b) Disclosure of Impacts. If a proposed mitigation measure would cause one or more significant effects, in addition to impacts caused by the Project as proposed, the environmental document should include a discussion of the effects of proposed mitigation measures [CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.4(a)(1)]. In that regard, the environmental document should provide an adequate, complete, and detailed disclosure about a project’s proposed mitigation measure(s). Adequate disclosure is necessary so CDFW may assess the potential impacts of proposed mitigation measures.
- 3) Biological Baseline Assessment. An adequate biological resources assessment should provide a complete assessment and impact analysis of the flora and fauna within and adjacent to a project site and where a project may result in ground disturbance. The

Tina Lui
City of Whittier
May 25, 2021
Page 9 of 14

assessment and analysis should place emphasis upon identifying endangered, threatened, sensitive, regionally, and locally unique species, and sensitive habitats. Impact analysis will aid in determining any direct, indirect, and cumulative biological impacts, as well as specific mitigation or avoidance measures necessary to offset those impacts. CDFW recommends avoiding any sensitive natural communities found on or adjacent to a project. CDFW also considers impacts to California Species of Special Concern a significant direct and cumulative adverse effect without implementing appropriate avoidance and/or mitigation measures. An environmental document should include the following information:

- a) 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)]. An environmental document should include measures to fully avoid and otherwise protect Sensitive Natural Communities from project-related impacts. CDFW considers these communities as threatened habitats having both regional and local significance. Plant communities, alliances, and associations with a state-wide ranking of S1, S2, and S3 should be considered sensitive and declining at the local and regional level. These ranks can be obtained by visiting the [Vegetation Classification and Mapping Program - Natural Communities](#) webpage (CDFW 2021c);
- b) 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 Sensitive Natural Communities](#) (CDFW 2018). Adjoining habitat areas should be included where project construction and activities could lead to direct or indirect impacts off site;
- c) Floristic, alliance- and/or association-based mapping and vegetation impact assessments conducted at a project site and within the neighboring vicinity. The [Manual of California Vegetation](#) (MCV), second edition, should also be used to inform this mapping and assessment (Sawyer et al. 2009). Adjoining habitat areas should be included in this assessment where project activities could lead to direct or indirect impacts off site. Habitat mapping at the alliance level will help establish baseline vegetation conditions;
- d) A complete, recent, assessment of the biological resources associated with each habitat type on site and within adjacent areas that could also be affected by a project. CDFW's [California Natural Diversity Database](#) (CNDDDB) in Sacramento should be contacted to obtain current information on any previously reported sensitive species and habitat (CDFW 2021d). An assessment should include a nine-quadrangle search of the CNDDDB to determine a list of species potentially present at a project site. A lack of records in the CNDDDB does not mean that rare, threatened, or endangered plants and wildlife do not occur in the project site. Field verification for the presence or absence of sensitive species is necessary to provide a complete biological assessment for adequate CEQA review [CEQA Guidelines, § 15003(i)];
- e) A complete, recent, assessment of rare, threatened, and endangered, and other sensitive species on site and within the area of potential effect, including California Species of Special Concern and California Fully Protected Species (Fish & G. Code, §§ 3511, 4700, 5050, and 5515). Species to be addressed should include all those which meet the CEQA definition of endangered, rare, or threatened species (CEQA

Tina Lui
City of Whittier
May 25, 2021
Page 10 of 14

Guidelines, § 15380). Seasonal variations in use of a project site should also be addressed such as wintering, roosting, nesting, and foraging habitat. Focused species-specific surveys, conducted at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, may be required if suitable habitat is present. See CDFW's [Survey and Monitoring Protocols and Guidelines](#) for established survey protocol for select species (CDFW 2021e). Acceptable species-specific survey procedures may be developed in consultation with CDFW and the USFWS; and,

- f) A recent wildlife and rare plant survey. 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 a proposed project may warrant periodic updated surveys for certain sensitive taxa, particularly if build out could occur over a protracted time frame or in phases.
- 4) Data. CEQA requires that information developed in environmental impact reports 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 by completing and submitting [CNDDDB Field Survey Forms](#) (CDFW 2021f). The City should ensure data collected for the preparation of any Project-related environmental document be properly submitted, with all data fields applicable filled out. The data entry should also list pending development as a threat and then update this occurrence after impacts have occurred.
 - 5) Biological Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Impacts. CDFW recommends providing a thorough discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources, with specific measures to offset such impacts. The PEIR should address the following:
 - a) A discussion regarding Project-related indirect impacts on biological resources, including resources in nearby public lands, open space, adjacent natural habitats, riparian ecosystems, and any designated and/or proposed or existing reserve lands [e.g., preserve lands associated with a Natural Community Conservation Plan (Fish & G. Code, § 2800 et. seq.)]. Impacts on, and maintenance of, wildlife corridor/movement areas, including access to undisturbed habitats in adjacent areas, should be fully evaluated in the PEIR;
 - b) A discussion of both the short-term and long-term effects to species population distribution and concentration and alterations of the ecosystem supporting the species impacted [CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.2(a)];
 - c) A discussion of potential adverse impacts from lighting, noise, temporary and permanent human activity, and exotic species, and identification of any mitigation measures;
 - d) A discussion of Project-related changes on drainage patterns; the 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 sites. The discussion should also address the potential water extraction activities and the potential resulting impacts on the habitat (if any) supported by the groundwater. Mitigation measures proposed to alleviate such Project impacts should be included;

Tina Lui
City of Whittier
May 25, 2021
Page 11 of 14

- e) An analysis of impacts from proposed changes to land use designations and zoning, and existing land use designation and zoning located nearby or adjacent to natural areas that may inadvertently contribute to wildlife-human interactions. A discussion of possible conflicts and mitigation measures to reduce these conflicts should be included in the PEIR; and,
 - f) A cumulative effects analysis, as described under CEQA Guidelines section 15130. General and specific plans, as well as past, present, and anticipated future projects, should be analyzed relative to their impacts on similar plant and wildlife species, habitat, and vegetation communities. If the City determines that the Project would not have a cumulative impact, the environmental document should indicate why the cumulative impact is not significant. The City's conclusion should be supported by facts and analyses [CEQA Guidelines, § 15130(a)(2)].
- 6) Project Description and Alternatives. To enable CDFW to adequately review and comment on the proposed Project from the standpoint of the protection of plants, fish, and wildlife, we recommend the following information be included in the PEIR:
- a) A complete discussion of the purpose and need for, and description of, the proposed Project, including all staging areas; access routes to the construction and staging areas; fuel modification footprint; and grading footprint;
 - b) Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(a), an environmental document "shall describe a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives to the Project, or to the location of the Project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project." CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(f)(2) states if the Lead Agency concludes that no feasible alternative locations exist, it must disclose the reasons for this conclusion and should include reasons in the environmental document; and,
 - c) A range of feasible alternatives to the Project location and design features to avoid or otherwise minimize direct and indirect impacts to sensitive biological resources and wildlife movement areas. CDFW recommends the City consider configuring Project construction and activities, as well as the development footprint, in such a way as to fully avoid impacts to sensitive and special status plants and wildlife species, habitat, and sensitive vegetation communities. CDFW also recommends the City consider establishing appropriate setbacks from sensitive and special status biological resources. Setbacks should not be impacted by ground disturbance or hydrological changes for the duration of the Project and from any future development. As a general rule, CDFW recommends reducing or clustering the development footprint to retain unobstructed spaces for vegetation and wildlife and provide connections for wildlife between properties and minimize obstacles to open space.

Project alternatives should be thoroughly evaluated, even if an alternative would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the Project objectives or would be more costly (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6).

- d) Where the Project may impact aquatic and riparian resources, CDFW recommends the City consider alternatives that would fully avoid impacts to such resources. CDFW also

Tina Lui
City of Whittier
May 25, 2021
Page 12 of 14

recommends alternatives that would allow not impede, alter, or otherwise modify existing surface flow; watercourse and meander; and water-dependent ecosystems and vegetation communities. Project-related designs should consider elevated crossings to avoid channelizing or narrowing of streams. Any modifications to a river, creek, or stream may cause or magnify upstream bank erosion, channel incision, and drop in water level and cause the stream to alter its course of flow.

- 7) CESA. CDFW considers adverse impacts to a species protected by CESA to be significant without mitigation under CEQA. As to CESA, take of any endangered, threatened, candidate species, or CESA-listed plant species that results from the Project is prohibited, except as authorized by state law (Fish & G. Code §§ 2080, 2085; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §786.9). Consequently, if the Project or any Project-related activity will result in take of a species designated as endangered or threatened, or a candidate for listing under CESA, CDFW recommends that the project proponent seek appropriate take authorization under CESA prior to implementing the project. Appropriate authorization from CDFW may include an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) or a consistency determination in certain circumstances, among other options [Fish & G. Code, §§ 2080.1, 2081, subds. (b) and (c)]. Early consultation is encouraged, as significant modification to a project and mitigation measures may be required in order to obtain a CESA Permit. Revisions to the Fish and Game Code, effective January 1998, may require that CDFW issue a separate CEQA document for the issuance of an ITP unless the project CEQA document addresses all project impacts to CESA-listed species and specifies a mitigation monitoring and reporting program that will meet the requirements of an ITP. For these reasons, biological mitigation monitoring and reporting proposals should be of sufficient detail and resolution to satisfy the requirements for a CESA ITP.
- 8) Translocation/Salvage of Plants and Animal Species. Translocation and transplantation is the process of moving an individual from a project site and permanently moving it to a new location. CDFW generally does not support the use of translocation or transplantation as the primary mitigation strategy for unavoidable impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered plant or animal species. Studies have shown that these efforts are experimental and the outcome unreliable. CDFW has found that permanent preservation and management of habitat capable of supporting these species is often a more effective long-term strategy for conserving sensitive plants and animals and their habitats.
- 9) Compensatory Mitigation. An environmental document should include mitigation measures for adverse project-related direct or indirect impacts to sensitive plants, animals, and habitats. Mitigation measures should emphasize avoidance and reduction of project-related impacts. For unavoidable impacts, on-site habitat restoration or enhancement should be discussed in detail. If on-site mitigation is not feasible or would not be biologically viable and therefore not adequately mitigate the loss of biological functions and values, off-site mitigation through habitat creation and/or acquisition and preservation in perpetuity should be addressed. Areas proposed as mitigation lands should be protected in perpetuity with a conservation easement, financial assurance and dedicated to a qualified entity for long-term management and monitoring. Under Government Code, section 65967, the Lead Agency must exercise due diligence in reviewing the qualifications of a governmental entity, special district, or nonprofit organization to effectively manage and steward land, water, or natural resources on mitigation lands it approves.

Tina Lui
City of Whittier
May 25, 2021
Page 13 of 14

10) Long-term Management of Mitigation Lands. For proposed preservation and/or restoration, an environmental document should include measures to protect the targeted habitat values from direct and indirect negative impacts in perpetuity. The objective should be to offset the project-induced qualitative and quantitative losses of wildlife habitat values. Issues that should be addressed include (but are not limited to) restrictions on access, proposed land dedications, monitoring and management programs, control of illegal dumping, water pollution, and increased human intrusion. An appropriate non-wasting endowment should be set aside to provide for long-term management of mitigation lands.

Conclusion

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the NOP for the General Plan Update and Housing Element Update (2021-2029) to assist the City of Whittier in identifying and mitigating Project impacts on biological resources. If you have any questions or comments regarding this letter, please contact Ruby Kwan-Davis, Senior Environmental Scientist (Specialist), at Ruby.Kwan-Davis@wildlife.ca.gov or (562)-619-2230.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

Erinn Wilson-Olgin

B6E58CFE24724F5...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Environmental Program Manager I
South Coast Region

ec: CDFW

Erinn Wilson-Olgin, Los Alamitos – Erinn.Wilson-Olgin@wildlife.ca.gov

Victoria Tang, Los Alamitos – Victoria.Tang@wildlife.ca.gov

Ruby Kwan-Davis, Los Alamitos – Ruby.Kwan-Davis@wildlife.ca.gov

Andrew Valand, Los Alamitos – Andrew.Valand@wildlife.ca.gov

Felicia Silva, Los Alamitos – Felicia.Silva@wildlife.ca.gov

Frederic Rieman, Los Alamitos – Frederic.Rieman@wildlife.ca.gov

Susan Howell, San Diego – Susan.Howell@wildlife.ca.gov

CEQA Program Coordinator, Sacramento – CEQACommentLetters@wildlife.ca.gov

State Clearinghouse, Sacramento – State.Clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov

References

Audubon Society. 2021. Important Bird Areas, California. [Accessed 21 May 2021]. Available from: <https://www.audubon.org/important-bird-areas/state/california>

[Cal EPA] California Environmental Protection Agency, California Natural Resources agency, California Department of Food and Agriculture, California Air Resources Board, and California Strategic Growth Council. 2019. Draft California 2030 Natural and Working Lands Climate Change Implementation Plan. Available from: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/nwl-implementation-draft>

[CDFW] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021. California Natural Diversity Database. [Accessed: 20 May 2021]. Available from: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Maps-and-Data#43018408-cnddb-in-bios>

Tina Lui
City of Whittier
May 25, 2021
Page 14 of 14

- [CDFWb] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021. Lake and Streambed Alteration Program. Available from: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/LSA>.
- [CDFWc] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021. Natural Communities. Accessed at: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/VegCAMP/Natural-Communities>.
- [CDFWd] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021. California Natural Diversity Database. Available from: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB>
- [CDFWe] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021. Survey and Monitoring Protocols and Guidelines. Available from: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/conservation/survey-protocols>
- [CDFWf] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021. Submitting Data to the CNDDDB. Available from: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Submitting-Data>
- [CDFW] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2018. Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities. Accessed at:
- [CDFW] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2015. SWAP Final 2015 Document. Available from: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/SWAP/Final>
- [CDFW] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2013. CDFW Departmental Bulletin. Human/Wildlife Interactions in California: Mountain Lion Depredation, Public Safety, and Animal Welfare. Available from: <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=68271&inline>
- [CFGCC] California Fish and Game Commission. 2020. Policies. Retention of Wetland Acreage and Habitat Values. Accessed: <https://fgc.ca.gov/About/Policies/Miscellaneous>.
- [CNRA] California Natural Resources Agency. 2018. Safeguarding California Plan: 2018 Update. California's Climate Adaptation Strategy. Available from: <https://files.resources.ca.gov/climate/safeguarding/>
- County of Los Angeles. 2021. Open Data. Fire Hazard Severity Zones. [Accessed 21 May 2021]. Available from: <https://data.lacounty.gov/dataset/Fire-Hazard-Severity-Zones/jwg2-9k5y>
- Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deepwater habitats of the United States. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. FWS/OBS-79/31. Washington, DC.
- [LACDRP] Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning. 2019. Significant Ecological Areas Program. Maps. Available from: <https://planning.lacounty.gov/site/sea/maps/>
- [LSA] LSA Associates, Inc. 2007. Final Resources Management Plan. Submitted to Puente Hills Landfill Native Habitat Preservation Authority. Available from: <https://www.habitatauthority.org/resource-management-plan/>
- Remington, S. 2006. Bat Surveys of the Puente Hills (Whittier Hills, Hacienda Heights, La Habra Heights, and Rowland Heights). Final Report. Conducted for The Puente Hills Landfill Native Habitat Preservation Authority. Available from: <https://www.habitatauthority.org/studies/>
- Sawyer, J. O., Keeler-Wolf, T., and Evens J.M. 2009. A Manual of California Vegetation, 2nd ed. ISBN 978-0-943460-49-9.
- [USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2021. USFWS Threatened & Endangered Species Active Critical Habitat Report. Online Mapper. [Accessed 21 May 2021]. Available from: <https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/report/table/critical-habitat.html>