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

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director

February 9, 2022

Cindi Hoover
Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department
2700 "M" Street, Suite 100
Bakersfield, California 93301

Subject: Ware Malcomb Industrial Project by Ware Malcomb (Project)
Notice of Preparation (NOP)
State Clearinghouse No. 2022010144

Dear Cindi Hoover:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) received a NOP for an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) from Kern County, as Lead Agency, for the Project pursuant the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines.[1]

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and recommendations regarding those activities involved in the Project that may affect California fish and wildlife. Likewise, 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 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.

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

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.

As a responsible agency, 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.

CDFW has jurisdiction over fully protected species of birds, mammals, amphibians and reptiles, and fish, pursuant to Fish and Game Code sections 3511, 4700, 5050, and 5515. Take of any fully protected species is prohibited and CDFW cannot authorize their incidental take. However, CDFW may authorize, pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2081.12, by permit, the take or possession of the State fully-protected blunt-nosed leopard lizard (*Gambelia sila*) resulting from impacts attributable to or otherwise related to the Project.

Other Rare Species: Species of plants and animals need not be officially listed as Endangered, Rare or Threatened (E, R, or T) on any State or federal list pursuant to CESA and/or the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) to be considered E, R, or T under CEQA. If a species can be shown to meet the criteria for a listing as E, R, or T under CESA and/or ESA as specified in the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14, Chapter 3, § 15380), it should be fully considered in the environmental analysis for the Project.

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).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Proponent: Ware Malcomb

Objective: The Ware Malcomb Industrial Project, as proposed by Ware Malcomb would develop an approximately 3,417,199-square-foot multi-story high-cube warehouse and related improvements, on approximately 69 acres of privately-owned land. The project site consists of one site located on a single parcel. The proposed facility would have a first-floor footprint of approximately 649,650 square feet (including approximately 33,000 square feet of office space, and break and ancillary space) that would primarily facilitate material handling equipment and warehouse uses. The project's permanent facilities would include, but are not limited to, perimeter security fencing and nighttime directional lighting at the on-site warehouse and distribution facility, new pavement, curb and gutter, and sidewalk on frontage roads with associated signing and markings, office, break and ancillary space, and Robotic Storage Platforms (RSP) that would house a large, automated storage retrieval system with shelf-like storage units (pods) that are moved by low-profile robots.

Location: The project site is approximately 68.98 acres in size, and is located at the southern end of the San Joaquin Valley, in unincorporated Kern County, California. The project site is bounded by Wible Road (west), Houghton Road (north), and agricultural land (south and east). The Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) for the project site is APN 184-391-08.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CDFW offers the comments and recommendations below to assist the Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department 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 CEQA document.

The Project area is within the geographic range of several special-status animal species including the State threatened and federally endangered San Joaquin kit fox (*Vulpes macrotis mutica*), the State threatened tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*), and the State threatened Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*). The Project area is also in the range of several species of special concern such as, American badger (*Taxidea taxus*), burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), California glossy snake (*Arizona elegans occidentalis*) and California legless lizard (*Anniella pulchra*)

CDFW requests that the EIR fully identify potential impacts to biological resources, including the above-mentioned species. In order to adequately assess any potential impact to biological resources, focused biological surveys should be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist/botanist during the appropriate survey period(s) in order to determine whether any special-status species and/or suitable habitat features may be present within the Project area. Properly conducted biological surveys, and the information assembled from them, are essential to identify any mitigation, minimization,

and avoidance measures and/or the need for additional or protocol-level surveys, and to identify any Project-related impacts under CESA and other species of concern. CDFW recommends that the following be incorporated into the EIR.

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: The Project is within the known range of SJKF. The NOP states that the habitat within the Project site consists of active agricultural fields. In addition to grasslands, SJKF den in a variety of areas such as rights-of-way, vacant lots, agricultural and fallow or 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 the Project area due to the type and level of ground-disturbing activities and the loose, friable soils resulting from intensive ground disturbance. As a result, there is potential for SJKF to occupy the Project site and surrounding area.

Specific impact: Without appropriate avoidance and minimization measures for SJKF, potential significant impacts associated with Project related activities include, 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). Western Kern County supports relatively large areas of high suitability habitat and one of the largest remaining populations of SJKF (Cypher et al. 2013). The Project and surrounding area could support SJKF; therefore, subsequent ground disturbing activities and conversion of suitable habitat associated with the Project may have the potential to significantly impact local SJKF populations.

Recommended Mitigation Measure 1: SJKF Surveys

CDFW recommends assessing presence/absence of SJKF by conducting surveys following the USFWS' "Standardized recommendations for protection of the San Joaquin kit fox prior to or during ground disturbance" (2011). Specifically, CDFW advises conducting these surveys in all areas of potentially suitable habitat no less

than 14-days and no more than 30-days prior to beginning of ground and/or vegetation disturbing activities.

Recommended Mitigation Measure 2: SJKF Avoidance

CDFW recommends implementing no-disturbance buffers, as described in the USFWS "Standardized recommendations for protection of the San Joaquin kit fox prior to or during ground disturbance" (2011) around den sites.

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 subdivision (b).

Recommended Mitigation Measure 4: Perimeter Fences

CDFW recommends all perimeter fencing be raised five to seven inches above ground level and knuckled under to allow SJKF movement through Project site and minimize impacts to SJKF habitat connectivity.

COMMENT 2: Tricolored Blackbird (TRBL)

Issue: TRBL colonies require suitable nesting habitat, nearby freshwater, and nearby foraging habitat including semi-natural grasslands, agricultural croplands or alkali scrub (Beedy et al. 2017). Based on information provided by the NOP, land use both within and surrounding the Project area may provide suitable nesting and foraging habitat for TRBL.

Specific impact: Without appropriate avoidance and minimization measures for TRBL, potential significant impacts associated with Project activities include nest and/or colony abandonment, reduced reproductive success, and reduced health and vigor of eggs and/or young.

Evidence impact would be significant: The Project site contains elements that have the potential to support TRBL nesting colonies. TRBL aggregate and nest colonially, forming colonies of up to 100,000 nests (Beedy et al. 2017). This species has been steadily declining due to annual breeding losses due to crop-harvesting activities, insufficient insect resources, and habitat loss due to land conversion for agriculture, rangeland, and urban development (Beedy et al. 2017).

Recommended Mitigation Measure 5: TRBL Surveys

CDFW recommends that Project activities be timed to avoid the normal bird breeding season (February 1 through September 15). However, if Project activities must take place during that time, CDFW recommend that a qualified biologist conduct habitat assessment surveys prior to Project activities at individual Project sites. If suitable habitat is present CDFW recommends that a qualified wildlife biologist conduct surveys for nesting TRBL no more than 10 days prior to the start of implementation to evaluate presence/absence of TRBL nesting colonies in proximity to Project activities and to evaluate potential Project-related impacts.

Recommended Mitigation Measure 6: TRBL Avoidance

If an active TRBL nesting colony is found during preconstruction surveys, CDFW recommends implementation of a minimum 300-foot no-disturbance buffer in accordance with CDFW's "Staff Guidance Regarding Avoidance of Impacts to Tricolored Blackbird Breeding Colonies on Agriculture Fields in 2015" (CDFW 2015). CDFW advises that this buffer remain in place until the breeding season has ended or until a qualified biologist has determined that nesting has ceased, the birds have fledged, and are no longer reliant upon the colony or parental care for survival. It is important to note that TRBL colonies can expand over time and for this reason, the colony should be reassessed to determine the extent of the breeding colony within 10 days for Project initiation.

Recommended Mitigation Measure 7: TRBL Take Avoidance

In the event that a TRBL nesting colony is detected during surveys, consultation with CDFW is warranted to discuss how to implement the Project and avoid take, or if avoidance is not feasible, to acquire an ITP, pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2081 subdivision (b), prior to any ground-disturbing activities.

COMMENT 3: Swainson's Hawk (SWHA)

Issue: SWHA have the potential to nest near the Project site, and forage within the Project site. SWHA have been documented to occur approximately 1.2 miles west of the Project site (CDFW 2022). The habitat types present at the Project site all provide suitable foraging habitat for SWHA, increasing the likelihood of SWHA occurrence within the vicinity. In addition, any trees in the Project vicinity have the potential to provide suitable nesting habitat.

Specific impact: 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. All trees, including non-native or ornamental varieties, near the Project site may provide potential nesting sites.

Evidence impact would be significant: SWHA exhibit high nest-site fidelity year after year and lack of suitable nesting habitat limits their local distribution and abundance (CDFW 2016). If potential nest site occur in the Project vicinity, approval of the Project may lead to subsequent ground-disturbing activities that involve noise, groundwork, construction of structures, and movement of workers that could affect nests and has the potential to result in nest abandonment and/or loss of foraging habitat, significantly impacting local nesting SWHA.

Recommended Mitigation Measure 8: Focused SWHA Surveys

To evaluate potential Project-related impacts, CDFW recommends that a qualified wildlife biologist conduct surveys for nesting SWHA following the entire survey methodology developed by the SWHA Technical Advisory Committee (SWHA TAC 2000) prior to Project implementation (during CEQA analysis). SWHA detection during protocol-level surveys warrants consultation with CDFW to discuss how to implement Project activities and avoid take.

Recommended Mitigation Measure 9: SWHA Avoidance

CDFW recommends that if Project-specific activities will take place during the SWHA nesting season (i.e., March 1 through September 15), and active SWHA nests are present, a minimum ½-mile no-disturbance buffer be delineated and maintained around each nest, regardless if when it was detected by surveys or incidentally, until the breeding season has ended or until a qualified biologist has determined that the birds have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival, to prevent nest abandonment and other take of SWHA as a result of Project activities.

Recommended Mitigation Measure 10: SWHA Take Authorization

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

Recommended Mitigation Measure 11: Loss of SWHA Foraging Habitat

CDFW recommends compensation for the loss of SWHA foraging habitat as described in CDFW's "Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson's

Hawks" (CDFG 1994) to reduce impacts to foraging habitat to less than significant. The Staff Report recommends that mitigation for habitat loss occur within a minimum distance of 10 miles from known nest sites. CDFW has the following recommendations based on the Staff Report:

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

Recommended Mitigation Measure 12: SWHA Tree Removal

CDFW recommends that the removal of known SWHA nest trees, even outside of the nesting season, be replaced with an appropriate native tree species planting at a ratio of 3:1 at or near the Project area or in another area that will be protected in perpetuity. This mitigation would offset the local and temporal impacts of nesting habitat loss.

COMMENT 4: Burrowing Owl (BUOW)

Issue: BUOW have been documented to occur approximately 2 miles west of the Project site (CDFW 2022). BUOW inhabit open grassland and similar habitat types containing small mammal burrows, a requisite habitat feature used by BUOW for nesting and cover.

Specific impact: Potentially significant direct impacts associated with subsequent activities and land conversion include habitat loss, 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). 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 Mitigation Measure 13: BUOW Surveys

CDFW recommends assessing presence or 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 the "Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation" (CDFG 2012), which suggest three or more surveillance surveys conducted during daylight with each visit occurring at least three weeks apart during the peak breeding season (i.e., April 15 to July 15), when BUOW are most detectable. In addition, CDFW advises that surveys include a minimum 500-foot buffer area around the Project area.

Recommended Mitigation Measure 14: BUOW Avoidance

Should a BUOW be detected, CDFW recommends that 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 15: 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), excluding birds from burrows is not a take avoidance, minimization, or mitigation method and is instead considered a potentially significant impact under CEQA. However, if it is necessary for Project implementation, 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 one (1) burrow collapsed to one (1) artificial burrow constructed (1:1) to mitigate for

evicting BUOW and the loss of burrows. 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.

Editorial Comments and/or Suggestions

Federally Listed Species: CDFW recommends consulting with USFWS regarding potential impacts to federally listed species including but not limited to San Joaquin kit fox. Take under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) is more broadly defined than CESA; take under FESA also includes significant habitat modification or degradation that could result in death or injury to a listed species by interfering with essential behavioral patterns such as breeding, foraging, or nesting. Consultation with the USFWS in order to comply with FESA is advised well in advance of any Project activities.

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).

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

To evaluate Project-related impacts on nesting birds, CDFW recommends that a qualified wildlife biologist conduct pre-activity surveys for active nests no more than 10 days prior to the start of ground disturbance to maximize the probability that nests that could potentially be impacted by the Project are detected. CDFW also recommends that surveys cover a sufficient area around the work site to identify nests and determine their status. A sufficient area means any area potentially affected by a project. In addition to direct impacts (i.e., nest destruction), noise, vibration, and movement of workers or equipment could also affect nests. Prior to initiation of construction activities, CDFW recommends that a qualified biologist conduct a survey to establish a behavioral baseline of all identified nests. Once construction begins, CDFW recommends that a qualified biologist continuously monitor nests to detect behavioral changes resulting from the project. If behavioral changes occur, CDFW recommends that the work causing that change cease and CDFW be consulted 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 parental care for survival. Variance from these no-disturbance buffers is possible when there is compelling biological or ecological reason to do so, such as when the construction area would be concealed from a nest site by topography. CDFW recommends that a qualified wildlife biologist advise and support any variance from these buffers and notify CDFW in advance of implementing a variance.

ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

CEQA requires that information developed in environmental impact reports and negative declarations be incorporated into a database, which may be used to make subsequent or supplemental environmental determinations (Pub. Resources Code, § 21003, subd. (e)). Accordingly, please report any special-status species and natural communities detected during Project surveys to the CNDDB. The CNDDB field survey form can be found at the following link: https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/Submitting-Data. The completed form can be mailed electronically to CNDDB at the following email address: CNDDB@wildlife.ca.gov. The types of information reported to CNDDB can be found at the following link: https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/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).

CONCLUSION

CDFW appreciates the opportunity to comment on the NOP to assist Kern County in identifying and mitigating Project impacts on biological resources.

If you have any questions, please contact Jaime Marquez, Environmental Scientist, at the address provided on this letterhead, by telephone at (559) 580-3200, or by electronic mail at Jaime.Marquez@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
Julie Vance
FA83F09FE08945A...

Julie A. Vance
Regional Manager

REFERENCES

Beedy, E. C., W. J. Hamilton III, R. J. Meese, D. A. Airola, and P. Pyle. 2017. Tricolored Blackbird (Agelaius tricolor), version 3.0. in The birds of North America. P. G.

California Burrowing Owl Consortium (CBOC). 1993. Burrowing owl survey protocol and mitigation guidelines. Pages 171-177 *in* Lincer, J. L. and K. Steenhof (editors). 1993. The burrowing owl, its biology and management. Raptor Research Report Number 9.

CDFG, 1994. Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson's Hawks (*Buteo Swainsoni*) in the Central Valley of California. California Department of Fish and Game. https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=83992&inline

CDFG. 2012. Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. California Department of Fish and Game. March 7, 2012.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), 2016. Five Year Status Review for Swainson's Hawk (Buteo swainsoni). California Department of Fish and Wildlife. April 11, 2016.

CDFW. 2015. Staff Guidance Regarding Avoidance of Impacts to Tricolored Blackbird Breeding Colonies on Agricultural Fields in 2015. March 19, 2015.

CDFW, 2022. Biogeographic Information and Observation System (BIOS). https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/BIOS. Accessed February 1, 2022.

Cypher, B. and N. Frost. 1999. Condition of San Joaquin kit foxes in urban and exurban habitats. Journal of Wildlife Management 63: 930-938.

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

Estep, J. 2009. The influence of vegetation structure on Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*) foraging habitat suitability in Yolo County, California. Prepared for the Yolo Natural Heritage Program, Woodland, CA.

Gervais, J. A., D. K. Rosenberg, and L. A. Comrack. 2008. Burrowing Owl (*Athene cunicularia*) *In* California Bird Species of Special Concern: A ranked assessment of species, subspecies, and distinct populations of birds of immediate conservation concern in California (W. D. Shuford and T. Gardali, editors).

Studies of Western Birds 1. Western Field Ornithologists, Camarillo, California, and California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento.

Kelsey, R. 2008. Results of the tricolored blackbird 2008 census. Report submitted to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, OR, USA.

Meese, R. J., E.C. Beedy, and W.J. Hamilton, III. 2014. Tricolored blackbird (Agelaius tricolor), The Birds of North America (P. G. Rodewald, Ed.). Ithaca: Cornell Lab of Ornithology; Retrieved from the Birds of North America: https://birdsna-org.bnaproxy.birds.cornell.edu/Species-Account/bna/species/tribla. Accessed April 20, 2021

Orians, G.H. 1961. The ecology of blackbird (*Agelaius*) social systems. Ecol. Monogr. 31:285-312.

Gittleman, J. L., S. M. Funk, D. MacDonald, and R. K. Wayne, 2001. Carnivore conservation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

Shuford, W. D. and T. Gardali (editors). 2008. California Bird Species of Special Concern: A Ranked Assessment of Species, Subspecies, and Distinct Populations of Birds of Immediate Conservation Concern in California. Published by Western Field Ornithologists and California Department of Fish and Game.

Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee (SWHA TAC), 2000. Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in the Central Valley of California. Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee. May 31, 2000.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), 1998. Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California. Region 1, Portland, OR. 319 pp. https://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es_species/Accounts/Mammals/giant_kangaroo_rat/documents/980930a.pdf

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.

Weintraub, K., T.L. George, and S.J. Dinsmore. 2016. Nest survival of tricolored blackbirds in California's Central Valley. The Condor 118(4): 850–8

Attachment 1

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

PROJECT: Ware Malcomb Industrial Project
SCH No.: 2022010144

RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURE	STATUS/DATE/INITIALS
Before Disturbing Soil or Vegetation	
Mitigation Measure 1: SJKF Surveys	
Mitigation Measure 3: SJKF Take Authorization	
Mitigation Measure 5: TRBL Surveys	
Mitigation Measure 7: TRBL Take Avoidance	
Mitigation Measure 8: Focused SWHA Surveys	
Mitigation Measure 10: SWHA Take Authorization	
Mitigation Measure 11: Loss of SWHA Foraging Habitat	
Mitigation Measure 12: SWHA Tree Removal	
Mitigation Measure 13: BUOW Surveys	
Mitigation Measure 15: BUOW Passive Relocation and Mitigation	
During Construction	
Mitigation Measure 2: SJKF Avoidance	
Mitigation Measure 4: Perimeter Fencing	
Mitigation Measure 6: TRBL Avoidance	
Mitigation Measure 9: SWHA Avoidance	
Mitigation Measure 14: BUOW Avoidance	