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

March 14, 2022

Mr. Iain Holt
City of Thousand Oaks
2100 Thousand Oaks Blvd
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362
IHolt@toaks.org

Subject: Conejo Summit Project, Mitigated Negative Declaration, SCH No. 2022020269; City of Thousand Oaks, Ventura County

Dear Mr. Holt:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has reviewed the City of Thousand Oaks (City; Lead Agency) Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Conejo Summit (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 & Game Code, §§ 711.7, subdivision (a) & 1802; Public 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 (Public 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 & Game 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 & Game Code, § 2050 *et seq.*), or CESA-listed rare plant pursuant to the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA; Fish & Game Code, §1900 *et seq.*), CDFW recommends the Project proponent obtain appropriate authorization under the Fish and Game Code.

Project Description and Summary

Objective: The proposed Project will erect a 15-building business park along three separate lots along 15 of the 16 different land parcels included in the development area. Lot eight is approximately 0.21 acres and will remain undeveloped as it restricted by a conservation easement. These separate lots and parcels are approximately 49.83 acres combined, of which 49.62 acres will be developed. The Project is surrounded by open space, industrial, and residential designated land use areas. The Project includes the following activities:

15- Building Business Park
The buildings will be built within the 49.83 acres and would range in size from 32,015 square feet (SF) to 93,308 SF of floor area. Building heights would range from 37 to 41 feet, although maximum average building heights for this zoning area is 35 feet. Primary access to the proposed buildings would be from Rancho Conejo Boulevard and Conejo Center Drive.

Parking Lot
Parking lots will be developed around structures in each of the three lot clusters, totaling 1,663 stalls along the development. The lots will be on all sides of the development. Vesting Tentative Tract Maps (VTTM) number 6021 (VTTM No. 6021), which includes two of the three lot clusters will have 1,120 car stalls. The remaining lot, VTTM No. 6022 will have a total of 543 car stalls.

Landscaping
Landscaping is planned along the development, although plans were not detailed within this report. It is unclear where landscaping will be placed, what plants will be used, or the City's plans for irrigation.

Exterior Lighting
No plans for lighting were outlined within this report. It is unclear how tall lighting fixtures will be, where they will be placed, how they will be placed, operating hours, or what type of fixtures will be used. Mention of shields was noted within the report to reduce spillage, but further details have not been offered.

Grading and Construction
The buildings within the Project are anticipated to be of conventional tilt-up panel construction with concrete interior slabs on grade. Grading would consist of minor cuts and fills to provide level building pads, parking, and circulation areas, and to remove the upper weathered, desiccated soils. Additional minor grading would be needed to level the previously graded pads. The proposed Project would require approximately 95,440 cubic yards of cut and fill, which would be balanced on the site. As such, the City claims no import or export of materials is anticipated to occur. The proposed Project would consist of a maximum of seven phases, with an anticipated construction period of 12 to 15 months for each phase. The planned phases are as follows:

- Phase 1: Buildings 1A, 1B, 1C, and 1D
- Phase 2: Buildings 1E, 1F, and 1G
- Phase 3: Building 2
- Phase 4: Building 3

- Phase 5: Buildings 5A and 5B
- Phase 6: Buildings 6A and 6B
- Phase 7: Buildings 4A and 4B

Additional On-Site Components
Utility hookups would be installed from existing lines within the streets to the proposed buildings. Loading docks and refuse areas would be developed.

Easements
The Project footprint will obstruct access to several trails in the area, which provide access to the Conejo Canyons Open Space (CCOS). Thus, several easements will be placed to allow foot traffic and emergency fire vehicles to access the trails and open space areas. A proposed equestrian trail will be built by different entities along Academy Drive, west of the Project. A three-foot-wide easement will be placed on the north side of Conejo Drive and an eight-foot-wide easement on the east side of Academy Drive to allow trail access. Additionally, a 20-foot-wide fire access easement and a 10-foot-wide pedestrian trail will be placed along the parking lot of Lot 6B. These easements will provide access to the Hill Canyon Fire Road.

Off-Site Improvements
The proposed Project would enhance 17.49 acres of native scrub vegetation located within adjacent Conejo Open Space Conservation Area (COSCA) land, at a ratio of 1:1. The proposed enhancement shall include, at a minimum, the treatment of non-native and/or invasive (Cal-IPC moderate or high rating) present within existing native scrub vegetation.

Location: The proposed Project is located in the City of Thousand Oaks, Ventura County. The lots are comprised of three separate clusters: on the western side of Conejo Center Drive, northwest of the intersection of Conejo Center Drive and Conejo Spectrum Street; along the eastern side of Conejo Center Drive from Conejo Spectrum Street up to Rancho Conejo Boulevard; and north of the intersection of Conejo Center Drive and Rancho Conejo Boulevard, extending west to a parcel at the end of Rancho Conejo Boulevard. Surrounding land uses include two-story, single-family homes to the south-east; open space to the north-east to the south-west; and industrial/office-park buildings directly to the south, north-west, and north-east of the sites.

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. CDFW recommends the measures or revisions below be included in a science-based monitoring program that contains adaptive management strategies as part of the Project's CEQA mitigation, monitoring and reporting program (Public Resource Code, § 21081.6; CEQA Guidelines, § 15097).

Comment #1: Impact to Rare Plants Due to Inadequate Surveying Protocols

Issue: The Project may impact rare plants and sensitive vegetation communities, including coastal sage scrub.

Specific Impacts: Construction activities and long-term development associated with the Project may result in mortality, reduced reproductive capacity, population declines, and/or local extirpation of special status plants.

Why impacts would occur: Based on the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) and the provided vegetation map on page 41 of the MND, the Project may impact CESA-listed plant species and sensitive vegetation communities. The MND states, "A biological assessment was conducted in February of 2020 by Environmental Science Associates to characterize habitat suitability for sensitive biological resources within the project site. The survey revealed that seven special-status plant species have the potential to occur within the project site." A more generalized system (*Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California* – Holland 1986) was used to classify vegetation of the Project site. However, the Holland classification system does not adequately describe vegetation beyond generic assemblages that are too large scale to determine uniqueness, rareness, value in the landscape, or base restoration planting appropriateness (CDFWa 2022). The ecology-based Holland classification system is no longer supported by the State of California. It has been replaced by the National Vegetation Classification System and its California expression, The Manual of California Vegetation, Second Edition (MCV) (Sawyer, Keeler-Wolf and Evens 2009) under section 1940 of the Fish and Game Code. Sensitive vegetation communities under the MCV are defined and have specific membership requirements. CDFW is unable to determine if the Project may impact sensitive vegetation communities without MCV names identified for the vegetation communities potentially affected by the Project. Likewise, CDFW is unable to recommend appropriate avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation measures without proper classification.

Given that the MND inadequately classifies sensitive vegetation communities on the Project site, it is unclear whether the coastal sage scrub designation is appropriate. Therefore, 1:1 is insufficient because sensitive communities may be present that warrant a higher ratio. In addition, 1:1 ratio does not account for temporal loss. This will result in a net loss of these sensitive communities.

CEQA Guidelines, sections 15070 and 15071 require the MND to analyze if the Project may have a significant effect on the environment as well as review if the Project will "avoid the effect or mitigate to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur." Sensitive and rare plants could be impacted by Project activities. The NPPA prohibits the take and/or possession of State listed rare plants unless authorized by CDFW or in certain limited circumstances. Take of CESA- or NPPA-listed rare plants may only be permitted through an incidental take permit (ITP) or other authorization issued by CDFW pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 14, section, 786.9 subdivision (b). CDFW is concerned the loss of CESA-listed rare plants may occur if appropriate avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation for these species is not adopted.

Evidence impacts would be significant: Inadequate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures for impacts to these CEQA locally sensitive vegetation communities will result in the Project continuing to have a substantial adverse direct, indirect, and cumulative 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

Impacts to special status plant species should be considered significant under CEQA unless they are clearly mitigated below a level of significance. Inadequate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures for impacts to special status plant species will result in the Project continuing to have a substantial adverse direct, indirect, and cumulative 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 USFWS. Additionally, plants that have a California Native Plant Society (CNPS) California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) of 1A, 1B, 2A, and 2B are rare throughout their range, endemic to California, and are seriously or moderately threatened in California. All plants constituting CRPR 1A, 1B, 2A, and 2B meet the definitions of CESA and are eligible for State listing. Impacts to these species or their habitat must be analyzed during preparation of environmental documents relating to CEQA, as they meet the definition of rare or endangered (CEQA Guidelines, § 15380). Please see CNPS Rare Plant Ranks page for additional rank definitions.

Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measure(s):

Mitigation Measure #1: CDFW recommends that floristic, alliance- and/or association-based mapping and vegetation impact assessments be conducted at the Project site and neighboring vicinity. The MND should identify, map, and discuss the specific vegetation alliances within the Project Area following CDFW's *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities* (Survey Protocols, CDFWb 2018) see: (https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/VegCAMP/Natural-Communities). The MND should include the following:

- The specific geographic locations where the special status plants and sensitive natural communities were found. Preferably this will be done by use of global positioning system (GPS) and include the datum16 in which the spatial data was collected, and any uncertainty or error associated with the data. If GPS is not available, a detailed map (1:24,000 or larger) showing locations and boundaries of each special status plant population and sensitive natural community in relation to the project area is acceptable. Mark occurrences and boundaries as accurately as possible.
- The site-specific characteristics of occurrences, such as associated species, habitat and microhabitat, structure of vegetation, topographic features, soil type, texture, and soil parent material. If a special status plant is associated with a wetland, provide a description of the direction of flow and integrity of surface or subsurface hydrology and adjacent off-site hydrological influences as appropriate;
- The number of individuals in each special status plant population as counted (if population is small) or estimated (if population is large);
- If applicable, information about the percentage of each special status plant in each life stage such as seedling, vegetative, flowering, and fruiting;
- The density of special status plants, identifying areas of relatively high, medium and low density of each special status plant in the project area; and,
- Digital images of special status plants and sensitive natural communities in the project area, with diagnostic features.

If the botanical vegetation mapping of the site yields polygons that do not conform to a known alliance/association, contact CDFW to discuss how this should be handled as new alliances must be vetted prior to use.

Mitigation Measure #2: If rare or sensitive plants are found on or near the footprint of the Project, the MND should provide species-specific measures to fully avoid impacts to all ESA- and CESA-listed plants. This may include flagging all plants and/or perimeter of populations; no-work buffers around plants and/or populations (e.g., flagged perimeter plus 50 feet); restrictions on ground disturbing activities within protected areas; relocation of staging and other material piling areas away from protected areas; restrictions on herbicide use and/or type of herbicide and/or application method within 100 feet of sensitive plants; and worker education and training.

Mitigation Measure #3: CDFW recommends the environmental document provide measures to fully mitigate the loss of individual Endangered Species Act (ESA)- and CESA-listed plants and habitat. The MND should provide species-specific measures for on-site mitigation. Each species-specific mitigation plan should adopt an ecosystem-based approach and be of sufficient detail and resolution to describe the following at a minimum: 1) identify the impact and level of impact (e.g., acres or individual plants/habitat impacted); 2) location of on-site mitigation and adequacy of the location(s) to serve as mitigation; 3) assessment of appropriate reference sites; 4) scientific [Genus and species (subspecies/variety if applicable)] of plants being used for restoration; 5) location(s) of propagule source; 6) species-specific planting methods (i.e., container or seed); 7) measurable goals and success criteria for establishing self-sustaining populations (e.g. percent survival rate, absolute cover); 8) long-term monitoring; and, 9) adaptive management techniques.

Please note that CDFW generally does not support the use of salvaging, translocation, or transplantation as the primary mitigation strategy for unavoidable impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered plant species.

Mitigation Measure #4: CDFW recommends avoiding any sensitive natural communities found on the Project. If avoidance is not feasible, the Project proponent should mitigate at a ratio sufficient to achieve a no-net loss for impacts to special status plant species and their associated habitat. CDFW recommends following the Coastal Commission's Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area ratio of 4:1 for impacts to the sensitive vegetation communities including some S4 and S5 habitats.

All revegetation/restoration areas that will serve as mitigation should include preparation of a restoration plan, to be approved by CDFW prior to any ground disturbance. The restoration plan should include restoration and monitoring methods; annual success criteria; contingency actions should success criteria not be met; long-term management and maintenance goals; and a funding mechanism for long-term management. Areas proposed as mitigation should have a recorded conservation easement and be dedicated to an entity which has been approved to hold/manage lands (AB 1094; Government Code, §§ 65965-65968).

Recommendation #1: If new significant effects to rare plants are identified and mitigation measures or project revisions must be added to the MND, CDFW recommends recirculating the environmental document so CDFW may provide additional comments on avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures (CEQA Guidelines, § 15073.5).

Comment #2: Mountain Lion (*Puma concolor*)

Issue: The Project is near designated open space which is in close proximity to wildlife corridors and essential connectivity areas. Although not obstructing the valley below, construction activities may disturb wildlife activity and movement. The Project may impact mountain lion (*Puma concolor*) because the Project occurs within the range of mountain lion habitat.

Specific impacts: The Project is near designated open space which is in close proximity to wildlife corridors and essential connectivity areas. Although not obstructing the valley below, construction activities may disturb wildlife activity and movement. Project activities may impact mountain lion population by increasing human presence, traffic, noise, air pollutants and dust, and artificial lighting.

Why impacts would occur: Mountain lions may occur within the Project footprint or in areas immediate adjacent to the Project. The Project may increase human presence (e.g., new development, public trail access), traffic, noise, and artificial lighting during Project construction and over the life of the Project. Most factors affecting the ability of the southern California mountain lion populations to survive and reproduce are caused by humans (Yap et al. 2019). As California has continued to grow in human population and communities expand into wildland areas, there has been a commensurate increase in direct and indirect interaction between mountain lions and people (CDFWc 2013). As a result, the need to relocate or humanely euthanize mountain lions (depredation kills) may increase for public safety. Mountain lions are exceptionally vulnerable to human disturbance (Lucas 2020). Areas of high human activity have lower occupancy of rare carnivores. Mountain lions tend to avoid roads and trials by the mere presence of those features, regardless of how much they are used (Lucas 2020). Increased traffic could cause vehicle strikes. Mountain lions avoid areas with low woody vegetation cover and artificial outdoor lighting (Beir 1995). As human population density increases, the probability of mountain lion persistence decreases (Woodroffe 2000).

Loss of wildlife connectivity is another primary driver for the potential demise of the southern California mountain lion population (Yap et al. 2019). Habitat loss and fragmentation due to roads and development has driven the southern California mountain lion population towards extinction (Yap et al. 2019). Conserving and restoring habitat connectivity and corridors is essential for mitigating impacts to mountain lions. This is especially critical in the face of climate change-driven habitat loss and increased frequency of fires (Yap et al. 2019). Under a high emissions and warm and wet climate scenario, much of the chaparral habitat in southern California that provide habitat for mountain lions would be climactically highly stressed by the year 2070 (Thorne et al. 2016).

Evidence impact would be significant: The mountain lion is a specially protected mammal in the State (Fish and Game Code, § 4800). In addition, on April 21, 2020, the California Fish and Game Commission accepted a petition to list an evolutionarily significant unit (ESU) of mountain lion in southern and central coastal California as threatened under CESA (CDFWd 2020). As a CESA-candidate species, the mountain lion in southern California is granted full protection of a threatened species under CESA.

Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measure(s):

Mitigation Measure #1: In addition to the 17.49 acres in the COSCA managed land, CDFW recommends setting aside a minimum of additional 32.34 acres of replacement habitat to have no net loss of 49.83 acres for wildlife movement. CDFW recommends the replacement habitat be located as near to the Project site as possible. There should be no net loss of suitable habitat for mountain lions. The Applicant should consult and collaborate with CDFW to conserve areas beneficial to the southern California mountain lion population that may improve chances of survival and reproduction of mountain lions in the face of climate change. The mitigation lands should be protected in perpetuity under a conservation easement dedicated to a local land conservancy or other appropriate entity that has been approved to hold and manage mitigation lands pursuant to Assembly Bill 1094 (2012). Assembly Bill 1094 amended Government Code sections 65965-65968. Under Government Code section 65967(c), the lead agency must exercise due diligence in reviewing the implementing Project-related ground-disturbing activities and prior to the Applicant's issuance of grading permits.

Mitigation Measure #2: Due to potential habitat near the Project footprint, a CDFW-approved biologist knowledgeable of mountain lion species ecology should survey areas that may provide habitat for mountain lion natal dens. This should be performed within one year of Project implementation, including site preparation, equipment staging, and mobilization. Caves and other natural cavities and thickets of brush and timber provide cover and are used for denning. Females may be in estrus at any time of the year, but in California, most births probably occur in spring. Survey results, including negative findings, should be submitted to CDFW prior to Project implementation. The survey report should include a map of potential denning sites. The survey report should also include measures to avoid impacts to dens and cubs if necessary.

Mitigation Measure #3: If potential habitat for natal dens is identified, CDFW recommends fully avoiding potential impacts to mountain lions, especially during spring, to protect vulnerable cubs. Two weeks prior to Project implementation, and once a week during construction activities, a CDFW-approved biologist should conduct a survey for mountain lion natal dens. The survey area should include the construction footprint and the area within 2,000 feet (or the limits of the property line) of the Project disturbance boundaries. CDFW should be notified within 24 hours upon location of a natal den. If an active natal den is located, during construction activities, all work should cease. No work should occur within a 2,000-foot buffer from a natal den. A qualified biologist should notify CDFW to determine the appropriate course of action. CDFW should also be consulted to determine an appropriate setback from the natal den that would not adversely affect the successful rearing of the cubs. No construction activities or human intrusion should occur within the established setback until mountain lion cubs have been successfully reared; the mountain lions have left the area; or as determined in consultation with CDFW.

Mitigation Measure #4: If "take" or adverse impacts to mountain lion cannot be avoided either during Project construction and, over the life of the Project, the City must consult with CDFW to determine if a CESA ITP is required (pursuant to Fish & Game Code, § 2080 *et seq*.).

Mitigation Measure #5: CDFW highly discourages the use of rodenticides and second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides due to their harmful effects on the ecosystem and wildlife. CDFW recommends the City include a mitigation measure prohibiting the use of such harmful materials.

Recommendation #1: CDFW recommends the City evaluate the mountain lion territory size and use of habitat within and surrounding the Project vicinity. The City should analyze the change (i.e., increase) in human presence and area of anthropogenic influence that will now be in mountain lion habitat and how it may impact mountain lion behavior, reproductive viability, and overall survival success. Based on these known anthropogenic impacts on mountain lions, CDFW also recommends the City provide compensatory mitigation for impacts to mountain lion. The CEQA document should justify how the proposed compensatory mitigation would reduce the impacts of the Project to less than significant.

Comment #3: Impacts to Least Bell's Vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*) and Coastal California Gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*)

Issue: CDFW is concerned that no surveys have been performed for ESA- and CESA-listed least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*) and ESA-listed coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*).

Specific impacts: Least Bell's vireo and coastal California gnatcatchers may occur on the Project's site or within the vicinity of the Project. Without standardized protocol surveys these species may be directly or indirectly impacted. The Project, as proposed, will remove several acres of suitable habitat for least Bell's vireo and coastal California gnatcatcher. The Project site contains elements of coastal sage scrub within the Project footprint, which is suitable habitat for the coastal California gnatcatcher. Additionally, willow-dominated riparian habitat, which is suitable habitat for least Bell's vireo, is within close proximity to the Project. Indirect effects such as noise, dust, and artificial lighting may adversely impact the two species as well as other nesting birds.

Why impacts would occur: Least Bell's vireo are expanding into their historical range, as well as, dispersing into new locations with suitable habitat. In addition, coastal California gnatcatchers affected by local fires (e.g., the Hills and Woolsey fires) may have moved into new locations. Least Bell's vireo and coastal California gnatcatcher have a high potential to occur within the Project site. Protocol surveys are necessary to identify listed species and supporting habitat necessary for their survival. The Project MND did not offer any surveying protocols or mitigation plans for least Bell's Vireo or the coastal California gnatcatcher. Without standardized protocol surveys these species may be directly or indirectly impacted. Direct impacts to both species could result from Project construction and activities (e.g., equipment staging, mobilization, and grading); ground disturbance; vegetation clearing; and trampling or crushing from construction equipment, vehicles, and foot traffic. Indirect impacts could result from temporary or permanent loss of suitable habitat including coastal sage scrub and an undisclosed acreage of riparian habitat. Additional impacts could result from increased noise disturbances, dust, and vibrations caused by heavy equipment.

Evidence impact would be significant: Ground clearing and construction activities could lead to the direct mortality of least Bell's vireo, the coastal California gnatcatcher, and other CESA-listed species and/or Species of Special Concern (SSC). The loss of occupied and suitable habitat could yield a loss of foraging potential, nesting sites, roosting sites, or refugia and would constitute a significant impact absent appropriate mitigation. CDFW considers impacts to CESA-listed and SSC a significant direct and cumulative adverse effect without implementing appropriate avoidance and/or mitigation measures. In addition, nests of all native bird species are protected under State laws and regulations, including Fish and Game Code, sections 3503

and 3503.5. Noise from increased road use, generators, and other equipment may disrupt mating calls which could impact their reproductive success (Patricelli and Blickley 2006, Halfwerk et al. 2011) .

Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measure(s):

Mitigation Measure #1: CDFW recommends the Applicant perform appropriate protocol survey for least Bell's vireo and coastal California gnatcatcher prior to Project construction. The survey(s) should be performed based on the species found, or likely to occur, on the Project's site. Survey results including negative findings should be submitted to CDFW and USFWS prior to implementing Project related ground disturbing activities.

Mitigation Measure #2: CDFW recommends fully avoiding impacts to least Bell's vireo and coastal California gnatcatcher. CDFW recommends that the Applicant submit an avoidance plan to CDFW for review and comment. A final avoidance plan should be fully developed prior to implementing Project related ground disturbing activities.

Mitigation Measure #3: If the Project will have permanent impacts to least Bell's vireo or coastal California gnatcatcher habitat, either during Project activities or over the life of the Project, CDFW recommends setting aside replacement habitat to be protected in perpetuity under a conservation easement dedicated to a local land conservancy or other appropriate entity that has been approved to hold and manage mitigation lands pursuant to Assembly Bill 1094 (2012), which amended Government Code, sections 65965-65968. Under Government Code, section 65967(c), 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. An appropriate endowment should be provided for the long-term management of mitigation lands. A mitigation plan should include measures to protect the targeted habitat values in perpetuity from direct and indirect negative impacts. Issues that should be addressed include, but are not limited to, restrictions on access; proposed land dedications; control of illegal dumping; water pollution; and increased human intrusion. A conservation easement and endowment funds should be fully acquired, established, transferred, or otherwise executed prior to implementing Project related ground disturbing activities.

Mitigation Measure #4: If "take" or adverse impacts to least Bell's vireo and/or coastal California gnatcatcher cannot be avoided either during Project activities or over the life of the Project, the City must consult CDFW (pursuant to Fish & Game Code, § 2080 et seq.) prior to construction.

Comment #4: Impacts to Burrowing Owls (*Athene cunicularia*)

Issue: The Project may impact burrowing owls (*Athene cunicularia*).

Specific Impacts: The Project as proposed may impact specially listed burrowing owls by increasing human presence, traffic, noise, air pollutants and dust, artificial lighting, and will further reduce available habitat.

Why impact would occur: The Project did not conduct focused surveys for burrowing owl to accurately determine presence or absence. The Project footprint is adjacent to the CCOS and

offers potential foraging and nesting habitat. Burrowing owls have been known to use highly degraded and marginal habitat where existing burrows or stem pipes are available. Without conducting presence/absence surveys, Project impacts to burrowing owl could result from vegetation clearing and other ground disturbing activities. Project disturbance activities may result in crushing or filling of active owl burrows, causing the death or injury of adults, eggs, and young. The Project may remove burrowing owl foraging habitat by eliminating native vegetation that supports essential rodent, insect, and reptile that are prey for burrowing owl. Rodent control activities could result in direct and secondary poisoning of burrowing owl ingesting treated rodents.

Evidence impact would be significant: 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.” Without appropriate take avoidance surveys prior to project operations including, but not limited to, ground and vegetation disturbing activities and rodent control activities, adverse impacts to burrowing owl may occur because species presence/absence has not been verified. In addition, burrowing owl qualifies for enhanced consideration afforded to species under CEQA, which can be shown to meet the criteria for listing as endangered, rare or threatened (CEQA Guidelines, § 15380(d)).

Insufficient survey efforts for burrowing owl may conclude false negative results, which would not require avoidance and mitigation measure implementation. Inadequate avoidance and mitigation measures will result in the Project continuing to have a substantial adverse direct and cumulative 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 USFWS.

Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measure(s):

Mitigation Measure #1: To reduce impacts to burrowing owl to less than significant, CDFW recommends that the Project adhere to CDFW’s March 7, 2012, Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. All survey efforts should be conducted prior to any project activities that could result in habitat disturbance to soil, vegetation or other sheltering habitat for burrowing owl. In California, the burrowing owl breeding season extends from 1 February to 31 August with some variances by geographic location and climatic conditions. Survey protocol for breeding season owl surveys states to conduct 4 survey visits: 1) at least one site visit between 15 February and 15 April, and 2) a minimum of three survey visits, at least three weeks apart, between 15 April and 15 July, with at least one visit after 15 June.

Mitigation Measure #2: Permanent impacts to occupied owl burrows and adjacent foraging habitat should be offset by setting aside replacement habitat to be protected in perpetuity under a conservation easement dedicated to a local land conservancy or other appropriate entity, which should include an appropriate non-wasting endowment to provide for the long-term management of mitigation lands. CDFW recommends that the City require a burrowing owl mitigation plan be submitted to CDFW for review and comment prior to project implementation.

Mitigation Measure #3: For proposed preservation and/or restoration, the final environmental document should include measures to protect the targeted habitat values in perpetuity from direct and indirect negative impacts (see MM #3 and MM #5 under comment #3).

Comment #5: Indirect Impacts to Aquatic and Riparian Resources

Issue: The Project may indirectly impact Conejo Creek, Arroyo Conejo Creek, North Fork Arroyo Conejo Creek, and Hills Canyon Creek. In addition, the Project may impact several species that inhabit the creeks. A 9-quad CNDDB search of the area revealed several specially listed freshwater species with potential to occur near the Project site. This review included southern California steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus pop. 10*), an ESA-listed species, and Arroyo chub (*Gila orcuttii*), a SSC.

Specific Impact: The Project occurs within 1000 feet of Hills Canyon Creek, which shares downstream connectivity with Arroyo Conejo Creek, Conejo Creek, and North Fork Arroyo Creek. Due to the close proximity of these creeks, direct and/or indirect impacts to the bed, bank, or channel of the stream may occur along with take of aquatic species that inhabit these creeks. Project impacts may result in the loss of streams and associated watershed function and biological diversity. The proposed Project may diminish on-site and downstream water quality, alter the hydrologic and geomorphic processes, and may impact fish, including southern California steelhead, Arroyo chub, and wildlife downstream. Project activities may also impact tributaries that occur upstream, outside of the Project boundary, where hydrologic connectivity occurs.

Why Impact Would Occur: The Project MND states “A complete list of the species generated in the CNDDB query are provided…Based on absence of suitable habitat, known geographic distributions and/or range restrictions, it was determined that many of these species do not have potential to occur within the study area (e.g., fish and aquatic species) and are therefore omitted from further discussion.” Relying only on CNDDB and/or 7.5-minute quadrangle maps alone to determine species presence or absence may conclude false negative results, which would not require avoidance and mitigation measure implementation. Without conducting site-specific protocol surveys, the Project may impact fish and wildlife species that occur on the Project site and downstream but have not yet been observed through appropriate surveys.

In 2013, a dead southern California steelhead was found in Conejo Creek under the Highway 101 overpass where moderate spawning, holding, and rearing habitat was identified in areas upstream of the finding (DFG 2013). This finding supports that southern California steelhead occurs within the Project’s vicinity. Without adequate analysis, including survey and disclosure, the Project will impact southern California steelhead and Arroyo chub.

The Project may indirectly impact Hills Canyon Creek, Arroyo Conejo Creek, Conejo Creek, and North Fork Arroyo Creek. Run-off from the project site could introduce higher levels of pollutants to nearby streams and potentially result in the degradation of water quality and riparian habitat. Debris, soil, silt, sawdust, rubbish, raw cement/concrete, or washings thereof, asphalt, paint or other coating material, oil or other petroleum products, or any other substances which could be hazardous or deleterious to aquatic life, wildlife, or riparian habitat resulting from Project related activities may enter the stream. Construction activities and development may also result in changes to the streams, altering hydrologic and geomorphic processes that may impact plant and wildlife species.

Moreover, construction equipment, vehicles, import of fill material, disposal piles, and staging areas can introduce and spread non-native, invasive plants. Invasive plant seeds, rhizomes, or stolons can be transported along streams and spread upstream and downstream.

Evidence Impact Would Be Significant: Fish and Game Code, section 1602 requires any person, State or local governmental agency, or public utility to notify CDFW prior to beginning any activity that may do one or more of the following: divert or obstruct the natural flow of any river, stream, or lake; change the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake; use material from any river, stream, or lake; or, deposit or dispose of material into any river, stream, or lake. The Project may adversely affect the existing hydrology pattern of the Project site as well as downstream. This may occur through the alteration of flows to streams. In addition, impacts to biological resources off site, such as the CCOS, may occur. The Project may substantially adversely affect the existing stormwater flows into streams through the alteration of drainages on site. It is unclear if these stormwater diversions would impact biological resources offsite because an investigation has not been made to determine so. Therefore, appropriate avoidance, minimization, and mitigations have not been determined. Inadequate investigation may result in the Project continuing to have a substantial adverse direct and cumulative 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.

Recommended potentially feasible mitigation measure(s):

Mitigation Measure #1: If the Project applicant (or "entity") will substantially impact a stream, written notification should be provided to CDFW pursuant to section 1600 *et seq.* of the Fish and Game Code. Based on this notification and other information, CDFW shall determine whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement is required prior to conducting the proposed activities. A notification package for a LSA may be obtained by accessing CDFW's web site at https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/conservation/lsa.

If necessary, CDFW's issuance of an LSA Agreement for a Project that is subject to CEQA will require CEQA compliance actions by CDFW as a Responsible Agency. As a Responsible Agency, CDFW may consider the CEQA document of the Lead Agency for the Project. To minimize additional requirements by CDFW pursuant to section 1600 *et seq.* and/or under CEQA, the CEQA document should fully identify the potential impacts to streams or riparian resources and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, monitoring, and reporting commitments for issuance of the LSA Agreement.

Mitigation Measure #2: Any LSA Agreement issued for the Project by CDFW may include additional measures protective of streambeds on and downstream of the Project such as additional erosion and pollution control measures. To compensate for any on-site and off-site impacts to riparian resources, additional mitigation conditioned in any LSA Agreement may include the following: avoidance of resources, on-site or off-site creation, enhancement, or restoration, and/or protection and management of mitigation lands in perpetuity.

Mitigation Measure #3: CDFW recommends fully avoiding impacts to waters and riparian/wetland vegetation communities. If feasible, CDFW recommends redesigning the Project to avoid impacts to the existing drainage features that support sensitive vegetation communities. CDFW also recommends the City consider Project alternatives that could incorporate the unnamed streams into the planned development. Design alternatives should attempt to retain as much surface flow and natural hydrologic processes as possible. CDFW recommends taking an inter-disciplinary approach to involve landscape architects, engineers,

and wildlife biologists, and hydrologists to develop design alternatives that could fully avoid or lessen impacts to waters and riparian/wetland vegetation communities.

Mitigation Measure #4: Jurisdiction surveys should evaluate all rivers, streams, and lakes including culverts, ditches, and storm channels that may transport water, sediment, and pollutants that discharge into rivers, streams, and lakes.

Mitigation Measure #5: If impacts to streams is unavoidable, CDFW recommends that mitigation occur at a CDFW-approved bank. Mitigation bank credits should be purchased, approved, or otherwise fully executed prior to implementing Project-related ground-disturbing activities and prior to the County's issuance of grading permits.

Mitigation Measure #6: If credits at a CDFW-approved mitigation bank are not available, CDFW recommends setting aside replacement habitat to be protected in perpetuity under a conservation easement dedicated to a local land conservancy or other appropriate entity that has been approved to hold and manage mitigation lands. Mitigation lands should be in the same watershed as the Project site and support in-kind vegetation. An appropriate non-wasting endowment should be provided for the long-term management of mitigation lands. A conservation easement and endowment funds should be fully acquired, established, transferred, or otherwise executed prior to implementing Project-related ground-disturbing activities prior to the City's issuance of grading permits.

Mitigation Measure #7: If impacts to riparian habitat, such as arroyo willow thicket, mule fat thicket, and cattail marshes cannot be avoided, CDFW suggests mitigation should be achieved entirely on site if possible. CDFW recommends that impacts be mitigated at no less than 3:1. CDFW recommends that an on-site Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) be developed. An HMMP should provide specific, detailed, and enforceable measures.

Mitigation Measure #8: CDFW recommends that all on-site mitigation sites for impacts to streams and riparian/wetland vegetation communities be protected in perpetuity from public encroachment and structural intrusion. This should include all water features on site, including ephemeral and perennial bodies.

Comment #6: Crotch's Bumble Bee (Bombus crotchii)

Issue: The Project may impact Crotch's bumble bee (*Bombus crotchii*) (an invertebrate of conservation and an SSC) through the removal of California sage brush communities. Crotch's bumble bees are generalist foragers and have been reported visiting a wide variety of flowering plants (Biesmeijer et al. 2006; Xerces 2018). They are known to occur in laurel sumac scrub, grassland, meadows, and coastal sage scrub, among other vegetation communities.

Specific impacts: The Project as proposed would develop 49.83 acres, of which 17.49 acres are comprised of native vegetation including, but not limited to disturbed California buckwheat scrub, disturbed coastal sage scrub, and disturbed coastal sage scrub-California buckwheat scrub. Native vegetation communities and grasslands could provide Crotch's bumble bee habitat. The Project as proposed would grade and/or develop habitat that could support Crotch's bumble bee. The Project may result in temporal or permanent loss of suitable nesting and foraging habitat for Crotch's bumble bee. Project ground-disturbing activities and vegetation removal may cause death or injury of adults, eggs, and larva, burrow collapse, nest

abandonment, and reduced nest success.

Why impacts would occur: Crotch's bumble bees are generalist foragers and have been reported visiting a wide variety of flowering plants (Biesmeijer et al. 2006; Xerces 2018). They are known to occur in laurel sumac scrub, grassland, meadows, and coastal sage scrub, among other vegetation communities. Suitable Crotch's bumble bee habitat includes areas of grasslands and scrub that contain requisite habitat elements, such as small mammal burrows. Crotch's bumble bee primarily nest in late February through late October underground in abandoned small mammal burrows but may also nest under perennial bunch grasses or thatched annual grasses, under-brush piles, in old bird nests, and in dead trees or hollow logs (Williams et al. 2014; Hatfield et al. 2018). Overwintering sites utilized by Crotch's bumble bee mated queens include soft, disturbed soil (Goulson 2010), or under leaf litter or other debris (Williams et al. 2014). Despite the presence of suitable Crotch's bumble bee habitat on site, the MND does not provide information as to what criteria would be used to conclude that the species is not present. Without adequate presence/absence surveys, ground disturbance and vegetation removal associated with Project implementation during the breeding season could result in the incidental loss of breeding success or otherwise lead to nest abandonment in areas adjacent to the Project site. Project activities may result in temporal or permanent loss of colonies, and suitable nesting and foraging habitat.

Evidence impact would be significant: Crotch's bumble bee is listed as an invertebrate of conservation priority under the California Terrestrial and Vernal Pool Invertebrates of Conservation Priority (CDFWe 2017). Crotch's bumble bee has a State ranking of S1/S2. This means that the Crotch's bumble bee is considered critically imperiled or imperiled and is extremely rare (often 5 or fewer populations). Also, Crotch's bumble bee has a very restricted range and steep population declines make the species vulnerable to extirpation from the State (CDFWe 2017). Accordingly, Crotch's bumble bee meets the CEQA definition of rare, threatened, or endangered species (CEQA Guidelines, § 15380). Therefore, take of Crotch's bumble bee could require a mandatory finding of significance by the City (CEQA Guidelines, § 15065).

Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measure(s):

Mitigation Measure #1: CDFW recommends that measures be taken, primarily, to avoid Project impacts to Crotch's bumble bee. Surveys should be performed by a qualified entomologist familiar with the species behavior and life history to determine the presence/absence of Crotch's bumble bee and within one year prior to vegetation removal and/or grading. Surveys should be conducted during flying season when the species is most likely to be detected above ground, between March 1 to September 1 (Thorp et al. 1983). Survey results, including negative findings, should be submitted to CDFW prior to implementing Project-related ground-disturbing activities. At minimum, a survey report should provide the following:

a) A description and map of the survey area, focusing on areas that could provide suitable habitat for Crotch's bumble bee. CDFW recommends the map show surveyor(s) track lines to document that the entire site was covered during field surveys.
b) Field survey conditions that should include name(s) of qualified entomologist(s) and brief qualifications; date and time of survey; survey duration; general weather conditions; survey goals, and species searched.

c) Map(s) showing the location of nests/colonies.
d) A description of physical (e.g., soil, moisture, slope) and biological (e.g., plant composition) conditions where each nest/colony is found. A sufficient description of biological conditions, primarily impacted habitat, should include native plant composition (e.g., density, cover, and abundance) within impacted habitat (e.g., species list separated by vegetation class; density, cover, and abundance of each species).

Mitigation Measure #2: If "take" or adverse impacts to Crotch's bumble bee cannot be avoided either during Project activities or over the life of the Project, the City should consult CDFW to determine appropriate avoidance and/or minimization measures for the species.

Recommendation #1: CDFW recommends the City update their CEQA document to reflect the possibility of Crotch's bumble bee within the Project site and discuss the local and regional significance of impacts to the species. Focus surveys should be conducted in order to determine presence/absence, identify potential nest sites, and to further evaluate the quality of habitat present for Crotch's bumble bee. The updated analysis should include appropriate avoidance, minimization, and compensatory mitigation measures to offset any impacts to below a level of significance.

Comment #7: Impacts to Bats

Issue: The Project is adjacent to natural habitats where bats may forage and roost. Therefore, the Project may impact the western mastiff bat (*Eumops perotis californicus*), pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), western red bat (*Lasiurus blossevillii*), and the hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus*).

Specific impacts: The Project proposes to remove an unspecified amount of vegetation and replace a small bridge structure. Direct impacts include removal of trees, vegetation, and/or structures that may provide roosting habitat and therefore has the potential for the direct loss of bats. Indirect impacts to bats and roosts could result from increased noise disturbances, human activity, dust, vegetation clearing, ground disturbing activities (e.g., staging, access, excavation, grading), and vibrations caused by heavy equipment. Demolition, grading, and excavating activities may impact bats potentially using man-made structures or surrounding trees as roost sites.

Why impacts would occur: Although there is potential for bat to occur, the MND does not include any measures to avoid, minimize, or protect the species. Without any avoidance and minimization measures, the Project may impact the species. In urbanized areas, bats use trees and man-made structures for daytime and nighttime roosts, and forage in sources of open water such as ponds and lakes (Avila-Flores and Fenton 2005; Oprea et al. 2009; Remington and Cooper 2014). Forested patches on parks and/or golf courses provide good habitat for foraging and commuting bats and may provide important refuge for bats in highly urbanized landscapes (Sewell 2019). Mature riparian trees and crevices in buildings and facilities in the Project site could provide roosting habitat for bats. Modifications to roost sites can have significant impacts on the bats' usability of the roost and can impact the bats' fitness and survivability (Johnston et al. 2004). Extra noise, vibration, or the reconfiguration of large objects can lead to the disturbance of roosting bats which may have a negative impact on the animals. Human disturbance can also lead to a change in humidity, temperatures, or the approach to a roost that could force the animals to change their mode of egress and/or ingress to a roost. Although

temporary, such disturbance can lead to the abandonment of a maternity roost (Johnston et al. 2004).

Evidence impact would be significant: Bats are considered non-game mammals and are afforded protection by state law from take and/or harassment (Fish & Game Code, § 4150; Cal. Code of Regs, § 251.1). Several bat species are considered SSC and meet the CEQA definition of rare, threatened, or endangered species (CEQA Guidelines, § 15065). Take of SSC could require a mandatory finding of significance by the City (CEQA Guidelines, § 15065).

Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measure(s):

Mitigation Measure #1: CDFW recommends a qualified bat specialist conduct bat surveys to determine baseline conditions within the Project site and within a 500-foot buffer to identify trees and/or structures (i.e., tunnels, maintenance buildings, food concession stands, comfort stations) that could provide daytime and/or nighttime roost sites. CDFW recommends using acoustic recognition technology to maximize detection of bats. Night roosts are typically utilized from the approach of sunset until sunrise. In most parts of California, night roost use will only occur from spring through fall while day roosts are typically utilized during the spring, summer, and fall in California (Johnston et al. 2004).

Mitigation Measure #2: Survey methodology and results, including negative findings, should be included in final environmental documents. Depending on survey results, please discuss potentially significant effects of the proposed Project on the bats and include species specific mitigation measures to reduce impacts to below a level of significance (CEQA Guidelines, § 15125).

Mitigation Measure #3: If maternity roosts are found, CDFW recommends, the following three mitigation measures:

a) If maternity roosts are found, to the extent feasible, work shall be scheduled between October 1 and February 28, outside of the maternity roosting season when young bats are present but are not yet ready to fly out of the roost (March 1 to September 30).

b) If maternity roosts are found and if trees and/or structures must be removed/demolished during the maternity season, a qualified bat specialist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to identify those trees and/or structures proposed for disturbance that could provide hibernacula or nursery colony roosting habitat. Acoustic recognition technology will be used to maximize detection of bats. Each tree and/or structure identified as potentially supporting an active maternity roost shall be closely inspected by the bat specialist no more than seven days prior to tree and/or structure disturbance to determine the presence or absence of roosting bats more precisely. If maternity roosts are detected, trees and/or structures determined to be maternity roosts shall be left in place until the end of the maternity season. Work shall not occur within 100 feet of or directly under or adjacent to an active roost and work shall not occur between 30 minutes before sunset and 30 minutes after sunrise.
c) If bats are not detected, but the bat specialist determines that roosting bats may be present at any time of year, trees will be pushed down using heavy machinery rather than felling it with a chainsaw. To ensure the optimum warning for any roosting bats that may still be present, trees shall be pushed lightly two to three times, with a pause of

approximately 30 seconds between each nudge to allow bats to become active. The tree shall then be pushed to the ground slowly and remain in place until it is inspected by a bat specialist. Trees that are known to be bat roosts shall not be bucked or mulched immediately. A period of at least 24 hours, and preferably 48 hours, shall elapse prior to such operations to allow bats to escape. Bats shall be allowed to escape prior to demolition of buildings. This may be accomplished by placing one-way exclusionary devices into areas where bats are entering a building that allow bats to exit but not enter the building.

Additional Recommendations

Conejo Canyons Open Space
The Project site abuts the CCOS, a non-developed natural area allocated for the preservation of land with historical and biological importance. Several endangered, threatened, and specially listed species have been known to inhabit this area. Potential direct and indirect impacts to the adjacent parcel including noise and lighting might directly/indirectly affect the biological resources within the CCOS. If the Project will result in indirect impacts via noise, light, and other disturbances that result from both active construction and long-term development, the MND should provide mitigation to reduce these effects on animals. Mitigation can include limiting seasonal timing of construction activities that generate noise/vibration; prohibiting the use of generators within 1,000 meters from the edge of any stream; installing sound barriers; implementing long-term monitoring to ensure human access does not degrading this area from current baseline; and eliminating night lighting. Directing light downward or away from habitat, reducing glare, and using lower wattage flat lens fixtures on streets reduces light pollution. Increasing reflectivity of signs and road striping in appropriate areas may increase driver visibility while reducing the need for artificial lighting. Turning off unnecessary lights at night is also recommended.

Fencing
CDFW recommends the City consider permeable fencing as part of its mitigation for Project-related impacts, which may include a naturalistic park design. Wildlife impermeable fencing is fencing that prevents or creates a barrier for the passage of wildlife from one side to the other. Los Angeles County's Significant Ecological Areas Ordinance Implementation Guide (https://planning.lacounty.gov/site/sea/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/SEA-IG-2-6-20.pdf) offers additional information on permeable fencing as well as design standards. CDFW recommends reviewing those design standards.

Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Plan
Per Public Resources Code, section 21081.6(a)(1), CDFW has provided the City with a summary of our suggested mitigation measures and recommendations in the form of an attached Draft Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Plan (MMRP; Attachment A). A final MMRP shall reflect results following additional plant and wildlife surveys and the Project's final on and/or off-site mitigation plans.

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 City and serve to help defray the cost of environmental review by CDFW. Payment of the fee is required

for the underlying Project approval to be operative, vested, and final (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 753.5; Fish & Game Code, § 711.4; Public Resources Code, § 21089).

Conclusion

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Project to assist the City in adequately analyzing and minimizing/mitigating impacts to biological resources. CDFW requests an opportunity to review and comment on any response that the City has to our comments and to receive notification of any forthcoming hearing date(s) for the Project [CEQA Guidelines, § 15073(e)]. If you have any questions or comments regarding this letter, please contact Angela Castanon, Environmental Scientist, at Angela.Castanon@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
5991E19EF8094C3...
Victoria Tang signing for

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Environmental Program Manager I
South Coast Region

ec: CDFW
Steve Gibson – Los Alamitos
Steve.Gibson@Wildlife.ca.gov

Emily Galli – Filmore
Emily.Galli@Wildlife.ca.gov

Cindy Hailey – San Diego
Cindy.Hailey@Wildlife.ca.gov

CEQA Program Coordinator – Sacramento
CEQACommentLetters@Wildlife.ca.gov

State Clearinghouse
Office of Planning and Research – Sacramento
State.Clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov

References:

Avila-Flores, R. and B.M. Fenton. 2005. Use of Spatial features by Foraging Insectivorous Bats in a Large Urban Landscape. Journal of Mammalogy 86(6):1193-1204.

Beir, P. 1995. Dispersal of Juvenile Cougars in Fragmented Habitat. The Journal of Wildlife Management. 59(2): 228-237.

Biesmeijer, J. C., S. P. M Roberts, M. Reemer, R. Ohlemiller, M. Edwards, T. Peeters, A. P. Schaffers, S. G. Potts, R. Kleukers, C. D. Thomas, J. Settele, and W. E. Kunin. 2006.

Parallel Declines in Pollinators and Insect-Pollinated Plants in Britain and the Netherlands. Science 313(5785): 351-354.

[CDFWa] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2022. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. Available from: < file:///C:/Users/kschmoker/Downloads/Holland%201986%20Preliminary%20Descriptions%20of%20Terrestrial%20Natural%20Communities.OCRed.pdf.pdf>

[CDFWb] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2018. Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities. Available from: https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=18959

[CDFWc] 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

[CDFWd] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2020. Notice of Findings - Mountain Lion ESU declared a candidate species. Available from: https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=178623&inline

[CDFWe] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2017. California Terrestrial and Vernal Pool Invertebrates of Conservation Priority. Accessed at: https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=157415&inlin

[CNPS] California Native Plant Society. 2020. Rare Plant ranks. Available from: https://www.cnps.org/rare-plants/cnps-rare-plant-ranks.

[DFG] Department of Fish and Game. First Record of Endangered Southern California Steelhead in Conejo Creek, Ventura County, California. 2013. Available from: file:///C:/Users/ACASTA~1/AppData/Local/Temp/Pages%20from%2099-3,%20155-159%20Steelhead-1.pdf

Goulson, D. 2010. Bumblebees: behavior, ecology, and conservation. Oxford University Press, New York. 317pp.

Halfwerk, W., Holleman, L. J. M., Lessells, Ck. M., Slabbekoorn, H. 2011. Negative impact of traffic noise on avian reproductive success. Journal of Applied Ecology 48:210–219.

Hatfield, R., Jepsen, S., Foltz Jordan, S., Blackburn, M., Code, Aimee. 2018. A Petition to the State of California Fish and Game Commission to List Four Species of Bumblebees as Endangered Species.

Johnston, D., Tatarian, G., Pierson, E. 2004. California Bat Mitigation Techniques Solutions, and Effectiveness. [Internet]. [Cited 2022 March 2]. Available from: https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ash?DocumentID=10334

Lucas, E. 2020. Recreation-related disturbance to wildlife in California – better planning for and management of recreation are vital to conserve wildlife in protected areas where recreation occurs. California Fish and Wildlife, Recreation Special Issue 2020: 29-51.

Oprea, M., Mendes, P., Vieira, T.B., Ditchfield, A.D. 2009. Do Wooded Streets Provide Connectivity for Bats in an Urban Landscape? Biodiversity Conservation 18:2361-2371.

Patricelli, G., and J. J. L. Blickley. 2006. Avian communication in urban noise: causes and consequences of vocal adjustment. Auk 123:639–649.

Remington, S and D.S. Cooper. 2014. Bat Survey of Griffith Park, Los Angeles, California. The Southwestern Naturalist 59(4):473-479.

Sawyer, J.O., T. Keeler-Wolf, and J.M. Evens. 2009. A Manual of California Vegetation, Second Edition. California Native Plant. Available from: https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/VegCAMP/Publications-and-Protocols/Vegetation-Manual

Sewell, L. 2019. Golf Course Land Positive Effects on the Environment. Seattle Journal of Environmental Law 9(1):330-356.

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

Attachment A: Draft Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Plan

CDFW recommends the following language to be incorporated into a future environmental document for the Project. A final MMRP shall reflect results following additional plant and wildlife surveys and the Project's final on and/or off-site mitigation plans.

Biological Resources (BIO)			
Mitigation Measure (MM) or Recommendation (REC)		**Timing**	**Responsible Party**
MM-BIO-1-Impacts to Plants – Vegetation Mapping Protocols	CDFW recommends that floristic, alliance- and/or association-based mapping and vegetation impact assessments be conducted at the Project site and neighboring vicinity. The MND should identify, map, and discuss the specific vegetation alliances within the Project Area following CDFW's *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities* (Survey Protocols, CDFWb 2018) see: (https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/VegCAMP/Natural-Communities). The MND should include the following: • The specific geographic locations where the special status plants and sensitive natural communities were found. Preferably this will be done by use of global positioning system (GPS) and include the datum16 in which the spatial data was collected and any uncertainty or error associated with the data. If GPS is not available, a detailed map (1:24,000 or larger) showing locations and boundaries of each special status plant population and sensitive natural community in relation to the project area is acceptable. Mark occurrences and boundaries as accurately as	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant

	possible; • The site-specific characteristics of occurrences, such as associated species, habitat and microhabitat, structure of vegetation, topographic features, soil type, texture, and soil parent material. If a special status plant is associated with a wetland, provide a description of the direction of flow and integrity of surface or subsurface hydrology and adjacent off-site hydrological influences as appropriate; • The number of individuals in each special status plant population as counted (if population is small) or estimated (if population is large); • If applicable, information about the percentage of each special status plant in each life stage such as seedling, vegetative, flowering, and fruiting; • The density of special status plants, identifying areas of relatively high, medium and low density of each special status plant in the project area; and • Digital images of special status plants and sensitive natural communities in the project area, with diagnostic features. If the botanical vegetation mapping of the site yields polygons that do not conform to a known alliance/association, contact CDFW to discuss how this should be handled as new alliances must be vetted prior to use.		

MM-BIO-2-Impacts to Plants-Avoidance of ESA- and CESA-Listed Plants	If rare or sensitive plants are found on or near the footprint of the Project, the MND should provide species-specific measures to fully avoid impacts to all ESA- and CESA-listed plants. This may include flagging all plants and/or perimeter of populations; no-work buffers around plants and/or populations (e.g., flagged perimeter plus 50 feet); restrictions on ground disturbing activities within protected areas; relocation of staging and other material piling areas away from protected areas; restrictions on herbicide use and/or type of herbicide and/or application method within 100 feet of sensitive plants; and worker education and training.	Prior to/ During Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-3-Impacts to Plants-Mitigation	CDFW recommends the environmental document provide measures to fully mitigate the loss of individual Endangered Species Act (ESA)- and CESA-listed plants and habitat. a) The MND should provide species-specific measures for on-site mitigation. Each species-specific mitigation plan should adopt an ecosystem-based approach and be of sufficient detail and resolution to describe the following at a minimum: 1) identify the impact and level of impact (e.g., acres or individual plants/habitat impacted); 2) location of on-site mitigation and adequacy of the location(s) to serve as mitigation; 3) assessment of appropriate reference sites; 4) scientific [Genus and species (subspecies/variety if applicable)] of plants being used for restoration; 5) location(s) of propagule source; 6) species-specific planting methods (i.e., container or seed); 7) measurable goals and success criteria for establishing self-sustaining populations (e.g. percent survival rate, absolute cover); 8) long-term monitoring, and; 9) adaptive management techniques. Please note that CDFW generally does not support the use of salvaging, translocation, or transplantation as the primary mitigation strategy for unavoidable impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered plant species.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant

MM-BIO-4-Impacts to Plants-Mitigation Ratios	CDFW recommends avoiding any sensitive natural communities found on the Project. If avoidance is not feasible, the Project proponent should mitigate at a ratio sufficient to achieve a no-net loss for impacts to special status plant species and their associated habitat. CDFW recommends following the Coastal Commission's Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area ratio of 4:1 for impacts to the sensitive vegetation communities including some S4 and S5 habitats. All revegetation/restoration areas that will serve as mitigation should include preparation of a restoration plan, to be approved by CDFW prior to any ground disturbance. The restoration plan should include restoration and monitoring methods; annual success criteria; contingency actions should success criteria not be met; long-term management and maintenance goals; and a funding mechanism for long-term management. Areas proposed as mitigation should have a recorded conservation easement and be dedicated to an entity which has been approved to hold/manage lands (AB 1094; Government Code, §§ 65965-65968).	Prior to/ During Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-5-Impacts to Mountain Lion-Mitigation	In addition to the 17.49 acres in the COSCA managed land, CDFW recommends setting aside a minimum of additional 32.34 acres of replacement habitat to have a no net loss of 49.83 acres for wildlife movement. CDFW recommends the replacement habitat be located as near to the Project site as possible. There should be no net loss of suitable habitat for mountain lions. The Applicant should consult and collaborate with CDFW to conserve areas beneficial to the southern California mountain lion population that may improve chances of survival and reproduction of mountain lions in the face of climate change. The mitigation lands should be protected in perpetuity under a conservation easement dedicated to a local land conservancy or other appropriate entity that has been approved to hold and manage mitigation lands pursuant to Assembly Bill 1094 (2012). Assembly Bill 1094 amended Government Code sections 65965-65968. Under Government	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant

	Code section 65967(c), the lead agency must exercise due diligence in reviewing the implementing Project-related ground-disturbing activities and prior to the Applicant's issuance of grading permits.		
MM-BIO-6-Impacts to Mountain Lion-Natal Den Surveys	Due to potential habitat near the Project footprint, a CDFW-approved biologist knowledgeable of mountain lion species ecology should survey areas that may provide habitat for mountain lion natal dens. This should be performed within one year of Project implementation, including site preparation, equipment staging, and mobilization. Caves and other natural cavities and thickets of brush and timber provide cover and are used for denning. Females may be in estrus at any time of the year, but in California, most births probably occur in spring. Survey results, including negative findings, should be submitted to CDFW prior to Project implementation. The survey report should include a map of potential denning sites. The survey report should also include measures to avoid impacts to dens and cubs if necessary.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-7-Impacts to Mountain Lion-Natal Den Surveys	If potential habitat for natal dens is identified, CDFW recommends fully avoiding potential impacts to mountain lions, especially during spring, to protect vulnerable cubs. Two weeks prior to Project implementation, and once a week during construction activities, a CDFW-approved biologist should conduct a survey for mountain lion natal dens. The survey area should include the construction footprint and the area within 2,000 feet (or the limits of the property line) of the Project disturbance boundaries. CDFW should be notified within 24 hours upon location of a natal den. If an active natal den is located, during construction activities, all work should cease. No work should occur within a 2,000-foot buffer from a natal den. A qualified biologist should notify CDFW to determine the appropriate course of action. CDFW should also be consulted to determine an appropriate setback from the natal den that would not adversely affect the successful rearing of the cubs. No construction activities or human intrusion should occur within the	Prior to/ During Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant

	established setback until mountain lion cubs have been successfully reared; the mountain lions have left the area; or as determined in consultation with CDFW.		
MM-BIO-8-Impacts to Mountain Lion-Take	If "take" or adverse impacts to mountain lion cannot be avoided either during Project construction and over the life of the Project, the City must consult with CDFW to determine if a CESA ITP is required (pursuant to Fish & Game Code, § 2080 *et seq*.).	Prior to/During Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-9-Impacts to Mountain Lion-Rodenticides	CDFW highly discourages the use of rodenticides and second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides due to their harmful effects on the ecosystem and wildlife. CDFW recommends the City include a mitigation measure prohibiting the use of such harmful materials.	Prior to/During Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-10-Impacts to Least Bell's Vireo and Coastal California Gnatcatcher-Surveys	CDFW recommends the Applicant perform appropriate protocol survey for least Bell's vireo and coastal California gnatcatcher prior to Project construction. The survey(s) should be performed based on the species found, or likely to occur, on the Project's site. Survey results including negative findings should be submitted to CDFW and USFWS prior to implementing Project related ground disturbing activities.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-11-Impacts to Least Bell's Vireo and Coastal California Gnatcatcher-Surveys	CDFW recommends fully avoiding impacts to least Bell's vireo and coastal California gnatcatcher. CDFW recommends that the Applicant submit an avoidance plan to CDFW for review and comment. A final avoidance plan should be fully developed prior to implementing Project related ground disturbing activities.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-12-Impacts to Least Bell's Vireo and	If the Project will have permanent impacts to least Bell's vireo or coastal California gnatcatcher habitat, either during Project activities or over the life of the Project, CDFW recommends setting aside replacement habitat to be protected in perpetuity under a	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant

Coastal California Gnatcatcher-Mitigation	conservation easement dedicated to a local land conservancy or other appropriate entity that has been approved to hold and manage mitigation lands pursuant to Assembly Bill 1094 (2012), which amended Government Code sections 65965-65968. Under Government Code section 65967(c), 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. An appropriate endowment should be provided for the long-term management of mitigation lands. A mitigation plan should include measures to protect the targeted habitat values in perpetuity from direct and indirect negative impacts. Issues that should be addressed include, but are not limited to, restrictions on access; proposed land dedications; control of illegal dumping; water pollution; and increased human intrusion. A conservation easement and endowment funds should be fully acquired, established, transferred, or otherwise executed prior to implementing Project related ground disturbing activities		
MM-BIO-13-Impacts to Least Bell's Vireo and Coastal California Gnatcatcher-Mitigation	If "take" or adverse impacts to least Bell's vireo and/or coastal California gnatcatcher cannot be avoided either during Project activities or over the life of the Project, the City must consult CDFW (pursuant to Fish & Game Code, § 2080 et seq.) prior to construction.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-14-Impacts to Burrowing Owls-Surveys	To reduce impacts to burrowing owl to less than significant, CDFW recommends that the Project adhere to CDFW's March 7, 2012, Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. All survey efforts should be conducted prior to any project activities that could result in habitat disturbance to soil, vegetation or other sheltering habitat for burrowing owl. In California, the burrowing owl breeding season extends from 1 February to 31 August with some variances by	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant

	geographic location and climatic conditions. Survey protocol for breeding season owl surveys states to conduct 4 survey visits: 1) at least one site visit between 15 February and 15 April, and 2) a minimum of three survey visits, at least three weeks apart, between 15 April and 15 July, with at least one visit after 15 June.		
MM-BIO-15- Impacts to Burrowing Owls- Mitigation	Permanent impacts to occupied owl burrows and adjacent foraging habitat should be offset by setting aside replacement habitat to be protected in perpetuity under a conservation easement dedicated to a local land conservancy or other appropriate entity, which should include an appropriate non-wasting endowment to provide for the long-term management of mitigation lands. CDFW recommends that the City require a burrowing owl mitigation plan be submitted to CDFW for review and comment prior to project implementation.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-16- Impacts to Burrowing Owls- Surveys	For proposed preservation and/or restoration, the final environmental document should include measures to protect the targeted habitat values in perpetuity from direct and indirect negative impacts (see MM #3 and MM #5 under comment #3).	Prior to After Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-17- Indirect Impacts to Streams	If the Project applicant (or "entity") plans have the potential to significantly impact a stream written notification should be provided to CDFW pursuant to section 1600 *et seq.* of the Fish and Game Code. Based on this notification and other information, CDFW shall determine whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement is required prior to conducting the proposed activities. A notification package for a LSA may be obtained by accessing CDFW's web site at https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/conservation/lsa. If necessary, CDFW's issuance of an LSA Agreement for a Project that is subject to CEQA will require CEQA compliance actions by CDFW as a Responsible Agency. As a Responsible Agency, CDFW may consider the CEQA document of the Lead Agency for the Project. To minimize additional requirements by CDFW pursuant to section 1600 *et seq.* and/or under CEQA, the CEQA document should fully identify the potential impacts to streams or	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant

	riparian resources and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, monitoring, and reporting commitments for issuance of the LSA Agreement.		
MM-BIO-18- Indirect Impacts to Streams	Any LSA Agreement issued for the Project by CDFW may include additional measures protective of streambeds on and downstream of the Project such as additional erosion and pollution control measures. To compensate for any on-site and off-site impacts to riparian resources, additional mitigation conditioned in any LSA Agreement may include the following: avoidance of resources, on-site or off-site creation, enhancement, or restoration, and/or protection and management of mitigation lands in perpetuity.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-19- Indirect Impacts to Streams	CDFW recommends fully avoiding impacts to waters and riparian/wetland vegetation communities. If feasible, CDFW recommends redesigning the Project to avoid impacts to the existing drainage features that support sensitive vegetation communities. CDFW also recommends the City consider Project alternatives that could incorporate the unnamed streams into the planned development. Design alternatives should attempt to retain as much surface flow and natural hydrologic processes as possible. CDFW recommends taking an inter-disciplinary approach to involve landscape architects, engineers, and wildlife biologists, and hydrologists to develop design alternatives that could fully avoid or lessen impacts to waters and riparian/wetland vegetation communities.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-20- Indirect Impacts to Streams	Jurisdiction surveys should evaluate all rivers, streams, and lakes including culverts, ditches, and storm channels that may transport water, sediment, and pollutants that discharge into rivers, streams, and lakes.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant

MM-BIO-21-Indirect Impacts to Streams	If impacts to streams is unavoidable, CDFW recommends that mitigation occur at a CDFW-approved bank. Mitigation bank credits should be purchased, approved, or otherwise fully executed prior to implementing Project-related ground-disturbing activities and prior to the City's issuance of grading permits.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-22-Indirect Impacts to Streams	If credits at a CDFW-approved mitigation bank are not available, CDFW recommends setting aside replacement habitat to be protected in perpetuity under a conservation easement dedicated to a local land conservancy or other appropriate entity that has been approved to hold and manage mitigation lands. Mitigation lands should be in the same watershed as the Project site and support in-kind vegetation. An appropriate non-wasting endowment should be provided for the long-term management of mitigation lands. A conservation easement and endowment funds should be fully acquired, established, transferred, or otherwise executed prior to implementing Project-related ground-disturbing activities prior to the City's issuance of grading permits.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-23-Indirect Impacts to Streams	If impacts to riparian habitat, such as arroyo willow thicket, mule fat thicket, and cattail marshes cannot be avoided, CDFW suggests mitigation should be achieved entirely on site if possible. CDFW recommends that impacts be mitigated at no less than 3:1. CDFW recommends that an on-site Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant

	(HMMP) be developed. An HMMP should provide specific, detailed, and enforceable measures.		
MM-BIO-24-Indirect Impacts to Streams	CDFW recommends that all on-site mitigation sites for impacts to streams and riparian/wetland vegetation communities be protected in perpetuity from public encroachment and structural intrusion. This should include all water features on site, including ephemeral and perennial bodies.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-25-Impacts to Crotch's Bumble Bee	CDFW recommends that measures be taken, primarily, to avoid Project impacts to Crotch's bumble bee. Surveys should be performed by a qualified entomologist familiar with the species behavior and life history to determine the presence/absence of Crotch's bumble bee and within one year prior to vegetation removal and/or grading. Surveys should be conducted during flying season when the species is most likely to be detected above ground, between March 1 to September 1 (Thorp et al. 1983). Survey results, including negative findings, should be submitted to CDFW prior to implementing Project-related ground-disturbing activities. At minimum, a survey report should provide the following: a) A description and map of the survey area, focusing on areas that could provide suitable habitat for Crotch's bumble bee. CDFW recommends the map show surveyor(s) track lines to document that the entire site was covered during field surveys. b) Field survey conditions that should include name(s) of qualified entomologist(s) and brief qualifications; date and time of survey; survey duration; general weather conditions; survey goals, and species searched. c) Map(s) showing the location of nests/colonies. d) A description of physical (e.g., soil, moisture, slope) and biological (e.g., plant composition) conditions where each	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant

	nest/colony is found. A sufficient description of biological conditions, primarily impacted habitat, should include native plant composition (e.g., density, cover, and abundance) within impacted habitat (e.g., species list separated by vegetation class; density, cover, and abundance of each species).		
MM-BIO-26- Impacts to Crotch's Bumble Bee	If "take" or adverse impacts to Crotch's bumble bee cannot be avoided either during Project activities or over the life of the Project, the City should consult CDFW to determine appropriate avoidance and/or minimization measures for the species.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-27- Impacts to Bats	CDFW recommends a qualified bat specialist conduct bat surveys to determine baseline conditions within the Project site and within a 500-foot buffer to identify trees and/or structures (i.e., tunnels, maintenance buildings, food concession stands, comfort stations) that could provide daytime and/or nighttime roost sites. CDFW recommends using acoustic recognition technology to maximize detection of bats. Night roosts are typically utilized from the approach of sunset until sunrise. In most parts of California, night roost use will only occur from spring through fall while day roosts are typically utilized during the spring, summer, and fall in California (Johnston et al. 2004).	Prior to/During Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-28- Impacts to Bats	Survey methodology and results, including negative findings, should be included in final environmental documents. Depending on survey results, please discuss potentially significant effects of the proposed Project on the bats and include species specific mitigation measures to reduce impacts to below a level of significance (CEQA Guidelines, § 15125).	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
MM-BIO-29- Impacts to Bats	If maternity roosts are found, CDFW recommends, the following three mitigation measures: a) If maternity roosts are found, to the extent feasible, work shall be scheduled between October 1 and February 28, outside of the maternity roosting season when young bats	Prior to/ During Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant

	are present but are not yet ready to fly out of the roost (March 1 to September 30). b) If maternity roosts are found and if trees and/or structures must be removed/demolished during the maternity season, a qualified bat specialist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to identify those trees and/or structures proposed for disturbance that could provide hibernacula or nursery colony roosting habitat. Acoustic recognition technology will be used to maximize detection of bats. Each tree and/or structure identified as potentially supporting an active maternity roost shall be closely inspected by the bat specialist no more than seven-days prior to tree and/or structure disturbance to determine the presence or absence of roosting bats more precisely. If maternity roosts are detected, trees and/or structures determined to be maternity roosts shall be left in place until the end of the maternity season. Work shall not occur within 100 feet of or directly under or adjacent to an active roost and work shall not occur between 30 minutes before sunset and 30 minutes after sunrise. c) If bats are not detected, but the bat specialist determines that roosting bats may be present at any time of year, trees will be pushed down using heavy machinery rather than felling it with a chainsaw. To ensure the optimum warning for any roosting bats that may still be present, trees shall be pushed lightly two to three times, with a pause of approximately 30 seconds between each nudge to allow bats to become active. The tree shall then be pushed to the ground slowly and remain in place until it is inspected by a bat specialist. Trees that are known to be bat roosts shall not be bucked or mulched immediately. A period of at least 24 hours, and preferably 48 hours, shall elapse prior to such operations to allow bats to escape. Bats shall be allowed to escape prior to demolition of buildings. This may be accomplished by placing one-way exclusionary devices		

	into areas where bats are entering a building that allow bats to exit but not enter the building.		
REC-1- Rare Plants	If new significant effects to rare plants are identified and mitigation measures or project revisions must be added to the MND, CDFW recommends recirculating the environmental document so CDFW may provide additional comments on avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures (CEQA Guidelines, § 15073.5).	Prior to/ During Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
REC-2- Mountain Lion	CDFW recommends the City evaluate the mountain lion territory size and use of habitat within and surrounding the Project vicinity. The City should analyze the change (i.e. increase) in human presence and area of anthropogenic influence that will now be in mountain lion habitat and how it may impact mountain lion behavior, reproductive viability, and overall survival success. Based on these known anthropogenic impacts on mountain lions, CDFW also recommends the City provide compensatory mitigation for impacts to mountain lion. The CEQA document should justify how the proposed compensatory mitigation would reduce the impacts of the Project to less than significant.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
REC-3- Crotch's Bumble Bee	CDFW recommends the City update their CEQA document to reflect the possibility of Crotch's bumble bee within the Project site and discuss the local and regional significance of impacts to the species. Focus The updated analysis should surveys should be conducted in order to determine presence/absence, identify potential nest sites, and to further evaluate the quality of habitat present for Crotch's bumble bee. The updated analysis should include appropriate avoidance, minimization, and compensatory mitigation measures to offset any impacts to below a level of significance.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
REC-4- Conejo Canyons Open Space	The Project site abuts the CCOS, a non-developed natural area allocated for the preservation of land with historical and biological importance. Several endangered, threatened, and specially listed species have been known to inhabit this area. Potential direct and	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant

	indirect impacts to the adjacent parcel including noise and lighting might directly/indirectly affect the biological resources within the CCOS. If the Project will result in indirect impacts via noise, light, and other disturbances that result from both active construction and long-term development, the MND should provide mitigation to reduce these effects on animals. Mitigation can include limiting seasonal timing of construction activities that generate noise/vibration; prohibiting the use of generators within 1,000 meters from the edge of any stream; installing sound barriers; implementing long-term monitoring to ensure human access does not degrading this area from current baseline; and eliminating night lighting. Directing light downward or away from habitat, reducing glare, and using lower wattage flat lens fixtures on streets reduces light pollution. Increasing reflectivity of signs and road striping in appropriate areas may increase driver visibility while reducing the need for artificial lighting. Turning off unnecessary lights at night is also recommended.		
REC-5- Fencing	CDFW recommends the City consider permeable fencing as part of its mitigation for Project-related impacts which may include a naturalistic park design. Wildlife impermeable fencing is fencing that prevents or creates a barrier for the passage of wildlife from one side to the other. Los Angeles County's Significant Ecological Areas Ordinance Implementation Guide (https://planning.lacounty.gov/site/sea/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/SEA-IG-2-6-20.pdf) offers additional information on permeable fencing as well as design standards. CDFW recommends reviewing those design standards.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant
REC-6- Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Plan	Per Public Resources Code section 21081.6(a)(1), CDFW has provided the City with a summary of our suggested mitigation measures and recommendations in the form of an attached Draft Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Plan (MMRP; Attachment A). A final MMRP shall reflect results following additional plant and wildlife surveys and the Project's final on and/or off-site mitigation plans.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Thousand Oaks / Applicant