



State of California – Natural Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
Inland Deserts Region
3602 Inland Empire Blvd., Suite C-220
Ontario, CA 91764
www.wildlife.ca.gov

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director



Governor's Office of Planning & Research

April 27, 2022
Sent via email

Apr 27 2022

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

Ms. Kelly Lucia
Planning Manager
City of Calimesa
908 Park Avenue
Calimesa, CA 92320
Klucia@cityofcalimesa.net

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report
Residential Infill Priority Area Overlay Zone (RIPAOZ) Project
State Clearinghouse No. 2022030754

Dear Ms. Lucia:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) received a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) from the City of Calimesa, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines.¹

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and recommendations regarding those activities involved in the Project that may affect California fish and wildlife. Likewise, we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments regarding those aspects of the Project that CDFW, by law, may be required to carry out or approve through the exercise of its own regulatory authority under the Fish and Game Code.

CDFW ROLE

CDFW is California's Trustee Agency for fish and wildlife resources and holds those resources in trust by statute for all the people of the State. (Fish & G. Code, §§ 711.7, subd. (a) & 1802; Pub. Resources Code, § 21070; CEQA Guidelines § 15386, subd. (a).) CDFW, in its trustee capacity, has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of fish, wildlife, native plants, and habitat necessary for biologically sustainable populations of those species. (*Id.*, § 1802.) Similarly, for purposes of CEQA, CDFW is charged by law to provide, as available, biological expertise during public agency environmental review efforts, focusing specifically on projects and related activities that have the potential to adversely affect fish and wildlife resources.

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

CDFW is also submitting comments as a Responsible Agency under CEQA. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21069; CEQA Guidelines, § 15381.) CDFW expects that it may need to exercise regulatory authority as provided by the Fish and Game Code. As proposed, for example, the Project may be subject to CDFW's lake and streambed alteration regulatory authority. (Fish & G. Code, § 1600 et seq.) Likewise, to the extent implementation of the Project as proposed may result in "take" as defined by State law of any species protected under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (Fish & G. Code, § 2050 et seq.), the Project proponent may seek related take authorization as provided by the Fish and Game Code.

PROJECT LOCATION

The City of Calimesa covers approximately 23.2 square miles and is bordered by unincorporated portions of Riverside County to the east and west, the City of Beaumont to the south, and the Cities of Yucaipa and Redlands the north. The RIPAOZ Project represents 36 parcels within the City. The proposed Project includes 36 parcels located east and west of Interstate-10 (I-10) throughout the City, Project Site. These properties are classified under five geographic areas. Specifically the RIPAOZ consists of: 1. Seven (7) parcels located west of I-10 (south of Avenue L); 2. Sixteen (16) parcels east of I-10 (south of Avenue L between 5th Street and 2nd Street); 3. Ten (10) parcels east of I-10 (south of Avenue L between 2nd Street and Bryant Street); 4. Two (2) parcels east I-10 (north of Avenue L between Bryant Street and Douglas Street); and 5. One (1) parcel along Buena Mesa Drive (south of the former Calimesa Country Club).

The site is located within the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-El Casco quadrangle; Township 2 South Range 2 West Sections 13, 14 and 24; and Township 2 South Range 1 West Section 30 of the San Bernardino Base and Meridian (SBBM).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

The proposed RIPAOZ Project intent is to comply with newly the adopted State residential laws requiring jurisdictions to increase the amount of housing opportunities available and to provide ways to meet their fair share of affordable housing units. To meet these requirements, the City of Calimesa has reviewed underutilized properties within City limits for their potential to increase density opportunities and is preparing a series of planning documents to allow up-zoning on these properties. The properties included within the proposed Project are vacant and undeveloped; or developed and zoned for residential usage, with exception of one property that has a split designation of residential and commercial.

The RIPAOZ identifies areas where residential infill development is encouraged; permits a flexible approach to providing affordable housing; aims to increase the variety of housing options in existing residential neighborhoods; fosters well-planned, compact developments keeping with the character of the existing neighborhood, promotes efficiency in the utilization of existing infrastructure and services, facilitates integrated physical design, promotes a high level of design quality, facilitates development

proposals responsive to current and future market conditions, and provides safe vehicular circulation patterns for residents and safety/service providers.

1. Specific Plan Amendment includes Zone Change 21-01 to amend City Municipal Code (CMC), Title 18 – Zoning, Land Use and Development Regulations; specifically Chapters 18.05 – General Provisions, 18.20 – Residential Zone Districts, 18.45 – Off-Street Parking, and 18.902.
2. General Plan Amendment (GPA) to amend the General Plan Land Use Element (Chapter 2).
3. Certify an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the zoning changes and GPA.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CDFW offers the comments and recommendations below to assist the City in adequately identifying and/or mitigating the Project's significant, or potentially significant, direct and indirect impacts on fish and wildlife (biological) resources. The comments and recommendations are also offered to enable the CDFW to adequately review and comment on the proposed Project with respect to the Project's consistency with the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).

CDFW recommends that the forthcoming DEIR address the following:

Assessment of Biological Resources

Section 15125(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states that knowledge of the regional setting of a project is critical to the assessment of environmental impacts and that special emphasis should be placed on environmental resources that are rare or unique to the region. To enable CDFW staff to adequately review and comment on the project, the DEIR should include a complete assessment of the flora and fauna within and adjacent to the Project footprint, with particular emphasis on identifying rare, threatened, endangered, and other sensitive species and their associated habitats.

CDFW recommends that the DEIR specifically include:

1. An assessment of the various habitat types located within the project footprint, and a map that identifies the location of each habitat type. CDFW recommends that floristic, alliance- and/or association-based mapping and assessment be completed

following *The Manual of California Vegetation*, second edition (Sawyer et al. 2009²). Adjoining habitat areas should also be included in this assessment where site activities could lead to direct or indirect impacts offsite. Habitat mapping at the alliance level will help establish baseline vegetation conditions.

2. A general biological inventory of the fish, amphibian, reptile, bird, and mammal species that are present or have the potential to be present within each habitat type onsite and within adjacent areas that could be affected by the project. CDFW's California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) in Sacramento should be contacted at (916) 322-2493 or CNDDDB@wildlife.ca.gov to obtain current information on any previously reported sensitive species and habitat, including Significant Natural Areas identified under Chapter 12 of the Fish and Game Code, in the vicinity of the proposed Project.

Please note that CDFW's CNDDDB is not exhaustive in terms of the data it houses, nor is it an absence database. CDFW recommends that it be used as a starting point in gathering information about the *potential presence* of species within the general area of the project site.

3. A complete, *recent* inventory of rare, threatened, endangered, and other sensitive species located within the Project footprint and within offsite areas with the potential to be affected, including California Species of Special Concern (CSSC) and California Fully Protected Species (Fish & G. Code, § 3511). Species to be addressed should include all those which meet the CEQA definition (CEQA Guidelines § 15380). The inventory should address seasonal variations in use of the Project area and should not be limited to resident species. Focused species-specific surveys completed by a qualified biologist and conducted at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, are required. Acceptable species-specific survey procedures should be developed in consultation with CDFW and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, where necessary. Note that CDFW generally considers biological field assessments for wildlife to be valid for a one-year period, and assessments for rare plants may be considered valid for a period of up to three years. Some aspects of the proposed Project may warrant periodic updated surveys for certain sensitive taxa, particularly if the Project is proposed to occur over a protracted time frame, or in phases, or if surveys are completed during periods of drought.
4. A thorough, recent, floristic-based assessment of special status plants and natural

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

communities, following CDFW's *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities* (CDFW 2018³).

5. Information on the regional setting that is critical to an assessment of environmental impacts, with special emphasis on resources that are rare or unique to the region (CEQA Guidelines § 15125[c]).
6. A full accounting of all open space and mitigation/conservation lands within and adjacent to the Project.

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

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

1. A discussion of potential impacts from lighting, noise, human activity (e.g., recreation and dumping), defensible space, and wildlife-human interactions created by zoning of development projects or other project activities adjacent to natural areas, exotic and/or invasive species, and drainage. The latter subject should address Project-related changes on drainage patterns and water quality within, upstream, and downstream of the Project site, including: volume, velocity, and frequency of existing and post-Project surface flows; polluted runoff; soil erosion and/or sedimentation in streams and water bodies; and post-Project fate of runoff from the Project site.
2. A discussion of potential indirect Project impacts on biological resources, including resources in areas adjacent to the project footprint, such as nearby public lands (e.g. National Forests, State Parks, etc.), open space, adjacent natural habitats, riparian ecosystems, wildlife corridors, and any designated and/or proposed reserve or mitigation lands (e.g., preserved lands associated with a Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other conserved lands).

Please note that the Project area supports significant biological resources and contains habitat connections, providing for wildlife movement across the broader landscape, sustaining both transitory and permanent wildlife populations. CDFW encourages project design that avoids and preserves onsite features that contribute to habitat connectivity, with a particularly focus on the onsite drainages that convey water, sand and nutrients across the site in a southeasterly direction and eventually into Smith Creek. The drainages include ecologically valuable ephemeral wash and

³ California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2018. *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plan Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities*. State of California, Natural Resources Agency. Available for download at: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Plants>

other habitat. The DEIR should include a discussion of both direct and indirect impacts to wildlife movement and connectivity, including maintenance of wildlife corridor/movement areas to adjacent undisturbed habitats.

3. An evaluation of impacts to on-site and adjacent open space lands from both the construction of the Project and any long-term operational and maintenance needs.
4. A cumulative effects analysis developed as described under CEQA Guidelines section 15130. Please include all potential direct and indirect Project related impacts to riparian areas, wetlands, vernal pools, alluvial fan habitats, wildlife corridors or wildlife movement areas, aquatic habitats, sensitive species and other sensitive habitats, open lands, open space, and adjacent natural habitats in the cumulative effects analysis. General and specific plans, as well as past, present, and anticipated future projects, should be analyzed relative to their impacts on similar plant communities and wildlife habitats.

Alternatives Analysis

CDFW recommends the DEIR describe and analyze a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project that are potentially feasible, would “feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project,” and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the Project’s significant effects (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6[a]). Alternatives might include the inclusion of additional buffer habitat surrounding the drainages that are planned as conserved habitat within the project area. The alternatives analysis should also evaluate a “no project” alternative (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6[e]).

Mitigation Measures for Project Impacts to Biological Resources

The DEIR should identify mitigation measures and alternatives that are appropriate and adequate to avoid or minimize potential impacts, to the extent feasible. The City of Calimesa should assess all direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that are expected to occur as a result of the implementation of the Project and its long-term operation and maintenance. When proposing measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts, CDFW recommends consideration of the following:

1. *Fully Protected Species*: Fully protected species may not be taken or possessed at any time. Project activities described in the DEIR should be designed to completely avoid any fully protected species that have the potential to be present within or adjacent to the Project area. CDFW also recommends that the DEIR fully analyze potential adverse impacts to fully protected species due to habitat modification, loss of foraging habitat, and/or interruption of migratory and breeding behaviors. CDFW recommends that the Lead Agency include in the analysis how appropriate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures will reduce indirect impacts to fully protected species.

2. *Sensitive Plant Communities*: CDFW considers sensitive plant communities to be imperiled habitats having both local and regional significance. Plant communities, alliances, and associations with a statewide ranking of S-1, S-2, S-3, and S-4 should be considered sensitive and declining at the local and regional level. These ranks can be obtained by querying the CNDDDB and are included in *The Manual of California Vegetation* (Sawyer et al. 2009). The DEIR should include measures to fully avoid and otherwise protect sensitive plant communities from project-related direct and indirect impacts.
3. *California Species of Special Concern (CSSC)*: CSSC status applies to animals generally not listed under the federal Endangered Species Act or the CESA, but which nonetheless are declining at a rate that could result in listing, or historically occurred in low numbers and known threats to their persistence currently exist. CSSCs should be considered during the environmental review process. CSSC that have the potential or have been documented to occur within or adjacent to the project area include, but are not limited to: burrowing owl, loggerhead shrike, northern harrier and yellow warbler.
4. *Mitigation*: CDFW considers adverse project-related impacts to sensitive species and habitats to be significant to both local and regional ecosystems, and the DEIR should include mitigation measures for adverse project-related impacts to these resources. Mitigation measures should emphasize avoidance and reduction of project impacts. For unavoidable impacts, onsite habitat restoration and/or enhancement, and preservation should be evaluated and discussed in detail. Where habitat preservation is not available onsite, offsite land acquisition, management, and preservation should be evaluated and discussed in detail.

The DEIR should include measures to perpetually protect the targeted habitat values within mitigation areas from direct and indirect adverse impacts in order to meet mitigation objectives to offset project-induced qualitative and quantitative losses of biological values. Specific issues that should be addressed include restrictions on access, proposed land dedications, long-term monitoring and management programs, control of illegal dumping, water pollution, increased human intrusion, etc.

If sensitive species and/or their habitat may be impacted from the Project, CDFW recommends the inclusion of specific mitigation in the DEIR. CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4, subdivision (a)(1)(8) states that formulation of feasible mitigation measures should not be deferred until some future date. The Court of Appeal in *San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center v. County of Merced* (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 645 struck down mitigation measures which required formulating management plans developed in consultation with State and Federal wildlife agencies after Project approval. Courts have also repeatedly not supported conclusions that impacts are mitigable when essential studies, and therefore impact assessments, are incomplete (*Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d. 296; *Gentry v. City of Murrieta* (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1359; *Endangered Habitat League, Inc. v. County of Orange* (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 777).

CDFW recommends that the DEIR specify mitigation that is roughly proportional to the level of impacts, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4(a)(4)(B), 15064, 15065, and 16355). The mitigation should provide long-term conservation value for the suite of species and habitat being impacted by the Project. Furthermore, in order for mitigation measures to be effective, they need to be specific, enforceable, and feasible actions that will improve environmental conditions.

5. *Habitat Revegetation/Restoration Plans*: Plans for restoration and revegetation should be prepared by persons with expertise in southern California ecosystems and native plant restoration techniques. Plans should identify the assumptions used to develop the proposed restoration strategy. Each plan should include, at a minimum: (a) the location of restoration sites and assessment of appropriate reference sites; (b) the plant species to be used, sources of local propagules, container sizes, and seeding rates; (c) a schematic depicting the mitigation area; (d) a local seed and cuttings and planting schedule; (e) a description of the irrigation methodology; (f) measures to control exotic vegetation on site; (g) specific success criteria; (h) a detailed monitoring program; (i) contingency measures should the success criteria not be met; and (j) identification of the party responsible for meeting the success criteria and providing for conservation of the mitigation site in perpetuity. Monitoring of restoration areas should extend across a sufficient time frame to ensure that the new habitat is established, self-sustaining, and capable of surviving drought.

CDFW recommends that local onsite propagules from the Project area and nearby vicinity be collected and used for restoration purposes. Onsite seed collection should be initiated in order to accumulate sufficient propagule material for subsequent use in future years. Onsite vegetation mapping at the alliance and/or association level should be used to develop appropriate restoration goals and local plant palettes. Reference areas should be identified to help guide restoration efforts. Specific restoration plans should be developed for various project components as appropriate.

Restoration objectives should include protecting special habitat elements or re-creating them in areas affected by the Project; examples could include retention of woody material, logs, snags, rocks, and brush piles.

6. *Nesting Birds and Migratory Bird Treaty Act*: Please note that it is the Project proponent's responsibility to comply with all applicable laws related to nesting birds and birds of prey. Fish and Game Code sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 afford protective measures as follows: Fish and Game Code section 3503 makes it unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird, except as otherwise provided by Fish and Game Code or any regulation made pursuant thereto. Fish and Game Code section 3503.5 makes it unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any birds in the orders Falconiformes or Strigiformes (birds-of-prey) to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any such bird except as otherwise provided by Fish and Game Code or any regulation adopted pursuant thereto. Fish and Game

Code section 3513 makes it unlawful to take or possess any migratory nongame bird as designated in the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or any part of such migratory nongame bird except as provided by rules and regulations adopted by the Secretary of the Interior under provisions of the Migratory Treaty Act.

CDFW recommends that the DEIR include the results of avian surveys, as well as specific avoidance and minimization measures to ensure that impacts to nesting birds do not occur. Project-specific avoidance and minimization measures may include, but not be limited to: project phasing and timing, monitoring of project-related noise (where applicable), sound walls, and buffers, where appropriate. The DEIR should also include specific avoidance and minimization measures that will be implemented should a nest be located within the project site. If pre-construction surveys are proposed in the DEIR, the CDFW recommends that they be required no more than three (3) days prior to vegetation clearing or ground disturbance activities, as instances of nesting could be missed if surveys are conducted sooner.

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

Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan

CDFW issued Natural Community Conservation Plan Approval and Take Authorization for the Western Riverside County MSHCP per Section 2800, *et seq.*, of the California Fish and Game Code on June 22, 2004. The MSHCP establishes a multiple species conservation program to minimize and mitigate habitat loss and provides for the incidental take of covered species in association with activities covered under the permit.

Compliance with approved habitat plans, such as the MSHCP, is discussed in CEQA. Specifically, Section 15125(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that the CEQA document discuss any inconsistencies between a proposed Project and applicable general plans and regional plans, including habitat conservation plans and natural

community conservation plans. An assessment of the impacts to the MSHCP as a result of this Project is necessary to address CEQA requirements. To obtain additional information regarding the MSHCP please go to: <http://rctlma.org/epd/WR-MSHCP>.

The proposed Project occurs within the MSHCP area and is subject to the provisions and policies of the MSHCP. To be considered a covered activity, Permittees need to demonstrate that proposed actions are consistent with the MSHCP, the Permits, and the Implementing Agreement. The City of Calimesa is the Lead Agency and is signatory to the Implementing Agreement of the MSHCP. To demonstrate consistency with the MSHCP CDFW recommends that the DEIR address, at a minimum, the City's obligations as follows:

1. Addressing the collection of fees as set forth in Section 8.5 of the MSHCP.
2. Completion of Joint Project/Acquisition Review Process set forth in Section 6.6.2 of the MSHCP.
3. Demonstrating how the Project complies with the policies for the Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools, set forth in Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP; the policies for the Protection of Narrow Endemic Plant Species set forth in Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP; compliance with the Urban/Wildlands Interface Guidelines as set forth in Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP; the policies for set forth in Section 6.3.2 and associated vegetation survey requirements identified in Section 6.3.1; and compliance with the Best Management Practices and the siting, construction, design, operation and maintenance guidelines as set forth in Section 7.0 and Appendix C of the MSHCP.

Because the Project is located within the MSHCP Criteria Area, pursuant to the Implementing Agreement, public and private projects are expected to be designed and implemented in accordance with the Criteria for each Area Plan presented in Section 3.2 of the MSHCP and all other MSHCP requirements as set forth in the MSHCP and in Section 13.0 of the Implementing Agreement. Section 13.2 of the Implementing Agreement identifies that City obligations under the MSHCP and the Implementing Agreement include, but are not limited to: the adoption and maintenance of ordinances or resolutions (Resolution No. 2004-10, Ordinance No. 377) , as necessary, and the amendment of general plans as appropriate, to implement the requirements and to fulfill the purposes of the Permits, the MSHCP, and the Implementing Agreement for private and public development projects (including siting, construction, design, operation and maintenance guidelines as set forth in Section 7.0 and Appendix C of the MSHCP); and taking all necessary and appropriate actions, following applicable land use permit enforcement procedures and practices, to enforce the terms of the project approvals for public and private projects, including compliance with the MSHCP, the Permits, and the Implementing Agreement. The City is also obligated to notify the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA), through the Joint Project/Acquisition Review Process set forth in Section 6.6.2 of the MSHCP, or proposed discretionary

Projects within the Criteria Area and participate in any further requirements imposed by MSHCP Section 6.6.2.

To examine how the Project might contribute to, or conflict with, assembly of the MSHCP Conservation Area consistent with the reserve configuration requirements CDFW recommends that the DEIR identify the specific Area Plan and Area Plan Subunit within which the Project is located, and the associated Planning Species and Biological Issues and Considerations that may apply to the Project. The DEIR should also discuss the specific Criteria for the identified Cell or Cell Group within which the Project is located and identify the associated Core and/or Linkage. Next, the DEIR should identify the vegetation communities toward which conservation should be directed along with the connectivity requirements. Finally, the DEIR should examine the Project with respect to the percentage conservation portion of the Cell Criteria. Following this sequential identification of the relationship of the Project to the MSHCP the DEIR should then include an in-depth discussion of the Project in the context of these aforementioned elements, and as mentioned, examine how the Project might contribute to, or conflict with, the conservation criteria of the MSHCP.

For example, a portion of the NOP describes the Project being located within the Badlands/ San Bernardino National Forest Subunit (SU2) of the Pass Area Plan and that one property (APN 413-320-003) occurs entirely within MSHCP Criteria Cell 410 and three properties (APNs 411-200-022, 411-200-007, and 411- 200-008) are in Criteria Cell 323. Conservation within Cell 323 will range from 5%-15% focusing on the southern portion of the Cell. Conservation within Criteria Cell 410 will focus on 30-40% conservation of chaparral and grassland habitat as connection between Criteria Cells 411 to the west and 407 to the east. The MSHCP states that conservation within Cells 323 and 410 will contribute to assembly of Proposed Constrained Linkage 23. Thus, conservation within Criteria Cells 323 and 410 would contribute to Proposed Constrained Linkage 23 as it is describes as the west to east connection between the Western Riverside Badlands and San Bernardino National Forest.

Based on the existing development within the Criteria Cells it is likely that the described conservation is unachievable. Criteria Cell 323 is approximately 160 acres, with described conservation of 5-15% of the cell focused on the southern portion, therefore approximately 8-24 acres should be identified for conservation in the southern portion. Criteria Cell 410 is approximately 160 acres, with described conservation of 30-40% of the cell focused on the eastern portion, therefore approximately 64-88 acres should be identified for conservation on the eastern portion. However, zero acres have been conserved, and the goals for the wildlife linkage, Proposed Constrained Linkage 23, appear difficult to achieve.

CDFW recommends that the project is modified to provide the described conservation for the Criteria Cells 323 and 410 that is consistent with MSHCP implementation procedures or the City addresses the acreage shortfall for described conservation through the Criteria Refinement Process in Section 6.5 of the MSHCP. The Criteria Refinement Process was included in the MSHCP specifically to address and mitigate

instances where project proponents or MSHCP permittees choose or seek to adopt projects that do not adhere to the MSHCP Cell Criteria.

Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools.

The MSHCP, Section 6.1.2, identifies that information necessary for the assessment of riparian/riverine and vernal resources includes identification and mapping of riparian/riverine areas and vernal pools. The assessment shall consider species composition, topography/ hydrology, and soil analysis, where appropriate. The assessment may be completed as part of the CEQA review process as set forth in Article V of the State CEQA Guidelines.

The documentation for the assessment shall include mapping and a description of the functions and values of the mapped areas with respect to the species listed above, under "Purpose." Factors to be considered include hydrologic regime, flood storage and flood flow modification, nutrient retention and transformation, sediment trapping and transport, toxicant trapping, public use, wildlife Habitat, and aquatic Habitat. The functions and values assessment will focus on those areas that should be considered for priority acquisition for the MSHCP Conservation Area, as well as those functions that may affect downstream values related to Conservation of Covered Species within the MSHCP.

The MSHCP identifies that for mapped riparian/riverine and vernal pool resources that are not included in the MSHCP conservation area, applicable mitigation under CEQA, shall be imposed by the Permittee (in this case the City). Further, the MSHCP identifies that to ensure the standards in Section 6.1.2 are met, the Permittee shall ensure that, through the CEQA process, project applicants develop project alternatives demonstrating efforts that first avoid, and then minimize direct and indirect effects to the wetlands mapped pursuant to Section 6.1.2. If an avoidance alternative is not Feasible, a practicable alternative that minimizes direct and indirect effects to riparian/riverine areas and vernal pools and associated functions and values to the greatest extent possible shall be selected. Those impacts that are unavoidable shall be mitigated such that the lost functions and values as they relate to Covered Species are replaced as through the Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation. The Applicant should complete the Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation process prior to completion of the DEIR to demonstrate implementation of MSHCP requirements in the CEQA documentation.

The following are covered species that are conserved under the MSHCP based on the location of the project site:

Burrowing Owl (*Athene cunicularia*)

The Project site has the potential to provide suitable foraging and/or nesting habitat for burrowing owl. Take of individual burrowing owls and their nests is defined by Fish and Game Code section 86, and prohibited by sections 3503, 3503.5 and 3513.

Take is defined in Fish and Game Code section 86 as “hunt, pursue, catch, capture or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture or kill.”

CDFW recommends that the City of Calimesa follow the recommendations and guidelines provided in the *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (CDFG 2012⁴). The Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation, specifies three steps for project impact evaluations:

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

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

Additionally, CDFW recommends that the City of Calimesa review and follow requirements for burrowing owl outlined in the MSHCP, specifically Section 6.3.2 (Additional Survey Needs and Procedures) and Appendix E (Summary of Species Survey Requirements). Appendix E of the MSHCP outlines survey requirements, actions to be taken if survey results are positive, and species-specific conservation objectives, among other relevant information.

Narrow Endemic and Criteria Area Species Plants

The Project site has the potential to provide suitable habitat for narrow endemic species identified in the MSHCP, including Munz's onion (*Allium munzii*), San Diego ambrosia (*Ambrosia pumila*), slender-horned spineflower (*Dodecahema leptoceras*), many-stemmed dudleya (*Dudleya multicaulis*), spreading navarretia (*Navarretia fossalis*), California Orcutt grass (*Orcuttia californica*), San Miguel savory (*Satureja*

⁴ California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 2012. Staff report of burrowing owl mitigation. State of California, Natural Resources Agency. Available for download at: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/survey_monitor.html

chandleri), Hammitt's clay-cress (*Sibaropsis hammittii*), Wrights's trichocoronis (*Trichocoronis wrightii* var *wrightii*), many-stemmed dudleya (*Dudleya multicaulis*). In addition, the Project site has the potential to provide suitable habitat for Criteria Area Species identified in the MSHCP, including thread-leaved brodiaea (*Brodiaea filifolia*), Davidson's saltscale (*Atriplex serenana* var. *davidsonii*), Parish's brittlescale (*Atriplex parishii*), Smooth tarplant, round-leaved filaree (*Erodium macrophyllum*), Coulter's goldfields (*Lasthenia glabrata* ssp. *Coulteri*), little mousetail (*Myosurus minimus*). CDFW recommends that the City of Calimesa review and follow requirements for these plant species outlined in the MSHCP, specifically Section 6.1.3 (Protection of Narrow Endemic Plan Species), Section 6.3.2 (Additional Survey Needs and Procedures) and Appendix E (Summary of Species Survey Requirements). Appendix E of the MSHCP outlines survey requirements, actions to be taken if survey results are positive, and species-specific conservation objectives, among other relevant information.

Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan

The Project occurs within the Stephens' kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys stephensi*) Habitat Conservation Plan (SKR HCP) fee area boundary. State and federal authorizations associated with the SKR HCP provide take authorization for Stephens' kangaroo rat within its boundaries, and the MSHCP provides Take Authorization for Stephens' kangaroo rat outside of the boundaries of the SKR HCP, but within the MSHCP area boundaries. The DEIR should identify if any portion of the Project will occur on SKR HCP lands, or on Stephens' kangaroo rat habitat lands outside of the SKR HCP, but within the MSHCP. Note that the SKR HCP allows for encroachment into the Stephens' kangaroo rat Core Reserve for public projects, however, there are no provisions for encroachment into the Core Reserve for privately owned projects. If impacts to Stephens' kangaroo rat habitat will occur from the proposed Project, the DEIR should specifically identify the total number of permanent impacts to Stephens' kangaroo rat core habitat and the appropriate mitigation to compensate for those impacts.

Lake and Streambed Alteration Program

Based on review of material submitted with the NOP and review of aerial photography, at least three drainage features traverse the site. Depending on how the Project is designed and constructed, it is likely that the Project applicant will need to notify CDFW per Fish and Game Code section 1602. Fish and Game Code section 1602 requires an entity to notify CDFW prior to commencing any activity that may do one or more of the following: Substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of any river, stream or lake; Substantially change or use any material from the bed, channel or bank of any river, stream, or lake; or Deposit debris, waste or other materials that could pass into any river, stream or lake. Please note that "any river, stream or lake" includes those that are episodic (i.e., those that are dry for periods of time) as well as those that are perennial (i.e., those that flow year-round). This includes ephemeral streams, desert washes, and watercourses with a subsurface flow..

Upon receipt of a complete notification, CDFW determines if the proposed Project activities may substantially adversely affect existing fish and wildlife resources and whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement is required. An LSA Agreement includes measures necessary to protect existing fish and wildlife resources. CDFW may suggest ways to modify your Project that would eliminate or reduce harmful impacts to fish and wildlife resources.

CDFW's issuance of an LSA Agreement is a "project" subject to CEQA (see Pub. Resources Code § 21065). To facilitate issuance of an LSA Agreement, if necessary, the DEIR should fully identify the potential impacts to the lake, stream, or riparian resources, and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, and monitoring and reporting commitments. Early consultation with CDFW is recommended, since modification of the proposed Project may be required to avoid or reduce impacts to fish and wildlife resources. To obtain a Lake or Streambed Alteration notification package, please go to <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/LSA/Forms>.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

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

Kelly Lucia
City of Calimesa
April 27, 2022
Page 16 of 16

FILING FEES

The Project, as proposed, would have an impact on fish and/or wildlife, and assessment of filing fees is necessary. Fees are payable upon filing of the Notice of Determination by the Lead Agency and serve to help defray the cost of environmental review by CDFW. Payment of the fee is required in order for the underlying project approval to be operative, vested, and final. (Cal. Code Regs, tit. 14, § 753.5; Fish & G. Code, § 711.4; Pub. Resources Code, § 21089.).

CONCLUSION

CDFW appreciates the opportunity to comment on the NOP of a DEIR for the Renaissance Ranch Project and recommends that the City of Calimesa address the CDFW's comments and concerns in the forthcoming DEIR. If you should have any questions pertaining to the comments provided in this letter, please contact John Dempsey, Environmental Scientist at john.dempsey@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

84F92FFEEFD24C8...

For
Scott Wilson
Environmental Program Manager

ec: Heather Pert, Senior Environmental Scientist, Supervisor
Inland Deserts Region
heather.pert@wildlife.ca.gov

Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse, Sacramento
state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov

Tricia Campbell (Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority)
Director of Reserve Management and Monitoring
tcampbell@rctc.org

REFERENCES

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 2012. Staff report of burrowing owl mitigation. State of California, Natural Resources Agency. Available for download at: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/survev_monitor.html